

sioners of election, returning officers, assessors, and all other officials, at its will. Merit would be disregarded and the test of office would not be ability, integrity, public spirit or worth, but subserviency to the behests of that company. Virtue would be the very best bar to official position.

The manner in which the lottery company went about the business of securing its desired new charter confirmed the Governor's declarations about its insidious and corrupting methods. A bill was introduced in the legislature providing for the submission to the people of the State of a constitutional amendment, in which a new charter was granted to the lottery company for twenty-five years in return for the sum of \$31,500,000, to be paid in annually to the treasury of the State, in the following amounts: For the public schools, \$350,000; for the levees, \$350,000; for charities, \$150,000; for pensions to Confederate soldiers, \$50,000; for the city of New Orleans for drainage and sanitary purposes, \$100,000; and for the general fund, \$250,000. This was indeed a bribe of enormous proportions — \$1,250,000 a year for twenty-five years offered to the people of the State to induce them to put gambling into their constitution, and thus make their State a partner in a gigantic gambling corporation. When the measure came up in the two houses it passed in each by exactly the two-thirds vote necessary. This was sufficiently clear evidence of careful and systematic work in its behalf. It was sent to the Governor, and promptly returned with a veto message in which he reiterated his former views, and made an eloquent plea against committing the State to the disgrace involved in the enactment of such a bill. He pointed out that the State had no need of such aid, that it had not been since the war in a better condition, and that it was moving forward to an era of assured prosperity. He declared that the company, composed of seven men, of whom the name of only one was known, was asking the State to sell its birthright for a mess of pottage, and thus solemnly adjured the legislature to do its duty:

I call upon it to pause before it takes finally that step and plunges this State into untold trouble. Is there nothing significant in the vote by which this bill has passed, the exact two-thirds vote in each house, and nothing deeply significant in the twelve of the votes in the house and four of the votes in the senate by which that exact majority was reached? Is not the future foreshadowed? To me it most certainly is.

I say to this General Assembly in all earnestness that should this measure be passed we shall enter upon a period of strife such as has never been seen before in Louisiana, and should this contemplated corporation ever be forced upon us, an era of corruption and degradation will follow, beside which the era of reconstruction will appear as one of honor and happiness.

Not the least impressive portion of the veto message was a passage in which the Governor expressed his conviction that if the charter were to be granted the ultimate result would be the pauperization of the State. "Extravagance, profligacy, and corruption will as surely follow the result as the night follows the day," he said; and then proceeded to argue that there would be an immediate falling off in legislative appropriations for all purposes for which the lottery money was given, depreciation in the State credit, and increase in the State's interest-bearing debt, with the result that at the end of twenty-five years a vast amount of interest would have been paid out unnecessarily, improperly, and illegally, and the State's poverty would be so ex-

treme as to furnish a far stronger claim than it does at present for a continuation of the lottery.

The lower house passed the measure immediately over the veto by the same vote as before, and it went to the senate. Before a vote was reached in that body, one of the senators who had voted for it on its first passage died, and there were not two-thirds in its favor. The company then had the senate shift its ground, sending the bill back to the lower house with the claim that it did not require the Governor's signature in order to be ready for submission to the people, and that hence the veto was of no account. The house rescinded its vote, and the clerical officers of both houses were directed to certify all proceedings upon the bill to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State did not include the act in the printed journals of the legislature promulgated in book form after the adjournment, on the ground that it did not belong there as it had not been passed in accordance with legal requirements. A mandamus was obtained to compel him to promulgate it, and, after argument on both sides, the Supreme Court decided in April last to make the mandamus peremptory, thus sustaining the lottery company in its course. This decision sends the amendment before the people for their approval or disapproval at the election in April of next year, and makes the lottery issue the absorbing one of that contest. Governor Nichols's successor and a new legislature are to be chosen at that time, and the campaign is certain to be the most exciting that the State has witnessed since it overthrew the carpet-bag régime in 1877. What the lottery company will do in order to carry the day is foreshadowed in the passages from Governor Nichols's message which we have quoted above.

The interest which the whole country has in the struggle, aside from the moral aspect of it, is emphasized by the declaration of the lottery company that only three per cent. of its revenue comes from the people of Louisiana; the rest is drawn from the country at large. It was to shut off the greater part of this ninety-seven per cent. that Congress passed the law which went into effect last year, excluding newspapers containing lottery advertisements from the mail, and prohibiting its use for sending tickets, collecting money, and distributing prizes. The lottery company is contesting the constitutionality of this law in a suit which is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, and which is to come up for hearing at the October term. The company's contention is that the act is an abridgment of the freedom of the press, and an attempt on the part of Congress so to pervert one of its legitimate powers to an illegitimate use as to accomplish a purpose entirely outside of Federal jurisdiction, that is, to suppress a business within a State. If the court shall uphold the constitutionality of this law, the power of the lottery company for evil, even if it succeed in obtaining its new charter, will be greatly lessened. Indeed it is difficult to see how, without the aid of the United States mails, the company will be able to do business enough to enable it to pay over to the State its annual bribe of a million and a quarter of dollars.

"Orthodoxy and Liberty."

NEVER in our generation, perhaps never in America, were questions of creed and of church discipline crop-

ping out in so many new ways, places, and humors, as at this moment. Creed revision, accusations of "unsoundness" or actual "heresy," discussions in the pulpit and in the so-called religious and so-called secular press, are with us continually. It is idle to say that the whole matter is a specialty and that the opinion only of specialists is of any account. Matters of religion are vital to every soul, and the pew as well as the pulpit must make up its mind,—the priest and the layman, the scholar and the unscholarly. We must all know and do something about it; we cannot, at the very least, help thinking about it; and we cannot be altogether blamed if sometimes we "think out loud."

Now this matter of *thinking* brings us straight to a point which some of those in ecclesiastical or official place seem sometimes to lose sight of. The modern world is too much in the habit of doing its own thinking to look without amazement at any apparent effort to put a stop to this highly sane and sanitary habit of the human mind. If it should get to be understood that in any branch of learning, in any historical, philosophical, moral, or religious system, in any society or group of scholars, or teachers, or preachers, fearless and unbiased investigation, and the frank acceptance of the results of such investigation,—in other words, honest, earnest, and independent thinking,—was at a discount, was, in fact, to be peremptorily, and hopelessly, and forever limited by some fixed and ancient formula, why, then there would arise a suspicion of—shall we say a contempt for?—that system, or that group, which would militate against its intellectual and moral influence to an extent beyond all computation.

We know well the honesty, the honor, the devotion, and the deep conviction of many of those active in stemming what they regard as "the tide of infidelity," which appears to them to be perilously invading, in our day, the most sacred places. But it seems to us they should welcome an outside view which they may at first deem entirely and impertinently secular, when that view is a warning as to the effect upon the world at large of what might have the appearance of persecution of preachers and teachers known in their various communities for a genuine, a glowing, a most helpful, a most passionate Christianity.

Nor should these questioners of the faith of others spurn the opinion of that world at large as an opinion unsanctified and worthless. The world at large is made up of separate souls to whom it is the mission of the Church to bring the food of the spirit. The Church, therefore, should seek—should it not?—to remove, so far as possible, every barrier that separates it from those it would succor and uplift—every barrier moral, spiritual, and intellectual. There are minds that do not wish to do their own thinking, that are happiest when utterly relieved of that duty; but there are others—and in the modern world the number is increasing—who can no more cease to think than they can cease to breathe. It would be moral and intellectual death in the first place as surely as physical death in the second. The motto, "Leave thought behind, all ye who enter here," over the door of any church or any institution of any kind of learning—what would be the effect, think you, of such a motto upon the young, curious, active, and earnest minds of this generation? And it is just such minds that are

needed now no less imperatively than at any former epoch to carry on the work not only of evangelizing the world but of christianizing christendom.

But is it a mere secular warning? A little while ago one of the leading divines of the country was elected to a chair in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Before entering upon his new duties the Reverend Henry Jackson Van Dyke passed suddenly away from the scene of a helpful, noble life. It is a great loss; yet many useful years in the important position to which he had been just called might not have had a wider or deeper influence than certain words of prophetic warning spoken by him a few days before his death. "If we cannot have orthodoxy and liberty," said Dr. Van Dyke, "let us have liberty, and go without orthodoxy!"

It is a general principle of which we are speaking; we do not desire to judge of particular events, of decisions made in this case or that. In every society, in every institution, there must be limits to individual action; even to the results of individual thought, when those results lead too far away from assumed standards or self-imposed obligations. The individual surrenders something of his individuality when he seeks certain advantages which can come only by association. And, too, the question must inevitably arise in the conscience of the individual, as to how far he may grow to differ with his surroundings—with the creeds, and rules, and obligations of his position—and still honestly maintain his original formal relationship to those surroundings.

It is therefore, we repeat, not our desire to refer to special occurrences, or to any details with regard to these occurrences—save a single one. When the question recently arose of the official confirmation of the election of a certain eminent Episcopal clergyman to the bishopric of his own diocese, one of the objections urged to the confirmation was, to quote the exact language of protest, "the presence" of the great preacher "at the so-called 'ordination' services" of another eminent preacher of the same Gospel of Jesus Christ—a preacher belonging, in other words, to another denomination of orthodox Christians.

When the study of ecclesiastical history can lead a good and conscientious Protestant ecclesiastic—along with many other good and conscientious and intellectual men and women—to conscientious and painful doubts of the propriety of making a bishop of one whom they acknowledge to be "great," "the prince of preachers," "a king among men," because he with other priests of his church takes a less strenuous and technical view of the "historical episcopate," and one that permits him to extend the right hand of fellowship to other pure, able, and devoted preachers of the word of God; when such a seeming perversion of Christianity is proclaimed to the world at large as of the essence of the Christian Church—the world looks at such a spectacle with an indignation, or a levity, that should turn instead to awe and wonder at the laws that govern the human mind and that involve such astounding inconsistencies in the intellectual processes of the good. And in the end this awe and wonder should breed that finest and most Christlike flower of the spirit of toleration—namely, the tolerance of intolerance.