Daily Globe.

BY H. P. HALL.

NO. 17, WABASHAW STREET, ST. PAUL.

Terms of Subscription to the Daily Globe.

By Carrier, per month	..85c	By Mail, per month	...75c
" 3 months	..$2.50	" 3 months	..$2.25
" 6 months	.. 5.00	" 6 months	.. 4.00
" 12 months	..10.00	" 12 months	.. 8.00

ST. PAUL, MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1878.

THE ISSUE.

The question for members of the Legislature to consider, is whether they should collect a private claim which properly belongs in the courts, or secure a second Pacific railroad for Minnesota. It ought not to take a great while to decide this point.

NO SURRENDER.

The whole plan of State text books for schools is pernicious, and one which should never have been inaugurated. Instead of strengthening what has been done, it ought to be wiped out altogether. As a general rule, however, it is pretty safe to leave a doubtful measure to the people. This is particularly so where the proposed measure is one directly affecting the pockets of the people. In this view it is perhaps as well for the Merrill-Appleton law of last winter to stand and be tested, provided the people can have an opportunity to decide upon it. Mr. Donnelly depicts the saving to the people by this bill as aggregating hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, but with a strange pertinacity Mr. D. steadily fights off any movement to submit the matter to the people. Is he afraid to trust the people with a matter which is to save them hundreds of thousands of dollars. Is Mr. Donnelly more interested in the welfare of the people than the people are themselves?

It will be singular if the House allows itself to be bamboozled into rejecting the Feller amendment, and accepting Mr. Donnelly's. The Feller amendment is especially exacting in that it requires three-fourths of the people to reject the Merrill Appleton books, but it has the advantage of allowing a vote at any general election instead of fastening the books on the people by force for five years before they can be heard.

The House should remember in considering this matter that the people are as competent to protect their interests as is a legislative body. The people do not delegate more than they can perform themselves. As the representatives of the people the House should resent the cavalier course of the Senate. The attempt to cram the Senate amendments down the throats of the House is on a par with the original plan to cram the whole job down the throats of the people. Duty as well as self-respect demands that the House should stand by its amendment.

A REMARKABLE CHANGE.

County Clerk Kiefer and Sheriff Becht both furnish statements showing that they are poorly paid officers, and that instead of having the emoluments of their respective offices reduced they ought to be increased. This is really a remarkable state of affairs. Those offices were held by Democrats for a great many years, and during that period we learned, from Republicans, that they were very lucrative positions. They were held up as the great source of taxation, and one might have supposed that if the throats of the Democratic clerk and the Democratic sheriff could be cut, our taxes would be reduced almost to nothing. The most fabulous stories prevailed, and the amount said to be expended to retain those places was placed at a royal figure.

It happens that those positions are now held by Republicans, and, *presto*, we learn from them and Republicans generally that they used to be very fat offices, but are now so attenuated that it is difficult to make a living. We do not know what freak of nature has been developed to produce this sudden transformation, but evidently something has happened. We cannot account for it on the theory that "it makes some difference whose ox is gored," for we are sure our Republican friends would take as much delight in reducing Republican salaries as Democratic. There have been so many instances of self-sacrifice by the Republicans that we are certain of this. In fact, we are approaching a frame of mind which prepares us to see the present incumbents turn over those offices to Armstrong and King as a noble revenge.

We are really very sorry for these gentlemen. We are sorry they were elected and they ought to be sorry also, for if they had been defeated, Democrats would have been elected and the small pay would have ruined the Democratic party. Their loyalty to their party ought to make Messrs. Kiefer and Becht greatly regret their election, especially when they are losing so much money by holding the offices.

LOCAL OPTION ON SCHOOL BOOKS.

The advocates of the Merrill-Appleton text book bill seem to be ready to go to any length to cheat and defraud the people of the State.

They first oppose all plans looking to the submission to the people of the question of whether they will take the books or not.

They propose to run their machine independently of the people, except they are to be graciously allowed to PAY for the books.

When Donnelly and his followers find that the honest members of the House are determined to allow the people to have something to say in the matter, they begin to cudgel their brains to devise some trick to defeat the people's choice at last. Senator Donnelly gets a vote in the Senate striking out the Feller amendment, and substituting one of his own which provides for a submission of the question in 1883, or five years after the people have been forced to take the books.

This is neither fair nor honest. If Mr. Donnelly fears to allow the people any choice, he should say so, and vote accordingly. But if he is willing that the people should have a voice in choosing these books, he should not oppose, and cannot honestly oppose the submission of the question to a popular vote, in each and every county this fall, and before expensive changes are inaugurated all over the State.

This course will secure county uniformity which is better than State uniformity, even if that were attainable under the Merrill law.

Mr. Donnelly said in the Senate that the friends of the measure were willing to let the people vote upon the question. If this is to be done, the sooner it is done the better, and no scheme to fasten the law upon the people and then allow them to vote afterwards should be for a moment tolerated.

The House has taken a new stand in the people's interest and should stand firm, and not allow the Senate to "bull-doze" them into the placing of the school fund at the mercy of the Merrill-Appleton-Donnelly crowd.

CATHOLIC VS. EPISCOPAL.

BISHOP IRELAND REPLIES TO REV. E. S. THOMAS.

He Boldly Intimates That Mr. Thomas Plagiarizes--And Controverts Dr. Pusey's Argument--A Vigorous Defense of Catholicism.

Last night, as hitherto on occasions of Bishop Ireland's controversed discourses, the cathedral was crowded beyond standing room. Immediately after vespers the bishop ascended the pulpit. He looked somewhat pale from the indisposition, amounting almost to serious illness, from which he was suffering the first two or three days of last week. Every head was turned in breathless attention toward the pulpit, and the bishop looked down upon the vast sea of upturned faces with calm dignity, and after several moments of silence which the fall of a feather might have broken, he gave out his text in a low but distinct voice. His sentences throughout the lengthy discourse were slowly uttered, and even when warmed to his subject he was not hurried. Sentence after sentence, and argument after argument were delivered with such a calm dispassionate earnestness and deliberate positiveness, that needs must carry conviction to the immense audience, if not of the incontrovertible truth of his deductions, at least of the speaker's own faith in what he preached. Many times during the lecture, the congregation audibly showed how keenly the salient points were appreciated. The subject was "The Protestant Episcopal Church and Religious Communism." In reply to Rev. E. S. Thomas, the Bishop said:

Going ye, therefore, teach all nations.--Matth. 28th chap., 19-20 vs.

The opponent this evening is Rev. E. S. Thomas, of the Protestant Episcopal church in this city.

I am grateful to him that he has seen fit to comment on my lectures against Protestantism. He represents a peculiar phase of Protestantism—the Protestant Episcopal church—a very Proteus among modern sects, well known for its skill in changing its position according to the direction of the attack. When brought to face other branches of Protestantism, which it contemptuously spurns from its side, as sects, schisms, dissenting conventicles, it leaps upon lofty Catholic ground, and would fain spread dismay amidst their ranks by the echoes of the old-time trumpets of church authority. An English poet, Dryden, has depicted the Episcopal church in this attitude:

"Her front erect with majesty she bore,
The crosier wielded, and the mitre wore.
Her upper part of decent discipline
Show'd affectation of an ancient line;
And fathers, councils, church and church's head,
Were on her reverend phylacteries read."

Should the Catholic church, however, appear in the front, the Episcopal tactics change at once, with a rapidity and self-possession that amaze. The Episcopal church becomes most Protestant among Protestants. Tradition and council are tried by scripture, and scripture by reason. Authority in church is laughed at, as a spectre of dark ages, from the vain terrors of which, it is declared, the valiant Henry, and the virgin queen Elizabeth, some three centuries ago, wrested forever England and her fortunate dependencies. The same poet has the old church say to her Anglican adversary—when the combat is engaged between the two:

"But you tradition by the scripture try:
Pursued by sect, from this to that you fly;
Nor dare on one foundation to rely.
The Word is then deposed, and in this view,
You rule the scripture, not the scripture you.
Thus (said the dame, and, smiling, thus pursued)
I see, tradition then is disallowed,
When not evinced by scripture to be true;
And scripture, as interpreted by you."

Aware of the special characteristics of the Protestant Episcopal church, I had always within me, while delivering my lectures against Protestantism, the feeling that my Episcopal friends, occupying for the nonce in their own fancy a corner of the Catholic ground, might deem that my arguments were not intended for them, or, at least, were such as to do them no sensible harm. I had come to the conclusion that a separate lecture was necessary, to establish the complete Protestantism of their sect. The occasion was wanting, and Rev. E. S. Thomas has kindly afforded it.

This reply has been the more gratifying, that his mere giving it goes far to prove my thesis. I was simply announced as being at war with Protestantism ; no mention whatever was made of the Episcopal church. Mr. Thomas, nevertheless, at the call of Protestantism, appears among its trusted defenders in the arena ; he instinctively took to his true colors.

Mr. Thomas dreads controversy. "The growing spirit of toleration in this 19th century," he says, "ought to discourage Christian polemics," and then, he tells us, the (Protestant) clergy have something better to do, as "they have resting upon them the care of souls." I am, certainly, pleased that my clerical friends in Protestantism esteem so highly the care of souls. But I beg leave to remind them that the first duty of a Christian pastor is to feed his flock with truth. The commission of the chief pastor to his delegates was, "Going ye, therefore, teach all nations—teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded unto you." Holiness of character, even, so much valued by Christ, is made by himself to be the result of truth. His prayer to the Father for his disciples is, "Sanctify them in truth ; thy word is truth." To teach Christ's truth men must be sent. "How," asks St. Paul, "shall they preach, unless they be sent"? Christian pastors owe to their flocks to prove that they have commission to preach, and this done, they owe to them the full teaching of Christ, not leaving out, to use the words of the Master, "one jot or tittle." The graces of sanctification, to be relied upon in the care of souls, will not surely be looked for among the theories of philosophers, or the mere resources of human nature: they are Christ's gifts. Pastors must tell their flocks where the gifts are treasured up and through what channels they can be secured. This work the world will call controversy; yet Christ and his apostles enjoin it, and men professing to be Christ's ministers should not heed the world. "The growing spirit of toleration in this 19th century" is but indifference to truth: it is the sleep of death passing over souls. Mr. Thomas should ask himself if there is no danger that by rocking souls into this sleep, he is not rushing them to perdition. The principles he advocates were not those of the Savior, who said: "Preach to every creature: he that believeth not shall be condemned"—nor those of St. Paul, who wrote to Timothy: "Preach the word in season and out of season * * * rebuke with all patience and doctrine."

Once entered upon this task, Mr. Thomas, I am pleased to bear him testimony in this regard, fulfills it—not, indeed, with all doctrine—but with all patience. There is in his discourse no bitterness, nor acrimony, as there never should be in religious controversy. A vein of humor, even, occasionally runs through his deliverances. He speaks in one place of the vaunting Goliath striding up and down the valley of strife. The allusion, you understand, is to the late onslaught made by a David of St. Paul. I will only blame Mr. Thomas for having by his own act impaired the simile: There should be but one David for a Goliath.

I will state briefly the whole question at issue in the present controversy. I would style it "Authority vs. Communism." Rev. Mr. Breed, in a sermon preached in the House of Hope, defined most correctly religious communism—the exact counterpart in religion of civil communism in the domain of politics—and held it up with righteous indignation to the opprobrium of his audience. I adopted Mr. Breed's premises and proved that Protestantism, in its very principles and all its logical deductions, is religious communism. That Christ should have been the author of this religious communism, I added, we cannot for a moment suppose, and I asked the question what, in fact, Christ did establish. I gave the answer from Christian history—exactly what common sense tells us he must have established, since He is God—an authority in religion. He appointed a body of men to be the teachers of his revelation—a high court for the preservation and interpretation of his doctrine. To these teachers he commanded that all men should render obedience: for the proper fulfillment of their office he promised to them His own protection—infallibility—and then, in the name of Omnipotence, He bade this court—the body of teachers—to be perpetuatal. "Preach the gospel to every creature—he that believeth not shall be condemned." "As the Father sent me, so also I send you." "All power is given to me in Heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have said unto you—and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." The conclusion, so far as it affects the present generation of Christians. I stated as follows: Christ's appointment of a body of living, infallible teachers, once admitted as his rule of faith for His church, such a body of men, we must grant, exists in the world to-day, and as one body of men only, the heirarchy of the Catholic church in obedience to the Pontiff of Rome—puts forward even a claim to infallible teaching, these teachers are necessarily Christ's teachers, the Catholic church in communion with Rome is Christ's church. The historical connection, I continued, between the Catholic church of to-day and the church of the apostles is easily shown by a perusal of the documents of history, but the examination of documents is not at all necessary for the completeness of the conclusion I have drawn.

Mr. Breed in his reply entirely overlooked the historic ground of my argument, which is after all my stronghold. I mean Christ's positive institution of a body of infallible teachers. His discourse was confined to a consideration of the two systems, as they appear before us to-day.

The same defect is visible in Mr. Thomas' reply. He aims to prove that Protestantism is not as bad as I make it to be, and he heaps up difficulties against the claims of the modern Catholic church to infallibility and to unity. Why not also battle against my position that Christ instituted an infallible Church? If this latter position be allowed, Protestantism, objectionable or unobjectionable as it may seem to us on its intrinsic merits, falls to the ground, and when, if ever, Mr. Thomas would have logically shifted from the scene the modern Catholic church, he should still have to show us, what would then be assuredly for him a most difficult task, where is to-day the infallible Church that Christ instituted.

I will now take up the positions followed out in Mr. Thomas' discourse.

He displays some skill in the partition of his subject. A defense of Protestantism was demanded, and a defense of Protestantism, he had said he would give. The task, however, no doubt, alarmed him, and he fell back on the old plan—an attack on "Romanism." The attack is the beginning, the middle and the end of his discourse—here and there only, by small slices at a time—does he wedge in the defense. The attack was not the point in question, but it was deemed easier, and the hearers, he thought, if possibly cajoled into the idea that the old church was made to totter, would thoughtlessly deem Protestantism safe, and call the whole discourse a defense!

Infallibility is the first target Mr. Thomas sets up for his thunderbolts. "There is in the theory of infallibility," he says, "a simplicity very attractive to a certain order of mind. The weak mind, unwilling to investigate for itself; the impatient mind, which desires to arrive at ultimate truth very quickly,and the tired mind, which, having essayed in vain to solve all the problems which grow out of man's relation to a personal God, has given up the effort in despair,—for all these classes of mind * * it may be well the Roman church exists." It cannot be well for them, Mr. Thomas, that the Roman church exists, if she is not the truth; an imposture is an evil; and such words in the mouth of one who rejects the claims of the Roman church are a depreciation of God's truth. The question of infallibility is by no means one of attractiveness for certain minds, but one of strict obligation upon all human minds, if God has established it, and you have not said one word in reply to my argument that God did establish upon earth an infallible authority. And are not your words bitter irony against all Protestantism, when you speak of "the tired mind, which having essayed in vain to solve all the problems which grow out of man's relation to a personal God, has given up the effort in despair." Who in Protestantism—rebellious Protestantism, which three centuries ago cut itself off from infallible authority—has ever assayed to solve religious problems, those most vital for one's own soul, without having been obliged to give up the effort in despair? "But," Mr. Thomas continues, "there must creep into the heart at times the doubt that perhaps after all the proofs of this claim be not sufficient, and oh, if not, what a sense of mental cowardice must attach to such a servitude." You may, indeed, call it servitude, if you can establish such doubt within our minds—but I indignantly ask on what grounds do you attribute to us at times such doubts? We have stated again and again the solid reasons of our convictions—Christ's own words to his apostles, and with those reasons before our minds, in regard to which you have observed an omnious silence, it is legitimate for us to ask, do not at least doubts by times cross your mind that Christ's institution must have a place on earth, and oh ! the sense of mental pain that follows—for you are in rebellion against that authority.

I had said, if the church were found fallible, she would have proved herself human. "You acknowledge too much," says Mr. Thomas to me. "We don't think your church is human; we don't believe that your ministry, your faith or your baptism came only from men, and yet the formal rulings of your infallible popes have been most sadly contradictory." Yes, Mr. Thomas, once found fallible, God has departed from her, she is human. You do not know the value before God of divine truth. He instituted His church to continue His own mission: "As the Father sent me, so also I send you." And that mission was to teach: "Teach all nations." Was error to be found in Christ's teaching? neither can it be in His church, which is "the pillar and the ground of truth." He will condemn those who listen not to His church: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned," And could Christ command belief in error? Therefore He promises to remain with His church "all days," A ministry, forsooth, from Christ, and deceiving men ! A faith from Christ, that is but a congeries of contradictory statement ! of course, you do not, with good reason, claim infallibility for the Protestant Episcopal church.

Therefore, say I, the Protestant Episcopal church has not inherited the promise: "Teach all nations * * * and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

"But the rulings of your infallible Popes have been sadly contradictory." Mr. Thomas gives instances. I cannot refrain from expressing my astonishment at the nature of the objections raised by Mr. Thomas against the Catholic position. They are simply irrelevant, and have to be at once ruled out of court as in no way affecting the case in point. Why did not Mr. Thomas, for his own reputation as a public speaker, study at least the Catholic position, before attacking it, so that his objections should not, by totally escaping the question at stake, be mere battling in the air? One fact slightly excuses him: he was in a hurry, and too innocently trusted his judgment to Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon, a book which Catholic controversalists have refuted a few hundred times within the last decade of years. The objections which, perhaps, the good people of St. Paul's church, on last Sunday evening, deemed the fresh and vigorous product of a week's cogitations, are, for the most part, a literal transcript of a few pages of the Eirenicon.

I will state the Catholic position on infallibility, giving the language of the Vatican Council: "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex-Cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of his office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, he defines, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the universal church, is endowed by the divine assistance, with that infallibility with which our divine Lord willed that the church should be furnished in defining doctrines of faith or morals." The subject matter of infallibility is limited to doctrines of faith and morals. The exercise of infallibility is confined to the one act of the pope's official teaching of the universal church.

Mr. Thomas tells us, one pope, Gregory, prohibits certain marriages on ground of divine law; another Pope, Innocent III, decides that in the divine law a dispensation cannot be given; still a third one, Alexander, grants a dispensation in some of the cases mentioned by Gregory. Are not the popes in contradition with themselves?

There is in the case no question of divine faith or morals. The objection is irrelevant, because outside the subject—matter of infallibility. The marriages contracted under papal dispensations were those prohibited by ecclesiastical law which the church makes or unmakes as she sees fit. The levitical laws on marriage have no binding force in the new dispensation except inasmuch as some of them may be at the same time natural laws. The reference by Gregory to the levitical law, when speaking of certain prohibited marriages, was merely as to a precedent, which justified the action of the Christian church. The divine law, from which Innocent said he could not dispense was the natural law. Nor was there contradiction of any kind between these Popes. Each one in his own time was the supreme moderator of church law, and had the same authority as his predecessors, whose laws he was free to change, or continue, in all and several cases. Dr. Pusey's profuse references to acts and decretals of Gregory, Innocent and Alexander, led Mr. Thomas to believe that he was this time in possession of a powerful objection. I would advise him to take for the future no second-hand reference: he should see the originals for himself.

A second objection. "Was St. Gregory the Great infallible," when he said, "the mediator of God and man is the rock from which Peter received his name and upon which He said He would build His Church?" An infallible Pope declaring that Peter is not the rock upon which the Church is built," Mr. Thomas thinks finishes Romanism. Most certainly, in this instance, Pope Gregory was not infallible. He was merely, when he said these words, preaching a sermon in one of the churches of Rome—speaking, Catholics would say, as a private doctor, not teaching the universal church. Be it right or wrong, what he said, an objection derived from it against the infallibility, is totally irrelevant.

Though speaking, however, only as a private doctor Gregory was most correct in what he said. Christ, of course, is the great, chief corner-stone on which the Church is built; all Catholics confess this doctrine. Peter is the foundation of the Church only inasmuch as he is united with the chief corner-stone, from which alone he draws his own solidity. Peter is but the secondary, the visible corner-stone: this is all that Catholics claim and Gregory has in his sermons and writings again and again applied the words recorded in Matt. 16th chap. to Peter. Mr. Thomas nicely exercises in his reading of the Fathers his right of private interpretation: he takes a passage, which by itself has a meaning favoring his views; but the hundred passages of the same writer, which clearly overthrow Protestantism, Mr. Thomas quietly ignores.

Again—"Is it possible that Gregory was infallible, when he refused the title of universal bishop?" Alas, no; Gregory was not in this instance infallible: he was refusing a title, not defining a doctrine. But neither from his words as a private doctor, shall Mr. Thomas take an argument against Papal supremacy. Gregory explains why he refuses this title, because the word might convey to some that he included in his own person the entire episcopate, thereby detracting from the dignity of his fellow bishops. Mr. Thomas knows that the supremacy never had in past ages on the Roman chair a more stern, uncompromising advocate of its claims than this same Gregory. It is he who as supreme pastor sent Augustine to convert the Anglo-Saxons, and who constituted Augustine the metropolitan of the old British bishops—a measure which Auglicans most heartily abhor.

But here is one, which Mr. Thomas did not take from Dr. Pusey. The church has approved the vulgate and in the vulgate there is an interpolation—the passage marked 4th verse 5th chapter of St. John. The passage, Mr. Thomas says, is not found in the four great uncial manuscripts of Europe. I would ask Mr. Thomas, if he is sure that the absence of a text from the uncial manuscripts proves it an interpolation? Are there not other, yet more weighty, documents, through which its genuiness may be established? The uncials are not all the Greek manuscripts. Far more authoritative than any class of Greek manuscripts are the versons into other ancient languages, made long before the date of the uncials, which at most can be brought back only to the fourth century. The text in question is not only in the old Latin, but in the Syriac, the Etheopic, the Georgian, the Memphitic, the Arabic, the Persian. The vulgate iaself is about as old as Mr. Thomas' uncials. Then he should not hug too closely the Sinaitic, which includes with the inspired books the writings of Barnabas and Hermas. But does Mr. Thomas forget that the passage, which he terms an interpolation is printed as genuine in all Protestant bibles, those books which with all ministerial zeal Mr. Thomas has been for years holding up to his several congregations as the pure word of God? An interpolation in the Protestant bible—the sole rule of faith for Protestants! Why, there may be other interpolations in it, his Protestant friends can well say, and what, then, of the entire system of the Christian religion, which we have always rested on this sole book? The vital question for St. Paul Protestants must now be, what texts are in the uncials?

I must despatch briefly Mr. Thomas' objections against unity of faith among Catholics. They are all no less irrelevant than his objections against infallibility. By unity of faith among Catholics, you all understand, we mean equal submission of all Catholics to the decisions of the church in doctrines of faith and morals. The subjects of the court are of one mind when the court has spoken. Now, Mr. Thomas' objections and questions under this head of unity of faith either refer to cases where no decision had been given by the church, or to cases in no way pertaining to faith or morals. Imagine Mr. Thomas asking me whether I belong to the liberal, or to the agressive, or to the "in statu quo" party in the recent struggle in the vatican? Parties in the vatican, we all know, were the lucubrations of certain European telegraphists whom Mr. Thomas takes as faithful exponents of the minds of the cardinals, and what connexion such parties, if proved to have existed, could have with doctrines of faith and morals, for my life, I cannot see. Mr. Thomas lays, of course, great stress on the "Gallican articles," so called, as a clear proof against unity of faith in the church. Mr. Thomas should have stated the whole case. A certain number of French bishops did indeed, under the pressure of royal influence, in the seventh century, sign the articles he quoted. These bishops simply made an egregious mistake: the church surely does not claim infallibility for a local gathering of bishops. But no sooner were the articles made public than they were condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff of Rome, to whose sentence the Episcopate of other countries at once assented. The bishops themselves, who devised the "articles," revoked them, sued for pardon, and sent a letter of recantation to Pope Innocent XI. When the chief had spoken, there was obedience—unity. For a while yet after this event, a factious theological school, small in the numbers of its followers, maintained that church doctrine could be so interpreted as to require the tacit assent of the episcopate, to give full force to papal decrees. This assent being always practically given, without delay, the church did not for a time pronounce formal condemnation against the opinions of the Gallican school, and no formal pronouncement being made, its existence was no proof against unity. The school died out of itself; it was buried before the Vatican Council assembled. I do not hope to convince Mr. Thomas of the fact. He has ways of his own of knowing what takes place in the Vatican, and he is sure that the bishops who discountenanced the late definition were not inopportunists, but genuine Gallicans. I would not disturb his placid confidence in his informants, whoever they may be—Dr. Pusey, or European telegraphists. He is, too, in this instance, the true Episcopalian in disproving the ecumenicity of church councils. If there were no Gallicans in the council, he says, "I feel that the council was not ecumenical, even in the Roman sense of the word." Well, there were in the council no Gallicans; even an infallible pope could not convoke to the Vatican, A. D. 1869, bishops no longer in the land of the living, and so Mr. Thomas' Protestantism needs not to be disturbed by the Vatican Council; it was not ecumenical.

Mr. Thomas' informants have told him that papal infallibility was developed from tradition and Holy Writ, by a majority of three. Those who were at the council have always fancied—not having the same source of information as the rector of St. Paul's—that the majority was over six hundred—the minority being two.

"Outside of a few dogmas like that of transubstantiation, the immaculate conception, and infallibility, there is no more unity in the Roman Church than in the so-called orthodox denominations of Protestantism." I dislike to be dealing from this pulpit with objections which, if I were to put to the children of our catechism classes, they would think I was trifling with them. Did Mr. Thomas ever peruse the single volume containing the decrees of the council of Trent. But whatever be our unity of faith, he shudders at the idea of it. "It is the unity of military discipline which allows no freedom of thought after the general has spoken. The disobedient is shot in the ranks," and he drops a tear over the name of the honored Dollinger, whom Rome excommunicated. Why, assuredly, Mr. Thomas, shoot the disobedient in the ranks. The determination of the American officer at Valley Forge, alone saved the republic in the dark days of the revolution. Authority must maintain its right, else it is no authority, or it fails to guard its sacred trusts. "Who touches that flag, the symbol of the nation's life, shall be shot," are words which in civil strife save the country, and thrill every patriotic heart. The church has her spiritual arms, excommunication; her life, God's trust to her, is truth. No one physically needs to fear her or to stay with her; but when one rejects known truth, would she be for a second God's church, were he not struck with her anathema? He is a traitor among her children; even with a spark of native honor in him he should himself leave her. She, if her authority is not a vain word, must force him to go. And it matters not to God's spouse what honored name he bears. God's truth is all her treasure, and him who violates truth, be he an emperor on his throne, or a genius among her scholars, she strikes with her anathema. It was the lesson of her master. "He that believeth not shall be condemned." It was the lesson of St. Paul. "If an angel from heaven preach another gospel—let him be anathema." The Protestant Episcopal church would not excommunicate the honored Dollinger; she has no authority, and the rebel would laugh at her pretensions. She does not value truth and why should she war in its defense? She would fear the human loss of a potent churchman, because she does not draw her life from Christ. She has not the spirit of the Master and consequently does not obey His injunctions. Her usual language is a sarcasm on the gospel—believe what you like, but stay with me. I am "the roomy church."

"I had rather," says Mr. Thomas, "see in the rival bodies of Christendom the note of holiness than the note of unity." What he cannot have he disparages even if it be God's appointment. Christ made holiness to depend on truth. "Sanctify them in truth." And His prayer at the last supper for the church was, "and not for them only do I pray, but for all those who through their own word shall believe in me. That they all may be one that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

I pass over some points in Mr. Thomas' discourse which have no bearing upon the present controversy, authority versus communism, and will now take up his defense of the Protestant Episcopal church.

Mr. Thomas is as opposed to communism as Mr. Breed. "True Liberty," he says, "whether in thought or action, I think all will concede, is regulated liberty, or liberty restrained by authority." Furthermore, Mr. Thomas is clearly with me, while I am attacking Mr. Breed, to prove that the Protestantism of the House of Hope is religious communism:" In his sermon of February 10th, these words occur: "The answer which makes the bible the sole authority in matters of faith, but at the same time concedes the unlimited right of private interpretation, has given us every variety of creed and sect which the human mind can conceive. It has proved most utterly destructive of organic unity in the church of God." My thesis is that Mr. Thomas' Protestantism is not only as bad as Mr. Breed's, but a good deal worse.

Mr. Breed's limitation on the individual reason is the bible. The whole difficulty, I said, is in the interpretation of the bible, and as the single individual is supreme in this matter of interpretation, the limitation is not in point, and communism reigns. Mr. Thomas gives us the Protestant Episcopal limitation. "The branch of God's church to which we belong, believes in the co-ordinate authority of the bible and the church and right reason." The three, he adds, must harmonize. He defines for us the position of the church,—"to formulate creeds and symbols, which, if not contrary to reason and scripture, shall restrain the license of private opinion." His appeals are; not to the fathers as judges, but as witnesses; not to single declaration, but to united testimony; "not to the church as an infallible judge, but as an indefectible witness; not to the church at one time or in one place, but in her universality in both regards." What have we after all? The individual reason in a worse plight than ever before in Protestantism! With Mr. Breed we have but the bible to quarrel over. There is matter enough, of course, for differences and combats, between the first chapter of Genesis and the last of revelations, and no wonder that ten thousand conflicting voices fill the air, and that the mind grows dizzy before the task of reaching ultimate religious truth and gives up in despair. But what will it be, when to the bible you add three hundred folios of Fathers, and ponderous volumes of liturgies and decrees of councils! Yet this is the position in which Mr. Thomas places you. The church must be consulted—"Not the church in one time or in one place, but in her universality in both regards." Then the testimony of the church must be proved not to be contrary to reason and Scripture, and the whole work devolves, finally, upon each individual Christian, be he poor or rich, ignorant or learned. Now if men disagree in interpreting, according to what each one deems right reason, church and Scripture, who will decide? Where will there be a limitation to individual license? Have we not absolute communism—communism all the more intensified that there is a more extended field of inquiry subjected to debate.

The Episcopal church has no power, no principle, to restrain license of thought among its adherents. It professes its liability to err as a judge, and tells the individual that it is his duty to examine its testimony and its decisions, and to judge for himself. In his sermon of Feb. 10th, where he terms Protestantism, outside of his own church, the destruction of unity, Mr. Thomas finds safety for the Episcopal in the creed. But if the individual churchman discovers that the creed is contrary to reason and Scripture, on what principle can the church rebuke him? The VII. Art. in the English Book of Common Prayer, enumerates three creeds, the Apostles' creed, the Nicene creed, and the Athanasian creed, and adds that "the three ought to be believed, as they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The American Episcopalians who met A. D., 1789, to organize the Protestant Episcopal church of America, did not believe that the Athanasian creed could be proved by Scripture, and refused to allow it into their Book of Common Prayer. A fierce battle is now waging in England to exclude it from the English Book on the same principle. The Nicene and the Apostles' can, and perhaps yet will, be dropped, or at least altered, and what then will be left? What logically, there should be—mothing. The conference of the Reformed Episcopal-church did, a few year's ago, at least propose to alter the Apostles' creed. On what principle could the mother church—the Protestant Episcopal—condemn their action?

Indeed, as a fact, there is no other Protestant church within whose pale there exists so much religious communism. The Episcopal church is a very bedlam of conflicting opinions. Mr. Thomas tells us it has been properly called "the roomy church," so multiplied the opinions it has to hold within its embrace. We all know the names of a few of its sections, divided one from the other on most vital points of religion—Ritualism, High Church, Middle Church, Low Church, Broad Church. Some ministers hear confessions, build up altars, upon which they affect to say mass, and adore their consecrated elements, professing to believe Christ to be really present. Others denounce such practices as idolatrous abominations. In one church baptismal regeneration is taught; in another the people are told that baptism is a mere outward ceremony. These venerate the Scripture as God's pure word; those—high in dignity—tell of the fables and mistakes of the bible. Some adhere strictly to the XXXIX Articles; others declare them damnable heresies, or worthless speculations. There churchmen are most exclusive in their religious associations; there, the Swedenborgians are allowed the benefit of temple and church choir, and Congregationalists and Presbyterians are invited to the communion table; and the strangest thing yet, authorities of the Episcopal church recognize this communism as the normal condition of the church. The Bishop of Ely, in England, said in convocation, A. D., 1868: "I agree with the words of the Bishop of Oxford, that it is most undesirable to limit the comprehensive character of the church of England—that in all times since the reformation people have been allowed to hold extreme doctrines on the one side and on the other, and I hope most earnestly that the time will never come when members of the church of England will not be allowed to hold extreme doctrines on one side and on the other. If clergymen in my diocese were to write to me and say, 'There is a layman in my parish who holds transubstantiation, the immaculate conception,and has a tendency to worship the Virgin; can I admit him to communion?' My answer would be, 'You certainly can.'" However, the bishop gave his own opinion of the doctrine of the immaculate conception: "It is a distinct heresy against the incarnation and mediation of our Lord." This is indeed "comprehensiveness" run mad. The Episcopal church is, indeed, the "roomy church." It is rank communism.

In England, however, there is yet one bond of unity left—the civil power. The Queen's privy council—how Englishmen are punished for having rejected the infallibility of God's church!—learnedly decides for Episcopalians on baptismal regeneration and the inspiration of the bible, and the court of Lord Penzance summarily locks up in jail self-confident ministers, who, as the late Rev. Mr. Tooth, rebel against its decisions on ritualism. In America we have no Queen's council, no Lord Penzance, and Episcopalianism is left civilly and logically to its fate—communism.

I had said that owing to its communistic principles Protestantism had no means of proving that the bible is God's word—consequently has no foundation imaginable as a system of Christian religion. I put under the head of this proposition five questions, to which I invited any Protestant minister to give answer, if he could. How does Mr. Thomas answer in the name of the Episcopal church? His lecture sustains most signally my assertion that Protestantism cannot answer the questions.

Mr. Thomas wants it understood that he is not responsible for the defense of Protestantism outside of his own sect—Mr. Breed's, for instance. Speaking of three of my questions, he says that the Protestant denying a historic church must give answer for himself. Let us hear him for his own:

First question—"Can Protestants prove in any way that the bible is God's inspired word, all God's word and nothing but God's word?

Mr. Thomas tries on me what I would call a witty Irish trick. He asks me another question—was Peter ever in Rome? And he appears most determined to put me off the track. "I make the assertion," he says—that Peter was never in Rome—"I make it broadly, I make it roundly." No use, Mr. Thomas; I understand the trick. We will discuss St. Peter another day, at your own choice. Keep now to the bible.

He attempts a proof. "We believe the bible to be the word of God, because of the testimony which the bible bears to itself; because it is easier to believe its supernatural claims than to account in a natural way for their existence." Such an argument is of no value. The question is not about the supernatural character of the Christian religion, nor of the divine features of the life of Christ, but of the inspiration of those who record the words and acts of our Lord. The Evangelists would have given us no lesser idea of Christ's grandeur of character and of the sublimity of his teachings, if they had been but faithful historians. The letters of Clement and Barnabas contain Christian doctrine, and breathe celestial piety as well as those of John and Jude.

"We believe the bible to be the word of God, because of our confidence in the integrity of the church as the witness and keeper of revelation." The appeal is just, if the church is infallible, as Catholics believe her to be. It falls to the ground, on Mr. Thomas' premises, according to which the testimony of the church must be examined by individual reason. Tradition once declared fallible, it cannot be relied upon as a witness to inspiration, which is of itself a supernatural, invisible act, and can be known only by revelation. Human tradition can prove an outward, visible fact, as the existence of the church, or can bring down to us words spoken by Christ, as his commission to his church, but cannot establish inspiration. Then Mr. Thomas will remember that for a long while Christian tradition, as it was, did not agree regarding the inspiration of several books of the bible.

Second question—"Can Protestants show that Christ instituted the bible as the Christian rule of faith ?" The Irish trick again. "Can Romanists show," he asks, "that Christ instituted the Roman Church as the rule of faith ?" And he not even attempts an answer to my question.

Third question—"Will Protestants prove that the Church did not exist before the bible ?" Mr. Thomas grants my assertion that the Church did exist before the Bible. I take as a consequence of his words that he must, then, grant that the bible is not Christ's rule of faith—which is the entire abandoning of the whole Protestant theory.

He here adds, "If, however, the bishop means to say that the Roman Church alone existed before the bible, I would make the assertion that the Sees of Jerusalem, and Antioch and Ephesus are other than the Western See." I confess I am puzzled to know Mr. Thomas' meaning. I am not talking of the local church of Rome, or of that of Ephesus, or of that of Athens. The question is of that one Church of Christ which was represented in the apostolate, when he said, "Going ye, teach." A local church, whether of Rome or of Jerusalem, is nothing to me, except inasmuch as it is part and parcel of Christ's church. Verily, it seems, as if Mr. Thomas fancied that Catholics believe the local church of Rome to be Christ's whole church—instead of the church Catholic, whose inheritance is the earth. The Church of Rome is simply for us, what Antioch once was, the residence of our chief pastor. Elsewhere, under the same misapprehension of our faith, he asked, if I could prove that Christ instituted the Roman Church the rule of faith. I have proved that he instituted, as the rule of faith, the Church Catholic, whose supreme head, Leo XIII., resides to-day in Rome.

Fourth and fifth questions—"What, under Protestant principles, of the Christians living before the bible was written, and before the bible could possibly be read by the millions—before the middle of the 15th century." Mr. Thomas does not answer. The questions, he says, have no pertinence for his Church ; let him prove that they have no such pertinence.

My questions are yet to be answered by Protestantism.

Mr. Thomas, I think, has principles of his own regarding the bible, which are neither Catholic nor Protestant. I already told you that he admits a passage of his bible to be an interpolation and he speaks of the certain advance of biblical scholarship, before which Rome will be obliged to give to her children a new and more perfect collation of the ancient MSS. Of course, in his view, the same advance of scholarshship will show the Protestant bible to be at fault, since so far as manuscript authority is concerned, the Protestant bible follows the vulgate. Mr. Thomas is not at all sure that he has at present a true bible. For the sake of his hearers, at least, whom he teaches to rely on the bible, for their faith, I hope he will hurry up his studies of the ancient MSS.

You have observed that Mr. Thomas speaks of the Protestant Episcopal church as a historic church, in contradistinction to other Protestant churches. He calls it "the branch of God's church to which we belong." I will explain his meaning to my Catholic and non-Episcopal Protestant hearers. According to him, Christ would, indeed, have instituted, some eighteen centuries ago, a church upon earth. This is the historic church. She lived on with the organic unity received from her builder, for eight hundred years. when she split up into two pieces, the Greek and the Latin. Thenceforward, there were two branches of the historic church. In the sixteenth century, the Latin branch received another volcanic shock, and divided into the Roman and the Anglican, and we have now three branches of God's holy church. The Anglicans or Episcopals, on this system, do "Romanism," as Mr. Thomas terms it, the honor of acknowledging it as a branch of the church. Their usual address to Rome is, "with all thy faults, I love thee still." Indeed, when we come to analyze with them the faults of Rome, we find her to be guilty, in their eyes, of only one mortal sin—she does not return the compliment of calling Anglicanism a branch of the historic church. But Episcopals have no such honor in store for other Protestant churches—Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists. These are not branches of the church; they are dissenters.

On what ground do Episcopals deem their church a branch of the historic church? On ground most arbitrary. They have bishops, valid orders. I will not discuss, this evening, the validity of their orders; but I beg not to be understood as admitting it. This ground once taken, the branches of God's church rapidly increase in number. We have the Jansenists of Utrecht, the Old Catholics of Germany and Switzerland, the Nestorians of Chaldea, the Coptics and Abyssinians of lower Egypt—all of whom are a hundred times more certain of the validity of their orders than the Anglicans. We have the American Reformed Episcopal church and the Lutheran church of Sweden, whose orders are on a par with those of Anglicanism. Then, among the branches of the historic church in the past, we must, in all logic, set down churches that Anglicanism has always repudiated, as manifest sects and schisms—the Donatists, the Arians, the Nestorians, &c. All these had most undoubtedly valid orders, and bishops, in numbers, were not only among the followers, but among the founders. And on what principle do Anglicans mark down, as a link that keeps them in God's church, whatever else they may do or believe, the possession of bishops in their ranks? On the principle of their right to their own private interpretation of scripture and church tradition. But have not Presbyterians and Methodists as much right to their version of scripture and tradition, which tells them that bishops are of no necessity at all in the church? And if Presbyterians and Methodists style themselves branches of the historic church, what objection, of any weight, can Anglicans raise against their pretensions? Once infallible authority in the church set aside, what constitutes church unity each one's taste must decide, and one taste has as much right to rule as another.

Let me invite you to glance for a moment at the church which the Anglican theory gives us. I can understand the Protestant idea, that Christ left no church on earth. The Episcopal idea, that He instituted a church, and that His church is what Mr. Thomas maps out for us, I certainly do not understand.

Christ's church is a social unit. The word itself, church, indicates this, as well as other words which apply to it in scripture, a kingdom, a fold. St. Paul terms her Christ's body. He prayed for unity in His church—for visible unity, and His prayer was surely heard. "Father, that they may be one, as Thou in me, and I in Thee * * * that the world may know that Thou hast sent me." Schism, the setting up of one party against the Church Catholic, the apostles and the Fathers, always deemed a heinous crime, as it seemed to them an effort to tear into shreds Christ's seamless robe, to divide into fragments His own body. As Christ instituted her, as Christ prayed that she should be, so must she ever remain. Else, man could have undone God's work. Yet He affirmed that not even the gates of hell should prevail against His church. Now, in spite of Christ, Anglicanism tells us the church is divided and her fragments scattered, shapeless and begrimed, through space and time! Christ's message to men was one—being truth itself—and this message as he gave it, the church was commissioned to repeat until the end of time, and consequently in virtue of the same eternal principle that there is but one Lord, St. Paul declares that there is but one faith. Now, we are presented with a so-called church, that speaks from a thousand tongues a thousand contradictions. Heresy, the attempt to divide the church, was sacrilege, against which the apostles poured their anathemas. Sects and schisms, St. Paul declared, exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven. Yet, according to this novel theory, sects and schisms are constitutive parts of the body of Christ—provided, simply, that there be in these sects and schisms, bishops.

Christ instituted His church as a teacher of truth, casting over her, for the sake of her office, His own mantle of authority. "Going ye. teach all nations." What of this office, in the Anglican theory? The so-called branches anathematize one another's doctrines, and with one exception each branch is a bedlam of contradictory opinions—the Episcopal branch especially. This church the witness to truth! She is at least equally the witness to error, for her branches are in sad contradiction. Where is her testimony to truth? How is the individual soul, hungering for truth and believing that it must obtain possession of it under penalty of damnation, to find it? Is truth something that changes from one country to another? Is it lawful to adore the Eucharist in Italy and to scoff at it in England? Is confession obligatory in France and a crime in America? The church a teacher of truth! Why, on this theory, confessedly so, she has been dumb for 1,200 years, and must be dumb for all future ages, so long as any little sect having bishops will choose to set up certain ideas of its own. We hear much of the authority, long, long ago, of the undivided church. According to Mr. Thomas' lecture, even the decrees of this undivided church had to pass through the crucible of private interpretation before having final authrity. This, then, the church of living God. He built her to teach men, to teach all generations until the end of time, and He pledged his own power to her for the fulfillment of her office. Yet, in whatever way she taught the world for a few centuries, by the malice of men for one thousand or more years she is reduced to silence. God is defeated by his creatures. The gates of hell have prevailed. God's promises have proved inglorious failures. The Savior has declared belief in His doctrines obligatory upon all men, upon us, consequently, who live in the 19th century; and yet, for centuries and centuries, there has been no teacher of these doctrines in the world, and no ingenuity can divine when there will be one. It to me is but bitter irony to hear you talk of the undivided church. I need a living teacher, to teach me my duty to-day. How can I even know what the undivided church, as you term it, did teach? Men do not agree as to what it taught—its decrees and creeds, as you give them to me, are dead letters. No use to blame human malice for having interrupted unity, whether you place this malice in Greek or Roman, or Anglican branch. God owed me truth, if faith is a necessary condition of salvation, and He should have overruled, as he promised to do, the malice of men and demons.

Look no longer, my friends, on a theory which in presence of Christ's promises is a blasphemy against the Lord. Christ's work endures: This church lives and teaches—one and infallible as He constituted her. "Teach all nations," He said to her. "He that believeth not shall be condemned." And she went forth to her task in the fullness of her splendor as His bride, with His own mantle of authority waving from her queenly shoulders. She gathered unto her spouse the nations of the earth, and fed them with His truth and graces. Rebels arose against her, heretics and schismatics. She wept for their souls, but in justice to her spouse she hurled against them her anathemas and continued, one and holy, her march through time. They were called Gnostics, Novations, Arians, Nestorians. Once lopped off, they were branches—without sap or life, and they withered off the face of the earth. Other rebels appeared; the same doom awaited them. They were Iconoclasts, Photians or Greeks, Manicheans. The 16th dawned upon her with storms ahead. Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans arose; her anathema fell upon them, and they are dead branches. The church pursued her onward career, held her councils, sent her apostles to America and Asia, taught the nations, saved souls. Her name never changed; it is Catholic, the church of nations.

A voice arises to protest. Anglicans are not in schism. There was no sufficient cause to separate them from the church. A saint, Firmilian, protested against unjust separations. No cause for the separation! Who is the judge? The party that has been excommunicated. Did ever heretic or schismatic acknowledge his anathema a just one? Lucifer, expelled from heaven, protested against the sentence of the Almighty. The judge is God's church, who speaks through her recognized representatives and whose sentence upon earth her spouse ratifies in heaven. A Firmilian quoted against the church's sentence! Firmilian became a saint in his latter days, but when he wrote his letter to Pope Stephen, the sword of excommunication was hanging over his own head, and in the true spirit of schism he declared himself and his friends to be right and him whom in the same letter he acknowledges to be his superior, to be wrong.

God is not as man; His work is stable. In the beginning of time He poised the heavens in space, and what hand has interrupted their revolutions or impaired their harmony. Eighteen centuries ago He placed in the moral world His church to teach truth and distribute grace, and she remains as He constituted her. O, Savior of men direct towards her the eyes of those hungering for truth and yet in despair because they know not where to find it. They will easily discern the divine features of Thy bride, so vastly removed in her unity and her unchangeableness from all human institutions, and once her divine authority acknowledged, they will thank Thee, O Lord, for having given light to their minds and peace to their hearts.

A Remarkable Story of Crime.

A remarkable murder trial has been developed at Sidney, Neb. A letter from that place written on the 25th, says :

About twenty days ago a young man named Charles Phillips, engaged at R. J. Watroth's ranche, between here and Big Springs, suddenly disappeared, and all inquiries failed to elicit tidings of him. Last night two stock men, intimate friends of Watroth, stopped at the ranche. Watroth was absent. Mrs. Watroth was partially prostrated by a nervous attack. While talking about the mysterious disappearance of Phillips Mrs. Watroth broke down in a fit of hysterical weeping, and said she knew where Phillips was ; that he had been murdered, and his body thrown into the Platte river. When further questioned, she avowed positive knowledge of the deed, which, she said, had been committed by Henry Duboise, another young man engaged on the ranche. In great excitement she told the circumstances of the murder. There had been a quarrel between Duboise and Phillips, on account of certain favors extended to them by herself. Phillips threatened to tell Watroth of her improper intimacy with Duboise. She asked Duboise to whip Phillips, who, attempting it, got badly thrashed. On the night of Feb. 5, Duboise told Phillips he was a member of the gang who robbed the express train at Big Springs, and that $20,000 of the gold was buried on the banks of Platte river, three hundred yards from the house, and offered him half the money if he would go with him and dig it up. Phillips consented, and they started at midnight. When a few yards from the river, Duboise dropped behind Phillips, and fired with a revolver, striking him in the back of the head, the ball coming out at the forehead. Phillips turned round as he fell, and Duboise fired again, hitting him under the right eye. Both balls penetrated the brain. Duboise filled the pockets of the murdered man with sand, threw the body into the river, and returned to the house and told Mrs. Watroth what he had done. The stock men telegraphed the facts to Deputy Sheriff Brown, at Sidney, who went to the Watroth place this morning, on a hand car and arrested Duboise and brought him and Mrs. Watroth to Sidney, and lodged them in jail.

R. J. Watroth is a brother of one of the county commissioners, a wealthy stock man. His wife is a pretty little woman of 22, and was married to Watroth a second time, having been divorced for improper intimacy with some young men. Duboise is 21, fine looking, well educated, and the son of wealthy parents who reside in Iowa. The examination takes place to-morrow, and some remarkable disclosures of illit love and crime will be made. The body of young Phillips has not been found. The Platte never gives up its dead.

That Bribery Case.

[Glencoe Register—Liberty Hall, Editor.]

We give elsewhere the evidence taken by the legislative committee relative to the alleged school book bribery matter. As the testimony of the editor of this paper is included therein, but little remains to be added here. Bribery in legislative or any other affairs is not to be countenanced in any degree, and the fact that it is (or is supposed to be) of common occurrence does not palliate the offense. We have only to add that we neither purchased nor attempted to purchase Mr. Brandt's vote. As stated in the evidence, we have never met him until he sought our acquaintance. If we had been in the bribery business and had desired to purchase Mr. Brandt's vote, we leave the public to judge whether we would have been likely to have waited until he sought an introduction a few moments before the bill in question was to be acted upon. It will be noticed that Mr. Brandt does not pretend that we in any way endeavored to meet him or ever ask his support of the bill until he came unsolicited and introduced the topic voluntarily. We make no attempt to engage in a personal defense or to commend our discretion, but, entering our solemn denial of being actuated by corrupt motives, we submit the testimony and leave the public to judge between us.

Three Bright Stars.

[Kansas City Journal of Commerce.]

The three bright new stars in daily journalism are the St. Louis *Post*, the Washington *Post* and the St. Paul GLOBE.