

"Counterblaste to Tobacco" he describes it as a "custom loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, hurtful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs, and in the black stinking fume thereof resembling the horrible Stygian smoke of the pit that is bottomless." How is it possible that good and lovable men,—men whose names are as ointment poured forth can allow so large a fly to spoil the ointment? They would not recommend others to follow their example. Once they would not have endured the practice themselves, though now they defend it. Such is the seductive power of evil.

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As, to be dreaded, needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Other considerations, familiar and cogent, against the use of tobacco might be submitted; but in the meantime we forbear. To those who follow their lower impulses these considerations may seem as nothing; not so, however, with those whose aspirations are higher, who seek to follow "whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report"?

No man who is open to conviction, need be undecided in this matter; for if any one doubts the righteousness of using tobacco, no one need doubt the righteousness of leaving it alone; and it is a maxim in morals that if we doubt respecting the virtue of an action, *we must not perform it*, unless we as much doubt whether we may leave it undone. Men's consciences may reproach them, and will one day reproach them, if they have indulged in this injurious, offensive, and enslaving habit; but who, before God, will feel guilty because he did not smoke tobacco?

EVANGELICAL UNION.

A SERIES of letters upon the French mission appeared some time ago in the *Witness*, which occasioned some interest in the matter, and brought up the question of Evangelical union among the various Protestant denominations. It was held that the great stumbling-block to the French Roman Catholic is the apparent dis-union among the believers whom he is asked to join. Without committing myself to a compliance with this argument, I can readily say that the Roman Catholic certainly has appearances in his favor in his opinion. It would require a better trained mind than the average *habitant* is credited with possessing, to discern the unity in Christ which we all claim; a unity as real and far-reaching as is the unity of his own Church in the Pope of Rome. It is claimed that organic unity is incompatible with freedom of thought; yet there may be nominal unity—a common basis of *plan*—when there is similarity of opinion or belief. Where the same general principles obtain, unity is possible, and history has shown that it is practicable. The union of England and Scot-

land attests this, as also the confederation of the United States. The sacrifice of a few specific prejudices has, in each of these cases, insured a fuller and more certain enjoyment of more general principles, and the better accomplishment of temporal destinies. Yet a Scotchman was as much shocked and dismayed at the question of union in Queen Anne's reign, as would the average Presbyterian of to day be at the proposal to amalgamate with "they Methodies." Physical force from without, compelled him in 1707; and should the Spiritual force which our Master can wield in the Christian's heart constrain to an ecclesiastical union now as above indicated, the prospect before him would not be a more hopeless blank than was that which his political union with the Saxon pictured to his mind.

But would we not have to sacrifice too many special principles which tradition and conviction have equally endeared to us and made necessary to our Christian life? Are not the differences so great as to eclipse any general principles under which we might associate with Wesleyans and Congregationalists?

In considering these questions there is a point which should properly be considered; should our study of them be subjective or objective? Should we make our own minds the judges, or admit external phenomena as our criteria to some extent? What should be the character of our views as to the duties which Christianity—not imposes upon but—secures to us? Surely objective—external to ourselves. There is nothing in ourselves to warrant us in giving self a prominent place in our thoughts; we find ourselves poor, degraded, fallen sons of Adam; we would look away from self to that Saviour whose love was extended to include our vile natures; our eyes are attracted by the world of beauty and comfort in which we have been placed, and to the masses of humanity ignorant of the true light, and living in darkness. The devoted Christian is not he who selfishly revels in the joy of a Saviour's love, or hugs some theory or dogma so tightly to his bosom that a wandering brother, from his weakened vision, cannot see the light within. I would suppose that our Saviour is better pleased with the sight of a disciple seeking to lead a soul to Him, than when He beholds a man seeking the presence and support of some indifferent neighbor in his especial church. As a matter of fact, who thinks of judging *another* by any subjective standard? What think we of a man's belief in Predestination, if we find it limited to the coming hay crop, or the "fall" prices? Or of an Armenian friend, who is so *free* in telling what God has done for him, and whose only other aim is to do still more himself? It is the practical objective results that we invariably accept as indications of sincerity in others. *By their fruits ye shall know them.* Then why not be consistent, and apply the same test unto ourselves? There is an old adage about regarding ourselves as others see us,