

MARCH 24, 1898

FROM THEIR BENCHES.

United Ireland. House of Commons, Wednesday. We must have a disquisition one of these days upon the art of mendacity as practised by the two curious persons, the male and the female, who, by a harlequin freak of political fortune, find themselves engaged at the present time in governing the British Empire.

He had come down with a very carefully prepared reply, the manuscript of which he anxiously studied, while Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, with quiet earnestness, delivered his lucid and damaging speech.

Mr. T. M. Healy was replying to him. He was exposing Mr. Balfour's ignorance of his own Land Act. "If there had been so many evictions, why did not the Chief Secretary, 'when why did not the tenants come into court and resist them when the applications were made?'"

But, dear me! I am not yet writing the disquisition upon the peculiar character of this Ananias and Sapphira of modern politics. I only intended to refer to the fact that in all his speeches since my last letter, whether in the House of Commons or out of it, Mr. Balfour's prop and mainstay has been his power of an unblinking, reckless and stupid mendacity.

Fourteen days, of course, had not been spent in abusing Mr. Balfour; of the twelve days on which the House had devoted to the Irish question. Of the other four to three (Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, February 20, 21, and 22) were taken up entirely with English, Scotch, Indian, and foreign questions.

before the Reform Act, before the word "democratic" was breathed in the precincts of St. Stephen's, when the Lower House consisted of the sons and private secretaries of the Upper House, and when the least important peer owned and bestowed seats on whom he pleased, just as he does Church livings now-a-days.

Well, the hours of the House now stand within very sensible limits, between three and twelve. That makes nine hours, a good working day; and if you recollect that a member may have been sitting from twelve meridian on a committee, you will perceive that it is possible for a M. P., without shirking much in debate either, to do some very hard work for his country, to do some very good work for the public, and to have a chance of his getting out of the precincts of the House while the 'busses are in the streets and the trains are yet running.

Seven Questions for the Atheist. If you meet an atheist, do not let him entangle you into the discussion of sin, issues. As to many points which he raises you must leave him to his rabbinical answer; raise not knock. But ask him these seven questions:

1. Ask him, "What did matter come from?" "Can a dead thing create itself?" 2. Ask him, "Where did motion come from?" 3. Ask him, "Where does life come from?"

Reader, do you care to hear about the hours of the House of Commons? Perhaps you think it is a small matter, of no importance to anybody except the members of the House of Commons themselves. If you do you make a great mistake—in my humble judgment at any rate. The hours kept by the House of Commons have an important influence upon the character of that body; and I sincerely hope the coming House in College Green will never arrive at what I am sorry to see our friend the Star is mistaken enough to describe as "the true democratic ideal"—namely, "morning sittings, say from twelve to six."

O'BRIEN AND BALFOUR.

The following is the closing portion of Mr. O'Brien's great speech in denunciation of Balfour and his Irish policy: There is absolutely only one redeeming feature of the right hon. gentleman's policy in Ireland, and that is its colossal and monumental nature, and that is one thing that softens the minds of the Irish people against the deeds he has committed.

Mr. O'Brien—they were undoubtedly, but there was a Scotch regiment there, a regiment of his own countrymen, the Scottish Fusiliers, and by some unhappy accident they also had to be driven away by special train for some awkward manifestations at Mitchellstown. He had employed police patrols to watch the prison officials. Yes, the police—the outer-world men—were between me and the jail and the wall, and not only that, but to my own knowledge—the right hon. gentleman cannot even count on the Royal Irish Constabulary—to my own knowledge he had to employ policemen to watch police.

Seven Questions for the Atheist. (Continued) 4. Ask him, "Where came consciousness?" 5. Ask him, "Where came consciousness?" 6. Ask him, "Where came consciousness?"

If you require a spring medicine, if you are suffering with languor, debility, pimples, boils, catarrh, chronic sores, scrofula, or loss of appetite, or any disease arising from impure blood, take Ayer's Sarsaparilla—the safest and most economical of all blood purifiers.

When Mr. O'Brien sat down, the House felt the Conservative side as well as the Opposition—the fact that Mr. Balfour could not, without damage to his reputation, defer his reply to the following day. A shout for "Balfour, Balfour," filled the House, and was often repeated, but the Chief Secretary would not stir. Mr. Finlay, a

gale Liberal, was on his legs, but could not speak so vehement as the demand for Balfour. The right hon. gentleman was gazed to his seat. Lord Randolph Churchill afterwards repeated in the lobby—"Balfour should have answered him!" So it was thought by everyone, but the immediate reply was left to Mr. Finlay. Mr. Herbert Gardner, speaking on the Irish side, told the Government they would disfranchise Ireland if they dared. After a splutter of drivel from the De Lisle, the Catholic, Mr. Evelyn drove through into the side of the Government, and expressed his deepest regret for having voted last year for coercion. His threats at Lord Salisbury were hollow. He accused his lordship of the Act—which secret intention of using the Act in a cruel and abominable manner. Coming from a Conservative, Mr. Evelyn's speech fell upon the Government benches like a shower of molten lead.

THE JESUITS.

A REPLY TO THE REV. A. CLEVELAND COKE, BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK.

From the Independent. RIGHT REVEREND SIR: Yesterday your note of February 12th, enclosing the open letter, published in the Independent of February 9th, to which I reply, was received. I must thank you for the courteous manner in which it was sent. If in answering, there should be any appearance of want of regard, I disclaim it; but, imitating you in freedom of expression, I shall speak plainly and to the point.

You permit yourself to go farther than this. You make an attempt which avers the name of Knollys days of your residence in Baltimore, to excite hostility against the Catholic Church. You presume to call American Catholics "a foreign colony." You attempt to excite the feeling of the ignorant and prejudiced against them. You strive to put them before the public as disloyal to the Constitution, and have the courage to bring forward a resolution passed by a tumultuary meeting in New York, to support your assertions that Catholics are "in bondage to a foreign potentate." Truly, my dear Right Reverend Sir, your residence in Buffalo must have made you fall a little behind the times.

At first a little, hacking cough. "The coughing but a cold." "First say, 'Well, very soon wear off.'" Alas, the story told! The hectic cheek, the falling strength, the griping pains, the loss of appetite, and a life's work gone out at length. In a consumptive's grave. If persons would use Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery, when irritation of the lungs is indicated by a cough, it would be an easy matter to avert consumption. Be wise in time.

rich, while her temples, thank God, are the homes of the poor. Such is this Church against which an Anglican Bishop seeks to stir up the most bitter feeling and even persecution. To come to my letter in the Independent of January 13th, which you style a gratuitous attack on you, I must say, first, it was not gratuitous. For the first time I saw this letter from you, to refute which mine was written, published by a clergyman of Montevideo. Its gross charges against the Jesuits were placed under the eye of my people, and before the non-Catholic community. Such facilities I have a right and a duty to dispense. In speaking of that letter you complain that I misrepresent your "sermon" in Baltimore by calling it a violent attack on the Catholic Church. I was only giving my impressions of years ago, for public opinion then gave you the character of bitter enemy of the Church.

Then you say I insinuate a want of theological knowledge on your part by the reference to your quoting from the "Encyclopaedia Britannica." Well, really, my dear Right Rev. Sir, without a pen, I did not know whether on that particular point you had gone further. It was your own fault that you had not, and that you had been led to trust to Dr. Littledale; though even that cannot excuse you. Now that I know that you have written so much, and have edited a work on the moral theology of St. Liguori, I am still more puzzled to understand how you could have written what you did. As I said in my previous letter, referred to above, "If the Bishop, instead of going to the 'Encyclopaedia,' had gone to the source whence the extract was cited, he would have found the following to enlighten his mind, were it possible to pierce the panoply of his prejudice. I quote from the Jesuit author, J. P. Gury, annotated by Antonio Balerio. In the treatise on Human Acts, he says, No. 39, 'Any choice of an evil means is bad act; but not every choice of a good means is a good act,' because the purpose or end might not be good, for the end determines the goodness of the act. 'Whoever uses a bad means for a good purpose is guilty of the wickedness which is in that bad means.' Note, that this is the principle here taught to be elsewhere and universally applied in each particular case. This, therefore, is the authoritative maxim of the Jesuits, as far removed from your asserted maxim laid to their charge, that 'the end justifies the means' as light is from darkness. I leave this before the public who will know how to judge between you and me.

As for you—I must confess myself to call it only cruel and unchristian. I had in the Jesuits, I can only say that you have defiled in the archives of their enemies to find charges against them. Any one who takes what was done against them during the latter part of the eighteenth century, as but little else than a fierce persecution of bad men, shows himself to be a shallow student of history. Even the suppression of the Order by the Pope, forced to it by the clamor of their enemies, proves nothing against them; for that Papal document does not condemn them of crime, contrary to what you assert.

I will not pursue the subject further. If in defending our theological teaching from attack I have come to the defence of the Jesuits who have been the foremost teachers of that theology, I am glad of it, for not having had the honor of frequenting their schools, I have learned to respect them greatly as highly educated, pious, and industrious men, an ornament and protection to society. I take for granted you keep away from these Reverend Fathers, and so escape the influence of their words. They are, however, waiting patiently for your answer to their challenge. I refer you, therefore, to them for further counsel on this subject, and to Mr. Gorman's article in the last issue of the Catholic Quarterly.

One word more in conclusion. You began your letter with a criticism on the press of the country, which you represent "as generally ready to do the Jesuits a service, on political motives." I think you are unduly severe on the newspapers of the country, thus making them organs of the Jesuits. This will be as new to them as to myself. What I see in the press of America is, generally, a love of fair play and sound common sense. To be sure the papers abound with extraordinary and unwarranted matter. But there is a winning process always going on among them, and when excitement subsides they ordinarily reach the truth, and that is what we want. If we make mistakes, they will undoubtedly take advantage of them. If just now you have been a little indiscreet in your attack, and they see it and disquiet you, you must bear it with equanimity, as I will try to do when my turn comes. With best wishes for your welfare, faithfully yours, FRANCIS WILLIAMS CHATMAN, Bishop of Vincennes.

THE MEDICINE FOR LIVER AND KIDNEY COMPLAINT.—Mr. Victor AUGER, Ottawa, writes: "I take great pleasure in recommending to the general public Paroel's Pills, as a cure for Liver and Kidney Complaint. I have been doctoring for the last three years with leading physicians, and have taken many medicines which were recommended to me without relief, but after taking eight of Paroel's Pills I was quite relieved, and now I feel as free from the disease as before I was troubled."