

ciation *en bloc*, so as to operate against each member separately and individually, is utterly unwarranted by any law, civil or ecclesiastical. The Guibord case was seized upon as a peg on which to hang extreme Ultramontane doctrine, but has no support from the law of the Church.

M. Doutre points out that, so far from regarding the matter at issue as a matter of conscience, the clergy have, since the commencement of this case, buried half-a-dozen members of the Institute in consecrated ground. The Freemasons are denounced by the Church, and declared liable to excommunication, though not individually and *ipso facto* excommunicated. The learned counsel mentions one fact which ought to tell with crushing effect in the present argument. In the church itself, of Pointe Claire, a parishioner was buried who belonged to both proscribed societies; for he was not merely a member of *l'Institut Canadien*, but a Freemason likewise. The *curé* was well aware of both facts; and if he had been called to account, he could have defended himself unanswerably, by pleading that the man had not been individually and by name extruded from the fold of the Church.

A statement is made by M. Doutre, which serves to show the clerical insubordination, not merely to the Sovereign, but to the Pope, which prevails at Montreal. "You may read the condemnation of your conduct, by the laws of the Catholic Church of all ages, by the Councils, by the theologians of all countries. And as a fly does not walk lame in this good Canada, without bringing opinions from Rome, I invite you to publish those you have obtained there on the Guibord affair. Rumour is a great liar if you have not been condemned there, rank and file. Your rebellion in this case would be not only against the Queen of England, but also against the opinions of Roman theologians. However, we are accustomed to see the religious authorities of Montreal laughing at decisions rendered at Rome, after having solicited them, so that no one can wonder at any kind of rebellion on your part." We should rejoice to find that the Pontiff has dared to do justice to the rectitude of English law, and the binding authority in all cases of the ecclesiastical canons of his own Church. Meanwhile, we agree with the learned counsel, that the desire of the *curé*

to enact the rôle of martyr will not be gratified, and that the vanity which prompts him to court attachment and imprisonment, should be treated with deserved contempt.

No more promising feature can be noted in this time of earnest religious controversy than the tolerant calmness which possesses the disputants. It is not so long since orthodox and sceptic alike seemed to be laid hold of by the demons of rage and unreason, whenever they came in conflict. To the former, doubt was a sure mark of immorality; to the latter, orthodoxy was a synonym for hypocrisy. Calm discussion or judicial examination of moot points on the most momentous subjects, was never thought of. The change which has taken place within the memory of living men is as welcome as in some aspects it is surprising. The *odium theologicum* still rages, but it is, for the most part, within the Church, not as between Christianity and its critics or opponents. The bitterest assaults come from scientific men, like Professor Clifford and a few other extremists, and the most unscrupulous and worthless of defences from those who know the least. We have only to contrast with the early English deists, Voltaire and Paine, the writings of F. W. Newman, Strauss, Hanson, Greg, and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, to note the difference on one side, and to compare the apologetic writings of both periods on the other, in order to recognize the essential difference in tone and treatment. Taking up the *Sunday Magazine* for July, we find, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Blaikie, a notice of *Supernatural Religion*. He does not, of course, approve of that work; but he can speak of it without abusing its author, and even concedes something to him. It is "a large and well-written book," and its arguments are "minute and elaborate." The editor then speaks of Dr. Lightfoot, who, like himself, would have been denounced as a rationalist not many years ago in England, and would almost certainly be so denounced in free Canada even now. Dr. Blaikie first makes a very important admission—"It cannot be denied that the subject (*i. e.* of the credibility of the Gospels) is not free from difficulty." He then proceeds to note that there are many persons who imagine that the New Testament was revealed as a whole. "The faith of such persons," he says, "is apt to receive a shock