

outside the churches is so weak and fruitless. To attain any grand and blessed accomplishment in Christian work, it is necessary that the lead given by the clergy should receive a warm and prompt response in the heart and effort of the Church members. Where there is a recognition of a joint partnership and cooperation in the work, the Church is conscious of a divine strength, and goes forward to its work with assurance of victory, and adds daily to the number of those who are being saved.

This is the first step in successful lay work—a stirring up in every man and woman and child in the Church of a sense of the high privilege to which they are called of being fellow-laborers with the clergy and with God in the work of winning souls to God through Christ. Unless this is first brought home to their hearts and consciences, there will be no efficient and permanent work for Christ. Guilds may be formed and clubs organized and brotherhoods started; there may be activity in all parts of the parish; and from the outside, there may seem to be great success; but God, who looketh on the heart, knoweth that it is but the form of godliness and not the power thereof. The Church is not put into the work to make successful parishes, and flourishing guilds; its office is to form character, to make men and women Christ-like; and the guild or club or brotherhood that is not contributing to that end, and has not that end in constant view, is but a delusion and a snare.—*Church of To-Day.*

DR. HODGE (PRESBYTERIAN) OF PRINCETON, ON MARRIAGE.

"Marriage is a divine institution: 1. Because founded on the nature of man as constituted by God. He made man male and female, and ordained marriage as the indispensable condition of continuance of the race. 2. Marriage was instituted before the existence of civil society, and therefore, can not, in its essential nature, be a civil institution. As Adam and Eve were married not in virtue of any civil law, or by the intervention of a civil magistrate; so any man and woman cast together on a desert island could lawfully take each other as husband and wife. It is a degradation of the institution to make it a mere civil contract. 3. God commanded men to marry when he commanded them to increase and multiply and replenish the earth. 4. God, in His word, prescribed, the duties belonging to the marriage relation; He has made known His will as to the parties who may lawfully be united in marriage; He has determined the continuance of the relation and the causes which alone justify its dissolution. These matters are not subject to the will of the parties or to the authority of the State. 5. The vow of mutual fidelity made by husband and wife, is not made exclusively by each one to the other, but by each to God. Any violation of the compact is, therefore, a violation of a vow made to God.

"Marriage is a sacred institution. Its solemnization is an office of religion. It should, therefore, be entered upon with due solemnity and in the fear of God; and should be celebrated, i. e., the ceremony should be performed by a minister of Christ. He alone is authorized to see to it that the law of God is adhered to; and he alone can receive and register the marriage vows as made to God. The civil magistrate can only witness it as a civil contract, and it is, consequently, to ignore its religious character and sanction to have it celebrated by a civil officer. As the essence of the marriage contract is the mutual compact of the parties, in the sight of God and in the presence of witnesses, it is not absolutely necessary that it should be celebrated by a minister of religion or even by a civil magistrate. It may be lawfully solemnized as among the Quakers,

without the intervention of either. Nevertheless, as it is of the greatest importance that the religious nature of the institution should be kept in view, it is incumbent on Christians, so far as they themselves are concerned, to insist that it should be solemnized as a religious service."

After a paragraph showing that the State must make certain regulations about marriage, property rights, etc., Dr. Hodge goes on to say:

"The legitimate power of the State in these matters is limited by the revealed will of God. It can make nothing an impediment to marriage which the Scriptures do not declare to be a bar to that union. It can make nothing a ground of dissolving the marriage contract which the Bible does not make a valid ground of divorce. It is a violation of the principles of civil and religious liberty for the State to make its will paramount to the will of God. Plain as this principle seems to be, it is nevertheless, constantly disregarded in all Christian nations, whether Catholic or Protestant. Because marriage is in some respects a civil institution, to be regulated within certain limits by the civil law, men have treated it as though it were a mere business engagement. They ignore its character as a divine institution regulated and controlled by divine laws. Civil legislatures should remember that they can no more annul the laws of God than the laws of nature. If they pronounce those not to be married who, by the divine law are married; or if they separate those whom God hath joined together, their laws are absolute nullities at the bar of conscience and in the sight of God.—*The Church Year.*

CANADA AND THE JESUITS.

By GOLDWIN SMITH, IN MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE FOR OCTOBER.

(Continued)

The Canadian Equal Rights Association, however, has to fight two foes in one. It is contending against ecclesiastical aggression and against French nationalism at the same time. The Jesuits' Estates Act is an audacious blow struck not only for Ultramontanism against Protestantism and the civil power, but for French nationality under priestly leadership against British ascendancy. "*La Verite*" is the Ultramontane and Jesuit organ of French Canada. In a recent article that journal says:

"For us [the French Canadians], confederation was and is a means, not an end. It is a means of enabling us to dwell in peace with our English neighbors, whilst safeguarding our rights, developing our resources, strengthening us, and making us ready for our national future. Let us say it boldly—the ideal of the French Canadian people is not the ideal of the other races which to day inhabit the land our fathers subdued for Christian civilization. Our ideal is the formation here, in this corner of the earth watered by the blood of our heroes, of a nation which shall perform on this continent the part France has played so long in Europe, and which she might continue to play if she would but resume the Christian traditions violently ruptured at the Revolution of 1789. To do that, it is not theoretically necessary that she should become a monarchy again; but it is necessary that she should return to Christ. Our aspiration is to found a nation which socially shall profess the Catholic faith and speak the French language. That is not and cannot be the aspiration of the other races. To say then that all the groups which constitute confederation are animated by one and the same aspiration, is to utter a sounding phrase without political or historical meaning. For

us, the present form of government is not and cannot be the last word of our national existence. It is merely a road towards the goal which we have in view—that is all. Let us accept the present state of things loyally; let us not be aggressive towards our neighbors; let us give them full liberty to pursue their particular ideal. But let us never lose sight of our own national destiny. Rather let us constantly prepare ourselves to fulfil it worthily at the hour decreed by Providence which circumstances shall reveal to us. Our whole history proves that it is not to be a vain dream, a mere Utopia, but the end which the God of nations has marked out for us. We have not been snatched from death a score of times; we have not multiplied with a rapidity truly prodigious; we have not wrought marvels of resistance and of peaceful conquest in the eastern townships and in the border countries of Ontario; we have not absorbed many of the English and Scotch settlements planted among us in order to break up our homogeneity—we have not put forth all these efforts and seen them crowned with success to go and perish miserably in any all-Canadian arrangement."

This is the frank expression of a sentiment which has been gathering strength and taking shape in the French Province during the last quarter of a century.

In 1880 the Abbe Gingras published an address, in which, after the most rampant assertion of the right of the Church to override the civil power, and of the clergy to interfere in elections, together with a thoroughgoing proclamation of Medievalism, and an unqualified defence of the Inquisition, there comes (p. 43) a notable passage in relation to the political situation of the French Province. The clergy, says the writer, understand the delicate position in which French statesmen have been placed since the conquest, and that practically it is necessary that they should "resign themselves to a policy of conciliation, more or less elastic." But with union and a common understanding the machine of the Provincial Government, though it has inevitably one of its wheels in contact with the Federal Government, may be worked for Catholic purposes. This is the device which every Canadian statesman, "though he may not inscribe it on his banner, lest he should provoke unjust reprisals, ought to engrave on the inmost fold of his heart." The autonomy of French Canada is all, the Federation is nothing. With the autonomy of French Canada it is necessary for the present to be content, but a grader vista is opened when the proper hour shall strike. The leaders, and the soul of the national enterprise, are the clergy.

After the victory of the Jesuits at Ottawa, a grand national festival was held at Quebec on the day of St. John the Baptist, the national saint of French Canada, in the joint honour of Jacques Cartier, the founder of French Canada, and Brebeuf, the great Jesuit missionary, a monument to whom was unveiled. At the banquet, Mr. Mercier, who is the Nationalist Premier of Quebec, and as the framer of the Jesuits' Estates Act has received a decoration from the Pope, made a speech in which he preached in impressive terms nationalism and national unity. "To-day," he said, "the Red and the Blue [colours of the two old parties in Quebec] should give place to the Tricolour. It is useless to imagine that we will ever cease to be French and Catholic. This monument declares that after a century of separation from our mother country we are still French. More than that, we will remain French and Catholic." Such was the strain of all the speaking and writing on the occasion. A gallant colonel of militia even hinted at a resort to arms. The Papal Zouaves who took part in the ceremony carried side by side with their own flag a flag which in the days of French dominion had been borne in battle against the British. The