

gives him such pain, I looked forward to all that has come to pass. I expected a visit from the widow, and that she would swear that the whole affair was false. Hear what Rome teaches her members—"It is an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the Church can be promoted."—Mosheim, vol. i., p. 371. With such a tenet in view, and knowing how Rome persecutes those who happen to make any disclosures of her abominations, it is difficult to see how her members can be truthful in such a case as the present. My Rev. opponent states what is *untrue*, when he says that I advised the widow to let the matter drop. Instead of this, I advised her to see to its origin, and gave her the names of my informants for this purpose. My words to her were these:—"I am sorry indeed, if I have said what is untrue, and should I find the slightest evidence of it being untrue, I will retract what I have said, and do all in my power to make amends for the injury I have done to your feelings." But from an investigation I made, accompanied by one of Her Majesty's justices of the peace, I find that I cannot retract, nor make any amends for what I have said. The story in substance is true, and if oaths are needed to prove its truth they will be forthcoming at the proper time, and in the proper place. The Rev. Father Molphy says that he was the priest who officiated at the funeral, and that he did not tell the widow that the soul of her deceased husband had gone to purgatory. Well, Rev. Sir, I find that not only in the hearing of one or two did you say so, but in the hearing of all who were assembled in Adelaide Church at the funeral service, and whose prayers you solicited for the departed. What fearful impiety to deny in such strong language what was said before a crowd of witnesses! And how much more fearful and awful to influence a human being to swear to what was *false* before God, in order to deceive the public? Why such conduct on the part of one who pretends to guide sinners to the kingdom of heaven, into which no one shall enter who *worketh abomination or maketh a lie*? Is the Rev. gentleman ashamed of that imaginary place his Church has furnished with ice and flames for the purpose of wringing money from her bereaved members for the release of the souls of their departed? If he believes he is doing right, when, God-like, he tells people that such and such a soul has gone to purgatory, and will be detained there till a certain number of masses have, for a round sum, been said fasting, why should he be ashamed? The very fact of such secrecy being enjoined on the people by the priests regarding the rites observed to bring souls out of purgatory, ought to condemn it, and show even Roman Catholics, that it is a fearful deception.

My Rev. opponent talks of his system of theology as being superior to every other system. Theology does he call it? Nay, call it *dupeology*, or *deceitology*, or *priestology*, or any kind of ology, but for the sake of all that is sacred, don't call it THEOLOGY. Take back, Rev. Sir, your slanderous language. It is yours, and no character does it describe more minutely than your own. Take it back, and keep it for the next opponent who may cross your path. But, if I am not mistaken, you will not be anxious to *air* your logic and foul abuse for a *long time* to come. Farewell.

In closing, allow me, Mr. Editor, to thank you sincerely for the honest, upright and gentlemanly manner you have exhibited during this controversy.

ROBT. SCOBIE,

Strathroy, March 14th, 1877. Presbyterian Minister.