

Tolet said, (in 1864), "that when a person takes from his debtor the sum owed him, he does not steal." De Lugo says, "if I know that you are not disposed to pay me in one month, I can take what belongs to me. If I know that you are to come to me to-morrow to steal one hundred pounds from me, who can say that I cannot take as much from you to-day?" "From this we conclude," says De Lugo, "that if the Judge questions, and even exacts, an oath from one who "compensates himself," he can deny." (p. 361). Fernand Revelle says, "If a salary was due to a servant, according to the common estimation, larger than he agreed for, he can subtract secretly, and without scandal, the surplus."

The Jesuits had once to repent of their teachings. In 1647, Jean d'Allea, a servant, stole from them, pretending that they owed him thirty pounds. "He argued before the court that from the teachings of his masters, a person could pay himself for his wages, and the Judge set him at liberty." (p. 360.) After Innocent XI. condemned this teaching, the Jesuits began to cavil and explain away the Papal condemnation. De Cardenas, a great authority, says: "The sovereign Pontiff does not speak of the case in which it is as clear as daylight that masters commit an injustice by diminishing the salary or not paying the price agreed upon. In such cases servants can use secret compensation." (p. 366.) And Taberna, while bowing to the Papal