

heart. As sacrifices now are the sacrifices of a broken and a contrite heart; so melody now is the melody from a grateful heart.

We have in the Revelation the seven branched golden candlestick representing the Church of God, Rev. i. 12-20; and the seven lighted lamps in the candlestick representing the Spirit, Rev. iv. 5. Here we have a beautiful figure of the Church's work, holding forth the Spirit, which shines out into the world to reveal Christ, and Him crucified. God's command was for pure olive oil in the lamps. So just as the Church offers nothing to the world but Christ and Him crucified, so much brighter shall the true light shine into the darkness. We see also that incense is the symbol of prayer, Rev. v. 8. The Christian is the temple of the Holy Spirit. And the Spirit dwelleth within the Christian, intercedes with and for him, his prayers being offered up through the Spirit. And so we are told to pray in the Spirit. Our prayers then are offered up through the indwelling Spirit in the heart. So also the incense was offered up on the altar, and needed to be offered through fire. As incense represents prayer, and prayer is offered through the Spirit, in all probability fire represents the Spirit. Especially is this probable as the lamps of fire represent one office of the Spirit on earth. Prayer is a part of our worship, and worship is by the Spirit of God; the other part of the Spirit's work, which makes it still more certain that the fire on the altar represents the Spirit. Nadab and Abihu were smitten with fire from the Lord, because they offered strange fire with their incense, which God commanded not. And if the fire on the altar represents the Spirit, then their sin lay in slighting the Spirit. Likewise in this instrumental music, is it not probable that there is the committing of the same sin; an offering of strange fire in God's worship which He has not commanded; a slighting of the Holy Spirit; an interference with His work; a being wise above what is written. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

It is not then a matter of indifference whether we worship with an instrument or not. But it becomes a matter of deep importance, in which vital principles are at stake; namely, how we ought to interpret the word of God; a matter of rejecting Paul's position in regard to the Old Testament ordinances, that that bond was nailed to the cross and has no place in the Christian Church; and that also of doing despite to the Holy Spirit. And these things are done for the gratification of the flesh, that the worship may be made more artistic and more attractive, and not for the sake of greater holiness. If we stand aghast at the Roman Catholic Church, let us fear lest we too are drifting from Christ, and as we fight against that apostate Church let us see to it that purity is within our own borders, lest God come and smite us with a curse.

W. W.

THE JESUITS IN CANADA.

MR. EDITOR.—In the *Montreal Witness*, Feb. 27, 1889, there is an article entitled "A Serious Affair," in which it is shown that so long as Mr. Mercier had his place to win, he was generous towards the Protestant minority in Quebec; but since his alliance with the Jesuits, he treats the Protestant School Commissioners with contempt, and refuses to do them justice. It says that Mr. Mercier will find that he has made the worst mistake of his life in thus insulting men of the eminence of Sir William Dawson, Ven. Archdeacon Lindsay, the Hon. Mr. Justice Church, Mr. R. N. Heneker, Rev. John Cook, D.D., and Mr. J. L. Mastan. The *Witness* says the Protestants of the Dominion have been inclined to treat French Catholics with generosity. But if Mr. Mercier thinks he can force Protestants to pay taxes to give to Roman Catholics, and Roman Catholic education, he will find himself mistaken.

What surprises me is that Mr. Mercier should call himself a "Liberal," and yet ally himself with the Jesuits, and incorporate their Order in Canada. Any one acquainted with the principles and history of the Jesuits—as set forth by Drs. Duff, Taylor, etc.—knows that they are the sworn enemies of liberty, civil and religious, and the subverters of all moral principles on which the well being of society is founded. They have taught that it is right to lie and deceive if it will serve the interests of Jesuitism. Talk of their missionary zeal! What has it accomplished for the interests of pure Christianity? Almost nothing. Prescott in his histories of the conquest of Mexico and South America, shows that their converts are semi-heathen still, and have remained so for centuries. Why? Because they did not receive the pure Gospel nor God's own Word in which it is taught. Such also has been the result in Asia and the Islands of the Pacific. Even the labours of their most devoted missionary, Xavier, have been a failure, for the same reason. As soon as they were well established in Japan, they began intriguing to gain a political ascendancy, which has ever been their habit, and the result was that they were expelled from that land, and Christianity put back for centuries.

They have been expelled from every Roman Catholic country of Europe, as well as from Great Britain and Germany. It is held by jurists that the incorporation of the Jesuits in Canada is contrary to the treaty of Paris, and that the French Canadians were only granted such liberties as were in accordance with British laws. But as the Jesuit order cannot be incorporated in Britain, so it must not be in Canada.

Well may the Rev. W. T. McMullen ask, Shall Quebec have the right to incorporate and endow, within this Dominion, an organization expelled from British territory, as from other nations of Europe, as dangerous to civil and religious liberty? It is said that this argument is not a strong one, because many Russians and others have been expelled from

their countries as dangerous in the opinion of the authorities. Every honest and intelligent person must see that the cases are not parallel. Lovers of liberty who sought the advancement of true liberty have been expelled by despotic governments. But the Jesuits have been condemned by the leading authorities of their own Church, as intriguers against the interests of peace and righteousness, and have been expelled by Roman Catholic governments, as the enemies of both civil and religious liberty. Such an argument is special pleading and dishonest, and will utterly disgust the friends of true liberty and justice. It is also argued that they are tolerated in Great Britain, and therefore we should not object to their incorporation and endowment in Canada. There is a great difference between toleration and incorporation. Many bad Churches are tolerated so long as they behave themselves.

The writer has ever been an earnest Liberal,—but he asks, Should Mercier, an ally of the Jesuits, be held as a proper representative of the Liberals of Canada? As well may the father of lies be held to be a proper representative of truth. We warn the leaders of the Liberal party that if Mercier's alliance with the Jesuits is not repudiated, the Liberal party will be seriously injured in the Dominion. Thousands of Liberals will cease to vote for that party, and will be compelled to form a new Christian party of true Liberals; for liberty and pure Scriptural morality are of more importance than any political party. It is not because Mercier or the French Canadians are Roman Catholics that we write thus. We have no quarrel with Roman Catholics as such. We have always sought to promote peace and good-fellowship with them; and there are many earnest Christians and excellent persons among them. But the Jesuits have always been the most dangerous society that the world has ever known. And all true patriots, all lovers of liberty, and of the best interests of mankind should unite in opposing their establishment in Canada, and if necessary an appeal should be taken to the Privy Council of the Queen.

A TRUE LIBERAL.

THE JESUITS ESTATES ACT.

At a time when the public press, public bodies and private individuals are discussing the action of the Quebec Legislature respecting the so called Jesuits estates, it may not be out of place to examine into the actual facts of the case as they appear upon the face of the Act.

In approaching the subject it is necessary to get rid of the notion that the Jesuits have been endowed by the grant of money in question, as public discussion would lead one to believe—a notion entirely unfounded, as a perusal of the measure will show.

It is proposed to treat the matter, first in a descriptive manner, and having ascertained the actual contents of the Act, to subject it to criticism.

The Act, which will be found in the Quebec Statutes for 1888, was assented to by a strange coincidence on the twelfth of July of that year. It contains in its preamble the whole of the correspondence between the Government on the one hand, and on the other the Roman Catholic authorities and dignitaries, professedly acting on behalf of the Pope. This correspondence ends in certain articles assented to on both sides, which were to be ratified by the Legislature and the Pope; and the Act proceeds to ratify them and to direct the disposal of certain funds. Let us now examine the negotiations, as upon them depends the meaning of the Act.

The preamble opens with a recital of that portion of His Honour's Speech from the Throne which referred to the question. It then proceeds to recite that the estates were "confiscated" by His Majesty, George III., and were afterwards transferred to the Province of Canada; that representations were made by various ecclesiastics and others "respecting these estates," and a letter from the Archbishop of Quebec to the Premier and its answer in 1885 are recited. Then follow the correspondence and negotiations of 1888 which culminated in the Act, the result of which will be shortly stated. The correspondence is opened by a letter dated February 17th, from the Premier to Cardinal Simoni, which states that a despatch from His Eminence in 1887 informed Cardinal Taschereau that the Pope had "reserved to himself the right of settling the question of the Jesuits' estates in Canada," that the property had been allowed to fall into great neglect, on account of its sale having been objected to by "exalted personages;" and the letter then proceeds: "Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to ask your Eminence if you see any serious objection to the Government's selling the property, pending a final settlement of the question of the Jesuits' estates. The Government would look upon the proceeds of the sale as a special deposit, to be disposed of hereafter in accordance with the agreement to be entered into between the parties interested, with the sanction of the Holy See." The answer states that the Holy Father "was pleased to grant permission to sell the property . . . upon the express condition, however, that the sum to be received be deposited and left at the free disposal of the Holy See." An objection was raised to this by a telegram from the Premier, who "respectfully objects to the conditions imposed," and cannot expect to succeed in a settlement "unless permission is given to sell the property upon the conditions and in accordance with the exact terms of my letter of the 17th February last." A telegram from Rome then states: "The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See."

At this stage, "permission" having been obtained to sell the property, it becomes necessary to have a duly

authorized officer to treat with. The Procurator of the Jesuits is therefore authorized to treat, and the letter from Rome giving him authority, in answer to the question put, "Should authority be given to any one to claim from the Government . . . the property, etc.," contains a reply, "Affirmatively in favour of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus . . . that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus treat in their own name with the Civil Government, in such a manner however as to leave full liberty to the Holy See to dispose of the property as it deems advisable, and consequently that they should be very careful that no condition or clause should be inserted in the official deed of the concession of such property, which could in any manner affect the liberty of the Holy See."

Then follows a letter from the Premier to the Procurator which desires him to bear certain things in mind. After providing for formalities, it points out that there is no civil, but a moral obligation only, to treat; that there cannot be a question of restitution in kind as that had been abandoned by those concerned, but only a money compensation; that the amount fixed should be exclusively expended in the Province; that a complete and perpetual concession of all property which may have belonged in Canada to the Fathers of the old Society should be made to the Province; that any agreement should be binding only in so far as ratified by the Legislature and the Pope; that the amount of the compensation should remain as a deposit with the Government till the ratification by the Pope and the making known of his wishes respecting its distribution; finally, that the statute should provide a grant for the Protestant minority. This despatch is acknowledged. The moral obligation is recognized as sufficient; the mode of compensation is said to be satisfactory; the expenditure within the Province is assented to; full concession of the estates is promised to be made; ratification is to bind the negotiations; the amount of compensation is to remain as suggested; and it is almost needless to add that a reply to the question of a grant to the Protestant minority is dispensed with. The claim is then put in at a little over two millions; and, in concluding the valuation, the humble suggestion is made that the Government should grant Laprairie Common to the Society of Jesus "as a monument to commemorate the eminently Catholic and Conservative Act which you are about to perform." The Premier's reply names the amount of compensation as \$400,000, and expresses willingness to grant Laprairie Common as asked. This offer is then graciously accepted, and nothing remains but to draw the necessary papers.

After a recital of all formal documents, the Act then ratifies "the aforesaid arrangements," and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is authorized to carry them out according to their form and tenor. Secondly, the Lieutenant-Governor is authorized to "pay out of any public money at his disposal, the sum of \$400,000, in the manner and under the conditions mentioned in the documents above cited, and to make any deed that he may deem necessary for the full and entire execution of such agreement." Thirdly, His Honour is authorized to transfer all rights in Laprairie Common to the Society of Jesus. Fourthly, on such settlement \$60,000 is to be paid to the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction. The Lieutenant-Governor is also authorized to dispose of the whole of the property known as the Jesuits' Estates. The Act respecting the disposition of escheated property is made to apply, and the proceeds of the property may be applied "for the above mentioned purposes, or for any other purposes approved by the Legislature."

This concludes the legislation; and we may deduce from the foregoing the following propositions:—1. Waiving the use of the term "confiscation," the Government recognizes the title to the estates as in the Crown. 2. It asks the Pope's permission to sell, before negotiations are opened. 3. Restitution in kind, that is, restoration of the specific estates, was abandoned by the claimants. 4. But permission to sell is granted upon terms. 5. The terms are accepted, viz., that the proceeds of the sale shall be held by the Government for the Pope, subject only to the condition that it be expended within the Province. 6. By the Act \$400,000 of public money is voted to the Pope, not the proceeds of the sale, though when the property is sold the proceeds may be used for the purpose of the grant.

Having arrived at the chief points of the negotiations and the basis of settlement, we are in a position to examine them critically. Whatever may be alleged elsewhere as to the title to these estates, we have the solemn avowal of the Legislature in this Act that at the inception of the negotiations the estates belonged to Her Majesty, and were in every sense of the term Crown lands. It is a common proposition of law that when a body corporate is dissolved without having disposed of its property, it reverts to the Crown. Whether the estates were so held, and reverted to the Crown upon dissolution and suppression of the Jesuits, it is immaterial to enquire, as the authorized statement is made in the Act that the property belonged to the Crown in Canada by transfer from the Imperial authorities; and by the succession of constitutional events it became the property of Her Majesty as represented by the Government of the Province of Quebec. When this is supplemented by the statement of the Premier, made during the negotiations, and assented to by the Roman Catholic authorities, that restitution in kind—that is, restoration of the specific estates—had long ago been abandoned, and that only a moral obligation to make compensation existed, we have the fullest assurance from both of the contracting parties that the title to the estates lay in Her Majesty, that no permission from any one was necessary in dealing with them as Crown lands, that no title or right of property could be conceded by the Pope or the Jesuits to the Gov-