

"Mobs," he says "do not burn the Pope in effigy for anything that Bacon, Locke or Butler has recorded. Tradition, the real source of this hatred, does not flow from the mouths of half-a-dozen learned men, but is contained in nursery-stories, school-stories, public-house stories, club-house stories, drawing-room stories, platform stories and pulpit stories. It is drawn from newspapers, magazines, reviews, pamphlets, bits of poetry, passages of history, sermons, chance essays, extracts from books of travel, and anonymous anecdotes." It is heard everywhere, known to every-body. Every Protestant child, when it has once acquired the use of speech can narrate some fiendish act of Catholics in by-gone days. These ideas become so indelible as to form part of the child's nature. Age cannot obliterate them, opinions and judgments in after-life are not required, for habit has usurped their place. Tradition then is the sustaining power of Protestantism. "It is the poor Protestant's preservation against popery." In England this is especially true, for there Protestantism does not consist in arguments, facts, Apostolic succession, the sanction of Holy Writ, but in maintaining unsullied the fables and traditions of the nation. How different in other countries! In Germany where Luther first taught the doctrines of his new religion, Lutheranism is almost extinct, and in Geneva, where Calvin first preached, Calvinism is practised but by the few. Theirs was an artificial tradition, devoid of the proper perpetuating power—the smiles of royalty, the approval of parliament, the support of the pulpit, and the diffusive power of the press. It was too cold, too mild. To prosper it requires strong and abundant food. Fetters and fagots, rocks and ropes, scaffolds and dungeons, hypocrisy and imposture, blasphemy and licentiousness, treachery and cruelty, would have served the purpose well. Nothing can be too extravagant. Only give it the proper savor and it is well relished. The fiercer and bloodier, the better, the deeper the impression, the higher the hopes for success. "Only throw mud enough, and some will surely stick." If, then, Protestantism resorts to such base means to preserve its integrity, if without those means it cannot hold sway over the hearts of a credulous people, why should we be surprised to hear our religion

denounced as idolatrous, our priests styled monsters of iniquity, our nuns hypocrites, our convents dens of infamy, and our bishops the embodied plenitude of savageness and perfidy? All this is necessary. More Maria Monks with more awful disclosures are what Protestant tradition craves. This answers the question why we as Catholic are so well hated, why we are stigmatized intolerant, cruel, bloody. That we are intolerant we freely confess, that we are cruel and bloody we emphatically deny. We are intolerant in the sense that truth is intolerant of error, and of that intolerance we are proud, for with us it is a question of first principles, principles which we hold sacred and inviolable. Catholics are intolerant because their first and great principle, the divine authoritative power of the Church to teach mankind, in all that concerns faith and morals demands this intolerance. We believe that what the Church teaches is the very truth of God, and that, like God Himself, this truth is one and only one, and indivisible. Our intolerance is perfectly in keeping with our principles, but the intolerant Protestant is the most inconsistent of mortals, since his actions are in direct contradiction with his doctrines of "private judgment," and "unrestricted liberty of conscience."

How can any Protestant, with any show of consistency, preach universal toleration, and at the same time degrade and punish a fellow mortal, for following his own moral sense of right and wrong? Are men allowed to preach sedition, anarchy and universal confiscation? Are they at liberty to set at defiance the laws of modesty and morality, and will not government interfere? Most assuredly it will, for no government can sustain itself a single day, if it be refused the right to suppress doctrines dangerous to social order, whether these doctrines are covered with the mantle of philosophy or disguised under the veil of religion. The liberty of man is not thereby assailed, for the only liberty worthy of man, is liberty in conformity with reason. But on what ground can government, fallible in the matter of morals, presume to coerce the individual conscience by its arbitrary decrees, and even visit the violation of them with disabilities and penalties, if the Protestant principle of universal toleration is to be respected? The truth is, universal toler-