

THE correspondence recently published between Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio, and the Canadian Minister of Customs, suggests some very interesting and perplexing questions. Mr. Ritchie, speaking on behalf of some of the ablest and best capitalists in the United States, proposes to carry on at Sudbury, in Ontario, mining and manufacturing operations on an immense scale, involving the expenditure of not less than \$25,000 per day, on condition of receiving a liberal bonus in aid of a railway and the free admission of mining machinery and coke. The Government has the question under consideration. So far as the free admission of the machinery and coke are concerned, most persons would think it a most un-national policy that would permit the question of taxes on these articles to prevent the establishment of a great industry. The giving of the railway bonus, too, provided the enterprise can be shown to be safe and *bona fide*, would be quite in accordance with the railway policy of the present Government. To many minds the proposal of such a transaction suggests a much larger question. It is evident that strangers would not come into the country and invest their capital in such an enterprise unless they were tolerably certain of realizing a handsome, probably an immense, profit. This profit, if realized, will come out of the products of Canadian soil—products which belong naturally to the people of the country. It is, of course, vastly better that these natural products should be turned to account, money put into circulation and employment given to many, in the process of enriching a foreign company, than that the resources of the country should remain undeveloped. Nothing better is, we suppose, possible under present circumstances. But may not a higher stage of political development be expected at some future day, in which the natural wealth embedded in the soil shall be drawn forth and utilized for the benefit of the owners of the soil—the people of the country to whom it really belongs—rather than for that of any individuals?

THE New York *Independent*, while referring approvingly to the Weldon Extradition Act, passed by the Canadian Parliament, and now awaiting only the sanction of the Imperial authorities in order to become law, says that the United States cannot reciprocate the compliment by passing a similar law for the delivery of fugitive criminals to Canada, since Congress has no power to legislate on the subject of international extradition treaties, and since the several States, as such, have no power to deal with the question at all. If the *Independent* is correct, this is a singular instance of the manner in which the hands of the Government and people of the United States are tied by the Constitution, with the result of putting it out of the power of the Republic to enact such measures governing its relations to another and friendly people as would clearly be in the interests of justice and morality for both nations. The *Independent* adds: "The true remedy—the one alike needed in both countries—is a new extradition treaty between the United States and Great Britain, enlarging the list of extradition crimes. The treaty of 1842, as experience abundantly proves, is entirely inadequate to the demands of justice in modern times; and it is creditable to neither country that this treaty has not long since been revised and improved." It is certainly not creditable to the United States that such action has not been taken, but it might puzzle the *Independent* to show what more Great Britain could have done than she has done to further the arrangements. The *Independent* frankly admits that the Senate made a mistake in refusing to ratify the treaty negotiated under the Cleveland administration, and hopes that President Harrison will renew the effort to secure a suitable treaty between the two countries on the subject.

#### THE ANTI-JESUIT CRUSADE.

WE are not disposed to look unkindly upon the recent uprising in Ontario against the Jesuit incorporation in Quebec. On the whole we regard this effervescence as wholesome, and as indicative of a right determination on the part of our fellow-citizens. The only thing we fear is that it may turn out to be what our neighbours call a fizzle. And a knowledge of history makes us dread that this may be the end of it. The Reformation is not played out. The principles which were enunciated by the leaders in the Reformation movement are eternal; and no State, so far, has ever prospered, which has negatived these principles. But there are different ways of asserting them, and we doubt whether they have been asserted in the best possible way during the last few months. Some of us are old enough to remember the sensation caused in

England by the creation of Roman Catholic Bishoprics in England by Pius the Ninth. Some of us can remember the excited meetings—far more excited than the recent assemblages in Ontario—which were held in all the principal towns and cities of the Mother Country, when the Pope was denounced and the supremacy of the English crown was declared. Some of us can remember the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill" of 1851. We can remember it, and we know its results! "The boy who chalked up 'No Popery' and ran away," was Lord John Russell; and the English people made themselves merry over him; but he was their representative. The English people did then chalk up "No Popery" in the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and they ran away, for no one was ever called to account for violating that Act of the Imperial Parliament.

We believe that the time is coming when Canadians will be able to consider calmly what some of them have been saying about this incorporation of the Jesuits. We think as they do about this dangerous Order. We think as they do about the Church that is under the rule of this Order. But we hesitate to affirm all their statements as to the best way of dealing with the state of circumstances in which we now find ourselves. We are not quite sure that the Dominion Government and the House of Commons at Ottawa were altogether in the wrong when they refused to negative the action of the Legislature of Quebec. We may be quite sure that, if we had been members of that Legislature, we should have voted against the incorporation of the Jesuits. But are we satisfied that we have the right to negative the action of that Legislature? When we have men like Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Edward Blake refusing to do so, are we certain that they are wrong, and that we should be right in opposing them?

Before we answer that question, we must make some other points more clear. For example, as we have said, we are dead against the Jesuits. We are dead against their theology and their ethics. Moreover, we are quite agreed with those who declare that it is our duty to inquire into the constitutional character of the Act of Incorporation. If it can be proved that the Legislature of Quebec had no right to incorporate this Society, that their doing so was an infringement of the Constitution under which we live, let that be proved, and the "question falls." The Jesuits are not incorporated and there is an end of it. But, when we are asked to go further, and to reverse the action of the Quebec Legislature and the Dominion Government; when we are told that whether the incorporation is legal or not it is our business to quash it, we hesitate to accept this view of our duty. And we do so on the double ground of *right* and *expediency*. Have we a right, then, to interfere with a sister Province, and, even if we have a right, shall we be benefiting the commonwealth by interfering with them in this matter? In answering these questions, we must draw attention to some points which are in danger of being overlooked.

In the first place, it is forgotten by some of those who are taking part in the present agitation that Jesuitism is now Romanism and Romanism is Jesuitism. There was a time when Jesuitism was merely a tolerated party or movement in the Church of Rome. The representatives of that policy were known as Ultramontanes or Curialists. They were simply an extreme Papal party. Now they are the Church of Rome. There is no essential point for which the Jesuits contended which they have not gained. The doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope has been promulgated by an Ecumenical Council and accepted by the whole Church. Any one who now questions that judgment is not rejecting a tolerated opinion, he is denying part of the faith of the Church, one of her accepted dogmas, he is, in fact, guilty of heresy; and, if he avails himself of any of the sacraments of the Church while holding such opinions, he is guilty of sacrilege.

The Jesuits were great advocates of the *cultus* of the blessed Virgin Mary. They have had their way. That which the Council of Trent refused to do, Pius the Ninth did when he proclaimed the immaculate conception of the Virgin "Mother of God." The great Council refused to formulate the dogma and resolved to leave the denial of it as a tolerated opinion. Although the new doctrine was not put forth by a Council, it was accepted by the whole Roman communion, and so has obtained a place beside the doctrine of the Trinity, as part of the Catholic Faith. Besides, the papal decrees, when spoken *ex cathedra* and addressed to the whole Church, are now declared to be irrefragable and infallible, apart from and without the consent of the Church (*sine consensu Ecclesie*).

On another point the Jesuits have triumphed. We refer to their oft-accused casuistry. Every one has heard

of the wonderful discipline by which the Jesuits have become the greatest directors and confessors in the Church of Rome. They have reduced this part of their sacerdotal work to a science. We do not blame them for this, we applaud them. It is only when any kind of work is done scientifically—that is, methodically and on principle—that it can be done satisfactorily. A casuist is not an enemy of society: he is a necessary appendix to the moralist. Jeremy Taylor, the Anglican, and Richard Baxter, the Presbyterian, have treated at large of "Cases of Conscience." The Jesuit Casuistry cannot be blamed for existing, but only for being what it is. It has been thus condemned by some of the greatest of the sons of the Roman Church. Every one has heard of Pascal's "Provincial Letters"; and, if Pascal was not always fair to the Jesuits, he certainly made out a very damning case against them. But how stands the matter now? We think we may say that, as in other matters, the Jesuits have triumphed here. The Jesuit casuistry is that of the Roman Catholic seminary and confessional.

This last statement is made on no mere general grounds. It is susceptible of particular proof. We know what are the manuals and text-books put into the hands of those who are preparing for the Priesthood. There is no secret or mystery about it. Great mistakes are made by some Protestant orators when they speak of people being secret Jesuits and the like. No doubt, Jesuits have been sent on particular missions without being known as such. The Jesuit is not under the ordinary obligation of wearing the clerical habit. He does not, like members of other religious orders, wear the tonsure. But the Jesuit is a priest, and his Order is not a private society. He is also quite explicit in his teaching. Now, the text-books on practical Moral Theology most commonly used in Roman Seminaries at the present time are those of Gury and Scavini. They are, in many respects, works of great ability and excellence. Few persons, called to decide doubtful cases of conscience, will consult either of them without advantage. But on all the points in which the Jesuits are supposed to be distinguished in their casuistry, these books are Jesuit. Gury is himself a Jesuit; and it would be his glory that he follows the great masters of his Society, Suarez, Sanchez, and the rest of them. Scavini founds his treatise mainly upon the principles of Liguori, who was not a Jesuit, but a Redemptorist; but there is no essential difference between the schools. We could give some startling examples of Roman casuistry from either, if that were our design. But this is not our purpose. We have, at present, nothing at all to do with the teaching of the Church of Rome in general, or with the teaching of the Jesuits in particular, except in one way. We are merely pointing out that Roman theory and teaching are Jesuit theory and teaching; that, in attacking the Jesuits, we are attacking the Church of Rome.

Now, we have, of course, no objection to attacking the Church of Rome; but it is just as well that we should know what we are doing and how best to do it. It is a complete mistake to separate Jesuitism and Romanism; for they cannot now be separated. We may suppress the Jesuit order, as is done in France and Germany; but we can suppress Jesuit principles only by suppressing the Roman Church itself. And it seems that, in modern times, we have made up our minds to suppress opinions only by means of arguments. We are not arguing on behalf of the Jesuits. We do not differ from the opinions which have been expressed—often eloquently, almost always loudly—at recent public meetings. But we want it to be known and understood that the principles denounced are not merely those of a particular society, but those of the whole Latin Church.

There is another part of the subject the consideration of which we must defer, namely, the question as to the right of the Province of Ontario to interfere in this matter with the Province of Quebec, and the expediency of so interfering, if the right exists.

#### CONCERNING RELIGION IN JAPAN, AND SOMETHING ABOUT BUDDHA.

THE introduction of Christianity into Japan is like the introduction of a bit of mediæval European furniture into a Japanese room. This means nothing derogatory to the furniture, and no reflection upon the room, but only that the effect of the two together seems highly incongruous. The religion of the Japanese is a natural outcome of the requirements of their hearts, and unless religion is an outcome of the requirements of the heart, it is worthless. The Japanese are by nature gay, free-hearted, superficial. They laugh most of their lives, and go to their grave in a