

attendance, an easy first. A Protestant authority, Mr. Reni Bache, who is described as a 'well-known newspaper man and grandson of Benjamin Franklin,' has made an elaborate compilation of statistics on the subject, and this is what he gives as the result of his investigation:—

'Nearly one-third of the churchgoers of the United States are Roman Catholics. Considerably more than one-fifth are Methodists. More than one-sixth are Baptists. One churchgoer in sixteen is a Presbyterian, and one in seventeen a Lutheran. One in thirty-nine is an Episcopalian, and one in thirty-nine a Congregationalist. The balance of the church-going people is split up into minor sects. New Mexico is almost wholly Roman Catholic; Arizona is three-quarters Catholic; Connecticut, Colorado, and California are half Catholic. Methodists are strongest in Delaware, South California, and Florida, numbering fifty per cent. of the churchgoers. Baptists are more numerous in Mississippi, Georgia, and Virginia, claiming fifty per cent. and upwards in those States. Twelve in every thirteen religious people in Utah prefer the Mormon faith; two in three are Mormons in Idaho, and one in eleven in Nevada. Catholic New Mexico is the most pious section of the Union, with sixty-eight per cent. of its population church communicants. Utah comes next with sixty-two per cent., for Mormons are first-rate churchgoers. Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut are high up on the list with over forty per cent.; but Vermont falls much below, and New Hampshire has a record of only twenty-seven per cent. Maine drops below twenty-five per cent. The really heathen States, however, are those of the far West, where the percentage of churchgoers drops off to a lamentably small fraction.'

It thus appears that of the whole of the churchgoers in the United States Catholics number no less than one-third, all the other religious bodies being far behind. And this in a country which, according to Protestant pulpit orators in Dunedin, 'stands for Protestantism.'

*

It is gratifying to find that, according to the latest statistics, the Church maintains in the Australasian colonies the same proud pre-eminence in church attendance which she has acquired in other lands. The Government statistician of New South Wales has furnished an official return on the subject, which is published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 22nd March last. The following are the official figures:—

Denomination.	Clergy or Ministers.	Churches.	Other Buildings for Public Worship.	Total.	Accommodation.	Habitual Attendance at Sunday Services in Churches and Buildings.	Attendance at Public Worship on week days in buildings where public services are not held.	Approximate number of Public Services performed during the year, including week-day services.	Vices.
Church of England	373	779	868	1,627	146,362	95,842	10,122	70,648	87,867
Roman Catholic	334	527	696	1,226	132,574	123,605	80	26,177	87,867
Presbyterian	184	312	586	898	50,736	27,030	1,006	11,013	11,013
Congregational	51	77	161	117	24,150	12,129	1,013	48,906	48,906
Methodist	177	588	613	1,351	120,137	85,491	836	7,909	7,909
Baptist	37	41	76	117	14,820	7,580	13,719	3,048	3,048
Salvation Army	160	116	223	341	43,800	17,811	340	8,414	8,414
Other Denominations	11	49	36	85	13,975	5,843	26,446	263,880	263,880
Total—All Denominations	1,357	2,119	3,113	5,562	546,654	375,691	26,446	263,880	263,880

It is a case once again of 'Catholics first, the rest nowhere,' the number of habitual attendants at Sunday services amongst Catholics being 123,605, or one third as many again as the Church of England, half as many again as the Methodists, nearly five times as many as the Presbyterians, more than seven times as many as the Salvation Army, ten times as many

as the Congregationalists, and nearly eighteen times as many as the Baptists. It is a record which speaks for itself and which bears eloquent testimony to the vigor and enduring vitality of colonial Catholicity.

'Bloody' Mary and 'Good' Queen Bess.

'Give a dog a bad name and you may hang him' says the proverb, and there are few characters in history whose memory has received such a deep and lasting stain from the stigma of a bad name as the English Queen Mary. Branded after her death with the epithet 'Bloody' by partisan historians, the name has been handed down from generation to generation and from one writer to another, no one thinking it at all necessary to examine and inquire for himself as to how far the odious soubriquet was deserved. Nowadays, however, history is being largely re-written; a careful sifting process is being applied to many of the hitherto most widely accepted 'facts,' and historians instead of being content to merely copy the statements of their predecessors go direct to the best documentary sources in order to arrive at the truth. The result, in the present instance, of modern historical research is to demonstrate how entirely unjust and false is the contrast which has so often been drawn between 'Bloody Mary' and 'Good Queen Bess.' The simple truth is, as a recent writer puts it, that Mary was at least as good as Elizabeth, and Elizabeth was at least as bloody as Mary. Both ladies undoubtedly persecuted under the influence of the intolerant spirit of the time, the only difference being that Mary persecuted Protestants and Elizabeth persecuted Catholics. Mary's persecution lasted only four years; Elizabeth's extended over forty-four. According to Miss Strickland—a recent authority—the victims of Mary's persecution numbered 'above two hundred,' and according to Lingard, 'almost two hundred.' The Catholic victims under Elizabeth amounted, according to Milner, to two hundred and four, and 'many others,' says Hallam, 'died of hardship in prison.'

*

Concerning the general character of Elizabeth's persecution, J. R. Green, an eminent historian and himself a Protestant clergyman, has the following:—'To modern eyes there is even something more revolting than open persecution in a policy which branded every Catholic priest as a traitor and all Catholic worship as disloyal. . . . If we adopt the Catholic estimate of the times, the twenty years which followed [1580-1600] saw the execution of two hundred priests, while a yet greater number perished in filthy and fever-stricken gaols in which they were plunged. The work of reconciliation with Rome was arrested by this ruthless energy.' This is how a competent Protestant writer describes the work of Elizabeth, and it shows precisely how much claim she has to be celebrated as 'good Queen Bess.' As to Mary's personal character and her personal share in the persecution which took place during her reign, the matter has been carefully dealt with in a new history just published, compiled at first hand from contemporary documents by Miss J. M. Stone, and this is what the writer says in her summary of Mary's character:—'Apart from all misrepresentation, exaggeration, distorted evidence, and positive fiction, there remains the fact that a considerable number of persons did perish at the stake in Mary's name. . . . Mary did but sanction that which was not only the common practice throughout Christendom, but which had been the law of England more than 150 years, and which continued in force for upwards of a century after her. . . . We must admit that Mary, and those whose business it was to carry out the law, far from entertaining feelings of vengeance, provided every possible loophole of escape for those under examination. Moreover, the accused, even on the showing of Fox, instead of being the meek and lamblike martyrs we have been led to consider them, persistently flouted their judges and treated them with flippant insolence and contempt.' That is the last word of history as to the character of Mary, and it is a complete vindication from the reproach of personal cruelty and bloodthirstiness with which her name and memory have so long been associated. The historian of the future will depict her character in a very different setting from that of 'Bloody' Mary.

Catholic Chaplains in the British Navy.

The shameful treatment meted out to Catholics in the Navy, through the deficiency of Catholic chaplains, was brought under the notice of the House of Commons recently by Mr. John Dillon, Lord Edmund Talbot, and Mr. Joyce, and a vigorous effort was made to secure from the Government an undertaking that for the future Catholic seamen would receive something like an approach to fair play in this matter. The attempt, however, met with no practical success. The claims put forward by Mr. Dillon on behalf of the Catholic seamen were modest enough in all conscience. They did not ask that there should be a Catholic chaplain in every ship that has an Anglican chaplain, but they did ask that a Catholic chaplain should be attached to each squadron and that,