

Our Contributors.

CUYLER ON SHORT CUTS.

BY KNOXIAN.

Dr. Cuyler has a timely and suggestive article in the *Christian at Work*, on Short Cuts. He is decidedly of the opinion that there is a rage for short cuts in the present day that ought to be cut short. Hosts of young men try to make money by short cuts; others try to become learned by short cuts, and sanguine reformers imagine that they can abolish drunkenness by a short and easy cut. The Doctor is of a different opinion:

I am an old-fashioned prohibitionist, and expect to be until my dying day. But thirty-five years of steady labour in the temperance reform has convinced me that there is no short cut to successful prohibition. A law for the suppression of saloons, if well enforced, is an immeasurable public blessing. But if it becomes a "dead letter" it is one of the worst of public nuisances; for it not only insures the free sale of intoxicants, it destroys reverence for the authority of law. A dead law is as unwholesome as dead dogs or dead horses in a public street.

A short time ago the Doctor had the following dialogue with a short-cut prohibitionist:

"Why does your National Temperance Society spend so much labour and money in printing Sunday school books and tracts and papers in favour of total abstinence?" said one of these sanguine enthusiasts to me a while ago. "Why not go for shutting up every liquor shop at once, and then there is an end of both drinking and drunkenness?" I asked my good friend how he would shut up the drinking dens without stringent laws, and how he could get his laws without a strong public sentiment to enact them and an equally strong public sentiment to enforce them? This sentiment cannot be created by force, or manufactured "to order"; it must be the result of powerful and persistent moral efforts directly brought to bear on individual consciences.

This is all true no doubt, but how are we to know when public sentiment is strong enough to enforce such laws? There is no difficulty in ascertaining whether public sentiment is strong enough to *enact* prohibitory laws. All you need do is submit the law to them and if a majority vote for the law, it is *enacted*; but how can any one know without trying whether the sentiments that *enacts* the law is strong enough to *enforce* it? Dr. Cuyler is of the opinion that the only trustworthy test is the amount of abstinence without the law. If a vast majority of the people have ceased to drink intoxicants *without* the law, the law can be enforced. Destroy the *demand* by moral means, and then it will be comparatively easy to suppress the sale.

The first prohibitory law to suppress tippling houses was enacted in the State of Maine about thirty-seven years ago. The whole State had been thoroughly leavened by temperance truth by pulpits, platform and press. The drinking customs of society had been broken down by moral arguments; the vast majority of the community had ceased to drink intoxicants. The demand was destroyed to such a degree that it was comparatively easy to suppress the sale.

To illustrate and enforce his position the Doctor gives these facts:

In all the towns of Maine in which there is a strong and healthy public sentiment against buying and drinking liquor, the prohibitory law is a grand success. In such a city as Bangor there is no such wholesome sentiment, and as a result, the law is trampled under foot, and 150 dram shops are in full blast. The simple reason why a prohibitory law is an impossibility in Brooklyn is that a large majority of the population is in favour of buying and using either spirituous or malt liquors. Probably not more than one-quarter of the inhabitants are entire abstainers from any kind of intoxicant. When a large majority in any city or town demand intoxicants, there will be a sale to meet it.

When the Scott Act was adopted in so many counties in Ontario three years ago the promoters of the Act often said that hundreds of men were voting for it who were not themselves abstainers. That was no doubt true, and it seemed a rather favourable sign of the times, but if Dr. Cuyler's contention is correct their support was no real gain in the end. If the *demand* must largely fall away before the law can be enforced, the elector who votes for the law and then *keeps up the demand*, virtually works against his own vote. He occupies the position of the Irishman who said he was in favour of the law, but "agin its enforcement."

Dr. Cuyler sums up in this way:

God has never ordained any easy, patent method of saving mankind from drunkenness, or any other popular sin. Preaching abstinence from the bottle, and practising abstinence is the surest way to make men and women sober. When sobriety is fixed in the conscientious convictions of a community, then such convictions can be embodied in wise

laws for the suppression of dram-dens. But this comes back to individual effort as the foundation work on which the whole superstructure of reform must rest.

Yes, and all real exertion for the good of mankind and the glory of our Master comes back to individual work. It is easy to attend conventions, and pass resolutions, and make speeches, and publish puffs, and cut out work for others. It is *easy* to resolve in the Assembly, and overture the Synod, and "bring it up" in the Presbytery. All that is easy enough, but what does it amount to? The real work—the foundation work—in any good cause must be done by individual men and women.

IS CHRIST OR PETER THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH?

BY THE REV. R. WALLACE.

(Continued.)

But is there any danger of Romanism regaining power? If all Protestants were as ignorant and apathetic in the matter as many are, the Church of Rome certainly would regain her former power, and carry out her declared and unalterable principles, by persecuting to the death all true and faithful servants of Christ. In order to see this, look at a few facts: According to the Rev. Dr. Wylie, of Edinburgh, since 1830 the Romish priesthood has increased fourfold in England and Scotland, and they have declared their resolve to reconquer Britain—the leading Protestant nation—for the Papacy. Hundreds of the nobility and thousands of the clergy of the Church of England have been infected by their principles, so that there is very little difference between High Church Ritualists and Romanists. Besides about 3,000 of the nobility and gentry, 1,000 of these were clergy, have gone over formally to Rome. Both England and Scotland have been covered with splendid Popish cathedrals, churches, convents and convent schools, and I saw when I was in Britain the best sites selected in Aberdeen and elsewhere for these places. The Popish ladies' academies are chiefly missionary schools, and they can well afford to receive pupils at a merely nominal charge, because their main object is to proselytize Protestant girls, and bring them over to the Church of Rome. And they have been successful in thus perverting thousands of the daughters of Protestants, and those chiefly of leading and influential families. Their position and influence in England and Scotland is vastly stronger than it was forty years ago. If any one wishes to know more fully the character of Romanism and the dangers of its return to power, let him read "The History of the Papacy," by Dr. Wylie, of Edinburgh, as well as his "History of the Waldenses," "The Israel of the Alps." And if any one doubts that there is any danger to Protestantism in Britain and on the Continent of Europe from the encroachments of Romanism let him read "The Papacy of Modern Times," being the report of the Glasgow Convention held in December, 1886, by the leading ministers and laymen of Scotland with several leading men from England and Ireland, price \$1; Toronto: 18 Front Street. He will there see that many of the leading minds of Britain are greatly alarmed at the wonderful growth of Popish power, claims and intrigues in Britain and on the Continent. Even the iron-handed Bismarck has come out second best in his conflicts with the Jesuits in Germany, and he has been compelled to yield to several of the demands of Rome. Years ago the English Protestant missionaries were expelled from Tahiti, whose people they had Christianized, and that at the instigation of the French Jesuits. Lately the French tried to seize the New Hebrides, where the Canadian Presbyterian missionaries have been so successful in the conversion of the whole people of Aneiteum and of hundreds on other islands, and had it not been for the spirited remonstrance of our noble young British Colonies of Australia, our missions there, too, would have been put down through the same influence, the same malign influence that has led lately to the expulsion of a leading English missionary from New Caledonia, the missionary being compelled to leave with only a few hours' notice, his mission being closed at great loss to himself and the London Missionary Society. It is proved conclusively that the Papacy is a great political confederacy to put down liberty of conscience, and indeed all true civil liberty the world over. The Jesuits again control the Vatican, and they are the sworn enemies of truth, justice, liberty, morality and the rights of men.

Every Protestant family should have "The Papacy of Modern Times," and "The Jesuits," by Dr. Duff, also "The Papal Conspiracy Exposed," by Dr. Edward Beecher, Kirwin's "Letters to Chief Justice Taney," "The More Priests the More Crime," Toronto: Methodist Book Room; "Lectures on Monachism," by Rev. Albert McLean, of Calton, Scotland; "The Woman, the Priest and the Confessional," \$1, by the Rev. Charles Chiniquy; and especially his "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome," \$2; "Popery as it Was and Is," by William Hogan, converted priest, \$1; "The Priest and the Nun," \$2; "Romanism as it Is," by Dr. Cumming. Cardinal Manning, himself a perverted minister of the Church of England, and now at the head of the Papal conspiracy against Protestantism in Britain, declares openly in one of his Essays on Religion: "Neither true peace nor true charity requires tolerance; the Church has the right to require every one to accept her doctrine, and the duty of the civil power is to enforce the laws and punish heresy."

That proves that the principles of Rome are unchanged, and that if she once regains her power she will put down Protestantism—that is, vital Christianity—as she was wont to do during the Dark Ages. But the special effort of the Church of Rome for over thirty years has been the conquest of the young giant nation, the United States of America—that is growing faster than any other nation. When in 1852 it became evident that Father Chiniquy's plan of forming a colony of Roman Catholic French-Canadians on the fertile plains of Illinois was to be a success, D'Arcy McGee, then editor of the *Free-man's Journal* (the official paper of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York), wrote Father Chiniquy to know his views, and immediately determined to put himself at the head of a similar enterprise in favour of the Irish Roman Catholics. Hence a convention of Roman Catholic bishops and priests met at Buffalo in the spring of 1853, at which Father Chiniquy was present. The bishops strongly opposed the patriotic plans of the generous-hearted McGee. They told him that they were determined to take possession of the United States and rule them for Rome, but they could only do that by acting secretly. They said the best way to succeed was to keep the Romanists in the cities, so rapidly growing in numbers and still more in influence, that they in the course of years would control the votes in the cities, and thus in the country, and send men to the Congress and Senate prepared and pledged to carry out their views. They have been carrying out their views ever since and with wonderful success.

Rev. Charles Chiniquy says in his pamphlet "From Chicago to Australia," that they already are masters of New York, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Paul, Milwaukee, St. Louis, New Orleans, Cincinnati and San Francisco. He says San Francisco, the rich, the beautiful, the great Queen of the West, is in the hands of the Jesuits. He says that while Protestants who gathered gold at the California mines generally returned to their original homes, the priests prevailed on the Roman Catholic gold-finders to remain in San Francisco, and that while you find only a few American, German, Scotch or English millionaires there, you will find more than fifty Irish Catholic millionaires in that city. Hence the leading banks, hotels and the power generally are in the hands of Romanists, and used for the advancement of the interests of Rome. Then, by means of convent schools, they are drawing over thousands of Protestant girls to Rome. More than 10,000 have been thus perverted within a few years. Even if they do not actually join the Church of Rome they become her devoted friends and supporters through the flattery and blandishments of their lady teachers who do all in their power to win their love and help.

I have often wondered at the criminal ignorance and indifference of Protestant parents who send their daughters to these convent schools. I would rather see a beloved daughter in the grave than send her to such an institution, endangering her eternal happiness for the sake of a few showy outside accomplishments such as music, drawing and fancy needlework, taught at a low price, for they give no real culture.

The nuns, and especially the teachers of the convent schools, are the stronghold of Romanism, and one of the chief sources of its success in Protestant lands. They are accomplished and amiable missionaries whose chief aim is to pervert the faith of Protestants.