

mutilate the national heart? Do they not see that falsehood is the chief weapon of faction and office and gain the motive cause of struggle. Take up a copy of each of the opposing party organs in any Canadian city and read the account of a political meeting held the preceding evening. According to one: "About seventy persons were present. Mr. Blank, M.P., attempted to speak but was hissed off the platform—a mammoth failure."

According to the other, we find that: "About 1,000 persons were present. Mr. Blank, M.P., delivered an eloquent and logical address which was most enthusiastically received—immense success."

The first question that occurs to the mind is: Which is lying? An attendance at the demonstration might force us to the irresistible conclusion that both had wilfully deceived their readers, to satisfy the debasing necessities of party. Making all reasonable allowance for diversity of opinion as to the brilliancy of oratorical fireworks, is an approximate calculation of the numerical attendance impossible? Or has the science of mathematics gone mad?

At such a time the organization of a National Society, whose objects are to place the demands of country before party, patriotism before faction should be hailed with feelings of satisfaction; the unsuccessful assaults upon it of the party press, and followers should be a testimonial to the worth of its objects. It is noteworthy that its platform has been endorsed by the non-party press. The attempts to defeat the organization by the devices of faction signally failed before the public meetings held in the City of Montreal; notwithstanding the efforts made to interpolate the false issues of loyalty to the crown and the maintenance of the connection with the Mother Country.

The maintenance of a truly Canadian National Society is not incompatible with the maintenance of the British connection, and it shall deserve well if it succeeds, even to the smallest extent, in making the Canadian people from the ignoble bondage of faction and prejudice.

The favour with which the SPECTATOR has been received by the Canadian people, may be accepted as a proof of the demand for high toned and patriotic journalism—an augury of the advent of a purer and higher public sentiment.

ETNA.

Montreal, 9th January, 1878.

"ON PRINCIPLE."

It is marvellous what things are done under the sun "on principle." Men have notions—form purposes—turn their purposes into deeds which destroy peace, "on principle." They have come to the conclusion that they are right, consequently, all who do not see as they see are wrong. Others see through a glass darkly—they see through a glass that is not smoked, is not concave, and is not convex; therefore, they see clearly. If they turn to politics and take a side they are quite conscientious in hating and persecuting those opposed to them. They are Conservative—holding on to what has been, cherishing traditions and ancient customs, and loving to be under the guidance of venerable leaders. And it is source of wonder and amazement that any should differ with them. What can ever be better than that which has been? You have tried the past, and found it more or less good. You have not tried the future, it is all a speculation—you have only theories to go upon, it is not safe. Or, they are Liberals. They do not understand a love for and a passionate clinging to things which are old and tried. They are eager to explore new continents—to try new experiments, and in a general way "get on." And the Tory, who has some love for the ways in which his fathers moved—who delights to linger in the picture gallery of his ancestral hall, and looks with misgiving on all and every change in society, in the church, in the nation, is a monstrosity, an anomaly—almost a miracle. So the Liberal will hate the Conservative, and the Conservative will pay it back in double measure, and each party will do it "on principle."

It does not cease with politics. It affects all religious communities. Some men will dwell on this or that part of general ethics—or a point in theological teaching; and looking on nothing else, working always with direct, or indirect, reference to it, they grow morbid; and to their diseased fancy the thing becomes exaggerated, until it fills all space and all time, and nothing else can be of moment. If they happen to be orthodox, they go about with pale and anxious faces, as if they had been specially retained to vindicate the honour and glory of all eternal verities. With a keen nose they sniff the wind to know if heresy is abroad. They are veritable soldiers, with a great love for fighting. To be on the losing side is joy to them—for then they can talk of persecution, and liken themselves to the early Christians, and die in glorious martyrdom, "on principle." They have nothing to do with friendship, with love—with peace, popular or personal—but only with their conscience. They are very grim in their way of working, having no pity, no relenting, and no concern for the thought and feeling of others—and no regard for the judgment of others. They will give their body to be burned; but charity is the weakness of women. They baptize their crotchet and call it "principle." They call obstinacy "conscientiousness," mount it, imagining that they are providentially put astride of Parnassus—give their hobby the rein, and ride straight to the devil. They are quite sincere, always in earnest, and never doubtful of themselves. It has never occurred to them that conscience has need to be educated, like every other faculty, mental or moral. They are wise by the light of their own peculiar nature, and all others are ignorant in a natural way.

How has this come about? In many cases it is the result of original nature. There are natural Liberals and natural Conservatives—natural Calvinists and natural Armenians—natural leaders and natural followers—natural wise men and natural fools. Man was doubtless made upright, but he sought out many inventions; and among the first of them was how to play the fanatic. The first murder on record was the outcome of religious fanaticism. Many men are fanatics by the nature of them. They were born with a moral twist, and doomed to be social corkscrews. Others again owe it to early training. They got warped, biassed, prejudiced in the days when the mind was being formed, and judgment put on its throne. They were taught to move in a hard and narrow circle—to view all matters from one standpoint, and to call pigheadedness by the name of "firmness." They do much mischief in the earth, for as a general thing they take great license in all other matters, living low and

questionable lives, when tried by the true standard of ethics. They will be lenient to all failings in those who acknowledge their conscientious position. Every commandment in the Decalogue may be broken, if society will but keep and honour the commandment which they have set up. Perhaps they are a necessary evil—and perhaps the world will be rid of them some day, but meantime their friends should look after them.

HILARION.

[The proposition that each writer should sign his own proper name was inserted in the prospectus and carried out in the first issue of the SPECTATOR, as a protest against the custom of allowing personal attacks to be made through the press under a *nom de plume*. It is not deemed necessary to do more. The principle will be rigidly maintained, and personalities will not be allowed. But in a general article the rule need not apply.—EDITOR.]

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA,

Viewed in its Civil Aspects.

(Continued.)

But this was a French colony, it was "new France" as they said, and the Church established here was the French Church—that is to say it was Gallican. And the principles of the Gallican Church differ vastly from the principles of Jesuitism.

Look back just a little. The French Church never put itself altogether under the control of the Pope of Rome. It was Romish as to doctrine and ritual and methods of working, but a national Church. It had the right of meeting in national Council to decide its own ecclesiastical affairs; it had and exercised the right of deciding and administering its own discipline. France accepted the doctrines laid down in the Council of Trent and other councils—honoured the Pope and obeyed him in things spiritual—defended him and his interests with her money and men, but held fast to the temporal headship of her own Church. The Bishops were compelled to take an oath of fidelity to the King. The French Bishops had a large measure of independence of Rome. They had jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes, and decided matters without appeal to the Pope. Appeals could be made from the ecclesiastical courts to the civil powers as being highest in law. France, with other nations of Gauls, held the doctrine that each nation must make its own rules of church discipline according to its own peculiar circumstances. And that is a sound doctrine. You can no more compel two differing nations to accept and walk by the same forms ecclesiastical than you can compel them to look alike or dress alike, or speak alike. Different people have different thoughts of the same thing because they see it through different atmospheres and education—one set of civil laws could never be imposed upon all the world, nor can one set of ecclesiastical laws. The proud boast of Rome is that she never changes—*semper eadem*, is the motto she flaunts in the eyes of the world. It is but a boast, and takes for granted that history is forgotten. She may be ever the same as to spirit and aim, though that may be questioned, but one and unvarying in outward form she has not been. We can point to changes in doctrine and in discipline; in the methods of appointing Popes and Bishops; in requirements made of the priests—we can point to one Pope undoing the work and annulling the decrees of another—a sect, like the Jesuits, at one time suppressed by papal bull, at another time receiving help and honour—there have been changes in feast days and fast days—in the dispensation and distribution of temporalities—*Semper eadem*? Why she can change her form and manner with marvellous facility. As to outward appearance, with regard to requirements for worship, processions, &c., she is quite unlike in England what she is here. Tell me—what is the difference between Archbishop Lynch of Toronto, and the late Bishop Bourget? And the French people took and exercised the reasonable right of legislating for themselves in matters ecclesiastical. They said "rules for the discipline of the Church are made for the benefit of the people, and neither Popes nor Councils can possess the knowledge necessary to form a correct opinion as to what rules would be best for any particular country, and a general rule for all people is impossible." The constitution of the Assembly of French Clergy ran thus:—1st. That the Bishops have the right, by divine institution, to judge in matters of doctrine; 2nd. That the constitutions of the Popes are binding on the whole Church when they have been accepted by the pastors as a body; and 3rd. That this acceptance, when made by the Bishops, should be in the exercise of their own judgment." And they exercised what they claimed. The King was absolute. A constitution of the Pope could only be received, or executed, in France when the King had ordered it by letters patent, being satisfied that it contained nothing that was contrary to the rights of the crown and the liberties of the National Church. When a papal bull was presented to the King, he called a meeting of Bishops to deliberate upon it. If they accepted it, and the court confirmed their judgment, letters patent were granted and the bull registered. Even general councils—those sources of supreme authority to the Church—were not allowed to impose their decrees on the French Church. The Councils of Constance and Bale were received with modifications, and the decrees of the Council of Trent as to discipline were rejected altogether. I am not losing sight of the fact that the liberties of the French Church were somewhat restricted by the Concordat which was entered into in 1516 between Francis 1st and Pope Leo XI., which took from the chapters of the French Churches the power of electing Bishops, and saying that the King should name the bishops and the Pope confer the benefice, and might reject the King's nominee on the ground of unfitness. It is true that the French Government was often lax in its attention to ecclesiastical matters, and that Rome was never slow to take advantage of it, and so France lost and Rome gained; but it is also true that the Church of France, while preserving jealously the unity of Catholic faith, has also preserved her own rights and freedom. I could occupy much of your time by giving illustrations of this, crowning the whole by reading the great charter of Gallicanism, drawn up by the French clergy in 1682. But I need not. My point is this—that Gallican Church was transplanted to Canada—was established here by royal intention. That, and not Jesuitism—Jesuitism was always opposed to Gallicanism, there in France, here in Canada, as we shall see. Of course the Jesuits have been on the