

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 45 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., June 29th, 1889.

OUR Mr. Luke King will for the future call on subscribers east and north of Toronto. Mr. Luke Nigh will act for us in the district west of Toronto, and Mr. John Nigh will represent us in the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND ITS EX-MODERATOR.

It has been the fashion of late with the Presbyterian ministers who have been so busy endeavoring to excite hostility against the Catholic Church, to flout in the faces of their auditors the sufferings which their ancestors endured, in testimony to the sincerity of their faith in Presbyterianism.

Mr. McMullen said: "If we are to sustain the splendid record of the Church of our fathers and prove ourselves the worthy sons of such noble sires, then must we with jealous vigilance guard the blood-bought heritage of Protestant liberty which they so nobly won, and of which we are the inheritors and guarantors."

It is a matter of history that it was in opposition to the efforts of Charles I., urged on by Archbishop Laud, that the great battle which ended in the triumph of Scotch Presbyterianism was fought. The half ludicrous and half serious event which precipitated this conflict, and which occurred in St. Giles' Church, Edinburgh, on the 23rd July, 1637, is not yet so entirely forgotten that Rev. Mr. McMullen should endeavor to persuade the "most potent, grave, and reverend signifiers" who compose the General Assembly, that their ancestors' fight for liberty of conscience was either with the Catholic Church or the Jesuits.

But the reverend signifiers are so thoroughly familiar with such misrepresentations as Mr. McMullen perpetrated, they may indeed infer that they are in fact so apt to speak as he spoke, that they made no manifestation of surprise, no indignant remonstrance when they listened to such a distortion of fact, uttered in a building assumed to be the house of God, on the occasion when both Mr. Moderator McMullen and the divines who were listening to him were assembled for the most solemn of all purposes for which they could be called together. It was the solemn assembly of the Church, when it was to be supposed that above all other occasions the Church was speaking in the name of God. The utterance of a falsehood, and its sanction by the silence of the hearers, are sufficient evidence that the Spirit of Truth who guards and guides the Councils of God's Church, was not regarded as the ruling spirit in that Presbyterian Assembly.

As there are some of our readers who may not be familiar with the facts to which we have alluded as having ended in the triumph of Presbyterian principles in Scotland, we will recount them briefly. Archbishop Laud determined to introduce into the Church of Scotland a Common Prayer and Liturgy similar to those used in the Church of England. King James I had before spoken of this Liturgy with all the contempt implied by the name of "an ill-mumbled mass," and it

was peculiarly odious to the Presbyterians of Scotland. On the day mentioned above, in 1637, the Dean of Edinburgh attempted to read the appointed liturgy in the church in presence of a large concourse of people. We will allow Sir Walter Scott to describe the result, as he will not be suspected of coloring the truth to shield the Catholic. Sir Walter says: "As the reader of the prayers announced the Collect for the day, an old woman named Jenny Geddes, who kept a green stall in the High street, bawled out: 'The deil colick in the wame of thee, thou false thief! Dost thou say the Mass at my lug?' With that she lunged at the Dean's head the stool upon which he had been sitting, and a wild tumult instantly commenced. The women of lower condition flew at the Dean, tore the surplices from his shoulders, and drove him out of the church. The Bishop of Edinburgh mounted the pulpit, but was assailed with missiles, and the widows were broken by stones flung by a disorderly multitude from without. This was not all. The pews were assaulted in the street and assailed by the mob. The life of the bishop was with difficulty saved by Lord Roxburgh, who carried him home in his carriage, surrounded by his retainers with drawn swords. The tumult, which was now something ludicrous in its details, was the signal for a general resistance to the reception of the Service Book throughout the country."

It was then that the peers and gentry of Scotland formulated the National Covenant which was adopted by hundreds of thousands of armed Scotchmen, who resolved to die rather than tolerate that the King should be the absolute master in religion as well as in secular affairs. The General Assembly has appointed a Committee to consider the matter of the Jesuits' Estates, and from the course which has been followed by the Ontario Presbyteries, there can be no doubt of the conclusion which will be reached. It will be resolved that because Jesuits have been persecuted in other countries, and especially because in penal times in England a price was set upon their heads, that they should be also subjected to persecution in Canada, and expelled from the country, and the same falsehoods will be repeated against them which have so frequently done service while the present agitation against the Jesuit Order was being excited, mainly by Presbyterian ministers. The Jesuits will, of course, be once more falsely accused of teaching immoral doctrines. We will, therefore, conclude by presenting the following extract from one of the Acts of Parliament of King James VI., which was embodied in the Presbyterian National Covenant of Scotland, and approved by the divines who compiled the same: "That Papistry and superstition may be utterly suppressed according to the intention of the Acts of Parliament. And to that end they ordain all Papists and priests to be punished with manifold civil and ecclesiastical pains as adversaries to God's true religion, preached and by law established within this realm."

This is the spirit of Presbyterian ecclesiastical legislation in the past, and the Presbyterian ministers of Ontario have made manifest that they are still animated by the same spirit of hate. If there is any immorality of doctrine which should bring upon its upholders the penalty of expulsion from a civilized country, it is the doctrine of Presbyterianism, which is to this day part of the teaching of the Presbyterian Church, that "we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of popery, prelaty (that is to say, Anglicanism,) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, etc." (Solemn League and Covenant, Article 2.)

We notice that after the praiseworthy conduct of the Church of England Synod of Toronto, in refusing to condemn the use of French in French schools, the synod passed the anti-Jesuit resolutions which have now become so familiar. The synod declares that the Jesuits should not receive the restitution which the Quebec Legislature has voted them, because Catholics do not acknowledge the Queen to be the supreme head of the Church. What will Mr. Moderator McMullen, and the Presbyterian divines think of this? This is the very doctrine against which their "noble sires" fought in the seventeenth century, and will they make common cause with the Church of England to expel Jesuits from Canada for not accepting it? Surely Mr. McMullen's comparison of the Pilates and Herods combating for a common purpose is better illustrated in this union of Anglicans and Presbyterians, than by his application of it to the overwhelming majority in the Canadian Parliament, who resisted the pressure brought to bear upon them to force them to interfere with Provincial rights, and thus endanger the Confederation of the Dominion.

However, after all the bluster, the Jesuits will not be expelled. They were in Canada before their would be persecutors set foot upon the soil of the country, and they will remain.

A number of honorable decorations have been recently conferred by the French Republic upon priests and religious. The Abbe Lanusse, of St. Cyr, and the Abbe Gaillard, a chaplain of the navy, have been made officers of the Legion of Honor; academic decorations have been conferred on Father Favier at Toulon, Father Herber, in the Chausey Islands, and the Abbe Magaudiere, chaplain of the Lyceum at Pau. A medal of honor has also been awarded to Sister Stanislaus, Superior of Relizane Hospital, for her devoted zeal during a small-pox epidemic. All these distinctions have been announced in the Journal Officiel.

GORDIANO BRUNO.

A statue has lately been erected in Rome in honor of this now famed martyr of free thought. About three hundred years ago he was tried in Rome on various charges, among others for having preached against the divinity of Christ and for having excited a sedition in Rome; for many other reasons, especially for having defied all authority, he was found guilty by the Court of Inquisition, and condemned to death by the civil power. Now his name is venerated by the Infidel Revolutionists who insult religion and make war on the Pope. It has been constantly repeated by those who hate the Church that if Rome had the power she would burn and destroy all heretics from the face of the earth. But in the days of Gordiano Bruno she was all powerful. He perished on the scaffold in 1600, at a time when Queen Elizabeth, in the splendor of her reign, was burning and disemboweling every unfortunate Jesuit or Catholic priest that happened to be found ministering consolation to the sick or dying. If statues could be erected to the memory and in honor of all the saintly priests who were first put on the rack, and then hung, drawn and quartered, during the reign of Elizabeth, and with her sanction, there is scarcely a town or village in England that would not be honored with a marble monument. The day may come, however, when such a change will take place in English sentiment; and public opinion has already called for the canonization of those intrepid martyrs who were not put to death for being disturbers of the peace, like Bruno, but rather for having brought glory to God on high and on earth peace to men of good will. Gordiano Bruno is the only one who suffered death in Rome at the period of her greatest power, while hundreds of priests perished in England. Mary Stuart was beheaded, and thousands of Irishmen and Irishwomen died in exile, by famine or by the sword, because they would not renounce the religion of their fathers.

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES.

Notwithstanding that the Mail has persistently maintained that the Jesuit Estates Act confers upon the Pope a part of the temporal sovereignty which belongs to the Queen, the public are not so blind as to be unaware that the consent of the Pope to the sale of the estates was given by the Holy Father, simply in his capacity as claimant to the property. Proprietorship certainly does not constitute sovereignty, nor does the right of the proprietor to administer his property, and to dispose of it, interfere with the high dominion of the sovereign. The dominion of the Queen over the entire country is essentially of a different character from proprietary rights, yet the Mail persists in confounding these two things.

From the fact that the Pope is the Supreme Head over the whole Church it necessarily follows that he has "full and supreme power and jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in faith and morals, but also in those things which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world." This is declared by the constitutions of the Vatican Council held in 1870, and it is in virtue of this supreme power that the Jesuits and the bishops of the Province of Quebec recognized the Pope's right to make a contract with the Government by which all their claims to the confiscated estates were finally settled.

Under the heading, "An extraordinary state of things," the Mail of the 19th inst. declares that this claim of the Pope is "a subversion, in phrase at least, of the organic law of Britain as embodied in the Acts of Pre-emption and Circumspete Agatia, which blossomed into the Act of Submission and the Act of Supremacy, whereby the temporal jurisdiction of Rome under any and every guise is excluded from the realm."

The Acts in question not only prohibit the exercise of temporal authority by the Pope, but also they deny to him all spiritual jurisdiction as well. But when the liberty was granted to Catholics in Canada freely to exercise their religion, it naturally followed that those Acts are not applicable to the country as far as they restrict the free exercise of the Catholic religion. This supreme jurisdiction of the Pope over the temporalities of the Church cannot be regarded as a temporal jurisdiction of the same nature as the civil jurisdiction of the sovereign and of the courts. The Pope's jurisdiction obliges Catholic ecclesiastics in conscience, but it is of a different nature from the authority which is exercised by the laws of the land over all temporal possessions, and it does not interfere with the laws of the land at all. Neither is it an "extraordinary state of things," as the Mail pretends. Every Church in Canada has power to legislate in reference to its own property. No one complains against the Baptists, who manage the legacy which was left them by Mr. McMaster, according to their own best interests, and no one has a right to complain, whether they leave the Woodstock institution where it is, or move it to Toronto. The Meth-

odists are allowed to settle among themselves the question of College Confederation, so Catholics have the same right to settle, according to the internal discipline of the Church, the temporal matters which belong to the Church, and there is no more interference with the Queen's sovereignty in their so doing than there is on the part of the Presbyterian Assembly or the Anglican Synods when they manage their own private business. It must be borne in mind that the Pope's jurisdiction is so essential to the Catholic Church, that she cannot be conceived as existing without it.

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

The Catholic Congresses which were held of late in different countries, at Vienna, Madrid, Malines, etc., are a striking evidence that the question of the restoration of the Pope's temporal authority is a living question which is not to be easily suppressed. With one voice these assemblies have declared, in union with the oft-repeated pronouncements of the Holy Father, that it is necessary for the freedom of the Church that the Pope's independence from the interference of any State is essential to the well being of the Church, and even the Protestant and anti-Catholic press of Europe acknowledge the fact. We have often heard it repeated that the temporal power of the Pope is gone, and that it will not be restored to him, still the question is one which continues to press itself on the consideration of statesmen, and at the present moment there is every evidence that a reaction is setting in in favor of the Holy Father. When it is borne in mind that the two hundred and forty million of Catholics spread throughout the world persist in regarding Rome as the centre of Catholic unity, and in looking upon the Pope's independence as a necessary condition of the welfare of the Church, it will be readily understood why this question is one of very great vitality.

Even in Italy the question presses itself constantly upon the notice of the population, for it is necessarily regarded as a very anomalous state of affairs that the Holy Father, who has undoubtedly been unjustly deprived of his sovereignty, should be practically reduced to the condition of a prisoner in his own palace, in his own dominion, and that he should be subjected to all the petty persecutions which a hostile king or his subordinates think proper to inflict upon him.

Recently there assembled in Rome a Congress of the Association of Peace and International Arbitration, of which Signor Bonghi is President. Signor Bonghi has been a Garibaldian, and the association over which he presides has always been bitterly hostile to the Pope; nevertheless the President was loudly applauded when he called attention to the fact that the working classes of Italy are very restive under the heavy taxes which now oppress them, and that he "invites the radical socialists, and the moderate clericals, to unite to infuse a spirit of peace among the people, and to modify the present policy of the government." A resolution was also passed expressing the hope that there would be a reconciliation between the Pope and the Italian Government, and that the Pope should be acknowledged as universal arbitrator in the interests of peace throughout the world. These sentiments would have been rejected with indignation by that assembly a very short time ago, but now they are received with applause. The Italian Government also is forced to meet face to face these changed sentiments of the people, in spite of itself, and it may reasonably be hoped that steps will be taken before long to bring about such a reconciliation as will satisfy the longing of Catholic nations, not exclusive of Italy itself.

Italian journals which have hitherto been most bitterly opposed to the temporal power of the Pope, now treat of its restoration as among the contingencies of the near future. The Rassegna is one of the ablest Italian magazines of this class, and lately it has maintained in a series of articles that a reconciliation is needed between the Pope and the Government, before Italy can be regarded as placed in a position of stability. The signs of the times show that some positive steps must soon be taken to make this reconciliation a reality. We have no doubt that these signs will soon be verified.

The hard-fought battle in the Massachusetts Legislature on the school question has been at last terminated by the defeat of the bigots. Instead of the bill by which it was hoped effectually to close parochial schools, the Wardell bill has been passed. This bill requires private schools to come up to a fixed standard, based upon what is required in the public schools, but an amendment which subjected the instruction given in private schools to the Public School Board was rejected by the Senate, though passed by the House of Representatives. This was the clause for which the bigots struggled so earnestly. The victory gained for freedom of education is especially due to Representative McEitrick, who was ably seconded throughout the contest by Mr. Chas. F. Donnelly.

MR. CHARLTON, ONE OF THE "THIRTEEN."

The following letter of George E. Casey, M. P. for the County Elgin, needs no comment on our part. Mr. John Charlton, who distinguished himself as one of the "Devil's Thirteen," has been perambulating the country in the company of Rev. Dr. Stafford, Rev. Hugh Johnston and a few other rev. firebrands, with a view to exonerate himself from the charge of treachery by uttering calumnies against the Pope and the Jesuits, of whom he is as ignorant as a "kiah-of-brogue." Rev. Dr. Stafford said in London that the Jesuits would be coming back every ten years with fresh demands for a few more \$100,000. This he knew to be a lie, as the Pope's consent to the present contract binds the bargain forever. Rev. Dr. Hugh Johnston said it was time to draw the sword and die fighting rather than submit to Papal rule. He would drive all traitors, meaning Papists, out of Ontario, and said: "You must leave this country, or help me Heaven, we'll make you go." Fingal ought to feel proud of her rev. hero, for

"His father's sword he has girded on And his wild harp strung to the hymn."

Although John Charlton has no religious faith peculiar to any denomination, he should be ordained to the ministry. He would fill in a grand "Quartette" with Wild, Hunter and Hugh Johnston for conferees en mal et en bien. Fingal, June 19th, 1889. To the Editor of the Catholic Record: DEAR SIR—I enclose a clipping from the Toronto Mail, which does great credit to the Catholics of North Norfolk, in which La Salette is situated. Although I utterly differ from Mr. Charlton as to the duty of the Dominion Parliament in this matter, I can admit that there are two sides to this, or any other question. And I beg to congratulate the Catholics of that district on their truly Canadian conduct in giving their member a fair and patient hearing about it. It is unavoidable that there should be a certain amount of heat in the discussion of questions like this. But the party who can keep their temper, and wait till the first froth of the discussion has passed off, have the best chance of being effectively heard "in the long run." I should, therefore, counsel such action on the part of all who believe, like myself, that the "Noble 188" has right, as well as might, on their side. Yours truly, GEORGE E. CASEY.

La Salette, June 18.—Mr. Charlton, M. P., addressed a large meeting here last night. This is the centre of a large Catholic settlement, and it was predicted that the meeting would be a disorderly one. It was even feared by some that violence would be offered to Mr. Charlton. To the surprise of all the meeting was orderly and attentive. A large number of Catholics were present. Mr. Charlton defended his action on the Jesuits' Estates Bill, and denounced the measure. He gave a history of the Jesuit Society, the reverses of flattery, and pointed out that it was under the ban of Imperial law, and that the Estates Bill was in its terms a gross insult to the Queen and a violation of the Acts of Supremacy. He declared it unconstitutional and not in the interest of the Dominion, and said that for these reasons it ought to have been disallowed. He dwelt upon the disallowance power, and the motives of politicians in failing to do their duty in these premises. By his action, he said, he was prepared to stand or fall. A Catholic voter interjected that he would fall by it. Mr. Charlton replied with kindling eye and ringing voice that he would fall by it ten thousand times rather than rise once by a vote given in violation of his conscience. This sentiment was received with cheers. On the whole Mr. Charlton was well received, and though some Catholics declared that they would withdraw their support they gave abundant evidence that they respected his frank, outspoken vindication of his vote.

MR. HUGH GRAHAM'S CHEQUE.

Mr. Hugh Graham, proprietor of the Montreal Star, is making a desperate effort to convince the anti-Jesuit agitators that the proper course to be pursued is to ask the Government to carry the case to the Supreme Court or the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council, to have the question of the constitutionality of the Estates Act tried. As an evidence of his earnestness in the matter he has deposited a cheque for \$5,000 to defray the cost of reference. The Montreal speakers at the anti-Jesuit meeting in Toronto very freely expressed their want of confidence in Mr. Graham's proposal, and the general opinion freely uttered by the press is that the object of the transaction is to create a sensation and to advertise the Montreal Star. It is not expected that the Government will accept Mr. Graham's offer, as they had no doubt of the validity of the Estates Act when they signified their intention to allow it to come into force, and the position taken by the Government has been most decisively ratified by Parliament. Mr. Graham's offer comes too late to be of any avail, and the Government would only stultify itself by acting upon it. In any case, the Government could not accept the money of a private citizen for the purpose of doing the public a service, even if they thought it their duty to bring the matter before the Privy Council. But the Minister of Justice certainly knew the law when he recommended to the Council

the allowance of the Act, and the Council knew the law when they acted on the recommendation.

Many of the Reform journals state that Mr. Graham's move is intended to save the Dominion Premier from the responsibility of his course, but the more likely opinion is that it is an advertising dodge to which the Government will not make itself a party. Mr. Graham will only be laughed at for his pains.

SOME CALUMNIES REFUTED.

If all were gathered in volumes which has been written and said within the last few months against the Jesuits, many huge books would be added to our libraries; yet most of these statements consist of repetitions of the same things which have been over and over again answered. Among the pronouncements which are supposed to prove that the Jesuits ought not to be permitted to remain in Canada, there is nothing which has been more insisted upon than that they have been driven out of Catholic countries, as Italy, France, Spain and Portugal, and that they were condemned and suppressed by Pope Clement XIV., in 1773. It is argued that this fact alone is sufficient to prove that the order of Jesuits are a danger to any community in which they may be found.

It is not customary for Canadians to look either to France, Italy, Spain or Portugal for precedents on which to decide how Canada ought to be governed, and we may be pretty sure that these countries would not be held up to our admiring gaze nor would their example be appealed to as worthy of imitation, were it not that they afford some kind of an excuse, however flimsy, for the persecution to which it is desired to subject the Jesuits now. Jesuits have been long enough in Canada that we might be able to judge them by their antecedents here, instead of going to those far-off climes in order to find out what character they bear, and though they are not very numerous, there are enough of them in this Dominion to enable us to judge whether or not the training they have received makes them the criminal lot that have been represented to be by Drs. Wild and Hunter, the Toronto Mail, and others of their class.

We do not propose here to enter upon a lengthy proof that the Canadian Jesuits are neither thieves nor murderers, for no one believes seriously such to be the case, notwithstanding the statements of the above very honorable authorities. The seventy-one Jesuit priests who are in the country comprise some of the most respected families, and the work in which they have been engaged, consisting of teaching and preaching, has brought them into contact with Protestants, who in every case recognize their worth and zeal. There are no priests more generally respected in Canada than the Jesuits by the Protestants who have the privilege of knowing them, yet we have before us a report of a sermon delivered in Fort Massey Church, Halifax, N. S., recently, by the Rev. R. F. Burns, D. D., a Presbyterian minister, in which we find the following statement: "The Jesuits had to do with the assassination of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France, the Spanish Armada, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Gunpowder Plot, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and some of the bloodiest pages in the Book of Time for two centuries. For their high crimes and misdemeanors prior to the abolition of the order in 1773, they were expelled from all the countries of Europe, as well as the regions beyond."

It appears that bigotry will never tire of using the weapons of calumny in order to effect its purpose, and there must be a very large proportion of Protestants ready to believe such calumnies, otherwise they would not be so persistently stated in their hearing by men who depend upon their popularity for a living. We had occasion a few months ago, when some of the above calumnies were repeated in certain Toronto pulpits and in the columns of the Mail, to refute at some length several of Mr. Burn's statements quoted above. We will here make a brief summary of the circumstances which led to the violent hatred which was entertained against the Jesuits in those Bourbon-ruled countries which expelled them before 1773, and which forced Clement XIV. against his will to issue the Bull for their suppression.

It is easy to understand why the order was expelled from Italy and France on the most recent occasion. France was and is still governed by a clique whose earnest desire is to overthrow, not merely the Catholic Church, but all Christianity. Naturally, it was the desire of such a Government to send out of the country all religious orders who were engaged in the noble work of teaching Christian schools, and the Jesuits, being one of the most prominent of these Orders, were one of the first against whom the antipathy of the anti-Christian Government was manifested. A similar state of things existed in Italy, and the result was similar. There is good reason to hope that in both countries these persecuting enactments will be soon reversed.

Before 1773, in several countries of Europe, infidelity attained great strength, especially among the nobles and courtiers, and the open profession of Atheism was quite common. The Marquis of Pombal, who succeeded in his ambitious project of becoming Secretary of State of Portugal, did not conceal his unbelief, but he saw that he could not do more towards propagating his principles than to establish in the country a national schismatical Church. This he desired to do. He hated the Jesuits because they were the mainstay of the Church in the kingdom, and their successful opposition to his plans increased his hatred for the Order.

To destroy the society, Pombal persuaded King Joseph I. that the Jesuits favored the accession of the king's brother, Don Pedro, to the throne. Just at this time the terrible earthquake took place by which the city of Lisbon was almost destroyed, and the zeal and charity of the Jesuits was so great that Pombal's plans were for the time being thwarted. The king even recalled a number of Jesuits whom Pombal had banished on one pretence or another.

Pombal's energies, however, were still directed towards carrying out his plans. Another circumstance occurred in South America which gave Pombal a new opportunity to malign the illustrious Religious. The Jesuits had succeeded in civilizing the Indians of Uruguay, and governed them in a truly patriarchal and religious manner. The Portuguese Governor of Rio Janeiro imagined that the Jesuits were there in possession of rich gold mines, and he induced the Portuguese Government to make an exchange with Spain, giving the Portuguese colony of San Sacramento for the Christianized reductions of Uruguay. It was stipulated that the Indians should be expatriated, so that the Portuguese should have access to the mines, which had no existence save in the fertile imagination of the Governor, Gomez d'Andrade. The Jesuits remonstrated against the cruel treatment to which their wards were subjected; nevertheless, as they could not reverse the measure they counselled the injured Indians to submit. Pombal took this occasion to represent, falsely, that the Jesuits made their apostolic mission a means for carrying on profitable commercial transactions. He even accused them of having founded an independent sovereignty of which one of the fathers was made Emperor.

Pombal had determined to drive the Jesuits out of the Portuguese dominions, and to this end he addressed himself, without success, to Benedict XIV., who in his Bulls of 1748 declares that "these religious are everywhere regarded as the good odor of Jesus Christ, and are so in fact," and that "they give to the world examples of religious virtue and great sanctity."

Pombal continued his persecution of the illustrious order, until he at last succeeded in having all Jesuits in Portuguese dominions banished by a royal decree in 1769.

Banke acknowledges that at this period the Jesuits of France were "the most formidable bulwark of Catholic principles, and therefore the most exposed in the warfare against the Church." Voltaire, their bitterest enemy, says in his correspondence, 7th Feb. 1746: "During the seven years that I spent in the Jesuits' house, what did I see? Their lives most frugal and laborious, and their time divided between the care they gave to their pupils and the exercises of their austere profession. I appeal to thousands of men who were brought up like myself. It is for this reason that I cease not to wonder how they can have been accused of teaching corrupt morality."

In 1752 Madame de Pompadour was in the height of her influence in France. While in the midst of her evil life she put on an appearance of devotion, and desired the eminent Father de Lacy to admit her to the sacraments. He refused, as did other Jesuit Fathers, afterwards, unless she would change her evil courses, and for this reason she was one who labored in France for the destruction of the Society.

An unfortunate occurrence, the act of an individual Jesuit, arising out of his thoughtlessness rather than any evil intent, gave an opportunity to their enemies to raise a great outcry against the Order. Father Lavallette, of the Jesuit house of Marquette, contrary to the canons of the Order, entered upon large commercial speculations in the hope of relieving his house of a great burden of debt. His ships were captured during the war which broke out between England and France, so that he became bankrupt. The French Jesuits were not bound to the payment of the debt of another establishment, nevertheless they undertook payment, but some of the Paris Jesuits appealed to the Parliament against the injustice of imposing on them so heavy a burden. Pompadour and Choiseul, the Prime Minister, governed the weak and wicked king, the former being an enemy to the Jesuits for the reason already assigned, and the latter because he was an ally of the Infidels and an obsequious courtier to Pompadour.