

tained by violence as well as argument. The Buddhist and Brahmin said: "When you are united yourselves, then you may try to convert us."

With these sentiments we fully agree, and we admire the zeal of the gentlemen who honestly aim at finding a remedy for the divisions and dissensions which have divided Christianity into so many discordant sects.

There is no doubt that all the evils depicted by these speakers result from the existing dissensions and diversities of doctrine taught by the various sects. When their missionaries have laid before the heathen their theories of religion, the latter ask at once, how can they be expected to embrace and believe the doctrines propounded to them, when no two missionaries agree upon what ought to be believed and how the teachings of Christianity are to be put into practice.

What is the true remedy for these diversities, and how is real Christian Unity to be brought about? To ascertain the correct answer to this important question, we should know whence these diversities arise, and it is not extremely difficult to trace them to their real source. It lies in the doctrine of Protestantism that each individual has himself the authority to decide what he should believe and practice in order to be saved.

If we read the New Testament carefully, we find that Christ established a Church, and only one Church, with authority to direct consciences. Of this Church, St. Paul says it is "the pillar and ground of truth." The Apostles who were the first pastors of the Church, were commissioned to teach all nations whatsoever Christ had revealed to or commanded them, and to enable them to fulfill their commission. He promised to send the Holy Ghost to guide them and teach them all truth. He commands all to hear the Church, thus constituted, under penalty of being regarded as "the heathen and the publican." It is, therefore, clear from Holy Scripture that no private individual is authorized to set aside the authority of the Church thus constituted, but that all men are bound to accept its teachings and obey its precepts.

There is, therefore, a supreme authority in the Church of Christ, and it is only by yielding obedience to that authority that Christian Unity can be preserved among Christians; and if that unity be lost through the disobedience of individuals, it can be restored only by a return to due obedience.

The centre of Christian Unity is to be found only in the Catholic Church, and in the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ appointed to be the rock on which His Church is built, and the shepherd who was to feed the lambs and the sheep of Christ's flock, that is, His whole Church, both pastors and people. From all this it follows that the only true basis of Christian unity is to be found in submission to the teachings and precepts of the Catholic Church, and of the Pope.

The Rev. Principal Caven of Knox's (Presbyterian) College was also one of the speakers, and he also expressed his belief that "union is in accord with the Word of God," but he declared that "what we are seeking is not so much outward and visible unity, as fundamental spiritual unity." He also said that "the Church should be broad enough for all."

This is to say, if it means anything, that the Church should tolerate within itself all manner of doctrines, and that Christians are not obliged to belong to one visible Church organization. Both of these propositions are contrary to the essential character of the Church of Christ, as laid down in Scripture, and as we have explained above. The Church has received from Christ a body of doctrine which all should believe, and a visible organization within which all are bound to include themselves.

We can readily concede that if there are some sincere persons who are desirous of knowing the truth of Christ, and who sincerely seek to find it out, but have not yet succeeded in discovering it, God will not hold them guilty of a disobedience which is not their fault; but they are none the less bound to seek the truth, and to embrace it when found.

Professor Caven's idea of the Church of Christ is one which prevails very much among Protestants of the present day, but it leads to a wilful discarding of truths which are known to have been revealed by God, and is, therefore, injurious to God, and unsustained by any teaching of Holy Scripture.

The Rev. Provost Welch of Trinity University laid it down as a principle that "all Protestant bodies are in

agreement as to the fundamental principles of faith, morals, and essential discipline, and in preaching."

This is equally as erroneous as the principle laid down by Professor Caven. Protestant bodies differ most widely on every Christian dogma, except the first article of the Apostles' Creed, which expresses belief in one God the Father Almighty. If it be true that the articles of belief on which Protestants disagree are non-fundamental, Christianity has no fundamental doctrines beyond Deism and Rationalism—an absurdity which no real Christian can maintain.

Provost Welch's and Principal Caven's principles are evidently not in accordance with the teachings of their own respective Churches, which lay down systems of doctrine which they proclaim to be the teaching of Scripture. These reverend gentlemen, therefore, have evidently laid down their principles for the purpose of covering up the differences between the teachings of their Churches, and of thus promoting an apparent union between discordant and irreconcilable creeds. It must be evident to all that by this means true Christian unity will not be promoted, neither will a trust worthy creed be offered to the Buddhist and Brahmin spoken of by Chancellor Burwash. The Catholic Church alone can present to these unbelievers a creed consistent with itself in every aspect under which it may be viewed.

The new society for the promotion of Christian Unity numbers about sixty members. Our desire in regard to it is that its members may arrive at unity by embracing the faith "once delivered to the saints." That faith will be found unimpaired and uncorrupted in the Catholic Church.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND TOLERATION.

In the Brooklyn Union of Saturday, Nov. 5, there appears an article from the pen of the Rev. Silliman Blagden, a well known Boston clergyman, in regard to "Christian Unity," which has been so much spoken of during the last few years.

The Rev. Mr. Blagden is sincerely zealous to bring about the desired union of all Christians, but he differs from the majority of his fellow-clergymen inasmuch as he does not, like them, exclude Catholics from the folds of his mantle of charity.

The occasion which led the Rev. Mr. Blagden to urge the repeal of a British law was the publication of a portion of that law which prescribes that British sovereigns shall swear not only to uphold Protestantism, but also to repudiate belief in the authority of the Pope within British Dominions. The purpose of this persecuting law was, in the first instance, to exclude James II., then Duke of York, from the throne, and afterward to exclude any Catholic heir. Its first object was not gained, as Charles II. resolutely refused to sanction his brother's exclusion, but the succession was limited to Protestants willing to take these oaths. This is the law objected to by Rev. S. Blagden as follows:

ANENT "CHRISTIAN UNITY."
By Rev. Silliman Blagden.
"And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works." (Hob. 10:24)
"A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."
By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John 13:35)

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.
Having read in the "Baltimore Christian Advocate" an article entitled, "England's Declaration," showing the "declaration" which every sovereign has to repeat on the day of coronation; and wondering whether it could be correct and true, I consequently sent it to the Earl Nelson, of Trafalgar, Salisbury, London, (whose tender heart and earnest and grand work in behalf of "Christian Unity," has brought us into occasional correspondence for years past) asking him to please write me about it, and to correct or refute it. And I have just received a letter from him, wherein he writes,—"The Newspaper extract you send me refers to a declaration which forms no part of the Coronation Service, and has no Church authority."

But was passed by Parliament, and has to be made by every king and queen of the age of twelve years, either at the coronation, or in the first Parliament on the Throne, in the House of Lords, and is called "The Declaration against Popery."

As I am in the country, I cannot get a book to verify the words, but I dare say it is very much as the newspaper gives them. The Bill enacting it was passed with the avowed purpose of excluding James II., who had become a Roman Catholic.

But he was strong enough in the House of Lords to prevent the Bill passing without a special clause freeing him from the obligation of making it.

Subsequently it was made binding on all Kings by the Bill of Rights—I don't think it has been repealed.

And this last clause of Earl Nelson's letter, namely, that he thinks that this Act or law has not been as yet repealed, moves me to write the following letter to the Hon. Earl Rosebery:

To the Hon. Earl Rosebery, ex Premier of England:

Honorable and Dear Sir—I will plunge, so to speak, in *medias res*—and request you to be so kind and gracious as to carefully read the enclosed letter to me, from the Earl Nelson, together with its marked paper clipping and contents. It is self-explanatory. And Earl Nelson's remark that the present law has never been "repealed," moves me to write to you this letter.

I am a great lover of the cause of "Chris-

tian Unity." I work and pray, and sow the seed, in its behalf, with all my might and main. I preach in all churches where I am invited. I make much of the Holy Communion; participating in, and partaking of this Blessed Sacrament several times each week, and sometimes every day.

I am "in touch" with our dear fellow-Christians in the Roman Catholic Church: only yesterday I received a copy of Cardinal Gibbons' (the ecclesiastical head of the Catholic Church in the United States) new book, entitled,—"The Ambassador of Christ," with his card inside, upon which he had written:—"Very glad of your getting well." For I have been quite sick; and I had asked for his prayers. I mention all this, as showing how real and practical a thing is, "Christian Unity," when our heart is really in it!

Now the law mentioned in the enclosed, clipping, which I sent to Earl Nelson, is diametrically and cruelly, as well as unjustly, antagonistic to this blessed cause and spirit of "Christian Unity," which is both ordained by Jehovah, and commanded by Christ Almighty in the Holy Bible. Now will not you put in motion, (and "set the ball rolling,") such Parliamentary legislation, as will bring about the quick and absolute repeal of the odious and God-offending Law, which so wickedly, and I may say blasphemously, militates against and renders for the time impossible, the Divine cause of "Christian Unity"? Nothing could add greater lustre to your already distinguished name and fame; nor cause it to shine more brightly and everlastingly, upon the pages of the history, of the years and centuries to come than such a Christ-like crusade in behalf of "Christian Unity!"

And why cannot you, with such men as Earl Nelson, undertake such grand and Heavenly Mission, which will redound to the spiritual good and blessing of not only all England and the British Empire, but also, by force of example, that of the whole wide world?

May the Lord Jesus Christ Almighty move upon you, and incline your mind and heart so to do; and give you wisdom, might, and the Holy Ghost power, both to do, and also to accomplish it; in accordance to His Divine Will and Way; and mightily Bless you in the act, for His Great and Dear Name's Sake. Amen.

I am most respectfully and faithfully yours,
Rev. Silliman Blagden,
No. 130 Bowdoin street,
Boston, Mass., U. S. A., 2nd Nov., 1898.

THE QUEBEC ANTI-PROHIBITION VOTE.

Some of the advocates of Prohibition, not content with legitimate argument in favor of a prohibitory law, declaim violently against the people of Quebec for having rolled up so large a majority against the proposed law. While the English-speaking provinces of the Dominion have given a majority of the votes cast, for prohibition, Quebec has given so large a contrary vote as almost to cancel the large majority given on the opposite side by the other provinces. In neither case was there even one half of the votes of the respective provinces cast, but while 22.1 per cent. of the voters in the English provinces were in favor of a prohibitory law, in Quebec there was only 8 per cent. on the same side. No one pretends that the people of Quebec are wanting in sobriety; for it is a well-known fact it is the most sober of all our provinces, and that the consumption of alcoholic beverages is smaller there than in any other part of the Dominion. The Local Option law is enforced in a large number of municipalities, and there are no licenses issued in over 300 municipalities. The cause of the large anti-Prohibition vote in Quebec is, therefore, certainly not intemperance on the part of the people. It arises, undoubtedly, from the conviction of the population that prohibition is an extreme and unnecessary measure.

We must enter a strong protest against the misrepresentations of the people of Quebec, in which some ultra advocates of Prohibition have indulged. Thus one Mrs. Maddock of Guelph, speaking recently at the Women's Temperance Union Convention at Ottawa, declared the reason of the Quebec vote to be that the people of that province are illiterate, and that "nearly one half of the population cannot write."

The exact figures are stated to be 784,026 who can read and write, and 720,830 who must sign (their names) with a cross. It is admitted by her that the latter number includes infants, but she adds: "Leaving out those under ten years of age, there are 274,904 who have no education at all, and 65,583 more who can read but not write. If that is not, for this country, an unparalleled record of ignorance, where would we find one?"

These figures are grossly exaggerated. It is probably true that there are some more in Quebec who cannot read and write, than in Ontario, in proportion to population, as the people of that province have been in the past laboring under some disadvantages in regard to climate, fertility of soil, wealth, comparative paucity of population, etc., but every effort has been made to advance in education along with the whole population of the Dominion, and these efforts have been very successful. The proof of this is that the average attendance at all schools in the Province of Quebec for the last twelve months, as officially reported, was 231,196, and in Ontario, 291,218. These figures show that the daily attendance at school in Quebec is 155 out of every 1000 of population, whereas Ontario has only 138 for its daily attendance out of every 1000. It is evi-

dent, therefore, that the education of the children in Quebec is now at least as carefully attended to as in Ontario, and if, years ago, Quebec was slightly behind, the case will probably be reversed before the lapse of many years, for the figures have stood in the proportion we have here given for many years. They indicate that the people of Quebec are even more in earnest in educating their children than those of any other province.

"LEST WE FORGET."

Every individual Catholic has a place in the important work of extending the light of faith to those who, from various causes, are groping in spiritual darkness. It is not sufficient to look out only for one's own salvation. That is our first duty, but not the only one we are obliged to perform. When God commanded us to love our neighbor as ourselves, He made each of us, in a certain sense, his brother's keeper.

The gospel of selfishness is utterly incompatible with the broad spirit of charity and brotherly love which Christ and His Church command us to practice. The person who contents himself, therefore, with taking care of number one in spiritual matters, to the exclusion of the rest of humankind, lives in a fool's paradise if he fancies that he is traversing the narrow way that leads to everlasting happiness.

It is quite characteristic of blindly selfish souls to cherish the hallucination that their conduct, though at no point approaching the ideal held up for our emulation by the tenets and teachings of Christianity, is all that is requisite to their own particular comfort and salvation. People who are thus self-deluded in their spiritual vision, are, necessarily, intellectually narrow and inconsiderate in all their dealings with fellow beings.

In the great membership of the visible organization of Christ's Church there are many of these bat-like creatures who vainly imagine that the little sphere of activity to which they carefully confine themselves is the only vitally important area of God's universe. They are stupidly indifferent to the broad, all embracing horizon of Catholicity in its true aspect, the embodiment of practical love and fellowship, of tenderness and charity—in short, of Christian unselfishness applied to our every relation to God and neighbor.

Such individuals call themselves Catholics, but in no single respect, it is safe to assert, do their lives and actions respond to the infallible test of genuine faith. It is not rash judgment to suspect that they are of the number of whom Jesus spoke when He said: "Not everyone who saith to Me Lord, Lord shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Unless we have that charity which concerns itself for the welfare of our brother man, valuable professions of faith and self-righteousness are worse than vain.

It is by no means optional with us, then, to serve our neighbor by means of kindness, consideration and good example: we are obliged to do so or forfeit whatever claim we may possess to the unmerited inheritance of spiritual favor.—Catholic Universe.

CATHOLIC STRENGTH AND PROTESTANT WEAKNESS.

Remarkable Sermon Delivered by a Congregationalist Minister of Newark.

Much comment has been indulged in by the congregation of the First Congregational Church, Newark, N. J., and by others concerning the latest sermon which the pastor, Rev. Dr. J. A. Chamberlain, preached on the subject, "What the Roman Catholic Church Can Teach the Protestant Churches." Among other things Dr. Chamberlain said:

"First of the lessons that she may teach her Protestant sister is magnificent devotion to the external forms of faith. The Catholic is true to the forms of His Church. He believes in His Church, reveres her services, honors her priests, attends her worship. The Catholic servant is up before day that she may go to early Mass, returns and provides breakfast, deafens herself ringing the rising bell for her Protestant employer, who, in spite of the noble example of the servant, rises too late to attend an 11 o'clock service."

"Again I turn to the same devout worshippers and I find a lesson to sacrifice for the services of faith. Do they build a church, the rich and poor pay for it. Together they rear the temple of the Lord. The servant girl gives her mite, and oftentimes, like the widow's mite of old, it is all that she bath. The laboring man gives up his wages and the rich man out of his abundance."

"Look at the Catholic Church's organized charities—hospitals, founding homes, rescue homes for those whom society in cold blood casts out, orphanages. And no man knows the number of her good works."

"Does not the Protestant Church do the same? Yes, in a measure, but you all know how meagrely."

"The weakness of Protestantism is her divisions. One Catholic Church, one hundred and forty-three Protestant denominations in the United States; divisions on most trivial lines—doctrines, governments, sacraments, even things absurd. Competition is rife. Churches are placed like stores, with the idea of competing. Denominations which work in the same general methods, even of the same name and doctrine, are in the same block and striving for the same people."

"Infinitely worse than all this is a division that is both weakness and

wickedness. The rich and poor do not meet together in the Protestant churches, as they should. They do meet together in the Catholic Church. Rich men in Protestantism have their churches, and there, once in a while, dole out a small contribution to keep up a mission for the poor."

"In the Catholic Church rich men and beggars do meet together and kneel on the same stool and partake of the sacred elements from the same hand. The Catholic Church has a power here that is not to be found elsewhere."

"The Protestant is not potent to change this, for, say what we will, we must admit that we do foster the divisions by an unwritten and unholy law that puts asunder those whom God hath joined together for worship."

"The Catholic Church can do more to day for the settlement of social problems than all the others combined. When she sees fit to enter the temperance war with a will it will be settled, and not till then. When she undertakes to teach men the arts of industrial life, conformable to justice for capital and labor, progress will be made."

BIBLICAL LOTTERIES.

We print in another column a letter from the Right Rev. Bishop of Anguilla, Mexico, to Rev. J. F. Sheahan of Pocantico Hills, N. Y., explaining the nature of the "Lottery for Souls," which has been so much talked about of late.

Put in its true light, as it is by the Bishop's explanation, there is nothing wrong in this casting of lots to determine who shall have the privilege of directing a work of charity; and that is all the Puebla lottery means. No one who is in any way familiar with the Holy Scriptures can object to it on the score that lotteries are sinful. There are many cases in the Scriptures where lotteries were resorted to to determine issues, with the approval and command of God.

For the instruction of Rev. J. S. Borton, Methodist missionary at Puebla and the sectarian editors who show the whites of their pious eyes in holy horror at lotteries, we will take the trouble to refer to some texts of Scripture over which they may ponder. If they are ignorant of these texts they have been talking without sufficient scriptural knowledge, and if they knew them while condemning lotteries as sinful and a heathenish custom they assume to know more about the subject than their Maker does. They imitate the example of the prohibition preacher who, with the unctuous ploy of half closed eyes and prayerful voice, said he thought if the Lord had foreseen the evils of spirituous liquors He would not have selected wine as the element of the Sacrament. This fanciful crank did not see that he was assuming to know more than the Son of God knew.

We hope the texts which we are about to give will not make Rev. Borton and the pious editors think the less of the Almighty; as the old Scotch kirk woman did of our Lord when she learned that He plucked corn on the Sabbath.

Now, gentlemen, take your Bibles in hands, turn the whole force of your pious and ill formed intellects on it and open it at Leviticus, chapter 16, verses 7 to 10; and you will learn that the goat that was to be sacrificed was to be distinguished from the emissary or scape goat by the casting of lots. This lottery you will observe was by command of the Lord. "And the Lord spoke to Moses and commanded him, saying," etc.

The next text we call your pious attention to is from Numbers, chapter 26 verses from 52 to 57. "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: To these shall the land be divided for their possessions according to the number of their names . . . yet so that by lot the land be divided to the tribes and families. Whatsoever shall fall by lot that shall be taken by the more or the fewer."

Again, the Lord said to Moses, "Josue the son of Nun thy minister, he shall go in (to land of Canaan) for thee: exhort and encourage him, and he shall divide the land by lot to Israel."—Deuteronomy 1, 38.

Again, "I have given it (the land) to you in possession, and you shall divide it among you by lot . . . to every one as the lot shall fall, so shall the inheritance be given."—Numbers xxxiii, 53, 54.

Again, Josue said: "The land in the midst between these, mark you out into seven parts, and ye shall come hither to me that I may cast lots for you before the Lord your God. . . . And he (Josue) cast lots before the Lord in Silo, and divided the land to the children of Israel into seven parts."—Josue xviii, 6, 9.

If you turn your sanctimonious attention to I. Kings, chapter 10, you will learn that Saul, the first King of Israel, was selected by lot.

The author of the Book of Proverbs says, "Lots are cast into the lap, but they are disposed of by the Lord. . . . The lot suppresseth contentions, and determineth even between the mighty."—Chap. xvi, 33, and xviii, 18.

Coming to the New Testament we find that the successor of Judas to the Apostolate was determined by lot. "And they gave them (Joseph and Matthias) lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles."—Acts 1, 26.

Now, gentlemen, having perused and meditated on all these Bible texts, what think you of lotteries? Are they sinful? Will you care to say so with the sacred pages staring you in the face? What think you now, Rev. Mr. Borton of Puebla, is casting lots a "heathenish custom"? If so, then

Moses, Josue, the Apostles, and even your Maker were guilty of heathenish customs. We do not for a moment doubt the capacity of your mouth, but it is really large enough to swallow the conclusion that follows from your words?

Some of the pious editors may say that it is not to the lottery they object, for this is scriptural, but to its abuse. Very well, if there be abuses they should be stopped. But if we must put a stop to everything that is subject to being abused, we should have to stop life, liberty, health, and even the grace of God, for all these things can be abused.

But after reading the Bishop's letter we believe that most if not all the abuses reported by preachers and tract peddlers have their habitat in their twisted imaginations. If some exist they are certainly without the knowledge of the Bishop, the responsible ecclesiastical superior, for he is not a faithless shepherd. He is a zealous, upright, scholarly man, who loves his Church and is wearing out his life for his clergy and people. Archbishop Corrigan knew him when they were both students in Rome. He is beloved and esteemed by all the Bishops and priests of the United States who have had the pleasure of knowing him.

Should he at any future time think that the lottery that exists in his diocese, good and innocent in itself, may be misunderstood by well meaning people and be occasion of scandal to his weaker brethren (see Romans xiv, 14 to 21) his own learning and piety, the promptings of his love of God and of his neighbor, the dictates of his own true and well informed conscience are sufficient to direct him what is best to do, without the busybody intermeddling of ignorant outsiders who have their axes to grind in the way of drawing on the missionary fund.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

"PARSONS AT SEA ABOUT SIN."

Such is the heading of an item of news in the New York World of Oct. 26. The item referred to the sixtieth annual gathering of the Manhattan Congregational Association in Brooklyn. These Congregationalists, after meeting regularly year after year for sixty five years, made, in their sixty sixth convention, a strenuous but unavailing effort to define sin, that is, to tell what it is. They, says the item, "tried with all their might to find out what sin is. They failed utterly."

A reverend gentleman started the discussion, and presumably started the meeting, by asking, "What is sin?" At once all hands tried to tell. One minister modestly suggested card playing. Another thought it was dancing. A third objected to these definitions. Still others tried to define sin, but failed and were laughed down. Another thought billiards and golf on Sunday would fill the bill as a definition.

A solid headed member asked the pertinent question, "Don't we know what sin is when we are always preaching against it?"

It appears that for sixty six years these "ministers of the Gospel" had been preaching against sin, and at the end of that time suddenly discovered that they did not know what it is; that is, did not know what they had been preaching about. Is it surprising that infidels and scoffers laugh?

These Reverend Lights and Watchmen on the ramparts of Protestant Israel remind one of an old Western preacher whose piety was more edifying than his theological learning was instructive. He once tried to snatch a brand from the burning; in other words, to convert a Catholic to his ism. In the course of the interesting and delicate process, he told the Catholic that he should avoid sin. The subject of his zeal thought well of the advice, and to give it a practical bearing, asked his instructor, "What is sin?" Of course, said the Gospel, being a Catholic you are not supposed to know. Well, sin is to cuss and swear and chew tobacco and dance and play cards. All these things may be sinful, but I want to know what sin itself is, replied the pupil. Can you tell me? Of course I can; it is card playing and dancing and tobacco chewing and swearing and cussin'. These may be sinful, but they are not sin, urged the pupil. But it was useless. The instructor could only repeat his list back and forth, with the occasional addition of some other item as it came into his head.

The Congregational Association, seeing that giving a bill of particulars was not equivalent to a definition, finally agreed on the following, which, as an illustration of theological hebetude, leaves nothing to be desired: "Sin is a moral responsibility depending solely on a personal point of view, always assuming there is desire to do right behind it."

The average mind will think that a moral responsibility with a desire to do right behind it is a very good thing to have. Had the gentlemen paid five cents for a Catholic child's catechism, studied it, they would have found the following piece of much needed information. "What is sin? Answer: Sin is any thought, word, deed, or omission contrary to the law of God."—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

It is strange what sensations of sublimity may spring from a very humble source.—Hawthorne: Night Sketches. All ill will which does not pass the region of thought seems innocent to us, and, with our clumsy justice, we excuse, without examination, the sin which does not betray itself in action. —Emile Souvestre.