

BY REV. M. J. WHELAN.

PENAL LAWS NOT THEIR OWN APOLOGY.

"The history of the times, does not furnish ANY PROOF of the necessity, nor afford AN APOLOGY for the hardship of these provisions. An account of the commencement and progress of the Act is given by a learned divine, who was at that time a member of the House of Peers, Bishop Burnet. It originated in a party faction, an opposition to the Court at that time. The Bill was brought into the House of Commons that the Court party might reject and draw upon themselves the odium or measure in favor of the Catholics, and those that brought in the Bill did not intend it should pass; they were disappointed in their view, the Court party made no opposition to the Bill, but wished to drop it, but they could not, upon which Bishop Burnet says they added very severe and unreasonable clauses to the Bill and sent it up to the House of Lords, in hopes that the House would reject it; in this they were successful, the House of Lords did not reject the Bill, but they passed it with the severe penalties and punishments I have stated. It is too much, in my opinion, (adds the Attorney General) that the House of

SOME "JESUIT MAXIMS."

I could give many passages from Gury's next book in confirmation of the conclusions just read, to show that this attack on the moral teaching of the Church is based upon misapprehension and misrepresentation. Although by no manner means a wealthy man, I can afford to make a fairly liberal offer in the interests of truth. It is this: *A reward of five hundred dollars will be given to me to give*

It was too late! He stood alone against the crowned heads of Europe, who, pointing to the bond, mercilessly exacted their pound of flesh. Broken in health and in spirits, and utterly weary of resistance, at last he abandoned the suits to their enemies. The Brief of apprehension was dated July 11, 1773, at 8 o'clock, in the evening of that day,

HOW CLEMENT DIED.
As might be expected, the Jesuits, against whom accusations of regicide have been constantly brought forward, were charged with having poisoned Clement XIV. To so contemptible an accusation silence is perhaps the best answer. At the same time it may be

There remains to be said but a few words about the Jesuits' Estates Act of 1863. The Jesuits' estates were acquired, by grants from the Kings of France, by gifts from individuals, and by purchases made by Jesuits themselves. These estates were confiscated by the Imperial authorities at the reign of George III, in 1800, and were afterwards transferred to the authorities of the former Province of Canada. A large portion of them was, at the time of, and since Confederation, ceded to the Province of Quebec. In all the official documents bearing on the subject, it is asserted that the Government of King George took possession, not by right of

ively in the Province." However, what has been so far discussed are but minor objections. The proposal "that the agreement will be binding only when ratified by the Pope," has called forth the most vehement denunciations, and excited many bitter controversies. The discussion has assumed a two fold aspect. It is asserted that the Legislature should not have one of its Acts sanctioned by a foreign power; that this is a degrading, and humiliating position to occupy. The statement is not a fair one, it is misleading. In all important treaties negotiated by an agent or attorney, ratification by the principal is necessary. The agreement under discussion is no exception in point. Father Tucker who conducted negotiations with the Govern-

At the eve
3rd, Father
Last Sunday
of truth, a li
agitator, wh
form and i
for them !—
of forty year
and passion
testants, w
slanders an
scandalous,
most coward
the challen
will not dar
terms it ma
I now re
DRED DOLLA