

edence uttered over the elements, the change would take place, and not that the presence of a few grains of buckwheat, or a few degrees of acidity would resist the power of omnipotence. Philosophers tell us of disturbing causes. Here are disturbing causes with a vengeance. And I hold on these most wonderful statements that no priest is safe; nay, that every priest is himself in danger of being guilty of Idolatry on his own principles, and of leading his flock into the same sin, unless he in every instance before he celebrate mass, send to Dalhousie for the Professor of Chemistry, to determine the quality of the flour and the mark of the wine. Nor is this the whole of it, for the whole thing may be damaged by a slight defect in the person of the priest; it may be the want of a tooth or the want of a toe. But what seems most of all astonishing is, that a defect in the toilette is as damaging as a defect in the person, so that if the alb should in a hurry be thrown on backside foremost, or if the girdle be not fastened in the precise spot, or with the precise degree of tension, the whole process may be fruitless, and the whole service of no avail. Nor can anything be imagined more puerile and unlike the solemn dignity of a religious rite. Is it not solemn trifling, and above all does not regard to such puerilities tend to throw suspicion over the whole, and tempt to adopt the conclusion, that it is neither more or less than a piece of broad farce?

It would perhaps do good to not a few now hearing me,—I am sure it would do immense good all round, if the priesthood were to receive a hint from a few of the long-headed Laics in the church to preach a sermon or two, on the defects of the mass.

There is, however, one circumstance which is especially worthy of notice; and with the mentioning of it I can close the argument of the Lecture. It is this:—Supposing every thing else were just as the rubric directs—suppose the bread