

lower of Hildebrand, who was a bigot and a tyrant all his days. The case of Pius proves that even infallibles may change; but unfortunately the change is commonly for the worse.

Pius professes now the same principles as Hildebrand did. The difference is, that Hildebrand carried his principles into practice, which Pius cannot do. The lion's teeth are drawn.

Pius holds that the church is superior to the state. Hildebrand converted the theory into fact by deposing the Emperor Henry IV. Pius would willingly do the same for the present Emperor of Germany, but society in the nineteenth century is not to be compared with society in the eleventh. Nevertheless, Pius goes as far as he can to show his sympathy with Hildebrand. Witness the harmless thunderings of his decrees. There will be another illustration of it next year. It is announced that the eighth centenary of the submission of Henry to Hildebrand at Canossa will be celebrated with Romish pomp at the Vatican and elsewhere, on the 25th of next January. Hildebrand tramples royalty under his feet, in the person of Henry IV. in 1077. Pius will declare himself to be of the same mind in 1877. The *Dictata* of Gregory VII and the *Syllabus* of Pius IX are parallels.

But that Proviso! The *Argosy* attempts to prove that the prohibition contained in the proviso is perfectly harmless, and may indeed be an effectual safeguard against numerous errors and evils. We shall see.

1. The insertion of such a clause, is a libel on the Senate of the University. They are told that they are not to be trusted—that they are either not able to distinguish dangerous books from others, or are themselves infected with principles perilous to faith or morals. There must be a legal check on them. Is not this a most creditable position?

2. The source of the check is to be considered. It is the Papal decree.

At the time of the revival of learning in Europe men began to think for themselves, and to pursue their inquiries into all subjects: in doing this, frequently arrived at conclusions differing from those which the men of the Church had admitted, and spoke slightly of the old creeds. But the theory which had been long predominant, was

that all men must think alike, and must express themselves on the subjects of thought in the same manner, not substantially, but literally; any, the least deviation, though only in words, implied heresy, and exposed to condemnation, that is, to excommunication from the church; possibly to fine, imprisonment, torture, or even death. The will of the Church, or, in other words, of the Pope for the time being, was expressed in the *Index Expurgatorius*, which is a list of books not to be read by Roman Catholics, without special permission—a privilege not to be obtained without difficulty. Additions to the *Index* are made every year, and it now includes the most valuable books in our language. No Catholic, for instance, may possess or read the works of John Locke, or John Milton, or Lord Bacon. The best books on Science usually find their way into the *Index*. Draper's "Lectures on Science and Religion"—a volume published within the last year or two, was reported the other day in the *London Times* as being already in the prohibited list. What, then, will be the practical working of the "Proviso?" Just this—that if, when a volume is proposed as a text-book, it should be discovered that the book, or any other by the same author, is in the *Index*, the Roman Catholic professors would refuse to receive it, and that would involve its rejection by the Senate.

It is evident, therefore, that those who accept the University Act, place their necks under the Papal yoke. They agree to receive or reject books, according to the ruling of Pontifical decrees. They endorse the *Syllabus*.

I have written at greater length, perhaps, than your limits allow. My excuse must be that I am desirous of warning Protestant young men against the dangers to which they are exposed. Romish influence is strong in the Government—both the Dominion and the Provincial. It is strong in Halifax.

The author of the article in the *Argosy*, speaking of Dr. Cramp, says: "Does he cherish a secret hankering after 'materialistic or sceptical philosophy?'" The boy who wrote that deserves a whipping. Dr. Cramp may forgive him, pitying his ignorance or smiling at his impudence; but certainly some chastisement would be justly inflicted.

Yours,

Oct., 18th, 1876.

CECIL.