

shows are spreading in Quebec, and he reminds us that Protestants are in a minority, and that the safeguards devised at Confederation are not so strong as they were supposed to be. To this it is no answer to say that Sir Alex. Galt did, or did not, devise those safeguards—that he did, or did not, think them sufficient a year ago. Such statements may, or may not, be important to Sir Alex. Galt; but to the Protestants of Quebec they are unimportant. Nor is it an answer to say that the Roman Catholics are in a minority in Ontario; because no one in Ontario is proposing to revive the obsolete intolerant statutes of England there. Nor is it conclusive to ask, with that triumphant air of utilitarian politics which is not to be confounded with political wisdom, "What are you going to do about it? You cannot help yourselves." To this we reply: 1st, That the calm and thorough discussion alone of these new and radical doctrines is their sure defeat; and 2nd, That it is not the custom of free people to sit quietly down and await any fate, no matter how inevitable it may seem to be.

While the attacks of the Neo-Catholic school in Quebec are incessant, and their productions, in pamphlets, editorials, letters, &c., are innumerable, the old tolerant school of clergy with whom Protestants have lived so quietly are fast passing away. And what is worse, those who survive do not reply to their more active and vigorous assailants, for the epithets "Liberal" or "Gallican" are not now lightly to be incurred. As specimens of this new Quebec style, we give extracts from a pamphlet published in 1872, violently attacking the Grand Vicar Raymond for liberalism. "Proof, if you please? Proof? It is that there is in Canada liberty of consciences, liberty of worship, liberty of speech, and liberty of the press—all liberties inscribed in our laws as rights, and applied every day in our society as facts; all liberties forming the balance of our social state, the protocol of our political existence; all liberties condemned and reproved by infallible Popes." And again: "We answer still that the Catholic Church has alone the right to liberty, because she alone possesses the truth." The writer indignantly asks, "Does prudence then demand that we should wait until the good dispositions of our politicians are changed with regard to the Church, before

demanding the reform of those of our laws which are not in harmony with the Syllabus? It seems to us quite the contrary." And again: "Ought we, we Christians, to exercise more circumspection in regard to the impious and to the Protestants of the 19th century than our brothers of the Primitive Church did to the impious and the pagans of their day?" This is rampant Neo-Catholicism, and there is abundance of it in the recent issues of the Roman Catholic press of the Province. In Laval University, which has been so much attacked for its liberal opinions, the lectures of the Professor of Theology, the Abbé Paquet, have been published under the sanction of the Archbishop. Upon the subject of toleration we read: "A Government cannot proclaim the civil liberty of worship without usurping a right which it has not got. It is not judge in the matter of religion, and in declaring the civil liberty of worship it arrogates to itself a right which belongs only to the spiritual power—it substitutes itself for the infallible tribunal of the Church." Again: "Absolute liberty of worship, set up as a principle, is then a chimera, an error, and an impiety. Always and everywhere the principle of religious or dogmatic intolerance will remain master of the position, because it is the truth, and truth is indestructible, because it is eternal." The Abbé explains the principle of toleration thus: "The rulers of nations, although they may grant civil liberty to false religions for the purpose of avoiding great evils, yet with regard to God and society are always under the obligation of promoting the true religion within the limits of their powers." He quotes Monseigneur Audisio ("Droit Public de l'Eglise") as stating that the civil liberty of worship may be tolerated, and as even citing Rome itself under the Popes as a crucial instance of that toleration on a pretty large scale. Now, such toleration as that would never suit the Protestants of Quebec, although they may kindly thank the good-hearted Abbé for straining his authorities to make it out. Here is the danger of the doctrine of the two swords when it comes firmly to be believed in by the majority.

Sir Alex. Galt has been reproached with endeavouring to stir up religious strife. On the contrary, we believe that open discussion at this period, will tend to prevent it. His style is quiet, though forcible. There