

nature of abuse of this grade, to give it more than mere passing notice. The explanation it is, that commands our attention for the moment. To attempt at this stage, as Dr. Campbell has done, to cast the blame upon the reporters is to belittle the intelligence of all who are interested in the matter. "Were you correctly reported?" The Rev. Dr. was repeatedly asked "and, if so, where are your words to be found?" Never did it occur to the Rev. Dr. when thus interrogated, to question the correctness of the report, whereas if the press had misreported him, one course and one only was open to him viz, to make the necessary correction without delay. Consideration for the interests of the Press in the absence of the virtue of charity would have dictated this course. In this connection, it is well to remember that the newspaper account of the 6th November was precisely the same in the different local papers, and that Dr. Campbell's denial, when it came a few days ago, was indignantly repudiated by the reporters, who insist upon the correctness of their account. Dr. Campbell, however, instead of acting in the manner suggested, undertook to prove his statement. Of the way in which he fulfilled his promise it is sufficient to say that it was the one thing wanting to place beyond question its author's dishonesty of purpose and wilfulness in the misstatement of facts.

We mention this not because it is of special import to us. The termination of this affair in no way strengthens our position. For us Catholics the matter was settled from the beginning, and for others who chanced to be in doubt Father Whelan's pamphlet amply sufficed. But there is another phase of this question and it is this. The slanderous utterance of the Rev. Dr. Campbell rested on the same foundation as many a previous calumny directed against our faith. Maria Monk

had quite as thin a base for her infamy and "The Lafayette Lie" thrived for years on just as meagre a living. Because these cases however were not local their hollowness was not equally apparent to all, and consequently their reputation lost much of its force. But here is an instance under our very eyes; we have watched each step in the proceedings, and a more disgraceful endeavor to malign the Church through one of her members, we venture to say was never exposed. Let the lesson not be lost then, and we appeal in an especial manner to those to whom Dr. Campbell's explanation was so sorely disappointing. To assume the offensive against one of the tenets of the Catholic Church, be it known to them and to all whom it may concern, is to stand in opposition to the reluctant testimony which well-nigh twenty centuries of unsuccessful siege, have wrested from the united forces of envy, hatred and abuse.

---

#### HABITS—

"Habit," says Mr. Morfin in *Dombey and Son*, "is all I shall have to report, when I am called upon to plead to my conscience, on my death-bed. 'Habit,' says I; 'I was deaf, dumb, blind and paralytic to a million things from habit.' 'Very business-like, indeed Mr. What's Your Name,' says Conscience, 'but it won't do here.'" We are all "creatures of habit" like Mr. Morfin, but unlike him we are too often unaware of the fact. We keep our habits as a careless person his finger-nails, paring them only when they become a nuisance and an eyesore. We are content to be moulded by circumstances and cling to a hereditary failing as tenaciously as to our hereditary estate.

We must be governed more or less by habit but it rests with ourselves to say whether our master shall be a good or a