

up; they have formed their views; the author they have trusted may, indeed, have been inaccurate in some of his details; it can be nothing more. Who can fairly impose on them the perplexity and whirl of going through a bout of the controversy, where "one says," and "the other says," and "he says that he says that he does not say or ought not to say what he does say or ought to say? It demands an effort and strain of attention which they have no sort of purpose of bestowing. The Catholic cannot get a fair hearing: his book remains awhile in the shop windows, and then is taken down again. So true is this from the nature of the human mind, that, even though my present audience is well disposed, not hostile, to Catholicism, I should scarcely venture, in these lectures, to enter into any minute investigation of this or that popular calumny, from my conviction that I should be detailing matters which, except in the case of the very few, would engross without interesting, and weary without making an impression.

Yet I think I may be able still, or at least I will try, without taxing your patience to the utmost, to bring before you two or three actual specimens of the mode in which the accusation against Catholics is conducted; which may serve to give you some insight into the value of the Tradition which king, lords, and commons are so zealous in upholding. The mighty Tradition flows on, replenished and refreshed continually by rivulets, which, issuing from new foundation-heads, make their way, in faithful and unfailing succession, into the main stream. I am going to put my finger on three of these small fountain-heads of the Tradition, which, as I have already complained, are not commonly accessible; they shall not be springs of vulgar quality, but they shall represent the intelligence, the respectability, and the strong sense of English society. The first shall be a specimen of the Tradition of Literature, the second of the Tradition of Wealth, and the third of the Tradition of Gentlemen.—*Cardinal Newman's Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England.*

HERE AND THERE.

Brighter days are dawning for the anti-papists of this province. The imbeciles who hold to Maria Monk and Chinquy have now here in Toronto a chance of exposing that most nefarious phase of Romanism, the kidnapping of young girls and their immurement in a dismal convent cell. I learn from a daily paper of the 12th inst. that a young girl of 13 has been (as the paper verily believes) captured by those horrid nuns. I trust the matter will be all "shook to rags" right here in Toronto where we know the parties concerned and where proper evidence of the misdemeanour can be had if it is to be had. The paragraph is, no doubt, by this time doing duty in all the anti-Catholic journals of the outside world where contradiction is impossible, just as similar ghost-stories from abroad have done duty in Canada. But I want this matter settled here where we can have *connaissance de cause*. If there is anything to it let the *Mail* and, for instance, Dr. Wild come right on and do their proving. If they can't prove the allegation I would suggest that in future the *Mail* print all such items in its "Sports and Pastimes" column.

The ministers are badly bothered about "Robert Elsmere," a novel by a Mrs. Ward, who has had the wit to construct a character which quite exceeds their powers of analysis. Her hero becomes an agnostic and the ministers are looking for valid reasons why he should not have become such and are not finding any or at least many. Professor Clark, of Trinity University, took the book for his theme at St. Stephen's Church a week ago and made such statements as should make his friends blush or weep for him. It appears Elsmere rejected Christianity because he could not admit its miracles, and the Professor gets over this by the assertion that miracles "are not the chief proof of Christianity." This is (as against Elsmere) an abandonment of the Christian position. Our Lord Himself appealed to His miracles. "If ye believe not in me, believe in the works I do." Prof. Clark contends that the very existence of Christianity to-day is proof enough of its divinity. Can he mean that that subsistence of Christianity through so many periods and difficulties is

not in itself a miracle? Does he know what miracle means? He is no better philosopher than all his kind are theologians. This defender of the faith, this Christian apologist, goes the length of making terms with infidelity in these words, as reported in the daily journals: "Of one thing he felt sure, that those who had abandoned a part of the truth (the italics are mine) were better than those who believed in a Gull, dead orthodoxy." What does he mean? One is overpowered by such flagrant blasphemy. The man who abandons any part of truth is an imbecile or a traitor.

The *Globe*, commenting on the late presidential contest, prosecutes a line of argument which it long ago took up; namely, that we here in Canada have a personal interest in Irish affairs. The Irish element in the United States undoubtedly has a controlling influence over the administration of that country. The very extravagance and, if you will, senselessness, of the Sackville-West episode proves it for the hundredth time. So long as we are an English possession, so long as the Union Jack floats from our fortresses, so long shall we be interested in Irish affairs, so long shall we have a right to demand that what we have the courtesy to call the "Mother-country," shall not imperil our interests here by continuing to exasperate the ruling power in the neighbouring republic. The *Globe* has the right end of the argument when it says: "An Englishman must be fonder than we are of laughter if he can make merry over so much evidence of the tremendous influence upon the United States of those who are, and have reason to be, passionately hostile to the Mother-land. The struggles of the wretched Irish of Ireland seem to amuse Mr. Balfour and his associates, but the Irish of America may well make the stoutest of them quake.

"It is all nonsense to allege that the Irish influence dies for three or four years after the election of a President. The policy of both U. S. parties is constantly modified and often directed by consideration of the Irish vote. And this will infallibly continue to be so till England shall have followed the lead of her noblest statesman and conceded to her long harried sister the boon and the right of self-government.

"Do we assail Old England in saying this? God forbid. Have Canadians no right to interfere in the politics of the Mother country? No right! Why, we are at this moment in a serious peril, by no fault of our own, because of the Balfouring of Ireland. In this country Irishmen have freedom, and privilege, and influence, and welcome in the highest degree. This Dominion and its Provinces have again and again implored the Imperial Government to concede to Ireland the blessings which have drawn Canada to Great Britain in a true union of hearts. But the Pharos of Downing Street will not let the people go. Wherefore we Canadians, who are better than blameless in the matter, stand liable to enormous losses of money and to worse dangers still.

The *Labour Reformer*, of this city, is leading "Labour" a pretty dance. I am not sufficiently conversant with its *clientele* to be able to say whether its editorials meet their ideas or not. If they don't they (the readers) should expostulate. If they do we shall shortly have as nice a lot of anarchists among us as even the ghost of Parsons could sigh for. Here are some samples of its kind regard for Christianity. "Mouthing of creeds and declaring of dogmas will no longer satisfy hungry millions. . . . The Church must cease to play the mummer's part.

"Out of the light, ye priests, nor fling
Your dark, cold shadows o'er us longer!"

Bir-r-r-rh! It is good for "the Church" (what does the fellow mean by "the Church"?) that the *Labour Reformer* has not yet taken to issuing special editions (in the shape of dynamite bombs) to be gratuitously distributed behind church-doors of a morning. EFFENDI.

Dr. Stewart, a well-known Scotch physician, has been received into the Church. He is a connection by marriage of the Duke of Norfolk.