

controversy. If the writer spoke with warmth and feeling, it was simply because he was in earnest; and he has no intention of retracting or apologizing for a single word uttered or epithet applied in the review. Every syllable was deserved, and the notice might easily have been made much more severe without doing full justice to the pernicious spirit which pervades almost every page of the book. Indeed, the *Guardian* reluctantly admits that he was right. In fact it dare not defend a writer who stigmatizes all whose views of the Gospel are not in accord with his own, as 'either ignorant, or insane, or wicked men and of the devil.' It is vain to offer as an apology for such abominable language, that the Homelies contain foul words, or that John Milton was abusive and violent. What is that to us, in the nineteenth century, when broader knowledge and more correct views of the scope as well as the amenities of controversy have led us into a region of clearer and serener light? Writing in the year 1827, Mr. Ouseley was highly culpable, and when his book is reproduced in 1877, it ought to be censured with all the severity it so well deserves. He may have been a saint, for aught we know; but in 'hatred and malice and all uncharitableness,' he was one of the worst of sinners. But if the author was to blame for writing as he did, what judgment shall be passed upon those, who, half a century later, re-issue a work whose tone and temper they are constrained to condemn, and palm it off as 'a standard authority' on the conflict between Protestantism and Popery? In point of fact, the book is a 'standing' reproach to the Irish Protestantism of the years preceding Catholic Emancipation—an incentive to Romanist intolerance and Protestant bigotry. One more correction of fact. Our reviewer did *not* allow 'numbers to weigh powerfully' with him at all, as every reader of the notice is aware. His object was to impress upon his co-religionists that lesson which, in the nineteenth century, humanity is beginning to learn,—the lesson of charity. At this moment, an overwhelming majority of our fellow-Christians are, as we who profess ourselves Protestants all believe, in unquestionable error on many important points. Shall we assert our own infallibility and claim that our little handful of human dust contains all the golden grains of sacred truth? Should not the knowledge, that, in the world beyond, where all things will appear as they are, the varnish and tinsel of this transitory scene will vanish away as though they had never been, give us pause when we are disposed hastily to judge our brothers, even if they be, as we believe them to be, in error? It is perhaps a common subject of complacent exultation with such blatant Protestants as was Mr. Ouseley, and as the *Christian Guardian* now is, to im-

agine the day when those idolatrous Papists, those miserable Pagans, those self-sufficient Brahmins or Mussulmans shall awake to find out their mistake. Did it never occur to them to imagine that THEIR awakening may be not less amazing? Do they ever think that it may be found, at the last, that their creeds avail nothing, and that crying from the corners of the streets, and Pharisical upturnings of the eye are things of no account with Him who does not look at the absolute truth of the creed, but searcheth the heart and trieth the reins of Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Pagan alike?

The argumentation of the *Guardian* is on a par with the tone and ingenuousness of its entire article. One brief reference will suffice, and we shall put it nakedly so as to show clearly its logical deformity. The Roman Catholic believes that the wafer in the mass is transformed into the body and blood of the Saviour; the Protestant on the contrary believes that it remains bread. Now the question here has nothing to do with absolute truth, but with personal belief, and we ask, would not any reasonable person say that, with such beliefs, the Protestant worshipping the host would commit idolatry, but that the Catholic would certainly stand on a different footing? And why? Because the one would worship what he believed to be bread, whilst the other would pay adoration to what he believed to be God. In point of fact, the absurd logic of the *Guardian* does not deserve a moment's examination. And here we leave him to his 'standard authority,' and to his reflections, with one of our own in addition. It is this: that the republication of such a book in Canada is distinctly a sin against society, because it tends to engender and foster in a peace-loving country a spirit of bitterness between classes of the population, the fruits of which, in the shape of riot and murder, we have lately seen in Montreal. That spirit the publishers of this rabid book are doing their best to arouse and encourage.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- SPEECHES ON THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURE OF THE DOMINION. By the Hon. D. L. Macpherson. Toronto: Williams, Sleeth, & Macmillan, 1877.
- SPECIAL REPORT TO THE HON. THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION ON THE ONTARIO EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT, AND THE EDUCATIONAL FEATURES OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION AT PHILADELPHIA, 1876. By J. George Hodgins, LL.D., Deputy Minister. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 1877.
- THE SCRIPTURE CLUB OF VALLEY REST, OR SKETCHES OF EVERYBODY'S NEIGHBOURS. By the Author of 'Helen's Babies,' etc. Belford Bros., Toronto.
- IN A WINTER CITY. A Sketch. By Ouida. A new edition. Toronto: Belford Bros, 1877.