

## Our Contributors.

### VARIOUS REMEDIES FOR THE JESUIT WRONG.

BY KNOXONIAN.

There is a legal fiction to the effect that the law finds a remedy for every wrong. It is a pleasant fiction no doubt, but a fiction all the same. If a man owes you \$100, and it costs you \$150 to collect the debt, it is pretty hard to see where the remedy comes in. The Jesuit difficulty is in a far better position than a man with a lawsuit. Why? Because the man with the suit may have only one doubtful and costly remedy, while at least half a dozen remedies are suggested for the Jesuit trouble. The most heroic remedy is

#### LET US FIGHT.

Fighting, except in the newspapers, in the courts, in Parliament and in the pulpit, is a rather dangerous business. It is hard on the constitution. Stopping a bullet is always dangerous. Besides being hard on the men who go to the front, it is very unpleasant for those who remain at home. A man who is likely to be any good in stopping bullets will be greatly missed by his wife and children. There are a few men in every community that could well be spared for target purposes, but these are just the fellows that would not go to the front. They would do for targets as well as better men, but they would most decidedly object to being used as targets. They start and storm and talk loudly about "driving the Jesuits out of the country," but if there was any driving to be done they would a great deal rather drive a provision wagon far in the rear than drive with bayonets at the front. Some of them would prefer driving the whiskey cart to any other kind of work in the campaign.

The number of men who really wish to fight is perhaps somewhat smaller than the number who talk about fighting. No doubt many of the alleged fighters are perfectly willing, like Mr. Ward, to sacrifice their wives' able-bodied relations, but they don't hanker after hot work themselves to any great extent. Of course any one of them could surround a hundred Jesuits and run them over Cape Diamond at a moment's notice, but they prefer allowing some one else to have the honour.

About the safest place in this world to fight in is the pulpit. On the platform there may be a man to speak on the other side and the audience may hiss. In Parliament, "honourable gentlemen opposite" are sure to reply. In the courts there is an opposing counsel paid to trip you up. In the press some anonymous Bohemian may tear you to pieces. In the corner grocery some other loafer may show that your facts are not facts or that your logic limps. On the battle field a Jesuit might shoot straighter than you can. In the pulpit you have everything your own way. From behind that cushion you can fire at anybody and nobody is allowed to fire at you. For a safe, comfortable battle-ground, always commend us to the pulpit.

Another remedy suggested is

#### LET US GO OUT OF THE CONFEDERATION.

If the people of Ontario would rather go out of the Confederation than bother with this everlasting cry about Romish aggression, there is nothing to hinder them from going peaceably. The British Government would not draw a trigger to keep Ontario from doing whatever the people of Ontario want to do. The other provinces could not keep us from going out. Some of them are ready to go out themselves. Nova Scotia never wanted to come in. British Columbia was bought. The Manitobans are in better humour now, but a short time ago it was said that the only loyal man in the Province was Mr. Van Horne. Mr. Van Horne is a Yankee. Manitoba would not try to keep us in and couldn't even if it did. Quebec would perhaps be rather glad to see us go. The other Provinces could not prevent us from going out if we wished to go.

But what would the Dominion say? There is no Dominion apart from the Provinces that compose it.

Once out of the Confederation the question arises, What next? Shall we set up as a separate colony, with a Governor-General, a Parliament, an army, a navy, an N. P., and all the rest of the governmental machinery? If so, where is the money to come from? We now need three millions and a half each year, and about one-third of our revenue comes in the shape of a Dominion subsidy. As a separate colony we might need twice or thrice three millions, and we again ask, Where is the money to come from? Supposing we set up as a separate Republic, the same question would arise, Where is the money to come from? We need three-quarters of a million for education, over half a million for asylums, and large sums for other purposes. Our people are now heavily taxed, and sensible men will ask where our revenue is to come from if we break the Confederation compact and go out. Scores of other questions will arise in the mind of any patriotic man who has anything to lose when this question of going out of Confederation is raised.

There is one short and easy solution suggested. Let Ontario become a State of the Union. If the people of Ontario are ready for that remedy for present ills, there is nothing to hinder them from applying it. The Home Government wouldn't and the other Provinces of the Dominion couldn't. But all the people are not ready for that remedy. The man who tells you that the Jesuits rule Canada, that their rule is the worst kind of rule on earth, that they have their foot on the Protestant neck, that they will never stop until they acquire Protestant Canada, trample out Protestant rights and spill Protestant blood—the man who tells you all this will

often propose to hang you if you suggest union with the United States as a remedy, and brand you as a rebel if you speak a word against the Government that refused to disallow the Jesuit Bill.

Another remedy suggested is

#### LET US GO TO THE FOOT OF THE THRONE.

Viewed as a mere phrase this is fine. There is no better way of winding up a climax than by threatening to go to the foot of the throne. That phrase has helped many a lame dog over a stile and split the ear of many a groundling. But what does going to the foot of the throne mean? It simply means that somebody carries a petition over to London and hands it to her Majesty's secretary. That functionary hands it to some understrapper in the Colonial Office, who lays it, in due time, before the Under Secretary or some other underling. After the document has gone through the Circumlocution office a reply is sent to the petitioners which, stripped of official verbiage, means, "You Canadians have responsible government, and if you don't like the laws your legislators pass, turn them out as we do over here." (Sensible to the last, Old John.)

Our dearly beloved Brother Parsons said the other day in an interview with the *Globe* that there must be provision in our constitution by which we can defeat Jesuit Bills. Yes, Doctor, there is. It is done in this way. You go into a place called a polling-booth and see three or four men sitting around a table. One of them takes up a printed list and sees if you pay any taxes. If you do, he gives you a piece of paper called a ballot, on which are names and cross-lines. You go into a quiet corner and find a lead pencil on a table or desk. If you are in favour of Jesuit Bills you make a cross opposite the name of the man who passes such bills or refuses to disallow them. If you are against Jesuit Bills you make a cross opposite the name of the man who refuses to pass such bills or is in favour of disallowing them. That is the remedy the constitution provides, and

IT IS QUITE SUFFICIENT IF APPLIED.

### ORIGIN AND OBLIGATION OF TITHES.

BY DELTA.

Since now and again there crops out, alike from our city pulpit and press, diversified observations regarding tithes, in order the better to illustrate and enforce the duty of systematic giving, it may not be out of place briefly to consider their nature and obligation. While the system of tithing existed among the Jews, it might be too much to assume that it originated with them, seeing that something akin to this was practised also by heathen nations. In regard to why a tenth part was first chosen rather than any other, the record saith not, but the reason why it was continued is shown as will be seen when the system was adopted into the Mosaic economy. It ought never to be overlooked, however, that in the Bible record the first giving of tithes is shown not only to be wholly optional and voluntary, but that the giving was not the tithe of Abraham's so-called possessions, but simply "the tenth of the spoils" which he had retaken from the marauders, and besides, the record saith not that he ever paid tithes again. In the case of Jacob the tithe was not a giving, but a promise, and that promise was conditional, and we read not that the condition was complied with, or the promise ever paid. Such, then, was the origin of tithes incidental, casual, special, the optional acts of two individuals, and where do we read that they were ever repeated? To attempt, then, to base a moral obligation on two such acts, at once optional, singular and solitary, seems to be somewhat more than questionable.

While such may cause a rush to the rescue with the question, "Were not tithes obligatory under the Old economy?" Well, have patience a little. No more is thereafter heard of tithes for upwards of a thousand years, and not till the theocracy was being established under Moses, and this being a combination of Church and State, the same constituted authority had to make provision alike for the sacred and the secular. The tithes under the Mosaic economy had no more relation to the two solitary incidents a thousand years before than merely the proportion or amount voluntarily given; they formed no part of the moral code, but were based upon, as we shall see, a foundation of simple equity and embodied among the legitimate requirements of the nation. The Sabbath, existing ere the decalogue was formed, is adopted into it by the words, "Remember," etc., but no such word is used in connection with the tithes. On the contrary, the sacred writer says: "Behold I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance for the service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation," or, as the Revised Version reads, "All the tithes in Israel for an inheritance, in return for the service which they serve." Now we all know that in the apportionment of the promised land there was no allotment made to the tribe of Levi, and as the other tribes were to receive all their lands and all their services, it was a matter of mere equity and claim of right, that they should receive a tenth of all in return. From this foundation, then, the Mosaic tithes rose, and on this alone they rested, and doubtless this element of the economy continued until the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away into Babylon broke up the nation. This element of their constitution was evidently revived and acted on after the restoration and rebuilding of the temple, for in the last of Bible prophecies by Malachi and in its last historic records by Nehemiah which bring us down to within a little of four hundred years B.C., allusion is there made by both to tithes. Thereafter all is silent regarding them till in the New Testament a few incidental allusions are made to them, but mark and memorize

them, simply as Jewish customs, not as Christian obligations, for now, as we there read, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."

Despite all this, it has been argued that the law of tithes having never been formally abrogated, it is still obligatory, but if so, there is much behind in the Old economy that is never heard nor heeded, that, on the same ground, is just as binding in the New. One, in order to let his light shine on the subject, in substance, says that the original and unrepealed law regarding tithes is still binding on the whole human race on account of the original ownership of God and the ceaseless dependence and stewardship of man. Now, such big talk, as an utterance is proof positive of its weakness, and as an argument it is its own best refutation. Another shows that "if Christians would contribute their tenth the Lord's treasury would overflow." Be this as it may, it brings up another question, viz: the payment of tithes is either a Christian duty or it is not, if obligatory upon Christians, then it is equally obligatory upon the Church to exact and enforce the payment, and if the obligation is not enforced by the Church it justly becomes a great sufferer because a great sinner. If, on the other hand, the payment of tithes is not a moral obligation, but a mere historic fact, why is the subject so frequently and designedly dragged into notice? Another, amid all, unhesitatingly asserts that the law of tithes is as binding on us the law of the Sabbath, but he must pardon if not pity me if, with my faint light and feeble faculties, I fail to find the shadow of a semblance between the two cases, the one being an absolute and divine enactment, the other being, as has been shown, an equitable and constitutional arrangement. Then he closes his contention and caps the climax with our Lord's severe censure of the scribes and pharisees, "Woe unto you, for ye pay tithe of mint, etc. These ye ought to have done," etc. His exposition thereof is that "these ought ye to have done," implies that they were under obligation to tithe the fruit of their ground, and concludes by assuring us that if the point be admitted as thus established, an important step has been gained. But, unfortunately for the good man, it is to be feared that he has missed the meaning of the passage (Matt. xxiii. 23) for the word "These," etc., could have no reference to tithes, seeing that Christ said they did pay them, but to "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith," which they had neglected. Besides, Christ was not speaking to Christians, but to Jews who still held strongly to the privileges and obligations of the Old economy.

In the establishment of the Christian dispensation, its first preachers seemed to have relied chiefly, if not wholly, on the hospitality of friends. In their further organization the broad and equitable principle was laid down that "the workman is worthy of his meat," and the measure of each one's giving was to be "as God hath prospered him," or, more correctly in the Revised Version, "as he may prosper." Such a reading very materially affects alike the utterance and the argument, but in either case the givings were voluntary and tithes were not even hinted at, far less enjoined. As the foundation on which tithes rose and rested in the Old economy did, and could, have no existence in the New, so neither could the obligation. On the contrary, it is well known that, while many of the first converts from Judaism sought assiduously to carry with them not a little of the old ritual in the New economy on the plea that what was wont to be right and good could not then be wrong and evil. Although among such tithes are not even mentioned, yet all well know how Paul determinedly and effectively battled against all such innovations as trenching on the simplicity of the Christian system and lessening that "liberty wherewith Christ maketh His people free." And if he did so, certainly so should we, seeing that such can have no place in, or relation to, the Christian economy. It was not till Popish progress on till the middle of the sixth century paved the way for Popish councils thereafter to enact and enforce the law of tithes, and even then, while some in their church held them to be of divine, many held them to be wholly of human obligation. Some time about the middle of the eighth century tithes were first introduced into England, and while they have ever since existed there yet they have passed through so many ordeals that the system of tithes known in modern times has very little, if any, semblance to that under the Jewish dispensation, either in their mode of collection or manner of disbursement.

A novel exposition has lately been given illustrative of the distinctive connection of systematic paying and systematic giving, the former implying the obligatory "tithe" on the ground that "the tenth is the Lord's," and the other the optional "lay by" on the ground "as he may prosper," enjoined by Paul. In other words, the "tenth is the minimum which must be paid, and the "lay by" is what may in addition be given. The conclusion that is drawn therefrom is, that none should talk about giving to the Lord till he pays what he owes Him. Such, however, proves a little too much, for as we always owe all to God, we can never give anything to God till we pay Him all we owe. But if it is meant that God's claim is a tenth, then not to pay a tenth is a great sin, and to give more is to exceed His requirement. Where there is no claim there is no obligation. Let us look for a moment at the equity of tithing under the Christian system. Can a man in our city who earns but \$500 a year and strives therewith to bring up his family, be expected or required to pay \$50 out of his poverty on the same ground as he who earns \$5,000 is expected to pay \$500 out of his abundance? Would not the former be violating the plain and primary injunction, "If any man provide not for his own, and specially for his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." As has been seen, the circumstances under which tithes originated and ex-