

to be the guest of the Governor-General for a day or two, and he will, no doubt, be graciously received. We hope that, in the quiet and unobtrusive hospitalities of Rideau Hall, he may find the repose of which he must be sorely in need.

Mr. Gladstone may congratulate himself on having made what managers call "the most successful hit of the season"—or more correctly, out of the season. A little *brochure*, not half the size of an ordinary review article, has put life into what promised to be the dreariest of Parliamentary vacations. There seems no prospect that the controversy it has excited will come to a speedy end. The weapon came at a white heat from the hands of the artificer, but the first glow was beginning to disappear in a dusky redness, when the Roman Catholic bishops eagerly plied the bellows, brandished the ecclesiastical hammer, and scattered metallic sparks on all around. Nor is the work yet done; for we have counted at least a dozen counterblasts just published or to come. Of these Dr. Newman's will be looked forward to with the greatest interest. It will be remembered by the readers of the *Expostulation* that Mr. Gladstone quoted a sentence from a letter written by Dr. Newman, to Bishop Ullathorne before the proclamation of the infallibility dogma:—"Why should an aggressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?" The explanation rendered necessary by the triumph of the "insolent faction," and Dr. Newman's enforced submission, will be attentively examined. Of the Episcopal strictures on the pamphlet, that of Bishop Clifford, of Clinton, is much the most satisfactory. His pastoral is not denunciatory, nor is it evasive. Taking up the gravamen of Mr. Gladstone's indictment, it meets it fairly and indignantly. It is said that the Bishop was originally an opponent of the new dogma at the Council—a state-

ment we can well believe, for he is certainly far from satisfied with it even now. His first step is an appeal to English history since 1829; his second an attempt to define the limits of the Papal infallibility in the sphere of morals. Dr. Clifford did well to remind his opponents of the loyal service rendered to the Crown by Catholics, and especially English Catholics; not that any serious imputation has been cast upon their fidelity, but because it is apt to be lost sight of in discussing the Syllabus and the Decree. He concludes his remarks on this head with some warmth of expression:—"Nobody, then, has the right to put Catholics on their trial, and say that they should be considered guilty of a want of loyalty, unless they can prove themselves innocent of the charge. We say we are loyal, and we claim the right to be taken at our word." That is all very well as a statement of the Catholic disposition, but it does not cover the entire ground. Mr. Gladstone did not impugn the loyalty of the Roman Catholics of England; on the contrary, he took it for granted. To have done otherwise would render unmeaning an "Expostulation" addressed directly to them. The question submitted was this:—Hitherto Catholics have been faithful to a "perfect and undivided allegiance" to the sovereign; could they be so in future, should a conflict arise between the Queen and the Pope? There was no reference to the past, or even to the present, but only to possible dangers in the future. Dr. Clifford, however, goes further. He asserts that the Pope has no power to "ignore or transgress boundaries already fixed between the temporal and spiritual powers, and so interfere with the allegiance of Roman Catholics;" and that "if the Pope were so to abuse his power as to seek to interfere in that which undoubtedly belongs to the civil authority, Catholics would resist it." These are brave words, and they would at once settle the question, if they could be reconciled with Dr. Manning's utterances on the Encyclical and