says Schall, "has the Pontifical See found itself in a crisis so fearful. The anti-religious party ruled in every court, and it is certain that the various states meditated schism. Clement XIV. dispelled the danger." The Jesuits, thrown overboard, like Jonas, quelled the storm. But Jonas was restored—and so were the Jesuits.

Every other Pope sustained the Jesuits against their enemies, who were the Jansenists, the Infidels, the Jezabels, the corrupt Statesmen and the Kings of Europe beset with Infidel tendencies and tyrannical dispositions.

To show how Pope Clement XIV. was driven by the force of circumstances to suppress the Jesuit Order against his inclination, it is sufficient merely to another the very first Bull of his pontificate "codes tium munerum," which is in their favor, and in which he says: "As we reckon among those faithful laborers, in the fields of the Lord, the religious of the Society of Jesus, we most assuredly desire to nourish and increase by spiritual favors, the enterprising and active piety of those religious men."

But to come nearer frome, let us find out the causes of the trouble between the Jesuits and Frontenac. Here, fortunately, we are not obliged, like the Dean, to quote a garbled sentence from Emmanuel, Aphor, Confessariorum, or from fifth-hand editions of Gabriel Velasquez, where neither volume, article, or page is mentioned. I quote from something more easily procured, "tne Child's History of Canada," by Henry Miles, M. A., Lil. D., D. C. L., sanctioned by the Council of Public Instruction, Quebec. Here I find that Bishop Laval was a member of the Eupreme Conneil. It is not true, as stated by Dean Innes, that Bishop Laval was a Jesuit. In the capacity of Supreme Connsellor it was in Bishop Laval's right to disagree with Governor Frontenac.

And not only Miles' history, but every other history, relates how the Jesuits quarrelled with Governors D'Argenson, D'Avanngour and Frontenac on the question of the liquor traffic. These Governors were feathering their own nests by introducing, or allowing to be introduced, fire-water by the ship-load among the Indians. The traffic nigh ruined the great work accomplished by the missionaries. The savages came to like fire-water so much, that they would part with furs, clothing, even their very children in order to obtain it. All the faults of the Indians were made worse by drunkenness. The missionaries at Quebec complained that the use of fire-water supplied to the Indians had destroyed their labors of thirty years. But the Governors connived at the open infraction of the severe laws enacted by the Supreme Council, and sanctioned by the Kings of France, against this debasing, ruinous liquor traffic. If, therefore, the Jesuits came in conflict with the Governors of their day, it was in defence of the lives and souls of the Indians imperilled by the infamous liquor traffic encouraged by said Governors. And now, we ask in all seriousness, is posterity going to condemn the Jesuit Fathers for protecting and saving their neophites, body and soul, at the dietation of Ven. Dean Innes? We trow not. But, in this instance, as in all others, where true history is allowed to speak, we find the much slandered, much-abused Jesuit Fathers on the side of temperance, on the side of pure morality, on the side of the poor and the oppressed, against the cupidity, the lust and the tyranny of the people's oppressors. The Jesuits were the fathers of the poor and the pioneers of pure morality and civilization in every land. They did in their day, and did effectually, what advanced Protestant missionaries are now striving for in Ontario. They established the White Cross Leagues on every point of vantage ground along the lakes and great rivers of our country; and they destroyed the liquor traffic, which it would be well for the Ven. Dean to designate, instead of the Jesuits, "as one of the greatest curses that ever