

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 44 and 48 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Proprietor.

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Messrs. LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Genesee and Lockhart.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as all having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Ont., June 1st, 1889.

AGNOSTICISM.

In our last issue we made some remarks on Professor Huxley's article on Agnosticism in the Nineteenth Century. We mentioned that as an objection to the reliability of the Gospels, while admitting that the four Evangelists are evidently sincere, the Professor states that there are discrepancies between them which show that they have a very imperfect knowledge of the facts which they relate, so that no reliance can be placed upon their narratives.

We may in the first place remark that even if such discrepancies existed, at all events, by all the rules of evidence, such facts as sincere witnesses relate, and which are public and quite palpable to the senses, must be true, when the witnesses are eye witnesses, or contemporaneous witnesses who have taken the trouble to ascertain from a number of eye-witnesses the truth of the matter. And this must therefore be the case, at least as regards those things on which the witnesses are in agreement. When they disagree on some points, it may justly be said that on those points there is a doubt, but the main features of the narrative will remain indisputable, especially those which are related by several of the witnesses. Now, it cannot be denied by the most sceptical, that by far the greatest part of the Gospels consists of statements concerning which there is no appearance, even, of a discrepancy. The salient facts ought, therefore, to be admitted as certain, even by Professor Huxley and his followers, and there will be enough, even then, to substantiate the divinity of the Christian religion. We shall have the birth and early life of Christ with many miraculous circumstances attending His missionary labors interspersed with continuous miracles, His healing those afflicted with every malady, His raising the dead to life, His admirable doctrine, the truth of which is attested by these miracles. His death and resurrection and His final ascension into Heaven in presence of His apostles and disciples are facts concerning which none of the bystanders could be deceived, and these, told by sincere witnesses, become undeniable. Let it be granted that some of the details are related differently. Still these main facts will remain unimpeached and unimpeachable, and Jesus Christ will have proved the divinity of His mission by His works, which are beyond the power of man.

Let us now see the nature of the discrepancies which Professor Huxley discovers, or pretends to discover, in the gospels. He says: "I am of opinion that there is the gravest reason for doubting whether the sermon on the Mount was ever preached, and whether the so-called 'Lord's Prayer' was ever prayed by Jesus of Nazareth. My reasons for this opinion are, among others, these." We gave in our previous article the continuation which amounts to this, that three of the gospels, often called the "Synoptic Gospels," are merely comparatively modern attempts to give a synopsis of a previous documentary or traditional narrative, from which they strayed away, every one according to his own notions, in relating the details.

We already gave reasons which prove that the Evangelists are the original writers of Christ's life as recorded in their respective Gospels, and that the theory of a previous Gospel, the basis of the extant Gospels, is without foundation. We should now see wherein consist the supposed discrepancies in their account of the "Sermon on the Mount." St. Matthew relates it in the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of his Gospel, beginning thus: "And Jesus seeing the multitudes went up into a mountain, and when He was sat down His disciples came unto Him, and opening His mouth He taught them, saying."

It will be remarked that the disciples were present on the occasion, and as by this term the Apostles were designated, there is no doubt that St. Matthew himself was one of the listeners, and that he wrote what he himself heard Jesus say. There cannot, therefore, be a reasonable doubt of the accuracy of his statement,

as even Professor Huxley acknowledges that he is "perfectly sincere."

But in St. Luke vi. there is a shorter report of a sermon of our Lord, very similar to the sermon on the mount; and in both cases it is stated within a few verses afterwards that Jesus entered into Capernaum, and there are other indications that both Evangelists have in view the same sermon. It is further to be remarked that St. Luke expressly names Matthew as one who was present on the occasion, with the other Apostles.

Professor Huxley declares that both sermons "cannot be accurate," because while there is considerable resemblance between them, St. Luke's omits much which is in St. Matthew's version; and he disposes of both in the following cursory manner:

"Luke either knew the collection of loosely connected and apocryphal utterances which appear under the name of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' in Matthew, or he did not. If he did not, he must have been ignorant of the existence of such a document as our canonical Matthew, a fact which does not matter to the genuineness or the authority of that book. If he did, he has shown that he does not care for its authority on a matter of fact of no small importance; and that does not permit us to conclude that he believed the first gospel to be the work of an authority to whom he ought to defer, let alone that of an apostolic eye witness."

Is it, then, such an extraordinary matter that two writers should differ in their style of relating the same event, that when such a difference is observed, the whole transaction must be set down as fabulous? The thing is so preposterous that we are surprised that a writer of Professor Huxley's undoubted ability should virtually maintain the proposition. If Professor Huxley's reasoning be correct, St. Luke should not have written his Gospel at all, unless he transcribed everything just in St. Matthew's words. We already pointed out a difference in the purpose of St. Matthew and Luke in the writing of their Gospels. None of the Evangelists proposed to record all Christ's sayings and doings, for St. John tells us in the end of his Gospel that scarcely would the world contain the books that should be written, if all the acts of Jesus were recorded. Each Evangelist, therefore, selects those facts which best suit his particular purpose in writing; and as St. Matthew writes for the Jews in Palestine, who already have a knowledge of God and of His providence, he dwells especially upon the salutary doctrines of our Divine Saviour. St. Luke, who writes for Greeks, apparently for this very reason, deals more with the miraculous events of our Lord's career which would induce that philosophizing people to acknowledge Christ, because of those works which proclaim His divinity. There may, indeed, have been many reasons why the Evangelists wrote their Gospels differently, but we can only speculate upon what they may have been. A very probable reason, besides that we have already given, is that by not confining themselves to the narration of the same events the faithful have a more full account of the life of Jesus than they would have had if the evangelists had followed exactly in each other's footsteps. The professor can only see in St. Luke's contempt for the authority of St. Matthew in the fact that St. Luke narrates an event somewhat differently from the apostle. If this be so infidels must entertain for each other most supreme contempt, for no two of them agree in their manner of assailing the authority of holy scripture. Professor Huxley himself does not agree in his methods with either Tom Paine or Col. Ingersoll, and we are sure that Strauss, Salvador, and Raman would not thank him very cordially for his admission that the writers of the four gospels, whoever they may have been, were "perfectly sincere." The three last named writers are of one accord in maintaining that the gospels are a mere myth or romance. Such irreconcilable differences as exist between the adversaries of Christianity, who all profess to give the most certain results of scientific investigation, give very just reason for the belief that they are all equally deluding in the mire of error.

Professor Huxley has still another discrepancy to produce between the first and third gospels. St. Matthew says of the sermon of Christ that it was delivered "on a mountain," whereas St. Luke says: "coming down with them (the apostles), He stood in a plain or level place." This gives occasion to the Professor to display his wit, so he tells us that while the discourse recorded by St. Matthew is known as "the Sermon on the Mount," the same discourse as recorded by St. Luke may be called, by way of distinction "the Sermon on the Plain."

We cannot bring ourselves to think that the Professor really believes that there is a discrepancy here. There is certainly none, and the learned Professor must know enough about Palestine to know that "plain or level places" are frequent on its mountains. It might very easily have been that Christ delivered two discourses which resembled each other, and that St. Matthew spoke of one and St. Luke of the other, but we believe with the generality of commentators and with Professor Huxley, that both Evangelists write

of the same sermon. But is it impossible that on a mountain, or near its foot there should be "a plain or level place?" That there is no such impossibility is evident from the simple fact that such "plain and level places" are numerous on the sides of the mountains of Israel. St. Luke throws some light on the matter by informing us in verse 12 that Christ "went into the mountain to pray," and that there "He chose twelve whom He named Apostles." After the selection of His twelve Apostles, "coming down with them, He stood in a plain place, and in the company of His disciples, and a very great multitude of people from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the sea-coast both of Tyre and Sidon were come to hear Him." St. Luke here certainly gives the impression that the sermon was delivered on the same mountain on which He prayed and chose His Apostles, but on a lower part thereof where there was a level spot, where He could be conveniently heard by the great multitude which had assembled.

Robinson states in his "Researches" that the mountains of Israel have on their sides "many terraces" which are "undoubted signs of former cultivation." There was no difficulty, therefore, in finding on almost any of them a plain or level place. Another traveller declares that he often counted forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy such terraces. In the presence of such facts, Professor Huxley's witticisms become very flat. The mountains of Palestine are numerous, but tradition points out a mountain near the sea of Galilee as that on which was delivered the sermon of our Lord. This mountain is still named the mountain of Christ, though called by the Arabs "the Horns or mountain of Hattin," from the village of Hattin which is near by. On the west side of this mountain there is a large undulating plain which is perfectly suited to the gathering of a great multitude of people, and which might very well be described either as St. Matthew describes it, on the mountain, or as St. Luke describes it, a plain place.

From what we have said it will appear that the statements made by St. Matthew and Luke, while differing in form constitute an undesigned coincidence, which is one of the strongest possible attestations to the truth of both Evangelists, and to the authenticity of their narratives. It is evident from the apparent discrepancy between them that they wrote independently of each other, and from sources of information quite distinct: yet the coincidence in each case with the nature of the locality to which they refer, proves that their sources of information were both correct. St. Matthew wrote as an eye witness, St. Luke as one who had taken pains to obtain authentic information, as he states in the beginning of his Gospel, ch. i, 2 to 5.

We have thought it advisable to enter upon this full refutation of Professor Huxley's greatest difficulty, as it will, undoubtedly, be one on which the rank and file of infidelity will love to harp. Our readers will thus be enabled to deal with it should it be brought forward in their presence as an argument against the strict accuracy of Holy Writ.

AGGRESSIVENESS IN NEW YORK.

Bishop Potter, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New York, resembles in many respects the persons in Ontario who are endeavoring to make the public believe that their impudent aggressiveness is caused by the aggression of Romanism on Protestant liberty. About twenty-five years ago the Episcopal Church of the Redeemer petitioned the Municipal Council for a building site, and the council granted the petition without selling the lot or giving any legal deed. The occupancy was expressly declared to extend during pleasure of the council. Later the trustees of the church determined to remove the old church and build a new one in such a position that it will cut off light and air from the establishment of the Sisters of Mercy, which is on an adjoining lot, but it so happens that the proposed site of the new church is on a piece of property which is not even included in the property which was temporarily granted to the Church of the Redeemer. The whole property granted consisted of ten lots, which were recently put up at auction, and eight of them were purchased by the church for \$87,500, about half of their value. Two lots remain unsold, but the site of the proposed church is on two other lots to which the trustees of the church have no claim whatsoever, except the claim of a squatter. These four lots are to be put up at auction in 1890, and the trustees of the church fear that the Sisters of Mercy will be competitors at the sale for their acquisition. Hence Bishop Potter's indignation. He sends to Dr. Shackleton, the rector of the church, a contribution of \$50, and at the same time complains that "owing to the desire of a hostile religious communion to get possession of what, by every rightful and equitable construction, was your own property, you are now compelled to pay thousands of dollars for continued possession of it. The whole history of this business, so far

as it relates to those who have been striving to dispossess you, is a thoroughly discreditable one, and it ought to awaken the generous resentment of every friend of religious liberty. For, certainly, it is a grave infringement of such liberty that any religious sect should be allowed to avail itself of a legal technicality in order to get possession, whether for so called religious or other purpose, of that which is not their own. And the conspicuous inconsistency of this action with that taken in the interests of those who have fattened upon State and municipal gifts and grants, would seem to indicate that Protestantism has still abundant *raison d'être*, and that Protestants may find in your case an object worthy, whatever their religious convictions, of their substantial sympathy."

Certainly if the city intends to put up the property at public sale the Sisters of Mercy have as much right as any other citizens to bid on it, and Bishop Potter's endeavor to cast odium upon them as "a hostile religious communion" for their supposed intention to do so is as unjustifiable as the attempt made in Ontario to impede Quebec legislation on the plea that the existence of Jesuits in Canada is "against public policy" in a British colony. That the course of the New York council was not dictated by a desire to curry favor with Catholics is sufficiently evident from the fact that the council determined on their course while Mayor Hewitt occupied the civic chair. Dr. Potter has taken the wrong method to gain public sympathy, and if his church should lose the property it will be a just punishment for the bigotry he displays.

CHURCH TROUBLES.

The above heading of an article on last Friday's Advertiser arrested our attention, so as to make us glance down the column for further and more precise information. Our apprehensions that some scandal, such as we read of cropping up occasionally in the Protestant churches of Toronto, were soon allayed, when we discovered that the cause of trouble this time, is an altercation between the choir and the pastor. The latter, Rev. H. D. Hunter, it appears, has ceased to "draw." Let him advertise all he may, and in the Saturday dailies promise any amount of hot fire and brimstone, or announce that he will illustrate "the machinations of Rome," or describe the avenging "angel pouring out the seven vials of wrath"—the multitudes will not come. He has ceased to draw. A few weeks ago, under the excitement of the Jesuit scare, and the expectation of something new and spicy in the lectures loudly advertised against "Jesuit intrigues," "The parson in politics," and "Protestantism in danger," the church was fairly crowded, and the Congregational Church was booming. But, alas! for Mr. H. D. Hunter's popularity and usefulness! The Jesuit card is no longer trumped, the "Parson in Politics" is played out, and no fear is apprehended by the general public that the Jesuit, armed with his misal, his cross and his sash, is about "to come down like a wolf on the fold." The excitement is abated, the reaction has been felt, and the poor man is driven back to the dry sources of an unimaginative mind, and a rebash of former sermons that will not strike oil—and that certainly refuse to strike fire—or kindle any, even the most evanescent enthusiasm. The great trouble, however, with the congregation and the church wardens is that while Mr. Hunter ceased to draw in one way, he is fully determined to draw the other way. He draws a big salary, and that he is determined, and his coteries, or the few friends who stand up for him are a unit in demanding that there shall be no diminution in his yearly allowance. They are bound he shall draw this no matter what objections there may be otherwise as to his popularity or effectiveness. In fact they will not admit that he is ageing and paling or adding to interest. The choir, they maintain, is to blame for the empty benches. Some few additions, a new soprano who would draw, a new baritone who has already started it in the Toronto pavilion, or an imported organist, would soon settle the whole difficulty. The climax was reached on last Sunday evening when it was announced from the pulpit that a grand organ recital would be held on the 3rd of June by the various local organists, "assisted by our friends in the rear," said the minister, pointing to the choir that was thunderstruck on hearing of the affair for the first time. Of course every member of the choir was indignant, and its leader, Mr. Allen, stated his intention of resigning, which he did subsequently. The rest of the choir, resenting the insult given their respected leader and themselves, unanimously decided to hand in their resignation. So that the church is now without a choir and Rev. H. D. Hunter has to do all the drawing himself. It is very evident this *status quo* of things cannot endure. That an ordinary Congregational minister should be able to keep his people together, or attract the loose fish who float around on the surface of society without owing allegiance to any religious organization, is a herculean task, fit only for the shoulders of

De Witt Talmage, Dr. Wild, or Professor Swing. Extraordinary men of acknowledged power, with an acquired reputation for genius and originality, if not for sound scriptural orthodoxy, may attract crowds and draw full houses any time independently of choir assistance. But from the turbulence raised in the Congregational Church of this city it would seem that Rev. Mr. Hunter has not reached the required standard for going it alone. It is not every week that a sensational scare can be furnished, and startling advertisements must have some nominal foundation. It seems to us that it was unwise policy for Rev. Mr. Hunter to overlook the advisability of securing the loyalty and attachment of the choir, instead of looking to other churches and strange organists for attractions that could not last unless "assisted and sustained by our friends in the rear."

THE VETO QUESTION.

The Mail of May 25th contains another long winded editorial on the Jesuit Estates' Act, filling nearly three columns, and indeed there is scarcely an issue of that journal now which does not give to the public a treatise showing why the Act should be disallowed by the Dominion Government. Nearly two columns are taken up with an elaborate argument to prove, what we believe no one denies, that the Dominion Government have really the right, under the British North America Act, to disallow the Acts of the Canadian Provincial Legislatures.

It was scarcely necessary to quote Sir Alexander Galt, Sir John Rose, Hon. Alexander MacKenzie, and others who took part in the debate on Confederation, to prove that this right ought to be exercised under certain circumstances; but it does not at all follow that it ought to be exercised merely to show that the Dominion Government has a certain amount of supremacy over the Provinces. If this be so, the Imperial Parliament, which also can override our Home Legislation, ought to be constantly interfering with the legislation of the Dominion, and Responsible Government, the glory of Canada, is a mere sham. There is, however, in Sir Alexander Galt's words something very appropriate to the present occasion. Sir Alexander said:

"The veto by the Federal Government is the real palladium of Protestant liberties in Lower Canada. The educational rights of the people of that Province are only safe under its shelter. . . . and their representation guarantee will some day dissolve into thin air without its exercise." He adds: "It is in the firm but moderate use of this vast power that safety may yet be found from the undue encroachments to which both Catholics and Protestants are exposed."

It will be seen from this that Sir Alexander speaks here of the legitimate use of the veto power, when the minority either in Ontario or Quebec feel that an act of their Provincial Legislature inflicts undue hardship upon them. But in the present case, the Quebec minority have really declared through their representatives in both the Legislature and the House of Commons that their liberties have not been attacked by the majority, that their perfect educational equality has not been impaired, and that there has been no encroachment on Protestant rights in the Estates Act. It is difficult to conceive, then, how the Mail can twist Sir A. Galt's words to mean that the Dominion Government should interfere on the present occasion. To do so would be a most unwarrantable interference with the right of Quebec to govern herself.

It has been frequently pointed out that in the Jesuit Estates' Act the Quebec Legislature has done more than justice to the Protestant minority; for while acknowledging that the Jesuits have an equitable right to five times the sum which was voted for the extinction of their claim, the Protestant minority have received a gratuity for education, to which they had no equitable claim whatsoever, and this gratuity is fully equal to what they would have received if the Legislature simply made the whole sum of \$460,000 as an educational appropriation, without reference to the just claim of the Jesuits. There never was a case when bigotry had less reason to display itself than in reference to the Jesuits' Estates Act. There is, indeed, a large Montreal faction which has allowed itself to be influenced by the Ontario Ministerial Associations, or Evangelical Alliance, to join in the anti-Jesuit cry; but the result of the Compton election has proved that the Protestant population of Quebec are really unmoved by it. We are aware that the Mail does not regard the Compton lesson in this light. It has declared that it does not prove anything as regards the feeling of the Protestants as to the Jesuits' Estates Act, and the way it attempts to prove this is truly characteristic. It tells us that Mr. Pope, who sustains the Dominion Government, was elected because his Reform opponent was equally favorable to the passage of the Act! Why then did not some third party man contest the seat? Why

did not some adherent of "the noble thirteen" lead on the indignant Protestant population of Compton to a glorious victory, under the no-Popery banner? The reason is not far away. The Protestants of Lower Canada will not be dragged through the mire of a no-Popery cry; and in one of the most Protestant counties of the Province, to the credit of the Quebec Protestants be it said, there was not to be found a single man who would raise the standard of the anti-Catholic bigot.

The rest of the Mail's article is devoted to a rebash of the reasons against the Act, which have been over and over again refuted. We are told that the Pope is recognized as legislating for Canada. The Act has nothing to do with the Pope as a legislator. It recognizes him merely as a claimant to the property, and deals with him as any fair claimant would be dealt with. We are told that the celebrated Syllabus claims the prerogative of the Papal supremacy is an essential doctrine of the Catholic Church, but neither in the Syllabus, nor in any other doctrinal act of the Pope or of the Church is temporal authority claimed over the nations, whether Catholic or Protestant. The real reason of the Mail and those who follow it, for opposing the Estates Act, is that they dislike to see Quebec govern herself, independently of Ontario fanatics. Quebec is a Catholic Province, and therefore the persons and the Orange-men cannot endure to see her exercise the same rights within herself which the Protestant Provinces of the Dominion enjoy without question. They would be as usefully occupied in beating their heads against the rocks of Queenston as in the agitation on which they are now expending their energies.

A FAIR STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

We have much pleasure in giving space to the following article from the *Sarnia Observer*. The wave of bigotry struck that town some days ago, and the persons took occasion to speak uncharitably as well as untruthfully of the faith of their Catholic neighbors, under cover of discussing the Jesuit Estates Bill. The cool common sense of the following article will be commended by all who are lovers of honesty and fair play, and is a fitting rebuke of the conduct of the erratic mountebanks of the Dr. Hunter stripe, who, instead of preaching Christ crucified, are willing to preach the gospel of hate when found to be more popular and profitable:

"The anti-Jesuit meeting on Friday evening differed in no respect from the generality of public political gatherings, and as a nucleus of feeling the feelings of the people was apt to be misleading as such meetings usually are. Rev. Dr. Thompson's address was a fair deliverance against Jesuitism, moderate in its language, but open to the objection that it contained attacks upon the Order, the truth of which have been denied and disputed over and over again by defenders of that body. Rev. Mr. O'Neil arraigned the Catholic Church, the French of Quebec and the separate school system, all of which furnish fruitful subjects for discussion, and do not suffer for lack of defenders. The fruitlessness of attacking the Quebec Jesuits' Estates Act on these lines ought to be readily apparent. Neither the Catholic religion, the Jesuits, the French language, nor separate schools are on trial before the people of Ontario or of Canada, and it is useless to arraign them, singly or collectively, for political purposes. That religion is the religion of the majority in the sister province; the language is the language of the majority; whatever may have been the law and the practice in Great Britain or France a century or more ago in regard to the Jesuits, at this day and in this country they are under no disabilities and possess the same rights as every other law-abiding citizen, and are entitled to all the privileges that the legislature of Quebec or any other Province chooses to bestow on them. Separate schools are not only the law of the land, but are beyond the power of legislatures or parliament in Canada to suppress. No political party nor combination of political elements could alter the status of the Catholic Church, the Jesuits, the French or the separate schools, by peaceful legislation, and no one, we believe, would seriously advise our people to attack these institutions in any other way. What good object can be gained, therefore, in arousing dormant passions and prejudices against any or all of the above named institutions.

"The question of disallowing the Estates Act must rest upon a broader basis than that which condemns it for favoring a religious order that in the dim past fell under the ban of Popes and royal potentates. If ancient edicts of suppression and expulsion are to stand as a bar against the enjoyment of civil rights and privileges at the present day, there would be few who could show a clear title to citizenship. The legality or illegality of the disputed Act depends not upon the fact that certain Jesuits or Church societies are benefited by the Act; but whether the Quebec Legislature had a right to dispose of the public domain affected by the Act and for the purpose specified therein. All other issues impinged into the controversy are extraneous, and would, if the case was brought before our courts, or the Privy Council, be ruled out of the argument as irrelevant. It is for these reasons that we deprecate appeals to the people on grounds that cannot be considered by governments or courts of justice in dealing with the subject, and that we advise a cessation of the agitation for disallowance on the lines so generally adopted

throughout this Province. None of the objects that appear so vital in the eyes of speakers at these public gatherings can be attained by making them political issues, and while we have the greatest confidence in the good sense of the majority of our people, much harm may be done, unintentionally too on the part of many of those who are taking a leading part in these discussions, by exciting national and creed prejudices among a mixed population such as ours."

THE RECORD OF THE JESUITS.

REV. FATHER FLANNERY MAKES ANOTHER REPLY TO REV. PRINCE PAL AUSTIN.

To the Editor of the Journal: Sir—When at your suggestion, and according to the expressed wish of some of my Protestant friends in this city, I declared this controversy closed in my last letter—I had no idea that Mr. Austin would prolong the combat by opening up new questions and re-opening new sores. The defendant has always a right to be heard last, especially when the plaintiff has made unjust and malicious charges that should not be left unanswered. I shall be very brief, however, and as the plaintiff has quoted the organ of the Third Party, the Toronto Mail, I hope to be allowed space for a quotation from a good Protestant paper—the New York Tribune.

Mr. Austin's arraignment of the Jesuits as to their acknowledged record has been whittled down to a few garbled quotations from Escobar, a Spanish author, whose works on casuistry appeared in print about fifty years previous to the Battle of the Boyne. They are out of print now for over 100 years, and only a few extracts remain. These extracts were taken by Pascal, and garbled and distorted in such a manner as to make the author appear odious and opposed to good morals. For this is all Mr. Austin has to rely on for his attacks on the moral teachings of the Jesuit fathers. I suppose there is no use in proving how totally unreliable is Pascal in his attacks on the Jesuits. Mr. Austin will still hug to his bosom Pascal, and Pietro Sargi, and Pompadour, and a list of names at Paris, or Satan himself, if only arrayed, as his Satanic majesty is always arrayed, against the Jesuits. De Ravignan, an able and conscientious French author, says the answers to Pascal's Provincial letters have proved that those letters contain 300 alterations, or falsifications of passages.

Voltaire (Siec de Louis XIV.) says: "Pascal attempted to prove that the Jesuits had a design to corrupt morality, a design which no society ever had, or could have, but the point was not to be right, but to be amusing at their expense." Voltaire was no friend of the Jesuits, his cry was "Crush out the Jesuits, and the Church shall soon follow." But he was a critical historian, and an able rhetorician. Chateaubriand, the great upholder of Christian faith and morals in a corrupt age, said: "Pascal after all is only a calculator; he has bequeathed to us an immortal lie." To this lie and calculator is Mr. Austin indebted for all his knowledge of the morality of the teachings of Jesuit Fathers, who lived in the south of France and Spain in the days of Elizabeth, Mary and James I.

Mr. Austin cannot for the life of him, innocent man, see how the manner, customs and laws can be different here in Canada, from what was the accepted rule in those days, either in England or France. But *tempora mutantur*, the times change, and so do laws and customs, even with these changes, and notwithstanding the alterations in the passages, scarcely one case has been quoted from Escobar which is in order in a modern system. An ethics or moral philosopher, would not find favor in the eyes of a competent judge. For instance: Usury is condemned by Escobar as a great sin. But supposing I have \$500 invested in the bronze or any other manufactory, which brings me twenty per cent profit, and Mr. Austin comes in with a loan of \$500, I tell him my circumstances, and he says, "Oh, that's all right, I am going to make thirty per cent on a purchase of real estate, you must get twenty per cent." Why should I lose fourteen per cent to accommodate Mr. Austin. This is what Mr. Austin styles usury, and similar cases he calls usury, lying, perjury, but every case is different, and is altered and distorted in such a manner as to change the whole nature of the subject matter in contention. As Mr. Austin does not tell the name of the treatise in *Gury*, which he, or the man who is writing for him, criticizes, I can not say exactly whether or not *Gury's* Moral Theology is written in French, and should be given in the original, or the chapter and page should be indicated. But Mr. Austin does nothing of this kind. He makes *Gury* say what he likes, or rather what the man likes who has found out those cases as the enemies of the Jesuit fathers, and the cases cited so triumphantly against *Gury* are open to judicial investigation. The public should understand here it is question of the internal court, or what is termed in foro conscientie—for instance, one of those cases given by Mr. Austin. If John, who is clerk in a store, bought a suit of clothes from his employer, and he sued before the court and condemned to pay a second time; if afterwards he comes to me in confession and tells me that, smarting under the injustice, he privately abstracted enough to indemnify himself, am I obliged to tell that man that he is guilty of theft, and that he must make restitution of what he has abstracted? *Gury* says "no," and I defy Mr. Austin to say in his conscience "yes." It is very easy, however, to garble cases of this kind to twist the meaning of one or two words in Latin, and then cry out, oh horror! *Gury*, a Jesuit, teaches robbery, murder, perjury, and every other crime from pitch and tins to manslaughter.

Therefore the record is bad, and therefore the Jesuit Fathers, who were the first white men in Canada West, who first

planted the Gospels of Christ with their holy Fathers' Heaven," as eyes than in Ishmelites, than his, he ex cathedra weeks ago in Globe. For "The moral Jesus is shoo standpoint, the society, wrong priest, immoral," etc. how low men attacks, such withal such have the c "delicacy choice opinion sons with the of men disti piety, untill to exception art of repel unruffled an A chief k dematation controversty to rule and Mr. Austin this grievan untruly this conscience sacrificed to however, it hence the heretic. How could obedience to way compar exist? Imp obedience in of any org members of themselves What was a railroad if not enforced and pride on tantism to and one Jesu are consequence Catholic who people's ob and of His I might istry and a decide it w pose two p can not do falling out earliest tr young men not get the cipal of the the names a telegra Mr. Austin on that ques warn him hi and to act and if neede and discip before Jud before Jud consensua Mr. Aus of standi testants th of by argu sented. He have encour own authi Protestan attack the on more s calamities to falsifi in order system. ethics or occasional perance virtue; that occur a proof of tion, off the excu the excu is that Pro cared for humane Protestan Thers are but go of reason it more pro ments m superior tions. T says that make an establish port of w made. The qu an alleged saying t patient c sending s should vent any duty. C only suo Protesa but reali make an Catholic to ente The civi lessons yet lear this year rest up it was the Catholic member put on th quarters