

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1898.

NO. 1048

An Unpublished Poem.
TO NELLIE HENRY, WITH THE DAILY BLESSING OF FATHER RYAN.
April 1, 1881.
In the eclipse of your soul—
Ah! me, they come to all.
Across the sunshine shadows roll.
O'er you, o'er each they fall;
And when you cannot help but cry
Oh, Christ! give more of rest and light!
Oh, Christ! give less of toil and night!
And when you cannot help but sigh
For something dim and vague and far
May words of mine be somewhat like a star,
To ring around your feet
Gleams fair and pure and sweet,
To guide your way
Each lonely day
To the good, the just, the true,
This prayer I breathe for you.
—Abram J. Ryan.

THE TRIUMPH OF WICKLIFFE

A Day With Rev. Dr. Kerr Boyce Tupper and His Pet Reformer.

The Rev. Kerr Boyce Tupper, D. D., of the First Baptist Church, delivered on last Sunday evening a sermon on "John Wickliffe and His Triumph Over the Papacy," which was a notable deliverance from several view points and which served to accentuate, as did the service, the inconsistencies of the Protestant sects. The differing views which even the members of one congregation hold are illustrated by their actions. On entering some lean their heads on their hands and pray devoutly, but the vast majority come into the church as to a social gathering and shake hands and chat. The humble usher escorts you to your proper place and there you find a hymnal entitled "Landes Dmmt" [Some Jesuit mist have sneaked in and stamped this Latin title on the book]. A psalm is chanted in alternate verses by minister and people and a hymn is sung by these private judgment advocates, in which the words occur, "Fear not, I will pilot thee."
The sermon, however, is the principal feature of Sunday's exercises, and yet the cry is "the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible." Catholics contend that Christ neither gave the New Testament nor ordered it to be written, but that He ordered His apostles to teach all nations by preaching. Their opponents argue that the Bible is the sole rule of faith and then exalt preaching to the most important place in their services. There was a novel feature introduced into the extemporaneous (?) prayer at this church. Near its close the organist was noticed to be fingering the keys and at the proper word he started up and the choir finished with a verse from a hymn. Ritualism is something to be condemned, say our Baptist brethren, but here is an effort at it which would be in much better taste were it less unexpected.

THE TRIUMPH (?) OF WICKLIFFE

"Wickliffe's triumph over the Papacy" at last had its turn, and poor Martin Luther was ruthlessly robbed of the questionable honor of being the pioneer reformer. The array of reformers who preceded him, with their various "isms," were recited, as also the things which they battled to reform—among them Papal despotism, monastic corruption, the base life of the clergy, the criminality of *curricular confession*, Masses for the dead, the prohibition of the translation of the Scriptures, the keeping of human minds in bondage, of human souls in fear. The times demanded and unchained and unenslaved Bible, in order that it might be proved that Christ was true to His promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church which He had founded.
Here began a eulogy of the preacher's hero, who, he said, was as gentle as a lamb, though bold as a lion in redressing wrongs. He contended for liberty of conscience, the right of private judgment, an open Bible for all, without regard to age or condition, and justification without merits. The Bible he found in one of three conditions—chained, on dark shelves or burned in "hot flames." This was all the use they had for the Word of God. The Pope, it seems, according to Dr. Tupper, was not the chief obstacle to the Bible's growth, after all. The Norman conquest sadly interfered with the Bible's translation. A new language had to be instituted, and the people during the years cared nothing for manuscripts. Macaulay was quoted as saying that the Bible for centuries had dried up, and that up to that time there had not been a single translation into English handed over to the people. But in 1382 every man and woman in England knew the Word of God, old and young, rich and poor, ignorant and learned.
The Queen of Bohemia then got her share of praise for making any one who stood in the way of the translation of the Bible amenable to the law. Despite the Archbishop of Canterbury and Pope Alexander V., who had said no man should read the Word of God, every one was permitted through Wickliffe's efforts to read it as he sat under his own vine. In 1378 his trial took place. The poor old man was quite alone and an earthquake broke up the assemblage at three different trials of Wickliffe, "a singular fact." He was condemned because he had given the Word of God to the people. Here Dr. Tupper got very dramatic, and quoted Wickliffe as saying: "If God be for me, who can be against

me?" His last moments were described thus: "Commending his spirit to God he sank quietly into his chair, was struck with paralysis and died." The Pope claimed his death was a judgment of God.
Among the results of his death, according to the preacher, were these: Ten years after the House of Lords passed a bill that no man in the United Kingdom shall read the English language; twenty-four years after it was commanded that no writing of Wickliffe should be read by the people.
The speaker told of Wickliffe's notes on the margin of his Bible, in which he showed he did not trust the people to interpret for themselves and was not very sure of his own view. "This I think, is the interpretation." When his attention was called to the phrase "do ye penance" and it was asked why he let that remain in his translation when he was against penance, he was quoted as saying: "I may be against something God is not against, I must give a correct translation."

A HOPELESS TASK.

The effort to convict the Church of opposition to the Bible, which the labor of monks preserved for centuries, is among the hardest tasks of the anti-Catholic preacher. Father Turner, of the cathedral, speaking of "chained" Bibles in a lecture some years ago, said that some bright luminary in the next century discovering an old Philadelphia directory chained will say that the people were not allowed to read it, and these directories are far from being as valuable as the manuscript Bibles were. As far as unchained Bibles, the sects have not got the whole Bible, and Wickliffe's Bible was practically condemned by Protestants themselves, for they awaited the publication of the English Catholic Bible of 1609 before publishing the King James version, and modeled it after the Catholic version, abandoning Wickliffe's, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Cromwell's, the Geneva and the Bishop's, all non-Catholic publications corrupted to advance certain religious and political views, and now the Revised version, which is still nearer the Catholic, replaces the King James. The Queen of Bohemia, who would not allow the publication of Bibles to be interfered with, was different from Queen Elizabeth, the Protestant Virgin Queen who persecuted Catholics for publishing it.
As for translating the Bible into the vernacular, the Catholic Church was away ahead of Wickliffe. Early in the eighth century the Venerable Bede translated it into Saxon, then the prevailing tongue. There were seven editions of the Bible in German before Luther's time, and all of them Catholic.

THE TRIUMPH (?) OF WICKLIFFE

The Catholic Church does not believe along with Dr. Tupper that the ignorant are as competent to interpret the Bible as the learned. Neither did Wickliffe, hence the marginal notes. The statement that in 1382 every man could sit under his own vine and read his Bible is certainly startling, considering that the art of printing was not yet in vogue, and for many years after was not in such a condition that every man could afford to own a Bible. Wickliffe was, according to his biographers, paralyzed a number of years before the day of his death and did not die so dramatically as depicted by the learned doctor, who for got to say that he died while hearing Mass. As to being alone at his trial, his supporters were so many that a riot was almost precipitated because the people thought an attack was being made on the presiding Bishop. As to the alleged earthquake: by what process of reasoning can Dr. Tupper urge that they were a judgment of Providence, which is not equally strong for the Pope's alleged utterance that Wickliffe's paralysis was? Sir David Brewer, LL. D., and Daniel Haskel, A. M., both Protestants, give in their "Chronological View of the World" any number of references regarding comets and earthquakes, but a *single fact* is that they do not name one near the period of the trials.
If in 1382 every man, woman and child knew the Word of God, it was because the Church of Christ under His vicar the Pope was doing its work thoroughly. Somelike Wickliffe knew the Word of God, but did not heed it. Their publications and the Word of God were two entirely different things. There were things, as Wickliffe admitted, which he was against and God was not. The Papacy is one of them. It still lives, and Wickliffe, if here to-day, would not recognize a single Protestant sect as his own. Wickliffe acknowledged the Papacy when he appealed to the Pope against Archbishop Langham, but, losing his case, he then denied the authority of the court. The preacher who blames the Catholic Church because she does not recognize every man's writings and translations as the Word of God should not at the same time withhold from his people the facts of history. Despite the so-called reformers of past ages and those who misrepresent her at the present time, the gates of hell have not prevailed against Christ's Church.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

The consummation of madness is to do what, at the time of doing it, we intend to be sorry for afterward—the deliberate and intentional making of work for repentance.—W. Nevins.

THE RAFFLE FOR SOULS.

Statement of Facts by Archbishop Perfectus.

(Translation)
Angelopolis,
(Puebla de los Angeles, M. Mex.)
September 26 1898.

To the Rev. Joseph F. Sheehan, rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Pucanito Hills, N. Y.:

Rev. Sir: A few days ago I received your letter, informing me of the attacks made in the newspapers of your country on my clergy, on account of our "Lotteries in Favor of the Souls in Purgatory."
First of all, I must thank you for your kindness in sending me the information, because it gives me an opportunity of saying a few words to remove any scandal that the Catholics of New York may have suffered from these reports, and also of repelling the calumnious charges of superstition made against my clergy and faithful people.
Whatever truth or falsehood there may be in the reports of the pious custom called "Lottery for Souls in Purgatory" (in Spanish, "raffle" on behalf of the souls in purgatory") in a few words I will explain to you what they are.

Shortly before the month of November, in certain churches, in which special works are performed in aid of the souls in Purgatory, the rectors of these churches make out a series of numbers, say, from 1 to 1,000. Opposite these numbers the faithful may write the names of the deceased persons for whom they wish the works to be performed, giving at the same time an aim of 10 cents or so to cover expenses. Certain special spiritual works are promised beforehand for the four or five souls whose numbers shall be drawn in the lottery. For example, for the first, the thirty Gregorian Masses; one Mass on each day for thirty successive days; for the second, a Silem Mass of Requiem; for the third, fourth, fifth, etc., a certain number of private Masses; and, besides this, some Masses are offered for all the souls in drawing. On the day appointed the drawing takes place, and then the works specified are performed, according to the established manner of the Church, for the souls of those whose names answer to the numbers designated on the lot. The money collected is given as stipends for Masses and for the other expenses. Thus the faithful are easily enabled to be the means of helping the souls in Purgatory, by the common works offered for all, and if their lot should be the one drawn they aid these souls by the special works also, which, otherwise, they could not obtain without some difficulty.

Neither have my priests given assurance that souls, even those aided by the special works, have certainly left Purgatory and gone to Heaven.

From what I have just explained to you, you will see, Reverend Sir, that there is nothing superstitious in this pious custom; and I will take care, and, with God's help, I shall use the greatest possible vigilance that no taint of superstition or sordid greed shall ever find an entrance here.
After having read this perhaps you will say: If this is so, how did all these complaints get in the newspapers? How did all these scandals arise?
If you ask me I will tell you. There are in this city two Protestant establishments from the United States. Their members not only scatter the tares of their detestable disquisitions among our Catholic people, but they also try, by every possible means, to vilify us before other nations as if we were sunk in the darkness of ignorance and superstition, that they themselves may appear as heralds of the truth and as the teachers of the people, and thus keep up the streams of money pouring into them from societies for the propagation of heresy. They are the originators of all the falsehoods and calumnies against us. Their manner of acting in trying to rob our Catholic people of their faith has this effect also: it has made the American nation detestable to Mexicans, as that is the nation from which these false prophets come. That these men and their methods are liable to be occasions of discussions and trouble in the future is easy to see.

I think that I have now complied with your wishes, and I will ask if you, as a favor, to explain this matter to those who have been scandalized by the reports concerning us, and at the same time warn them not to be too ready to believe similar stories reflecting on the Mexican clergy. By doing so you will do a service to our common mother, the Holy Church. With my best wishes and kindest regards, I am,
Your servant in Christ,
Perfectus,
Bishop of Angelopolis.

—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Oh, do not, in proof that you did not forget your departed ones, call attention to the pompous funeral display you ordered, to the costly casket, the imposing monument. Vanity of vanities! It is help, help they need, relief for which they cry in the words of Joseph in Pharaoh's prison: "Remember me when it shall be well with thee and do me this kindness to take me out of prison."—Rev. John A. Nagelsien.

IS ONE RELIGION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER?

Rev. Father Calmer, in His Fifth Lecture, Discussed Truth and Error.

"Indifferentism, or, Is One Religion as Good as Another?" was the subject of Rev. Father Calmer's fifth lecture at St. Xavier's Church last Sunday night. Father Calmer introduced his lecture by comparing unbelief to the Dead Sea. He said that the spirit of unbelief is deathlike, and to inhale its pestilential breath begets moral ruin. As upon the shores of the Dead Sea grow apples of Sodom, fair to view, but when, if you touch, turn to ashes; so upon the shores of the Dead Sea of unbelief there ripens fruit, all fair without, but rottenness within.

This fruit is Indifferentism. Its teachings are not merely theoretical, but have a practical bearing, not only upon the daily moral life of the individual, but, like poisonous waters, they filtrate from the upper to the lower strata of society, sapping the foundations of the private and public faith of the people, so that before we are aware the whole superstructure of religion crumbles to ruin. How often do we not hear that religion is necessary—but why be so intolerant? Why not practice greater charity to your fellow-men? It makes little difference what a man believes: one religion is as good as the other; it matters not which one you profess, provided you are religious. Let the rising generation choose from among the thousand and one forms of religion, which, like a crazy quilt, covers the earth: God has given reason to man, and let each one's private judgment dictate the choice. It is intolerance not to put all on an equal footing; it is an undue restraint put on man's freedom of action.

These affirmations, at first sight, seemed vanished with plausibility; there is nothing narrow or cramped about them—but in truth when touched by the finger of sound sense they are found to be like the apples of Sodom—fair without and rottenness within. They are radically false, since religion, if at all admitted as necessary to all moral life, is essentially one. Religions cannot allow a variety of contradictory tenets, and if unity is of its essence, it is necessarily intolerant.

Absolute indifferentism, which is the total denial of all positive belief, is, perhaps, not so dangerous, if we have a spark of faith left, on account of its repellent form. Relative indifferentism, which consists in the admission of the compatibility of various creeds, all of which are true and necessary to salvation, no matter how opposed to each other, is more dangerous because more insidious. It is like being stung by a death dealing scorpion hidden in an bush behind a bank of fragrant flowers.
Father Calmer said that, as children of the Church, we are warned against it by the authoritative pronouncements of the Church. The encyclicals of the Pope condemned it. In the Syllabus, the catalogue enumerating the errors of the present age, we are forbidden to assert that eternal life may be attained by any and every form of belief: for it is evident that to affirm this would be the same as to assert that all religions are true. Popular prejudice may be roused; the teachings of the Church are said to be opposed to modern advanced thought, progress and reform.

Intolerance is the watchword of the Indifferentist, but arguments cannot be found, for reason plainly proves its consistency and correctness. Throw aside all bias and what does reason teach?
In the ultimate analysis of the nature of religion, we find, in the first place, God, the Creator, to whom is due the service of reverence, love and obedience—it is not what the creature wants, but what the Creator demands; in the next place, there is the rational creature, who, by her nature, is morally bound to the Creator. He is a creature dependent on Him, and he must recognize and acknowledge this dependence. He cannot escape the law of this creaturehood. Now reason teaches that God is one, the alpha and omega of his being. There is, therefore, but one way of tending and attaining to this end, and that is by a service such as God has pointed out and by no other, since, as Supreme Lord and Master, He has a right to be served and worshipped as He commands. Who can gainsay this palpably plain truth? Moreover, men in this respect are equal, all dependent, and consequently this dependence and the manner of showing it are one and the same for all men. Therefore, reason teaches that religion, which consists in the recognition of this dependence and the acting out of the obligations which this dependence entails upon the creature, must be one and the same for all men. Paul of Tarsus put the conclusion of the argument pithily: "One God: one baptism; one faith."

The popular argument of the Indifferentist, is, as there may be various roads leading to the same terminus, so there may be various ways of tending and attaining to our final end—God. This is altogether a fallacious assumption. This would hold true if all the roads led in the same direction, but is totally false if they lead in diam-

etrically opposite directions. One would lead to, the other from, the object of our journey—and such is precisely the case with truth and error. Truth is not only the opposite but the negative of error. The veriest tyro in logic knows that contradictories cannot at one and the same time be true. Now religion is eternal truth, and cannot teach contradictories to be true. If one be true, the other is necessarily false.

"I truth, therefore, is absolute and not relative, what holds good in all other matters must hold good in the matter of religion. What sane man would admit that Christ was the Messiah foretold by the prophets, as the Christian asserts, and that both Jew and Christian are right; that Christ was true God of the true God, as all Christians hold, and that He was mere man, as the Arians of old, the Turk and Unitarian believe, and that all of them are right; that the gates of hell, the powers of error, shall not prevail against the Church, as the Catholic affirms, relying on the infallible assurances of the Christ, and they did prevail, if the Church needed a reformation in faith, as Protestantism supposes and that Catholicism and Protestantism are both right? The fact seems so patent that it is almost impossible to conceive how reason can fall so low in the scale of common sense as to assert the variety of religious belief and to deny the unity of religious faith."

Dr. Calmer next treated of liberty of conscience and tolerance. He said that liberty, which is so highly panegyricized by modern thought, is misunderstood by it. Liberty, according to it, is license, and even that must not be morally restrained by law. The flower of liberty strikes its roots in the intellect and blossoms in the will. The object of the intellect is truth, and that of the will good. The flowers turn to print and the print of freedom is the true and the good.
What, therefore, restrains man's intellect from error and keeps his will from evil aids him in perfecting his freedom by making it in some manner indefeasible, like God's. Hence, if unity is of the essence of religion, any doctrine or moral practice opposed to it must be restrained, for the simple reason that error and evil destroy the perfection of man's liberty. On the same principle the State restrains the spread of an epidemic by enforcing quarantine, and does not the restraint deserve the praise of the people whom it preserves from contagion and death? How inconsistent, then, to blame religion, which keeps men aloof from error and orders all false doctrines into a moral quarantine. How fallacious, then, the dictum that truth and error must be placed on an equal footing and be subject to an equal examination.
To put the case strongly, suppose someone were to assert that it would be well to re-establish in our midst the old Phoenician religion, with its human sacrifices to Moloch, would you tolerate it? Why? Because you think it barbarously wrong. But suppose he thinks it right? You are, therefore, intolerant. Such intolerance is a sacred duty. Now, the Church is infallibly certain, relying on the promise of Christ, that the spirit of truth would abide with her to the consummation of days. Consequently she holds all other creeds are far from the truth in proposition as they differ from the tenets of her belief, which rests as the threefold pillar of reason, authority and faith. Is she, therefore, to be censured for condemning the disseminators or false doctrines and endeavoring to lead them aright—for refusing to admit premises which would undermine the faith of her children? She must always bear in mind to distinguish between condemning error and the person who professes it. She proscribes the error, but feels sympathy for him who has been misled by it. This is true charity. The great lesson taught by the Prince of Peace from His manger pulpit is love for God and love for our fellow men.
The freedom of conscience which we enjoy in this country is the country's debt to Catholics, as General Bradley F. Johnson has so ably shown in an address on the charter of religious liberty granted by that charter colony of Maryland. In that charter the great principle was laid down that Faith is an act of the will, and cannot be compelled by force or the will of other men. Still this does not give the right to believe what you please or that toleration means to you extended to him. Freedom of conscience means to every earnest man only that thought should not be constrained by force and that faith should not be compelled by human law. The theory that every man has the right to think as he pleases, logically leads to indifferentism—for if it has the right to deny everything that I believe true, then I cannot be certain that what I believe is true, and if I am uncertain, faith is gone, and the man, the nation, the race whose faith decays is on the road to that disintegration which has overwhelmed the religion of Zoroaster and is overtaking that of Confucius, Brahma and Buddha. Every man has the power to think as he pleases. He can never have the right to think wrong.—Western Watchman, St. Louis, Nov. 3.

The sin that is not forsaken soon leads to another.

COL INGERSOLL.

The Boston Herald for last Sunday contains a refreshing editorial on our great American blasphemer, Colonel Ingersoll, lately and telling the benighted citizens thereof how grossly absurd are the old superstitions about God, man, the Bible and Faith. The Herald pronounces him a "back number" and deals with him as follows:

"Age and superannation are no reproach to a man if only he quietly withdraws from public activity, and declines to lag a superfluous veteran on the stage. If he can no longer mentally keep up with the pace of advancing knowledge and imbibe new ideas; if such ideas as he has essayed with time and become mere fossils; if his true place is henceforth that of a specimen of a bygone period on the shelf of a museum of antiquities, why that is but the common fate of man. The trouble with Colonel Ingersoll is that, while he does not know it, he belongs in reality, clear back in the antediluvian theological age, the age in which huge theological scurians "tare each other in the slime," and called it ushering in the reign of sweetness and light.
"With his remarkable gifts as a speaker, Col. Ingersoll might be a great power for good, if only he knew anything. But that is now past praying for. There is no constructive element in his mind, only a destructive. He is totally destitute of the historic sense. Even in his avowed atheism, he is simply the narrow partisan dogmatist, with no fine sense of what a fate atheism implies. Contrast, for example, the truculent tone of his utterance on this issue in the Boston Theatre, last Sunday night, with the utterances of George John Romanes, a man of real science, who at one time equally lost his faith, although in later life, to his unspeakable joy, recovered it: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God, the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness. . . . When at times I think, as I think I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it—at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible." What a contrast with the "Hurrah, boys! there is no God and I am his prophet. Admission, fifty cents, reserved seats one dollar!"

A RICHLY LADEN PURSE.
List of the Priests of the Diocese of Kingston Who Contributed to its Weight.

The following is a list of the subscriptions to the press of gold presented to His Grace Archbishop O'Leary by the priests of the Diocese of Kingston on the occasion of his reception in Kingston on the afternoon of the 17th of October:

Right Rev. Monsignor Farrally	\$100 00
Rev. Father J. S. O'Connor	100 00
" " J. Masterson	200 00
" " M. J. Stanton	200 00
" " C. Murray	50 00
" " T. J. Spratt	100 00
" " T. Davis	50 00
" " J. McDonagh	100 00
" " G. A. Cleary	100 00
" " P. A. Twomey	50 00
" " J. Hogan	100 00
" " T. Kelly	25 00
" " D. A. Twomey	50 00
" " T. McCarthy	50 00
" " T. Davis	100 00
" " M. J. O'Rourke	50 00
" " M. McLaughlin	50 00
" " J. V. Neville	50 00
" " M. Meagher	20 00
" " W. T. Bridonnet	50 00
" " T. P. O'Connor	40 00
" " C. Killen	15 00
" " J. O'Brien	25 00
" " J. Meagher	50 00
" " J. S. Quinn	50 00
" " J. J. Collins	50 00
" " M. J. Spratt	50 00
" " J. D. O'Gorman	50 00
" " A. Carson	20 00
" " J. J. Connolly	25 00
" " J. P. Kehoe	50 00
" " T. Carey	50 00
" " C. Duffus	75 00
" " J. McCarthy	50 00
" " W. McDonagh	25 00
" " J. P. Fleming	50 00
" " P. C. O'Brien	25 00
" " P. J. Hartigan	30 00
" " W. Walsh	50 00
" " T. Murtagh	50 00
Total	\$2,270 00

HAS BECOME MONOTONOUS.

At a recent monthly meeting of the Methodist ministers in Baltimore, the Rev. Doctor E. S. Todd tried to stem a tide of abuse which was being poured on the Catholic Church and the Spaniards by a fellow-clergyman. With rare courage and candor Doctor Todd told his brethren that instead of throwing stones at the Church they should wish her God speed. And he found a supporter, too, in the Rev. Doctor Lathrop, who is supposed to be a Methodist of the Methodists. He spoke of the lack of fairness and wisdom shown in condemning the Church constantly, and said: "Let us not encourage this business of dragging Rome into all our sermons. I must say that I myself long since grew tired of hearing ministers making Romanism their topic. These were brave words and they were sadly needed, but we are afraid that they will not convert the ministerial bigots.—Sacred Heart Review.

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, November 19, 1909

THE "ALLIANCE."

We all remember the intense excitement that prevailed in the "Queen City" some years ago about the carrying of the "Stars and Stripes" in a procession. If memory serves, the Toronto City Council were moved to pass an ordinance against the repetition of such an "outrage!" True, the offence was then committed by Irish Americans and Irish Canadians, but now that the "Anglo-American Alliance" is all the go, would it not be in order to repeal the aforesaid order: with an humble apology to "our kith and kin" across the border?

AID TO THE DESERVING.

The New Zealand Legislature has made many experiments outside the ordinary course, with the hope of bettering the condition of the people, but the latest experiment of the kind is one which will be regarded with surprise on account of its novelty and unexpectedness. It is in the form of a pension of £18 per annum which the House of Representatives has voted to every citizen whose age is over sixty-five, and whose income is less than thirteen shillings per week. This law will go far towards making abject poverty unknown in the colony, and it has been already favorably commented on by several statesmen in England and on the continent. The principle on which this grant has been made is that a workingman who has done his work well till he is old has benefited the whole community, and is entitled to a reward from the community, or at least that he should be placed beyond a situation of suffering in poverty.

BISHOP'S DISAGREE.

On the very same day on which the Archbishop of Canterbury issued his pastoral charge to the clergy, wherein he declares that not only is voluntary confession permitted in the Church of England, but that the clergyman would neglect his duty if he refused to hear the confession of a parishioner who asked this, the Bishop of Liverpool, Dr. Ryle, said in an address delivered at North Meols, Lancashire, that confession is "an abominable thing, and any minister who gives absolution in confession insults our Lord." There is evidently something very vague about the actual teaching of the Church of England on this subject, whereas two such great lights of the Church utter sentiments on this subject so irreconcilable. It is certain, however, that Bishop Ryle goes counter to the commandment of the Book of Common Prayer, which directs the priest who visits the sick to give absolution to the penitent who "humbly and heartily desires it," when he has made a "special confession of his sins."

HOME RULE.

Mr. E. F. Vesey Knox, M. P. (of the Healy Nationalist party), at a complimentary banquet given to Mr. T. M. Healy in Belfast, some weeks ago, in reply to the toast of "Our Guest," predicted that Home Rule will be gained for Ireland, with the co-operation of the Protestant body, through the working of the new Local Government Act. He expressed his conviction that this Act is a more potent weapon for good than any Irish party ever yet secured. Under this Act, in Mr. Knox's opinion, there will be a constant action and reaction which will bring Nationalists and Unionists to work side by side for the improvement of the condition of the people, and the result will be the gradual building up of the nation. Hence he desires that the foundations be made broad, and that no man of any party should be excluded from the new County Councils, unless he is positively anti-Irish. By thus generously forgetting past differences, he believes that by working for the good of the people, even those who are not Home Rulers now will become so in time, and will aid in securing for Ireland that

measure of justice which the people of Ireland have to the present moment vainly sought.

WHERE IS KENSIT?

The Associated Press telegraphic despatches give no account of the result of the attempt of Mr. John Kensit to create a general disturbance in Ritualistic Churches throughout England by public protestations in one thousand of these churches, on Sunday, November 6. The probability is that the movement proved a fiasco, but more will be known regarding the matter in a few days.

It is not unlikely that the revelations made by London Truth, placing Mr. Kensit before the public as a propagator of obscene literature, as well as the preparations made by the Church officials to put down the disturbers of the peace by force, or to eject them from the churches, or to prosecute them for breaking the law protecting divine service, may have disheartened the intending heroes, and caused their great demonstration to fall flat.

THE LINK STILL MISSING.

A remarkable discovery has been made in Thebes, Egypt, by Professor Flinders Petrie, of a large number of skeletons belonging to a people who are believed to have been of the Ammonite race, and who are supposed to have lived in that country about the year 3000 B.C. The skeletons do not differ greatly in size from the average size of people of the present day, and the Professor states that they were of similar stature to the Frenchmen of to-day.

The discovery was made that these ancient people had the habit of squatting, as the bones of the feet show the peculiarities found among modern tribes which have that practice. The Professor looked for characteristics which might confirm the Darwinian theory that man is descended from some of the monkey tribes, but no such characteristics were found. A notch in the base of the vertebral column, which is found in monkeys, was looked for in these skeletons, as it was supposed that so early a race of men might possess it, but nothing of the kind was discovered. There were special racial characteristics discovered, but, for the most part, the structure was precisely the same as is seen in the skeletons of modern men. Darwin's missing link is evidently still missing. The skeletons have been sent to Cambridge University, and will be placed in the museum of that institution.

PROTESTANTS HONORING OUR LADY.

Another evidence of the great strides made among Protestants towards a return to Catholic devotional practices is recorded in a New Jersey City paper, which thus describes a new stained-glass window which has been erected in a Protestant Episcopal Church in Hoboken:

"A handsome window, presented by Mrs. C. B. Alexander to the Holy Innocents church, Sixth street and Willow avenue, Hoboken, was placed in the Lady Chapel yesterday over the altar of the Blessed Virgin. The window represents 'The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.' The figure of the Virgin four feet high, in robes of blue and white, beside the Adoring Angel, stands out boldly in a background of varied tones of blue. The Rev. Father Ernest Magill, rector of the church, will bless the window next Sunday."

The conviction is evidently gaining ground among Protestants that it was a mistake on the part of the Reformers of the sixteenth century to abolish the respect in which the ever Blessed Mother of God was regarded by Catholics. The Holy Scripture shows that respect should be shown to the Mother that the Son may be honored, and right reason brings us to the same conclusion. The gradual return to so many Catholic doctrines will lead many Protestants to see that they should become Catholics, as the Catholic Church alone does not need to change her belief or teachings, because she has never departed from the truth as originally committed to her by our Blessed Lord.

ADMIRAL CERVERA ON THE AMERICANS.

Admiral Cervera, whose fleet was annihilated by the American fleet under Admirals Sampson and Schley, while endeavoring to make its escape from the harbor of Santiago, has written an open letter, accepting the nomination which has been offered him to represent the district of Ferrol as Senator in the Spanish Cortes. He declares that he will resign his position as Admiral in the navy, as he believes he can now do more good for Spain by assisting, as a civilian, in making laws for the Spanish people which will better advance their general interests. He states that he has learned much

during the war between the United States and Spain, which can be made useful in the future government of Spain, and among the lessons by which Spain may profit, one is that she should develop her latent powers by encouraging the various industries, that so she may once more achieve her position in the front rank of nations.

He says that in the Cortes he will advocate a policy of progress, and will endeavor to induce his countrymen to take pattern from the Americans in many things, as he asserted this will be greatly to the advantage of his country.

The Admiral speaks gratefully of the kindness shown to him, his officers, and men, by the American people while he was their prisoner. He declares he will never forget their generosity, and he advises Spaniards to lay aside all animosities and to become sincere friends of the Americans.

Some Spanish journals have censured the Admiral for his expressions of friendly sentiments towards his late enemies; but there is a very general disposition among the people to follow his advice, and there is a strong probability that he will be elected to the Senatorship, in which position, he declares, he will endeavor to improve the policy of the Government in the direction of cultivating more earnestly the arts of peace, and developing the vast resources of the country.

The Admiral's letter has given to the Spaniards an impression regarding Americans much more favorable than has been hitherto generally entertained.

ORANGE BIGOTRY IN ULSTER.

His Excellency Lord Cadogan, the Viceroy of Ireland, while paying an official visit to Belfast, laid the cornerstone of the new town hall, in the presence of the Lord Mayor and City Council, and a large crowd of citizens. A banquet followed, at which His Lordship spoke of higher education in Ireland, in a manner which, on account of the liberality of his sentiments, will raise him greatly in the estimation of those who wish to see equal justice rendered to all of her Majesty's subjects.

Lord Cadogan declared that he knew where he was standing: that is, he knew he was in presence of an audience most of whom were Protestants and Orangemen. Nevertheless he declared plainly that he coincides entirely with the views frequently expressed by Mr. Arthur Balfour, that a Catholic University should be established for the Catholic people of Ireland, and that until that is done, Ireland will have a serious grievance undressed.

It was a noble courage in His Excellency thus to express his adhesion to the just claims of the Catholics of Ireland, before such an audience, and it is creditable to the people of Belfast that they signified their approval by hearty applause, a thing which we could hardly have expected when we consider the hostility usually shown toward Catholics in that city.

In other parts of Ulster Lord Cadogan's expression of his views has not been so well received, and has excited the bitterest indignation.

A few days after his Belfast speech, Lord Cadogan was speaking in Lurgan, and at the same moment the Town Commissioners were assembled in their hall, where they had been called for the purpose of preparing a loyal address to be presented to him. The Town Commissioners, instead of agreeing upon the address, determined not to present it on account of the sentiments he had expressed in Belfast. Councillor Bullock refused to take off his hat at the meeting, and said that if it had been proposed thirty years ago to offer an address under such circumstances, the board-room would have been burned over their heads. He threatened that "if the meeting were held for the purpose for which it was called, he would have the names of the commissioners placarded through the town and published in the press. They wanted no Ritualism or Popery there, and they would not dare to set at defiance the feelings of the loyal residents by presenting an address of loyalty to Lord Cadogan."

The meeting then broke up in disorder without passing an address. Such is the loyalty of the Lurgan Orangemen: it is a loyalty entirely dependent upon their retaining the power to ride rough-shod over the Catholic majority of the country.

It is stated by the Viceroy himself that his Belfast speech has offended the whole population of Ulster. It is, perhaps, well this should be the case, for it may convince both His Lordship and the Government that there is neither loyalty, nor honesty, nor liberality among their Ulster supporters.

A MILITARY DESPOTISM.

The newspapers of Ponce in Porto Rico complain bitterly of the lawlessness of the United States soldiers stationed in that city, and it is established beyond doubt that there is good reason for the complaint.

We do not suppose that the American soldiers are any worse than soldiers in general, but it is well known that the life of a soldier is such that those who lead it are apt to be supercilious and arrogant, especially toward those whom they have vanquished, or whom they imagine they have vanquished.

Actually, the Porto Ricans can scarcely be said to have been vanquished, as they received the American invaders with joy, regarding them as their deliverers from Spanish rule; and the Americans represented themselves in the same light. The Porto Ricans were not in a state of insurrection against Spain, as were the Cubans, nevertheless when the opportunity was given to them to be relieved from the Spanish yoke, they embraced it joyfully, imagining that after being annexed to the free Republic they would enjoy the liberties of American citizens.

In this they have found themselves greatly mistaken, at least so far as regards their present circumstances. One Ponce paper, the Bomba, describes the situation thus:

"We observe with sorrow that these troops are not a disciplined army. They are a heterogeneous mass of base and shameless people, without the elementary ideas of morals and good manners. Their vandal acts show this to be true. This drunken multitude daily buffet and maltreat our suffering townspeople. They rob servants on their way to and from the market. They enter restaurants, and, after eating and drinking until intoxicated, beat the servants and break the crockery. They refuse to pay cabmen, and rob peddlers wherever they find them. They enter private houses and steal what they can lay their hands on. Women can not appear in public for fear of insult from these North American savages. Complaining at headquarters is like looking at the moon. If this is our destiny, let us sink this fair land in the depths of the sea."

Other papers speak similarly, and it is seriously thought of to send a commission to Washington to lay the complaints of the people before the American Government and people.

We do not at all imagine that it was at any time the design of the American Government that such a state of things should exist, but it is likely to continue as long as the military occupation lasts, unless stringent measures be taken by the Government to put an end to these scandals. The best remedy would be to establish an efficient civil regime. It ought not to take long to do this, unless there is an excess of red tapism in the governmental departments.

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR.

Judging from the tone of the clerical meetings held by the various sects at this critical moment while the peace of the world is imperilled, the Christianity which these sectaries desire to propagate is of a widely different character from that which Christ came on earth to establish.

The Methodist Social Union gave a banquet a couple of weeks ago in Chicago, and the subject of the whole evening's talk was the opportunities afforded to Methodism by the capture of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. These localities were spoken of as if the natives had been left by the Spaniards in the dense ignorance of their original heathenism, and that it is left for Methodism to carry to them the knowledge that the world has had a Redeemer.

There cannot be conceived a greater fallacy than such a misrepresentation of the truth. Whatever were the faults of the Spaniards, they did not either exterminate the natives of their island colonies, as was done in America, nor leave them in ignorance of the great truths of the Christian religion, and it would be to the credit of the United States at this moment if it could be said that they had taken a moiety of the pains to educate, civilize and Christianize the aborigines of this vast continent, which the Spaniards took for the amelioration of the condition and for the Christianization of the natives of their colonies. It was not, however, precisely the Spanish government, but Spanish priests and monks and nuns who from the moment when these localities were discovered, sacrificed their own comforts on the altar of Christian charity for the spiritual and temporal benefit of these people. The colonies of which these Methodists speak are already Christianized, with the exception of a comparatively small number of Mahomedans and Pagans on the Philippine Islands, and these over zealous Methodists would do wisely first to enlighten the heathen Indians and Vodoo negroes, and the white descendants

of the Puritan pilgrims of America, who have given up their Christianity, before attempting to disturb the faith of those who are already Christians, with their Babel of conflicting beliefs.

More preposterous still was the announcement made at the same meeting by a minister who professed to speak on behalf of the 1,600,000 Young Christians of the Epworth League to the effect that "no American flag once raised will ever be lowered." Commenting on this, the Springfield (Mass.) Republican very justly says that it is "a purely piratical and savage sentiment." The same journal remarks that "another recent Church gathering at Chicago applauded the declaration that it would be an act of disloyalty to God if we fail to grab all the Spanish colonies."

Among religious bodies in England and Scotland there crops out the same spirit of land grabbing. A meeting of Congregational ministers a few days ago postponed the consideration of the Czar's disarmament proposition to applaud Lord Salisbury's threat to go to war with France, and the preachers of Dundee Presbytery voted down a resolution commending the Czar's proposition, and approved of the counter proposition that Great Britain should increase her armaments instead of diminishing them.

The spirit of Christianity is completely metamorphosed by these worldly religions, and the same journal which we have already quoted says that "Christianity obtained its hold among the people (of Great Britain) by the sublime example of its founder, and the lofty ideals it set up, and by no bending or yielding to the weaknesses and appetites of the proposed converts. The Church cannot lower those ideals to suit the fighting and land grabbing instincts of this people, without bringing upon itself this people's contempt."

In striking contrast to the pronouncements of these ministers of America, England and Scotland, stand the noble efforts made by Pope Leo XIII. to preserve peace, when war was imminent between the United States and Spain, and even to encourage the Czar in his proposals looking towards universal peace.

It is easy to see where the true spirit of Christianity is to be found.

BIGOTRY REBUKED.

It is a fact worthy of notice that within the last few years there has been a great change in the attitude of many Protestant ministers towards Catholics, indicating a tendency towards liberality which in former years did not exist.

The majority of the ministers in nearly all the sects are still as uncompromisingly hostile to Catholics as they have ever been, and thus the voice of the Methodist Conferences, and the Presbyterian Assemblies as a whole, is still to be heard denouncing "Romanism" as loudly as ever, but there are now frequently to be found honest ministers who raise their voices in these assemblies in protest against the bigotry and intolerance of the majority.

There was an instance of this at a meeting of Methodist ministers held a few days ago at Baltimore, where a paper was read by the Rev. Frank H. Havenner on "The Necessity of Missionary Work Among the People of the Territories recently taken from Spain." The writer of this paper said:

"Spain is bankrupt, morally and financially. Honor is gone; credit is gone; morality is gone. She is what Rome made her. The priest, the politician, and the soldier, have plundered the native at home as well as abroad. Behind all the evil is the sinister form of the Church of Rome. The friars in the colonies are the vilest and most ignorant of creatures. Is it a wonder that chaos, anarchy and rebellion crop out where such men are powerful? Can there be any doubt of the duty of American Protestantism in this hour of opportunity? The call to duty comes from the head of all the Churches, and its requirement is that we hold up under the Southern Cross the cross of Christ."

These views were upheld by a majority of the ministers present, but two of them, at all events, entered their protest against the continual vituperation against Catholics to which they are obliged to listen at all ministerial gatherings. The Rev. Dr. E. S. Todd declared that Methodists had learned from the example of John Wesley to denounce Catholics, but Wesley had spoken very uncomplimentarily of Americans also, and he (the speaker) was convinced that the "good man" was wrong in both instances.

He called upon his brother ministers to look at the Catholic Church without passion and prejudice, and they would find that she has done a good work in the Spanish colonies. "She [had to

deal," he said, "with Asiatic tribes in the Philippines, and with half breeds and colored people in the West Indies; and if her work among the American Indians be taken into consideration, we shall have to admit that she has done fairly well as compared with any Protestant denomination."

He added that: "Catholicity in the United States has within it a strong American party which is doing much towards making it a religion thoroughly compatible with the American sentiment, and her Bishops and priests are quite as patriotic as the clergy of any other denomination." Do not, therefore, keep up this old fashioned rant on Rome which in the light of modern civilization has become distasteful to Christian men. Rather let us extend to the Roman Catholic Church the hand of friendship and fellowship when we see her doing good. Let us wish her godspeed, instead of continually throwing stones at her."

In regard to what was said of the Spaniard, he remarked that "like other human beings, he has vices, but those who have visited him in his own home in Spain have found him to be a gentleman unsurpassed in courtesy and good breeding." He instanced Admiral Cervera, who showed himself to be "a perfect Christian gentleman."

Another clergyman who followed spoke similarly, declaring that he was tired of hearing ministers making Romanism their topic for abuse in all their sermons.

It may not seem worth while to notice the insulting and calumnious remarks of a would be orator who is so ignorant of the things he speaks of as to put the Philippine and West Indian Islands under "the Southern Cross," but his tirade is a sample of what is uttered at almost every ministerial meeting, and we congratulate the Methodist of Baltimore District that they have some few ministers, at least, who have the courage to express their disgust at such senseless talk.

In reference to the substance of what the Rev. Mr. Havenner said, we answer that Spain has been unfortunate in her wars of this century, but though these misfortunes have impoverished her there is that activity among her people which will enable them to recover their prosperity as soon as they shall have a period of peace; but notwithstanding the misfortunes of the country, she has not lost her honor; and in morality she will compare most favorably with the United States, or any other country.

The conduct of Spain, also, toward the natives of her colonial possessions, will compare very favorably with that of either the people or the Government of the United States. The latter country, it may be said truly, has almost exterminated the aboriginal population, whereas Spain educated, civilized, and Christianized the natives of the Islands she colonized. These natives may not be so forward in the arts and sciences as the European and American nations, but they are at least a testimony to the unselfish efforts of the brave Spanish missionaries who raised them up out of the heathenish condition in which they found them sunk in the first place.

A CHRISTIAN UNITY SOCIETY.

The matter of Church Union is once more a topic of consideration among the clergy of the various Protestant denominations, and on the evening of the 10th inst. a meeting was held in Toronto by a society which has been formed for the purpose of promoting such a union. The society is named "The Canadian Society of Christian Unity."

The Rev. Principal Grant of Queen's (Presbyterian) University, Kingston, as chairman of the meeting, explained the purposes of the society to be "to promote closer union by prayer, by united discussion of the questions that interfere with unity, and by educating the public mind. It is a society open to all sects and sexes, to any one in sympathy with its subjects, and willing to pay the annual fee of 25 cents."

It was further explained by the Rev. Principal that the divisions among Christians is "a calamity which has arisen through human infirmity and sin. Its evils are evident to all."

The Rev. Chancellor Burwa, of Victoria University, Coburg, said: "The spirit of unity is not modern, but has its foundation in Christ's religion. The prayer Jesus uttered had been uttered by the best men of all the ages that they may be all one, even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may also be in us." The power of the Church lay in its spiritual life. Common co-operation and effort for the great purposes of Christ are the true basis of union. Division had arisen through the sin of men, and had, in the past, been main-

tained by violence as well as by... The Buddha Brahmin said "When you are yourselves, then you may try to vert us."

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

There is no doubt that all the depleted by these speakers reduce the existing dissensions and divisions of doctrine taught by the various religions, the latter ask at once can they be expected to embrace believe the doctrines propounded them, when no two missionaries upon what ought to be believed how the teachings of Christianity to be put into practice.

What is the true remedy for diversities, and how is real Unity to be brought about? To obtain the correct answer to this question, we should know these diversities arise, and it is extremely difficult to trace them to their real source. It lies in the doctrinal testantism that each individual himself the authority to decide should believe and practice in be saved.

If we read the New Testament fully, we find that Christ established the Church, and only one Church authority to direct conscience this Church, St. Paul says it pillar and ground of truth. Apostles who were the first preachers of the Church, were commissioned to teach all nations whatsoever Christ revealed to or commanded them enable them to fulfil their commission. He promised to send the Holy Spirit to guide them and teach them. He commands all to hear the thus constituted, under penalty being regarded as "the heathen publican." It is, therefore, from Holy Scripture that no individual is authorized to the authority of the Church constituted, but that all men are to accept its teachings and precepts.

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

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

The Rev. Principal Caven (Presbyterian) College was the speakers, and he also expressed the belief that "union is in the Word of God," but he declared "what we are seeking is unity, outward and visible unity, mental spiritual unity." He said that "the Church should be enough for all."

This is to say, if it means that the Church should tolerate itself all manner of doctrine Christians are not obliged to one visible Church organization of these positions are of the essential character of of Christ, as laid down in and as we have explained the Church has received from body of doctrine which all believe, and a visible organization in which all are bound themselves.

We can readily concede to are some sincere persons desirous of knowing the truth and who sincerely seek to but have not yet succeeded in doing it. God will not hold of a disobedience which fault; but they are not bound to seek the truth, brace it when found.

Professor Caven's idea of of Christ is one which pre much among Protestants of day, but it leads to a wilful of truths which are known been revealed by God, and un any teaching of Holy Scripture. The Rev. Provost Welton University laid it down a that "all Protestant be-

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 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 13:34, 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 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 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 irrevocably binding 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, now 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 a rolling,") such Parliamentary legislation, as will bring about the quick and absolute repeal of this 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. 139 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 720,890 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 Catholic, but in no single respect, it is safe to assert, do their lives and actions respond to the inflexible 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 hath. 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 Pœbia 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 piety 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. Whosoever 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 i., 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 i., 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 starting 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 Gospels, 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.

Sacred Heart Review. PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

VIII. St. Paul says: "Charity believeth all things." In other words, when any one in the Christian brotherhood (for of this the apostle is speaking immediately) professes in anything to be governed by the same high ends, under the leadership of the same Redeemer, we are to lend him a generous confidence, and rather to exceed than fall short.

I have lately been so delighted to find that a member of the Boston Presbytery has been actually found capable of examining and finally rejecting as spurious a story invented to discredit the Catholics in general and the Jesuits in particular, that I have, perhaps somewhat precipitately, but with a precipitation of which I cannot find it in my heart to repent, assumed that he was superior to the Landings and such people, not only in intellect and manner of speech (of which there is no question), but also in honesty of purpose.

Had I not some reason? Consider: Professor John Moore (professor of what I cannot find out, any more than of what I am professor myself) is an immediate associate of such men as James B. Dana and Scott F. Hershey. The latter, some time since, paraded a story (which I need not say that Lansing flourishes, too) to the effect that all those concerned in the murder of Abraham Lincoln were either Catholics or pupils of Catholic schools.

As to the Rev. James B. Dana, D. D., I take it there is not much occasion to describe him to the readers of the Review. I do not refer to a remark in *Our Day*, to the effect that when one Catholic Bishop forbids his people to send children to the Public schools, and another allows it, both are acting under orders from Rome. That remark may not have been Dunn's.

All the editors of *Our Day* are tarred with one stick, it is true, but Dunn has stuck shallowly enough of his own to answer for without being held responsible for all his fellows. Dunn's dishonesty, as concerns the Catholics, (for of that only am I speaking in the case of these men) is by no means so flagrant as Hershey's. It lies rather in a general temper of unkindliness. This appeared in his obstinate silence when the Review asked him to submit his interpretation of a Papal encyclical to arbitration. It appeared also when in an editorial article designedly insulting in style, it described me as a blunderer as to the Roman doctrine of marriage, although in the article itself he betrayed the fact that he was contradicting his own better knowledge, and when I referred him out-and-out in the Daily Advertiser, maintained a silence at once malicious and helpless.

I may refer also to a member of the Presbytery not now living, who wrote me several letters in which an ill-mannered ill temper advanced curiously with a certain rough good nature. The tone, and in part, the very terms, of the letters, seemed to bear this device: "No matter whether the charges against the Catholics are true or false, it is in itself an indecency for you to defend them."

Now had I not a right to regard it as almost a moral miracle when a member of a body of which such men are in the forefront has had the courage to deny the genuineness of the pretended Jesuit oath, and to declare that, while no man is more intensely hostile to the Church of Rome than he (which indeed is true), yet he could not consent to advance the good cause of Protestantism by means of fictitious and forgotten names? This is a means of coming in very early with a certain rough good nature. The tone, and in part, the very terms, of the letters, seemed to bear this device: "No matter whether the charges against the Catholics are true or false, it is in itself an indecency for you to defend them."

Now had I not a right to regard it as almost a moral miracle when a member of a body of which such men are in the forefront has had the courage to deny the genuineness of the pretended Jesuit oath, and to declare that, while no man is more intensely hostile to the Church of Rome than he (which indeed is true), yet he could not consent to advance the good cause of Protestantism by means of fictitious and forgotten names? This is a means of coming in very early with a certain rough good nature. The tone, and in part, the very terms, of the letters, seemed to bear this device: "No matter whether the charges against the Catholics are true or false, it is in itself an indecency for you to defend them."

This is a means of coming in very early with a certain rough good nature. The tone, and in part, the very terms, of the letters, seemed to bear this device: "No matter whether the charges against the Catholics are true or false, it is in itself an indecency for you to defend them."

I am sorry to say that my high expectations concerning the Rev. John Moore have been disappointed. I will not liken him to Hershey, but I do not

see that, for honesty of purpose, he is much above Lansing, from the way in which he has received my refutation of the Lehmanowsky fiction. Some ten years ago, when Lansing, after his own peculiar style, was raving and raging over that very recent event, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, as if everybody concerned in it, even after the fact, was a criminal of the blackest dye, in exactly the same sense in which we would now abhor the Whitechapel murderer, I reminded him that while the deed was atrocious among atrocities, it by no means excused the new war being contending for life and death, and to many it seemed as if the world were dissolving, true children of God might not, for a while, be misled into applauding even so grisly a deed as that. Otherwise, what are we, Protestants, to think of Calvin and Melancthon, and Cranmer and Knox, and Latimer and Beza, every one of whom defended the burning of heretics or the butchery of religious enemies? Thereupon Mr. Lansing expressed his dismay at "hearing a Protestant minister defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew's." What are you to do with such an incomparable idiot? He has plainly the advantage of you. You have no hope of hammering any last impression into his weak and watery brain. Now the Rev. John Moore has turned out just as bad. Rather, he has turned out much worse. He can not, like Lansing, plead hopeless mental imbecility in excuse for his malignant falsification of my purpose and distortion of my words. I have, as my readers know, described the Spanish Inquisition, in the Sacred Heart Review, as a tribunal whose jealous vigilance brought Spain into a fatal stagnation of intellect. I have remarked on the cruelty with which it treated its prisoners in best of times, in their melancholy solitude. I have spoken of the incessant complaints raised by the Popes over its suspiciousness and harshness—complaints that began with its second year of existence and continued, accompanied in several cases, by the excommunication of inquisitors, for about a century, when the number of victims fell to such relative insignificance that Rome had thenceforward little to say, and when she had succeeded in averting the Spanish Inquisition from Naples and Milan. Yet, because I follow Lorente, the one great authority on the Spanish Inquisition, compared with whom all other authorities are second hand, and who is its intense enemy, but who says that, had as this tribunal was at its best, yet after about 1750 it was "a model of mildness" compared with the earlier institute, and that even after 1831 the more vigorous supervision of the Supreme Council reduced its proceedings in a large measure out of their original exorbitances, though leaving them still detestably cruel and unjust, because I thus copy Lorente himself, Moore shamelessly declares me "a defender and apologist of the Inquisition." These are his very words.

Now see the unimaginable malignity of this evil man. He has brought a charge against me which, if he could verify it, would shut me out of civilized society, and all American Catholics, but the Spanish Catholics themselves, to disown all fellowship with me. As the Spanish inquisitors, according to that very Lorente whom this Moore (for I owe not even the commonest terms of courtesy henceforth to this slanderous man) treats with pretended respect, and in fact with immitigable contempt, as these very inquisitors joined hands with the secular judges to abolish the reality of torture in Spain, though still insisting on it as a fiction of law, so Freemasons and Catholics at last made common cause in the overthrow of the Inquisition itself. A man who wishes it revived in the Catholic Christendom is stared at as a *tusis naturae*. Could this Moore make people really believe that I was a friend of the Inquisition, he would reduce me to the wanderings of Cain. Happily there are honest men in the land in abundance, though he is not one of them. There, too, are my words, that speak for themselves. As to his followers, why should they not believe what he says? Let them think what they will of me, provided only they do not think well.

This man is an admirable sample of an early Spanish inquisitor. He should have been born soon enough to help Torquemada, and born in Spain instead of in Ireland. He illustrates perfectly that spirit of angry, unapproachable suspiciousness, intensified by jealous self conceit, which Lorente describes as distinguishing the first generations of the Holy Office. Lorente remarks that if any one showed the slightest disposition to question the cogency of inquisitorial proofs against suspected Judaizers, he was set down at once by the inquisitors as a Judaizer himself, or at the very least as an enemy of the Inquisition. He might esteem himself happy if he escaped with three months imprisonment, a public penance and a scolding fine. Here you have this John Moore as in a mirror. I follow Lorente in describing the Spanish Inquisition as fierce and odious, as Macaulay well says, the most odious tribunal ever known among men, not so much on account of its direct cruelty, in which it fell short of the Scottish and German witchcraft courts, as on account of its withering blight upon all free movements of thought, however staunchly Catholic. It even dared to proscribe an Italian Bible published by the Pope himself. I follow Lorente, too, in saying that bad as it was in reality, popular report out of Spain made it still worse than it

was, especially in its last two generations. Yet because I copy, almost literally, this moral enemy of the Inquisition, on both sides of his statement, and do not, like this Moore, carefully evade, and even hypocritically affect to disbelieve everything which does not serve the diabolical ends of religious malice, he denounces me to all religious world as a friend of the Inquisition! This man has a long article directed against me in the Morning Star of Sept. 8. I purpose dealing with it piece by piece. It is a veritable "mystery of iniquity." This Presbyterian imitator of Torquemada (happily now only able to persecute through slander) is not a member of the Pope, but assuredly he is "a member of Anti-Christ." He need not go to Rome to search for the "man of sin" if he would only send me his own photograph, I could easily pick out the "man of sin" on the benches of Boston Presbytery. The "man of sin" is easily found where ever Harsh and slanders, above all slanders in the name of religion, foregather, and wherever, as with this man, a pretended zeal for God leads to the belief, and to the practice of the belief, that "the end sanctifies the means."

I purpose holding this Rev. John Moore close company for some time to come, closer company than perhaps he will find agreeable, but not closer than I hold needful for my honor, and for the public good.

Charles C. Starbuck. Andover, Mass.

MAN'S NEED OF GOD. In our Divine Lord were to reappear in the flesh to-day, waking amongst men, as He did nineteen centuries ago, He would, no doubt, have with Him again the multitudes, attracted by the sweetness of His divine personality. He would see at His feet, amongst the miserable millions embodying mankind's collected woe, not only the dumb, the blind, the lame and maimed, casting themselves down before Him to be healed, but crowding around Him a multitude of those who have nothing to eat. Compassion would again be dominant and rule supreme in His Sacred Heart, and who can doubt that the Healer of mankind would again, while healing the sick, not send away the others fasting?

We will not dwell here on the fact that in the present, as in bygone times there is scarcely much difference as to the vastness in numbers of those who literally, in plain gospel language, "have nothing to eat." We will only say, that if the percentage of the poor and needy, of those hungering for their daily bread, has remained unchanged, as great as in the past, it is owing to the prevalent, all but universal, love of gain. If, then, the wretched become dependent upon others more fortunate than themselves, their relief is a means to make those who help them like Jesus Christ. But though without such help the wretched multitude must go away fasting and fainting, this sorrowful truth is not the whole truth. The real state of things is still worse. For if we consider likewise, as we ought to, the spiritual and moral condition of the greater number of those that have abundance—that is, that are filled with bread and meat and the other good things of this life—we find that in another sense of the divine text they have nothing to eat. If we only were able to read their souls, it would be seen that, in spite of their bodily fullness, they still are spiritually fasting, owing to the void in their hearts.

God alone can satisfy the necessities of the human heart and the aspirations of man's soul. In vain has mankind attempted to live without its Creator. But nobody has succeeded; nobody can succeed without God. The oft repeated attempt of man to deceive his own heart and soul into the belief that anything but God will still his hunger, has caused only wretchedness and supreme misery.

The truth, then, is that to-day, as of old, multitudes are without God, without Christ, by their own fault. They will not listen to His words, ponder upon them; will not ask for grace to believe and be filled with truth. No; in pride, in deluded self-satisfaction, in the bustle of life, in the entanglements of passion or business, they suffer life to run on in some faint, half-hearty way, desiring the truth, but never, as the apostle says, coming to the knowledge of it. But we, by God's mercy, have the truth, we have eaten and been filled; oh! let us prize it, let us above all be faithful to it—for Our Lord says: Blessed are you, not because you know the truth, not solely because you possess it, but blessed are you if, knowing it, you live up to it.—Sacred Heart Review.

Kidney-Bladder Trouble. There is no more serious menace to good health in the present age than Kidney disorders, and it is an appalling fact, but a true one, that four-fifths of the country's people have the taint of this insidious disease with them. Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills cure all Kidney disease.

INTERCOURSE WITH THE DEAD. If the memory of the dead is so sweet, if it strengthens us so much in well doing, what must be the efficacy of the more intimate thought of our intercourse with the dead!

The Catholic doctrine opens the most consoling perspective in this sweet and tender communion with the souls of the elect, which begins beyond the tomb and is continued in a happy eternity. It in no way forbids us to consider our beloved dead as not gone from us, but still near us though invisible to our senses.

Ah! father, mother, child, friend, it was not only that body which I could see and touch that I loved so tenderly, but that soul which God filled with affection for me; that soul no longer materially manifest, but whose presence I feel.

Let us permit those to speak here to whom God gave the grace of feeling all the sweetness and consolation of this communion between the Church militant and the Church triumphant. We shall speak later of the communication of our treasures; we confine ourselves at present to the communication of sentiments and affections.

"He whom we mourn," wrote Fenelon, "is not only to our senses and our imagination; though we do not see him, he is with us more truly than he ever was. We always find him in our common centre. He sees us and procures us real assistance; he whose own infirmities have vanished sets ours more clearly than we do ourselves, and he pleads for the remedies necessary for our cure. Although I was deprived of seeing him for years, yet I feel that I can speak to him; I open my heart to him. I believe that we meet before God; and though I have wept bitter tears at his death, I cannot believe that I have lost him. Oh the reality of this intimate and invisible communion which the children of God enjoy!"

UNUTTERABLE AGONY. ENDURED BY MRS. ELLEN FOX, OF ST. MATTHIAS ST. TORONTO.

Stone in the Bladder Made Life Miserable—A Surgical Operation at the General Hospital Failed to Relieve Her—Dodd's Kidney Pills Cured Her.

Toronto, Nov. 14.—Mrs. Ellen Fox, of No. 3 St. Matthias St., this city, is a lady, well known, and highly esteemed by a large and constantly increasing acquaintance. For a long time she was a victim of ill health, which prevented her from performing her social and domestic duties, greatly to the regret of her many friends.

Now, however, she is enjoying the most robust health, and the story of how she escaped the clutches of the disease that held her a victim is unusually interesting, affording, as it does, one other instance of how a famous remedy—Dodd's Kidney Pills—banishes suffering, wipes out disease, and brings health, strength, and happiness to every home wherein it is used.

Mrs. Fox writes of her case thus: "I endured agonies that neither tongue nor pen can describe, and that racked my body night and day. My trouble was Stone in the Bladder."

"I was, for a time, under treatment at the Toronto General Hospital, but no relief was afforded me, much less a cure. I underwent a painful surgical operation, but still my disease continued to grow worse and worse. My sufferings were simply awful, and at times were enough to turn the brain. I had almost abandoned all hope of ever getting better, when I was persuaded to try Dodd's Kidney Pills. I got relief from the very first, and a continued use of this heaven sent medicine cured me absolutely and perfectly. I can never be thankful enough for my release, which was due wholly and solely to Dodd's Kidney Pills."

Dodd's Kidney Pills have cured thousands of cases of Stone in the Bladder, and of Gravel. They have never failed to cure. They are the only positive and unfailing cure for these diseases. Price fifty cents a box, at all druggists, or, by mail, on receipt of price, by The Dodds Medicine Co. Limited, Toronto.

Your Best Interests Will be served by making sure of health. It will be a loss of time and money to be stricken with serious illness. Take Hood's Sarsaparilla and purify your blood. In this way all germs of disease will be expelled, sickness and suffering will be avoided, and your health will be preserved. Isn't this a wise course?

Hood's Pills are the only pills to take with Hood's Sarsaparilla. Price 25 cents.

Delicate children! What a source of anxiety they are! The parents wish them hearty and strong, but they keep thin and pale.

To all these delicate children Scott's Emulsion of Cod-liver Oil with Hypophosphites comes with the best of news.

It brings rich blood, strong bones, healthy nerves, and sound digestion. It is growth and prosperity to them.

No matter how delicate the child, it is readily taken.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

