

The three great Catholic nations, Austria, France, and Spain, were long allowed to exercise a restricted veto in the election of a Pope. In return they were supposed to guard the rights of the Holy See from violence and invasion. The veto of each of the three Powers named above was strictly limited to one Cardinal. Moreover, the veto had to be pronounced before the election was complete. Otherwise it was of no avail. 'Besides,' says Father Keller in his 'Life of Leo XIII.,' 'each of the Governments could make use of its veto but once, so that at the most only three Cardinals were excluded. . . . Once that this veto had been pronounced against any candidate, the privilege was at an end, and could not be used against any other in the same election. In this manner it was sought to observe all due regard towards the great Catholic nations, whilst, on the other hand, the freedom of the election was secured. This privilege granted to the three leading Catholic Governments (Austria, France, and Spain) was termed the "exclusiva." But even this concession does not constitute a formal right to be maintained against the Church, or to which she would consider herself bound to yield unconditionally through a sense of moral obligation. It is nothing more than a grant or concession, grounded on motives of prudence. If a Pope chose to abolish this veto, it would cease; and if a Pope were elected over the veto, he would still be Pope.' As a matter of fact, the right of veto no longer exists. It was pole-axed by the decree of Pius IX., which excluded 'all and every intervention of the secular power' in the election of the Sovereign Pontiff. If Francis Joseph of Austria attempted to interfere, as reported, in the late Papal election, he played the part of an offensive busybody and intruder. A recent number of the 'Voce della Verita' (Rome) contains what seems to be an official announcement that the Holy See will take steps to ensure perfect freedom in Papal elections. 'The announcement,' says an English contemporary, 'may be taken as a definite sign that steps will be taken to avoid any cause for the spread of such reports in the future, by the formal repudiation of the veto by the Holy Sec.' It is well that the State should begin to mind its own business and cease poking a meddling finger into a matter that is so completely of the spiritual domain as the election of a successor to the See of St. Peter.

An Auckland Controversy

A whirlwind of energetic controversy has been shaking Auckland of late. It was all about the running of Sunday trams. A small majority in an exceptionally heavy poll decided in favor of the running, and there, for the time, the matter rests. But occasional tremors of controversy keep vibrant an atmosphere that is still heavily charged with electricity. Polemics rumbled angrily in pulpits, on platforms, and in the columns of the secular press. The discussions served to demonstrate the extraordinary vitality—even among clergymen, who certainly ought to know better—of the absurd notion that the Christian Sunday is identical with the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday). In fact, among a vehement, if unlearned, portion of the disputants, Sunday was habitually referred to, in the religious slang of the Puritan days, as 'the Sabbath' (Saturday), and the proposal to run the trams on Sunday was pilloried as 'Sabbath desecration.' It is passing strange that such a blundering use of common words could endure to our day among people who profess to read the Bible and to base upon it their many and ever-varying religious beliefs.

With the general question we deal at some length in another part of this issue. Here we content ourselves with touching upon that immortal catchword, 'the Continental Sunday.' Of course it was flung like a lyddite shell right into the thick of the Auckland Sabbatarian dispute. Years of residence and travel have made us tolerably familiar with the Continental Sunday and its various phases in various lands. But 'the Continental Sunday' of pulpit and newspaper discussion is quite a

different thing. It is a vague, undefined, formless terror—an Awful Warning, a Popish Rawhead-and-Bloodybones to secure lukewarm and undutiful Protestants into turning the Lord's Day of the New Dispensation into the discarded Sabbath of the Old. In practically every case, when the expression, 'the Continental Sunday,' is used, the inference is drawn, or left to be drawn, that the Catholic countries of Europe are the sole 'Sabbath-breakers,' and that the Church is in some unexplained way responsible for this distressing condition of things. The Church's general attitude on the subject of Sunday rest and worship is touched upon sufficiently elsewhere in this issue. It is sufficiently well known. It has not altered down the ages. Unfortunately, her ideas have been antagonised by large bodies of lawmakers. This has been especially the case since the epoch of the great French Revolution. Since that date modes of thought and action have rapidly risen which are in rank antagonism with Catholic and even with Christian ideals, both in the home and on the floor of legislative assemblies in Continental Europe. Add to this the fact that the legislatures in all or nearly all of the real or so-called Catholic countries of Europe are, and have long been, dominated by the Freemasons—the Church's declared enemies. France, Italy, and Spain are melancholy instances in point. Again, the 'Continental Sunday' is at least as well known in Protestant countries in Europe as in Catholic. In Germany, for instance, Sunday is a favorite day for amusement-meetings, picnics, concerts, etc. 'Orthodox German pastors,' says Chambers, 'take their households to miscellaneous concerts on Sunday evenings, and would consider hesitation to do so as a remnant of mere Jewish prejudice.' There—as we have recently shown in the case of England and America—Catholics are by far the best church-goers. And this, so far as the Fatherland is concerned, is fully and frankly admitted by the Rev. Dr. Williams, an American Protestant author, in his work, 'Christian Life in Germany,' which was published in 1897.

A Protestant writer in the 'Edinburgh Review' for October, 1880, voices the contrast in still more emphatic terms. 'The land which was the cradle of the Reformation,' said he, 'has become the grave of the Reformed faith. . . . All comparatively recent works on Germany, as well as all personal observation, tell the same tale. Denial of every tenet of the Protestant faith among the thinking classes, and indifference in the masses are the positive and negative agencies beneath which the church of Luther and Melancthon has succumbed.' 'In contiguous parishes,' says the same writer, 'of Catholic and Protestant populations, one invariable distinction has long been patent to all eyes and conclusions. The path to the Catholic Church is trodden bare, that to the Protestant Church is rank with grasses and weeds to the very door.' Berlin, with its two million inhabitants, has church accommodation for only 60,000 or 70,000 of its greatly preponderating Protestant population. Yet Sunday after Sunday its ministers preach to rows of almost empty benches. The Rev. Dr. Williams' book, already quoted, has the following: 'It is said by persons who have made careful examination that only about one-third of those who die in Berlin in any given year are buried with religious service.' On the same page (57), speaking of Germany as a whole, he says: 'Nowhere in the world is the Roman Catholic Church doing better work.' But one has not to go to the Continent for a Sunday that is godless in a wholesale way. Prominent Protestant divines whose words are before us estimate that barely five per cent. of the population of England attend public worship, and that great masses of the people are as pagan as those whom St. Paul portrayed in such immortal though fearful words. A London Protestant clergyman, Rev. W. J. Dawson, in a discourse delivered some weeks ago at the conference of Free Churches, said: 'The sooner we get rid of the delusion that London is a Christian city the better. The plain fact is that London