

suffered and the guilty went off scot-free. French ladies who are encouraged to think they do right in superseding the action of the courts will be found making mistakes with their pretty little firearms. They will be killing the wrong man, or practising with a revolver on a living target where no sympathizer can find proof of provocation, and then will come a sudden revulsion of feeling, and a demand that an example shall be made.

LORD ROSEBERY still clings to the belief that the House of Lords may be reformed from within. That it must be reformed soon or perish utterly is a conviction which is strongly rooted in his mind. Under such compulsion of conviction he has assumed the attributes more usually associated with the family of which he is the great political rival, and with a hardihood which the boldest Buccleuch never surpassed he issued a circular to his peers requesting the aid of all who may think with him in an effort to reform the House of Lords. He does not say how this work is to be done. A very good criticism on this proposal of Lord Rosebery's to reform the Lord's from within was pronounced by an outspoken member of the National Liberal Club. "The only possible reform of the House of Lords," said this hostile critic, "is that the stupid members should efface themselves. But, then," he added, "they are so very stupid as to suppose that to do this would be the most stupid thing conceivable." "It is a fresh illustration," said another member, "of the old saying, '*Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.*'"

It is true that Mr. Howard Paul is tolerably well-known in certain London circles, but *Progress* is too charitable to that gentleman when it speaks of him as "always to the front through some good work." The remark is apropos of a dinner given by the astute ex-theatrical manager to a number of "sandwich men"—a most commendable proceeding, without doubt, but also a cheaper mode of advertising than paying by the line in the regular way. To those who have the pleasure of Mr. Paul's acquaintance it is funny to be told he is "one of the wittiest of men," though there is no gainsaying the assertion that he "writes a great deal to magazines and newspapers." Had the paragraphist added that it is a mystery in Fleet-street why those writings are printed, he would have been equally exact. Thanks to a modest competence left by "the female tenor" (Mrs. Howard Paul) her Bohemian husband is enabled to eke out a comfortable existence and win that meed of notoriety which is as the breath of his nostrils.

Boston is having a serious discussion as to whether the white or black cravat is the proper form for gentlemen's full dress. There has been an intense struggle to have the black ribbon recognized because waiters wear white, but white continues to hold its own by a large majority. If any change is to be made, ask the advocates of white, why not give the waiters black? That is in the line of argument adopted by the Philadelphia *Progress*. Everything demonstrates that the present evening dress for gentlemen is not to be superceded. There might easily be a more comfortable and better looking costume; but habit has so accustomed us to what we have that it may be said to be impossible to have anything acceptable in its stead. The complaint that the waiters dress in exactly the same mode can and should be obviated by putting the waiters in other attire. That remedy could be enforced by the mere issuing of orders by the hotel and restaurant proprietors.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All communications intended for the Editor must be addressed: EDITOR OF THE WEEK, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

Contributors who desire their MS. returned, if not accepted, must enclose stamp for that purpose.

S. G. W.—The matter is treated *in extenso* by another correspondent.

ALFRED R. C. SELWYN.—Owing to the crowded state of our correspondence columns your letter is carried over to next week.

SIR FRANCIS HINCKS' REMINISCENCES.

To the Editor of the Week:

SIR,—I venture to ask permission to make a few remarks on the notice in THE WEEK of the recently published "Reminiscences of my Public Life." One motive for publishing them was my desire that they should be submitted to public criticism as to matters of fact during my lifetime, and when I could have an opportunity of defending my statements. I have no intention of correcting minor inaccuracies of no real importance, and which it would be hypercritical to notice. Such inaccuracies I have observed in various notices with which the public journals have been kind enough to honour my work. In the last paragraph of THE WEEK's notice, which treats of the Consolidated Municipal Loan Fund, there is a statement which is calculated to mislead. It imputes to me the introduction of a bill, or to be more accurate, a motion to empower the municipalities "to make grants in aid of railway construction," and this not as a Government measure, and in opposition to Mr. Baldwin, who was then my colleague. It further states that Mr. Baldwin was "beaten on the division," and that he showed "poignant signs of regret." It is even implied that his defeat on this measure was the real cause of his desire to retire from public life. Before offering a few remarks on the foregoing statements, permit me to point out that they can have no bearing whatever on the Consolidated Municipal Loan Fund Act, which was passed nearly a year and a-half after Mr. Baldwin's resignation, and in a Parliament of which he was not a member. That Act was a Government measure, was mentioned in the Governor-General's opening speech, and was read a second time with one dissenting voice, that of Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie, while the Hon. George Brown, though in opposition to the administration, spoke in favour of it, and voted for it, as did all the Conservative members present. This was the only measure of the kind adverted to in the "Reminiscences." I am quite at a loss to discover what motion you can have reference to as having been introduced by me prior to 1852. The municipalities have power under Mr. Baldwin's own Act "to make grants in aid of railway construction," and

I have no recollection of the motion which I am said to have offered. I think it highly improbable that I would have proposed such a measure without Mr. Baldwin's approbation. The length of time which has elapsed must be my excuse if such an occurrence really took place, but I trust that by giving the date you will enable me to verify the correctness of a statement which has an important bearing on Mr. Baldwin's retirement from public life.

Truly yours, F. HINCKS.

[It was not intended to imply that the cause that led Mr. Baldwin to desire to quit public life was a motion made by Sir Francis Hincks in the Legislative Assembly. The motion itself Sir Francis may, from the lapse of time, have forgotten, but nevertheless there can be no doubt that a marked difference of opinion between the two statesmen on the subject was disclosed.—ED.]

"BYSTANDER" AND THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

To the Editor of the Week:

SIR,—"Bystander's" latest fling at the Athanasian Creed is an unfortunate one, and that for the following reasons:—

(1st) He proclaims it "a form of words without meaning," and yet condemns it as "uncharitable anathemas," "reckless denunciation," which prove it to have, at least in the mind of "Bystander," considerable meaning.

(2nd) It is "an ecclesiastical falsification like the false Decretals, etc.," and "a forgery." The origin of the Athanasian Creed is undoubtedly involved in obscurity, but it is nowhere authoritatively ascribed to anyone in particular, the words of Article viii. of the Church of England "Athanasius' Creed" being explained in the Rubric by "commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius." The Creed is called after Athanasius, simply because it contains so full a statement of those doctrines for which Athanasius so ably contended against the Arians, and not because it is pretended Athanasius wrote it. Even if it were an "ecclesiastical fabrication" and "a forgery," that should hardly condemn the Creed itself, provided it is true.

(3rd) "Bystander" says: "If venerable antiquity is pleaded as the title of the Athanasian Creed to retention, the antiquity of the whole Roman Catholic system, or at least of its essential parts, is at least equally venerable." This Creed is not retained because it is ancient, but because it is true, and if the Roman Catholic system is true, it too should be retained. The difference between the two is not one of antiquity but of truth. And so Article viii. of Church of England says: "Athanasius' Creed . . . ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for it may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

(4th) A heavier charge against the Creed is its "uncharitable anathemas" and "reckless denunciations." This charge has been advanced over and over again, and has been as often answered. The Athanasian Creed contains no "uncharitable anathema," no "reckless denunciation." It is simply a "Confession of our Christian Faith" (Rubric), and, "Bystander" and the learned and pious George III. notwithstanding, it is more charitable to hold up for our warning those clear predictions of evil for the unbelieving—"He that believeth not shall be damned"—and for the wicked—"They that have done evil into everlasting fire," which fell from the lips of our Lord—shall we call Him, too, uncharitable?—than, by hushing up the Athanasian Creed, do what we can to blind men to the awful, if sad, truths of Holy Scripture. We might perhaps wish that truth were other than it is, but being what it is it were surely folly to shut our eyes to it, lest we should appear to a few, like "Bystander," to be denouncing curses on our fellow-Christians, which no one who utters this Creed intends, nor for a moment dreams that he is doing.

(5th) "Bystander" approaches very near to a heresy, that of the Flandrian Anabaptists, which Bishop Pearson condemned in his day. He says: "It is hardly possible to construe the fourteenth verse of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel otherwise than as a contradiction of the words 'not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh.'" Bishop Wordsworth is a tolerable scholar, and he thus comments on this passage: "The word became flesh; not changed into flesh. 'Became' is here used as by the Lxx. in Gen. ii. 7—not that man was changed into a living soul, but was endued with it."

Finally, "Bystander" asks: "What meaning can any human understanding attach to such terms as 'begotten' and 'proceeding' when applied to relations between Beings believed to have existed from eternity?" Here "Bystander" impugns not only the Athanasian Creed, but also the Nicene Creed, and the Holy Scriptures, neither of which perhaps he would regard as "unhappy relics of mediæval dogmatism and intolerance."

The Nicene Creed—the authoritative Catholic Creed of Christendom—calls our Lord Jesus Christ "the only-begotten Son of God," and declares He is "begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not Made," and says of the Holy Ghost that He "proceedeth from the Father and the Son." Likewise St. John, after declaring the eternal existence of "The Word," calls Him "the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father" (John i. 18), and in his first epistle (iv. 9) says that "God sent His only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him;" while it is our blessed Lord Himself who uses the word "proceeding" with reference to the Holy Ghost: "When the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me." (John xv. 26.)

Verily under cover of The Athanasian Creed has "Bystander" made his attack upon the Bible and Christianity, and it is not hard to see why, holding such views as he has here given expression to, he should dislike this ancient bulwark of Christian faith. Nor have the words long ago written by Bishop Waterland lost their point yet: "As long as there shall be any men left to oppose the doctrine which this Creed contains, so long will it be expedient, and even necessary, to continue the use of it, in order to preserve the rest; and, I suppose, when we have none remaining to find fault with the doctrines, there will be none to object against the use of the Creed, or so much as to wish to have it laid aside."

Yours, etc., T. W. P.

DOMINION GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—Under the above heading Professor Powell, in THE WEEK of January 1st, takes exception to the fairness of two statements made by your correspondent "J. C. S.," in the number for December 11, wisely avoiding others of more importance. Such of your readers as would judge between them should read the report of the Committee for them. Professor Powell's first criticism may be questioned even on general principles, for it is often better to publish incomplete or even erroneous ideas than to wait indefinitely for perfected knowledge; but this fear of premature publication can surely not apply to such descriptions of work done and records of facts observed as have, according to the Committee, "been improperly withheld, suppressed by the director, or so seriously delayed as to render them practically valueless," or to a ten-years' delay in the preparation of a catalogue of the museum and library! The interest and value of the ethnological materials collected by the survey is not underrated either by the Committee or by your correspond-