

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, A WEEKLY EDITION OF THE "EVENING POST"

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY

761 CRAIG STREET, MONTREAL.

By M. G. MULLIN & CO., Proprietors. Terms (by Mail) \$1.50 per Annum in Advance City (Delivered) \$2.00

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, FEB. 5.

NOTICE.

Subscribers should notice the date on the label attached to their paper, as it marks the expiration of their term of subscription.

Subscribers who do not receive the TRUE WITNESS regularly should complain direct to our Office. By so doing the postal authorities can be the sooner notified, and the error, if there be any, rectified at once.

Subscribers, when requesting their addresses to be changed, will please state the name of the Post Office at which they have been receiving their papers, as well as their new address. When making remittances, always date your letter from the Post Office address at which you receive your paper.

Special Notice.

Subscribers, when writing to this office, will kindly date their letters from the postoffice at which they receive the TRUE WITNESS, and thereby save us much time and trouble in attending to their correspondence.

A New Industry.

Superphosphate manure manufacture is growing apace near Ottawa. The rich fields of phosphates found near the capital promise to be of much benefit to Canadian industry. The phosphate can, we learn, be worked at a greater profit when the crude ore is manufactured into superphosphate manure for use in this country and for exportation. In Europe the supply of phosphate is, if not falling, at least declining, and thus Canadian superphosphate may come into greater use. But not only does the phosphate promise to be abundant, but in consequence of the high percentage of tri-basic phosphate of lime which it contains, Canadian phosphate promises to be the phosphate of the future. It can be worked cheaply and exported cheaply. If the mines are as well supplied as there is good reason to expect, we may expect within the next few years to see superphosphates occupy an important position in our home and export trade. We learn, too, that the most approved machinery and the most experienced manufacturers are to be imported. A good deal of crude phosphate is now imported into England from the West Indies. The article manufactured from it is very often sent back to the West Indies again. The new industry has a large field, and it promises well.

The Glasgow Bank.

The directors of the Glasgow Bank have been convicted, and will have to don the dress and undergo the drudgery of convict life. They defrauded the public, and they must suffer the consequences. English law makes no distinction of persons. Prince and peasant who outrage the law will, by the law, be made to suffer. What a commentary this is on our law, our institutions, and our morality? Here crime and fraud are sheltered. Here it is no sin to rob your neighbors. Here no one is under a ban if he willfully knowingly and with intent, deliberately "fails," refusing to pay his debts while yet in possession of means enough wherewith to do it. No one would dream of sending Bank Directors to penal servitude in Canada? Fortunately none of our Bank Directors are in the sad plight to which the Glasgow Bank Directors reduced themselves; but even if they were, they would not be punished. The public would not stand a serious prosecution; or if it did, and conviction followed, a term of three months' imprisonment would wipe out all their sins. However, we have no reason to anticipate such a calamity, and we suppose the country will forever be saved from such a catastrophe. It is fortunate, too, that we have a good example before us, and we hope it will have a good effect.

Mr. Dunbar Browne.

What are we coming to? Where are the constitutional rights and liberties of the people drifting to? Is van of confidence in the commercial integrity of the country to be followed by want of confidence in the administration of laws? A public officer is arrested for embezzlement. The embezzlement is not denied; nay, it is admitted. The culprit is brought before a Magistrate and the Magistrate first apologizes, mark you, apologizes for doing his duty, by refusing to accept bail! What has the duty of Mr. Desnoyers, as a public servant, to do with his "private" friendship for Mr. Dunbar Browne? He is paid to do his duty to the State and not to haul his private friendship into the courts. Again, it is said that the "Minister of Inland Revenue has been telegraphed in order to know if bail shall be accepted!" This is an outrage upon all law. The Minister of Inland Revenue has nothing to do with the case, beyond giving his evidence, if he has any evidence to give. Mr. Dunbar Browne is in the hands of the law, and the Minister of Inland Revenue has no power to interfere, unless he is willing to take the responsibility of telling the people of this country that he is the law, and that his word must be obeyed. If this is to be the case, then let us know that we no longer live in a country governed by constitutional principles, but that we live under an autocratic partnership, which is worse than autocratic tyranny. Mr. Dunbar Browne must be treated on his merits as a citizen, and without prejudice either for or against him. If not, then the sooner we see the depths to which we have fallen the better for us all.

The Speakership.

The Ottawa correspondent of the Herald says that there is a good deal of trouble about the Speakership. He says that Blanchet has the promise, but that Mr. Costigan's friends are not idle. All we can say is that the Irish Catholics of Canada were sold, deliberately and treacherously sold, by the Conservative party; and that the only chance Sir John A. Macdonald has of removing the stain of treachery from his name is to shuffle his cards again and prove that he is not the gay deceiver the Post and the Irish Canadian call him. The facts are as plain as noon-day. The Reform Government gave us a Minister of the Crown and a Speaker; the Conservative Government gave us a President of the Council, and if there was

anything with less authority to give, the Irish Catholic representative would, no doubt, be the honored recipient of it. These are the facts, plain and unvarnished, and anyone who attempts to excuse the Government for party or selfish purposes is the deadliest enemy the Irish Catholics can have. When an Irish Catholic endeavors to explain this wrong away, rest assured that he is looking out for himself. He is of a class of men who would use his countrymen in order to advance his own individual ends. He is a man of the Dr. Bergin class, who makes speeches in Montreal in order to benefit by them in Ontario. But if our arrangements for the coming session are perfected, as we hope they will be, the mask will, we expect, be torn from many a countenance, and the men who sold the Irish Catholics of Canada, and the men who want to sell them, will have the satisfaction of seeing their policy given to the world.

The Local Legislature.

When the Conservatives return to power in the Province of Quebec, which we hope they will do this summer, we think the Irish Catholics should agitate for a representative in the Ministry. At the present moment we think the Irish Catholics are pretty unanimous in their desire for a change, and they will no doubt do their share towards bringing about the defeat that is in store for the Hon. Mr. Joly. The Local Premier may have commended the public funds, and he may have done good, but he has done nothing to warrant us in supposing that he is desirous of giving our people in that position which Irish Catholics think themselves entitled to. Like the powers that be in Ottawa, the Local Legislature has persistently treated the claims of the Irish Catholics with as much stern indifference as they will could, and we are not aware that we owe anything to either side of the House. But as the Hon. Mr. Joly did not think proper to give a position in his Cabinet to one Irish Catholic, then it may be as well to try what the others will do in order to give the Conservatives no excuse. As for our part, we believe that both parties will give us just as much as we can force from them. Neither of them love us, and they can only be made to respect us by making our influence felt where, when and how we can. But we are disposed to think that the Conservatives mean to do us justice, and if they do, we shall rejoice when they give up office, for our mission is to stand to those who stand to our people; and if the Conservatives in the Local House betray us as the Conservatives in Ottawa have done, we can enjoy the luxury of making them.

\$5 Per Day.

Why should our law-makers get \$1,000 for attending a session of Parliament? The session may be thirty, it may be sixty, or it may be ninety days, and yet the pay is the same—\$1,000 for the session. Take an average session of sixty days, exclusive of Sundays; this makes more than \$16.50 a day. This is far too much. The men, as a rule, are not worth one-third of it. It would be cheaper and better to pay some of them to stop away than pay them \$16.50 for doing nothing, pairing their seats in public, and playing follow-my-leader at the expense of the country. There are many of the American States that only pay law-makers \$3, \$3, and \$4 a day, and one, Rhode Island, only gives them \$1 a day. There are quite a number of them, including Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina and others that only pay \$3 a day, and we fail to see why our legislators should receive any more. In the whole of the United States there is only one that pays more than Canada, and that is New York, which pays \$1,500, but this, according to a new arrangement, is to be reduced to \$3 a day. Thus Pennsylvania will be the highest. It will continue for the present to pay \$1,000 a session. The population of Pennsylvania is nearly as large as the population of Canada, and no doubt, there, too, the indemnity of the legislators will be regulated by the day, after some time. But, meanwhile, if the Government is in earnest about reducing the expenses of the country it should commence by cutting down the indemnity of the members of Parliament, and follow the excellent example of our neighbors across the line. If it could be done, we would rather see members of Parliament paid according to the ability they displayed, and, indeed, we would have economy in legislation.

"The Rev. Joseph Inman."

Some "Rev. Joseph Inman," who advertises quick medicines all over the Dominion and the United States, has been found out to be a fraud. His advertising patronage is extensive, and the name of the "Rev. Joseph" was known far and wide. As the Seythian Ambassador said to Alexander, "The world was scarcely large enough to contain him!" His fame spread from east to west, and the "Rev. Joseph Inman" was made the confident of many a silly man and woman's woes. But fate, in the columns of the New York Sun, has at last claimed him for its own, and henceforth the "Rev. Joseph Inman" must assume some other name in order to enable him to carry on his nefarious "practice." As a great number of Canadian journals, as well as a great number of people, were duped by this advertising quack, it may be as well for them to know that the New York Sun shadowed the so-called "Rev. Joseph Inman," and found—a myth. Some one, however, did a certain class of business in the name of the "Rev. Joseph Inman," and associated the fictitious cleric with the address of a bible class, both of which have no existence. Persons suffering from some weakness were advised to write to the "Rev. Joseph Inman, Bible Class" such an address, and they would, in return, be advised what to do. The "title" and the "bible class" were calculated to mislead, and no doubt, did mislead, a great number, and we suppose the fertile brain of the "Rev. Joseph Inman" will find some other title and some other address by which he will be enabled to continue his "practice" and dupe the silly people who believe in quack medicine, and who furnish food for charlatans like the "Rev. Joseph Inman."

Iron Work in Canada.

There is now in Canada a gentleman named Wrigley. This gentleman is the agent of an English iron-work company. His business to this country is to ascertain the likelihood of starting iron-works here with any degree of success, and to select the most favorable site for the erection of a foundry. In a letter recently published Mr. Wrigley says:— "I am not quite certain in what part of Canada the English company I am now acting for would prefer to locate their iron works. This is a matter which they have yet to take into consideration, and they will decide the question for themselves, after I have tried what I can do with some of the most favorably situated municipalities in Ontario. The lead situated on the Toronto marsh does not fully meet my approval, and there are also some engineering difficulties in the way; so that at present I am not in a position to

say where the iron works will be permanently located." Like a prudent man of business, he wants to find out the best location, and no doubt he will not make his choice in a hurry. But in another part of the letter we are told that nothing will be done until it is seen what protection Government means to give. If Parliament protects the company, then the company is, it is said, prepared to transfer its works from England to Canada. The contemplation of such an enterprise is but the commencement, or at least an indication, of what some English manufacturers think of Protection. It furnishes us with an example of how men are willing to risk their means under a system calculated to advance the commercial resources of the country.

The Insolvency Law.

It has been generally admitted that the Insolvency law has been a failure, and the Dominion Board of Trade only reflected the opinions of the people in suggesting a reform. There can be no doubt that the Insolvency law is too often used for the purpose of defrauding creditors, and legitimate trade must be injured by an act that protects men in the practice of a dishonorable business. To men who fail in business because of unfortunate speculation every protection should be given; but to men who fail for the purpose of cheating their creditors there should be no other protection than the penitentiary. In the old country there is some pretence at commercial morality; in this country there is little or none. Fraudulent bankrupts are in the old country supposed to be scarce; here, however, if public rumor is to be believed, fraudulent bankrupts are in the ascendant in commercial life and in social surroundings. Any law that encourages such a state of affairs must be an evil. It is an incentive to men who are dishonestly inclined. It points out a road by which men may with impunity rob their neighbors, and escape the consequences of fraud. To such a state have affairs come that even honest tradesmen who fail in an honest way is subject to suspicion. It is for these reasons that the public will, we believe, be glad to see some reforms made in the Insolvency Act, or if reforms are impossible, to return to the old method of collecting debts by the ordinary process of the laws.

Irish Catholics.

There is not in Montreal, and we are not aware that there is anywhere in the Province of Quebec, an Irish Catholic at the head of a department. In the Local Legislature, or in the Municipalities, it appears to be considered that second or third-rate positions are good enough for Irishmen. The bones of office are thrown to them after they have been picked by men of every other nationality, and it is time for Irish Catholics to realize the fact, that in the calculations of those who surround them, they amount to—little or nothing. It may be a humiliation to be obliged to admit this, but there is the fact. In numbers the Irish Catholics are many, in influence they are few. They can muster a goodly number, but that is all. They have neither the standing nor the influence which their numbers entitle them to, and the fact that not one Irish Catholic is at the head of a department either in Montreal, or, as far as we know, in the Province, is substantial proof of what we say. It is useless at this time to inquire into the cause of this exclusion, or accident, as the case may be. It may be traceable to influences for which Irish Catholics themselves may, in some degree, be responsible. But whatever the cause, the fact is patent, and neither the polished subtlety of our so-called friends the Conservatives, nor the "walk into my parlor" invitations of our so-called friends the Reformers, should blind Irish Catholics to the one broad truth, that both parties use them, and, after using them, throw them away as things to be polished anew when the elections are at hand. And this will continue so long as the Irish Catholics continue the slaves of either one party or the other. There are times when Irish Catholics must take sides; but they should be careful not to be deceived by the treacherous intonations of politicians who use the Irish Catholics, not for the benefit of Irish Catholics, but for the aggrandisement of men who are politicians above all, and who care no more for Ireland and the Irish than a tombstone cares for the bones of the dead.

The Cattle Trade.

The news about the Cattle Trade this morning is somewhat conflicting. From one source we learn that the action of the Home Government has been exaggerated, and that there has been no "prohibition" of the Cattle Trade, but that a strict supervision over all cattle landed in England will be instituted. So far this is satisfactory. But according to another telegram received this morning the question again assumes a somewhat serious aspect. We are told that the English Consul in New York has telegraphed to the Foreign Office that pleuro-pneumonia undoubtedly exists amongst cattle in his district. Here, then, is the issue, and in view of this news we cannot help thinking that the Canadian Cattle Trade via the United States is seriously threatened. But, so far as we can learn, we can see no proof that pleuro-pneumonia exists in Canada. There may be some cases in Ontario; but, if so, the press has been singularly reticent about them. If the disease exists, the country had better know it, and the Government should be urged to take measures to stamp it out. Again, the telegram we publish from London about the "Ontario" makes the case more serious still. On board there were American and Canadian cattle, and the disease made its appearance on the voyage. The animals were slaughtered when they landed, and American and Canadian alike suffer the consequences. At first people, who do not know England well, might be disposed to attribute the prohibitory order to a desire to satisfy the English cattle raisers. But anyone who knows anything about England, knows that such a thing was impossible. The order was made with a genuine desire to prevent the importation of diseased meat. Subsequent circumstances have proved that the Government was right. It may, however, be still possible for the Canadian cattle trade to be continued, but the only safe way is to see if the cattle cannot be shipped by Halifax, instead of New York or Boston. The expense of transportation will be greater, but the Intercolonial, no doubt, will do what it can to encourage the industry.

Bad Books.

It is some satisfaction to notice that the authorities in some American cities are awakening to the fact that the cheap literature of the day has much to do with the immorality and degradation of the masses of the people. The telegram we published last evening from Albany—which said that "cheap novels and cheap serials are to be found where bread is wanting, and in the pockets of almost every boy and girl able to read"—carries with it a moral which should receive more than passing attention. The greed for stories of the "dime novel" class is one of the most demoralizing

tendencies of the age. Children are crammed with crime, which deprives of all its grossness "loses half its vice." The minds of children are trained to view crime as if it were not crime at all. The passions are made to triumph, but to triumph as if virtue triumphed over vice, and not vice over virtue. But there is no occasion to go to Albany for a lesson. Go into the first newspaper shop you meet. Take a look over the counter, and you will see enough of the vicious literature to poison the mind of every poor child who is able to read it. And this, too, is the kind of reading that is eagerly sought after. The young people crave for it, and if it is to be had within the city limits, they will find out the place. But it is an unfavorable commentary on the parents who allow it, for it is they and not the poor children who are to blame. Even if we put this question on no higher ground than that of expediency, that alone should induce parents to be careful of what their children read. If it be true that the minds of children, who are allowed to read bad books, must yield to the presence of the subtle but poisonous breezes of sensational works. Nay, we would go beyond this. If there is no other way of stopping this vicious and wholesale scattering of bad books, we would like to see the sale of them prohibited by law. We call for Protection for our trade and manufacturers; why not protect the morality of our youths as well? We already prohibit the sale of certain works, and such prohibition has, we are sure, done good. Why, then, not go further and stop the sale of a class of books which are calculated to undermine the morality of the young, and to form for vicious purposes minds which might be easily trained to better ways and nobler aspirations.

Baby Farming.

Baby farming is one of the results of overcrowding. As people multiply in the cities crime proportionally increases, and as crime increases baby farming flourishes. Crime will always flourish as the detection of it becomes less, and detection is always less in large, than it is in small, communities. There is more crime in London than there is in the whole of Scotland. In the case of one, crime has a chance of escaping detection, because the chances of detection are great, because the community is scattered. In London baby farming is a flourishing institution. Children are "raised" at so much a head. If they are starved to death before they get old enough to toddle about, so much the better for those who put them out to "farm." And from London it is only to be expected that baby farming should come to Canada. We are not aware of the extent to which baby farming is carried on in this country, but we see that Toronto has been furnishing the country with a few examples of late. As in the old country the children were "given out," and as in the old country the children are starved, sometimes to death. Of the "mothers" of those poor children we shall say nothing. They are in many cases more to be pitied than despised. But if there are women in Canada who are known as baby farmers, we do not see why they cannot be reached by a process of law. If there is no law by which they can be amenable, then a law should be made for their special benefit. A police surveillance should be enforced over all private individuals, as well as over public institutions, who are paid for the care of other people's children. If lunatic asylums must be visited, we see no reason why houses where children are "farmed" should escape.

Hard Times.

The present Government has intimated that it intends to reduce the salaries of all Government officials ten per cent. Considering the hard times, this is a necessary measure of economy. It will, too, set a good example, and the people will begin to see the necessity of living within their means. Extravagance has had a good deal to do with the poverty many are now enduring, and the hard times have been the means of bringing thousands to their senses. If Montrealers, or Canadians in general, lived for years past as they are living now, we would hear very little about hard times. Men, as a rule, stand adversity better than they stand success. A decade of commercial enterprise, during which everybody made money, set the country half crazed. Poor men found themselves rich in a few years. They were not accustomed to wealth and they rushed into extravagance. The "bugger on horseback" catered through the thoroughfares and now he has fulfilled his proverbial mission, and we find him at his destination. If Canadians had been economical the change in the times would not have perceptibly influenced the happiness of the people. It is the change from extravagance living to moderate expenditure that makes the cry of hard times so usual. It is not the fact that Canadians are not now making money, so much as the fact that when they made money they spent it. But quiet and economical living, with Protection, will make Canada what it was. The Government has meanwhile set a good example, but that example must be real, and not a delusion. For instance, the Government hints that it will reduce the salaries of its officials. Yes; but by this morning's telegrams from Ottawa we learn that the "incomes of civil service officials are not assessable." Now, if this be so, there should be, as a still greater reduction than ten per cent. Suppose a government official gets \$2,000 a year. Ten per cent reduction would leave this \$1,800. This reduction was promised, or implied if you like, at a time when it was not known that the \$2,000 could not be assessed. If that is so a further reduction must be made, or else the assessment will in some measure play off against the ten per cent, and the country will be sold.

Catholic Education in Ireland.

If Protestants want secular education, they are quite right in insisting upon having it. If they think religious instruction unnecessary in schools, by all means let them have their way. But we must not be denied the privilege of differing from them, and if we prefer to have religious education it is a right which we claim to exercise. As for our part, we, in common with all Catholics, think religious instruction, not only necessary, but of vital importance. If a child has a soul at all it is worth looking after, in schools as well as out of schools. If Christ was God, and if God is indeed the ruler of the Universe, then, of a surety, any instruction that is calculated to teach a love for Him and a knowledge of Him, must be desirable. We would like to see Protestant and Catholic children receive a religious education, but if Protestant parents object, then it is their own business, not ours. We may regret the position they take but we would not coerce them. Now, this is all Catholics, in every part of the world, ask for themselves. Let Protestants educate their own children as they like; let Catholics do the same. Give liberty

of conscience to all Catholics say that it is a satire. To speak of liberty of conscience so long as Catholics are denied the right of educating their children according to the dictates of Catholic conscience. Take the question of education in Ireland, which we hear, by this morning's news, is likely to be taken up by the English Government next session. All the Catholics ask for is to educate their children as Catholics think best. Why should Catholics be forced to give their children a secular education, any more than Protestants should be forced to give their children a religious education? The only thing in favor of the "National" system is that it brings Catholic and Protestant youths together, and by contact rubs away the bitterness too often engendered by foolish animosities. Anything that does this must do good. It is a becoming and a Christian thing to see men live in peace and harmony, and no doubt, the "national" system of education may have done something towards bringing about such a result. But we are satisfied that the same result would be obtained through the agency of denominational education, and the English Government will do a kindly and a generous act, if, as the cable indicates, it yields to the demands of the Catholics of Ireland, and gives to them that which every man should possess without being subjected to disadvantage—the right to educate his child as he thinks best.

France.

Once again in the history of France a great mistake has been made. A tried patriot, a stern soldier, and a necessary man, has been obliged to hand over his authority to a man of radical inclinations. France needed a Conservative chief. None other was able to restrain the fiery impulse of the people. A weak mind and a yielding spirit at the head of the nation will plunge the country in anarchy. MacMahon would not yield to radical bluster. The danger is that M. Grevy may MacMahon saw that radical France was shooting Niagara. He saw the impious follower of Voltaire heading the nation to its ruin; he saw great men like Gambetta and Grevy coquet with the theorists of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." The country was crazed with folly, and views destructive to society and at war with order were blated over the land. To give way to such sentiments would be to give way to ruin. Radicalism in France means no society, no property and no God. MacMahon faithfully resisted the torrent until it overwhelmed him. For six years year he has saved France from itself, and it will be well for M. Grevy if he can leave behind him so good a record. M. Grevy is an old man, and Gambetta will be the power behind the throne. Authority and responsibility often restrain men who, removed from either might be radicals. Men are extremists, as a rule, where they have little or nothing to lose. Gambetta may curb his fiery opinions and labor to consolidate the Republic on a Conservative basis, but the danger is that Radicalism will now overwhelm him, and a radical France means civil war. France may be satisfied with a Republic. She may accept the Republic, and under its aegis become all her admirers wish her to be, but France will never quietly accept a rule that precludes God and saviors of the devil. Gambetta has already brought enough of evils to France. It was he who raised the cry of "Guerre a l'etranger" after Sedan. Were it not for Gambetta, France would, after that disaster, have bent her head and would have accepted defeat. But the "fiery young barrister," who took care to keep out of harm's way, urged the country on to destruction and to ruin. It was he who influenced the nation. And it was owing to his policy that the Germans marched into Paris and overran the country. He was "dictator," and his "dictatorship" savors more of the doings of a bravo than the cool deliberations of a statesman. He may have sobered, and with sobriety will come a desire to conserve the institutions of the country. We hope so, but if not, then the future is full of trouble, and before many years the world may witness another attempt to raise the standard of the Commune, and if that triumph, then farewell all that is good in the world. However, we hope that the authority now vested in the Radical Chiefs will sober them, and out of all this a strong Conservative Republic will come, and that Communism will be kept where it properly belongs to—in the dust.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Science a Little Confused.

To the Editor of the True Witness and Post. Sir.—Dr. Howard may rest assured that his kindly sentiments are fully reciprocated by me; and there is one thing I desire the learned gentleman to be convinced of in *limine*, viz. that I am rather referring to general principles held by some scientists than particularly criticizing the opinions of Dr. Howard. Where Dr. Howard accords with the materialistic ideas of the positive school, I must condemn him; where his views are in consonance with sane philosophy and the moral doctrine of the Church—which, I am glad to say, is generally the case with him—I have nothing to object to. The wild theories of Comte, Spencer, Percival, Tyndall, Huxley & Co., are of terrific import in this century, one of the last staggering steps, I do believe, of dying Father Time. If the Catholic Church, full of Divine instincts, took the alarm at their covert or open materialism, and instantly condemned Millik, Arnold, of Brescia, Giordano Bruno, Savonarola, and the other speculative Communists, who were the precursors of the worshippers of Humanity, the Positivists, the Idealists, and the rag, tag and bobtail who bawled forth their crude conceptions in an atmosphere of beer and tobacco—their own muddled brains being the be-all and end-all of morals—how much more should we fear those monstrous errors when an irreligious press furnishes the masses with the poisonous pabulum of false liberty, false progress, false enlightenment, and lends its tremendous influence to the defilement of man, his weaknesses, his ignorance and his crimes?

Can Dr. Howard have overlooked the real significance of the struggle now going on between the Catholic Church and infidel materialism? Can he have forgotten the solemn voice lately hushed in death, and the tears of the true friend of humanity, the immortal Pius IX.? On every side we see premodern scientists striving to indoctrinate the masses with the idea that man's perceptibility is the result of pure human effort—that he should limit his aspirations to earthly well-being—that the various relations of man with man and with society are of human origin—that laws, rulers, forms of government and moral obligations are simply the result of human development—that obedience must be measured, by man's own wants and desires—that God, in short, is a myth, merely imagined by a sacerdotalism which has ever sought to establish itself upon the ruins of free thought and human independence. The astronomer reads the heavens, and finds upon its starry page everything except the Creator. The geologist penetrates the hidden depths of the

globe, and finds mysteries of Nature, but never Nature's God. The physician dissects the minutest portion of the human body, not to manifest the admirable wisdom of the Creator, but rather to establish materialistic theories which ignore God. And, may I study the manifestations of a shattered intellect imagining that physiology itself furnishes an adequate explanation of phenomena which lie deeper than the surface—whose explanation is beyond the most acute observation of man's science.

Science has no greater foe than pride. We have plenty of scientists, but very little humility. A haughty delirium to admit oneself baffled by a seeming trifle, lies at the bottom of many a false theory. If man knows not the mysteries of his own mind, how can he profess to have grasped the hidden springs and secrets of his neighbor's intellect? Its superficial manifestations he knows; its tremendous cosmos which exists below he is ignorant.

There is one very grave error, of a purely materialistic tendency, into which Dr. Howard has fallen, that is, if we take his meaning literally. He says: "I, therefore, state that man's mental organization—that is to say, his intellectual and moral faculties—are not of the supernatural, but of the material order, and are part and parcel of a man's brain." It is true enough that man is not a supernatural being, but a rational creature, composed naturally of soul and body, but to hold that the moral and intellectual faculties of man are part and parcel "of his brain," would be, if taken literally, pure materialism, and nothing else. The soul is immaterial, simple, unextended, indivisible, spiritual; the brain is material, compound, extended, divisible, material. We describe the soul by negative, the body by positive argument. They are essentially different, and their union is a mystery which the Creator alone can explain. To say, then, that the soul and brain are one is materialism, pure and simple. But the mind, the intellect, is nothing more than the soul manifesting its rational nature through the instrument which God provided for that purpose, namely, the brain. And, recollect, the soul does not absolutely stand in need of the brain, otherwise it would cease to think after its separation from the body, and he who should hold this view would be a materialist and a heretic.

On the other hand, if we consider the intellectual act of rational man *in concreto*, that is, as a product of mind and brain taken together, then we may say, in that case, that mind and brain are one, not, however, *per se* and essentially, but in the one result of intelligent action. I doubt not but this is the meaning which Dr. Howard attaches to his statement. Nevertheless, it is perilous in the extreme to neglect rigid definitions in things of such grave importance.

Moreover, in the following words, Dr. Howard is guilty of a glaringly contradictory statement:

"In teaching that man's mental organization, that is, his intellectual and moral faculties, were purely of the material order, I did not do so to do away with man's moral responsibility, but with the object of graduating responsibility, that is, holding each man responsible according to the degree of his intellectual and moral faculties."

Now, how can that act which is purely of the material order be subjected to the code of moral responsibility? What makes a sin a crime? Is it not a formal, voluntary deflection from law, divine, or human? I have shown that the thinking principle is immaterial; how then, can the material think? What is positive in our action is no sin nor crime. I take an axe—mise it—strike a man down with it. Is the sin or crime in those material acts? Not at all, for, otherwise, if any enemy attempts to kill me, I cannot strike him down with my axe, because it would be a sin. Where, then, must the sin or crime be sought? In the mind, the intention. The malice *effortu*. So, all responsibility for sin and crime must be measured, not by the material, but by the immaterial part of man. The purely material order obeys like a slave, but, of itself, is neither responsible nor irresponsible. It is purely material and, therefore, purely indifferent. As to the grading of responsibility, I would respectfully refer to the learned Doctor the Treatise on Human Acts taught in all Catholic schools of moral, where the subject is treated *in extenso*.

Dr. Howard says that he would lock up for life the incurable, irremediable class of criminals. As a general proposition this might pass in the abstract; but, practically considered, I think he would find himself in direct antagonism to human rights when he came down to individuals. Should this offender be locked up, *hic et nunc*, for life? Yes, you say, because you say he is irremediable. How do you know that? While there is life there is hope, and irremediability might be a good argument for life incarceration, did we not see everyday examples of radical change which completely overthrow the prognostics of those who sometimes forget that total depravity must be sought for in hell alone. I do not deny that there may be exceptional cases for which such deprivation of liberty would be salvation; but to establish a general rule would be, I think, both tyrannical and unjust.

To hold, with Dr. Howard, that great men "spend all the intellectual force they possess upon whatever may be their calling in life, and have nothing but a barren intelligence to hand down to their offspring" is contrary to plain facts. Great men had offspring long before they had reached the zenith of their fame, and the Memoirs of Napoleon or the speeches of Wellington show no diminution in the intellectual force of those great men. But the question requires no lengthy argument.

Dr. Howard says:—"I maintain, therefore, that parents are, to a very great degree, responsible for the whole physical organization of their offspring." Nothing could be truer or more just; but the dispute refers not so much to the physical as to the mental and moral conditions of their offspring. The parents are the progenitors of the body—not of the soul; but if the brain and mind were one, then the parents would be progenitors of the soul as well as of the body—which proposition no Catholic can hold for an instant. The principle of heredity, considered in its purely physical aspect, involves no debate; it is held by parents responsible for the wilful acts of their offspring, by a species of vicious solidarity. I consider neither true nor equitable.

Dr. Howard asks me to look at his views, not from a theological standpoint only, but to look at them from every point. But when a question of morals and of human responsibility is involved, there is but one point of observation—God's point. We may argue with the nicest scientific technical precision—we may fashion and devise the most specious theories—we may satisfy our own measure of intelligence by arguments which appear to us conclusive—but how often does a short study from God's point of view, prove conclusively that as blind men we were expatiating on colors, or as deaf we were constructing a system of harmony. I hope the learned gentleman will take no offense from the foregoing remarks, for, truly, none is intended.