

The move was only partially successful as the mechanic element predominated and assumed the responsibility of applauding the speakers. The speeches were in the incendiary key we are accustomed to hear from the pulpit orators of the Ministerial Association, though the professed teachers of a Gospel of peace. If Sir John and his party appointed a Judicial Commission to sit on charges inciting to crime not many of the anti-Jesuit orators would come out of the ordeal white as the Parnellites. However, the meeting has not been unproductive of good. The immoderate tone of its speeches has brought upon its promoters and supporters the condemnation of the Protestant press as well as the expressed disapproval of Montreal's best English-speaking citizens, lay and clerical. Instead of weakening the common vote, it has served only to emphasize it, and thus hastened the day when bigotry and fanaticism cannot lift their hideous heads in our fair Dominion.

J. J.

Montreal, April 29, 1889.

### THE MONTREAL ANTI-JESUIT MEETING.

The following letter in reference to the Anti-Jesuit meeting held in Montreal on Thursday last, appeared in the *Gazette* of that city on Saturday:—

To the Editor of the *Gazette*:

Sir,—On calmly reading the speeches of the Protestant champions of civil and religious liberty, delivered last evening before a Protestant audience, the *suggestio falsi* and the *suppressio veri* struck me as being the most powerful weapons employed, and that scholarly logical reasoning was painfully absent. I was also astonished at the number of ministers present at this politico-religious meeting, and it occurred to me if a Catholic meeting had been held to protest against some supposed Government ill-treatment, and priests had shown up as numerous, what an outcry the "civil and religious liberty-loving press" would have made against priestly influence. One minister railed against tax exemptions of property used for Catholic Church purposes, but he forgot to tell his audience that numbers of Catholics are opposed to church exemption, and that Protestant church property is also exempt, and that if Protestants desire to set an example of consistency and public virtue, they should be the first to relinquish the privilege. All the ministers ignored the fact that the money about which they are fighting is Catholic money, that it was originally subscribed and donated to the Jesuits by pious Catholic French people, and by the French King for purely Catholic purposes, and that not one cent of it came from Protestant sources.

One of the political intermeddlers from Ontario gave a very erroneous explanation of the Bill itself and inferentially led the audience to suppose that the Provincial Government voted the indemnity money to the Jesuits, whereas the Bill, taking a receipt in full of all demands from the Jesuits, made over the amount to the Catholic people as represented by their Church, and in order to prevent future disputes invited the chief bishop, which is the Pope, to divide it among the different dioceses. I would ask whether the Queen could have done this as satisfactorily? I do not hazard any opinion as to the opportuneness of the Hon. Mr. Mercier's touching the question at all. I suspect that it was the Castor element which forced him on.

Other ministers went off into other subjects where they were again at sea, evidently not grasping the questions at issue. A lay member, one of the "anti Sir John Ontario Liberal phalanx," touched up a sore point to most Ontario bigots, namely, the extreme fertility of the French Canadian women and the consequent large natural increase of this section of our population. The speaker stated that they were actually settling in hitherto entirely Protestant localities. Of course all this was Jesuitical intrigue. Why did not this lover of "civil and religious liberty" advise his own people to go and do likewise?

Let us hope when the oft-used safety valves have let off the superabundant steam of the ultra-Protestant papers and political hacks, that we poor benighted Papists shall be allowed to sleep in peace, as good subjects of her Majesty and of the Dominion of Canada.

ANTI-HYPERBO.

### THE JESUITS.

The following communication appears in a late issue of the *Richmond Hill Liberal*.

Sir, I am informed on credible authority, that in one of his recent lectures on the Jesuit Question, Rev. Mr. Percival has attributed to that learned and illustrious Society of Catholic priests the doctrine that the end justifies the means.

I may say at once that the Jesuits teach nothing that is contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. The doctrine that the end justifies the means, is wicked, and is repudiated alike by the Jesuits and the entire Catholic Church. I am told that Mr. Percival gave some proofs to substantiate his charge against the Jesuits, and the teaching of the Catholic Church; proofs no doubt satisfactory to himself and to his audience, and claiming to be from the writings of the Jesuits.

I presume Mr. Percival never saw the passages in the *original* from which he took these proofs; and erred, like the rest of that credulous crowd, in pinning his faith to the sleeves of his fellow-workers against the Church and the Jesuits. He trusted that his audience would take his mere word for any anti-Catholic statement he might make, and he has rewarded them as they deserved by abusing their confidence, and *deceiving* them.

The error is a serious one. A minister of the Gospel, as he claims to be, should have had a little more discretion—and I may add, a little more conscience. It might be well for him to take a lesson out of the moral theology taught by these wicked Jesuits, and endorsed by the Church. They say it is a grievous sin, not only to slander another, but also to deliberately expose one's self to the danger of slandering him, by recklessly and without due inquiry accusing him of teaching what is blasphemous and subversive of the Ten Commandments. And the slander acquires a tenfold intensity when such ignorance is attributed, not to one individual, but to thousands of men consecrated to God, and in whose holy lives even a hostile world finds no matter for reproach.

It is a proud distinction for the Jesuits that their enemies find no valid weapons against them, and are compelled to resort to falsehood and slander. They are in this point faithful representatives of the Church of Christ at this day, as she is of the primitive Church of the Apostles. Are our Protestant friends aware that they are repeating against us the identical slanders that were hurled against the Church in the days of St. Paul? Then the wicked Jews or lying Pagans charged her with holding the maxim, that evil may be done for a good purpose.—Rom 3: 8.

I call upon the Rev. Mr. Percival to prove from their own writings, not by second hand quotations, that the Jesuits teach that "the end justifies the means." It will not do to quote garbled texts from the "Encyclopedia Britannica," or "Chamber's Encyclopedia," or the Infidel Paul Bert. or Littledale, or any but one of their own authors, where the context may also be seen. I shall leave the decision to any two professors of Latin, Protestant at that, in the University of Toronto. Let him obtain this decision and I shall surrender the whole case. Mind, isolated texts will not do. It must be shown that the Jesuits teach this, or even its equivalent, from their own authors, not from authors or authorities, which have been manufactured for them.

I have now before me the Text Book of Moral Theology, used in our Seminaries. It is by a Jesuit (Gury). I shall give a specimen of his theology on the subject.

*Omnis electio mali medi est nulla; sed non e converso, omnis electio boni medi est positive bona.* This is the very condictory of the proposition, the end justifies the means.

To prove this the quotation is sometimes made *Fini detrimat probatum actus.* This does not mean "the end justifies the means." It means that the end determines the probity of an action and from the context it will be seen that the author is referring to actions indifferent, or at least, not bad in themselves, for if the action is *malum in se*, no end can justify it, as we have seen above.

The mistakes that are made in attributing false doctrines to the Catholic Church are not always the result of ignorance or neglect. They are very often deliberate misstatements ranging from the *suppressio veri* to downright mendacity.

Who has not heard that Catholics are not allowed to read the Bible? That Catholics adore images, and are consequently idolaters, and all that kind of thing? Why a priest