

The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE. PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY No. 195, Fortification Lane, by J. Gillies to whom all Business Letters should be addressed. G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE: To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half. The TRUE WITNESS can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts. To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

ECCLIESIASTICAL CALENDAR. DECEMBER—1874. Friday, 25—CHRISTMAS DAY. Saturday, 26—St. Stephen, M. Sunday, 27—Holy Innocents, MM. Monday, 28—St. John, Ap. Tuesday, 29—St. Thomas of Canterbury, B. M. Wednesday, 30—Of the Sunday within the Octave of Christmas. Thursday, 31—St. Sylvester, P. C.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. The European news is of little interest. In the English papers a lively discussion on the merits of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet still continues, and it is generally admitted that the writer has abundantly proved what no one ever doubted—that no Christian can yield an absolute or unlimited allegiance to any human authority.

From Germany we learn that the Von Arnim trial has resulted in a verdict of guilty against the accused, who has been sentenced to three months imprisonment, the time that he has already been confined to be reckoned as part of the term. The German Parliament has been adjourned, not however till it had shown Bismarck that his power in that Assembly was on the wane. Indeed it is said that he has actually tendered his resignation, which the Emperor, however, refused to accept.

The Ontario Legislature has concluded its sessions. The Committee named by the Quebec Parliament for investigating the Tunnery Land question has commenced its sittings in Montreal, and is busy examining witnesses. It is to be hoped that it may succeed in bringing the whole truth to light, so that the guilty parties, if guilty parties there be, may be punished, and that full justice may at last be done.

B. Devlin, Esq., is now spoken of as a candidate for Montreal Centre, in opposition to M. P. Ryan, Esq. The "Sisters of Charity" have been suppressed, and their labors prohibited by the Liberal Government of Mexico. Were Our Lord almighty to appear on earth in any country where liberal principles were in the ascendant, and were he to go about healing the sick, comforting the afflicted, giving sight to the blind, and preaching glad tidings to the poor, He would fare as badly at the hands of the civil rulers of that country, as He did at the hands of the Pharisees in the days of His sojourn upon earth.

THE GUIBORD CASE. The full text of the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in this long pending case, being now before the public, we think that many of our readers may be pleased to have a short account of the circumstances which led to this long litigation.

Guibord, the deceased, a printer by trade, and at one time a member of the Catholic Church, died excommunicate; the sentence of excommunication having been pronounced by the Bishop of Montreal, in accordance with the laws of the Church, applied to all, without exception, who should in spite of her admonitions remain members of a society known in Montreal as the Institut Canadien. Of this society Guibord, up to the time of his death, was a member; in consequence he died without the sacraments, and was refused burial in that part of the Catholic cemetery reserved by the law of the Church for the interment of the bodies of her faithful children. Sepulture, civil sepulture, however, was offered in another part of the cemetery; but of course, unaccompanied with any religious ceremonies.

This offer was refused by the friends of the deceased Guibord; and the Institut of which he had been a member, taking the matter in hand in the name of the widow of the deceased, instituted legal proceedings to compel ecclesiastical burial of the body of its deceased associate. A judgment in its favor was rendered, but was subsequently set aside by the Court of Revision in Montreal, whose decision, quashing the first judgment, was confirmed by the Court of Queen's Bench. Hereupon the case was appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

To understand the merits of the case we must needs say a few words about the Institut Canadien. The Institut Canadien is a literary society founded some thirty years ago in Montreal with the avowed object of furnishing the public with a reading room, a library, and other appliances for educational and scientific purposes. About the year 1855 several of the most members of the Society

not being pleased with many of the books contained in its library, proposed the naming of a Committee charged with the revision of the catalogue, with the object, we suppose, of eliminating any peccant matter the said library might be found to contain. A warm discussion ensued; and finally it was voted by a large majority of the Institut, that its library contained no improper books, and that the Institut itself was the sole judge of the morality of its library. Under these circumstances the affair came under the cognizance of the Bishop, who took the side of the minority of the members of the Institut; declaring that its library did contain many most immoral books, which no Catholic, which no Christian, which no man with any respect for the natural law, should read, or put into the hands of young persons of either sex. His Lordship therefore declared that the Institut had incurred the censures pronounced by the Church until its library should be purged of the books which he denounced as immoral.

To judge of the merits, in a moral point of view, of this action of the Bishop, we must make some allusion to the contents of the library of the Institut. It contained no doubt many good and valuable books; but it also contained others of a most objectionable character—books to which not only all Catholics and all Christians must object as contrary to Christianity; but to which every decent man who respects the natural virtues of chastity and moral cleanliness, must, no matter what his views of religion, also object.

Of these objectionable books we will mention some that have mostly struck us on a perusal of the Catalogue of the library of the Institut. We find therein, for instance, ALL Voltaire's Works; his filthy, his unmentionably obscene Romans which not only throw ridicule upon all revealed religion, but which are very cess-pools, throwing out day and night a stench sufficient to poison the moral atmosphere of the entire world. A singular circumstance connected with this portion of the Institut's library we must mention. One of the books contained in a complete collection of the Works of Voltaire (which the Institut announced as being in its possession) comprises of course the ineffably beastly Pucelle; but though, by implication from its catalogue, acknowledging the possession of this work, the Institut pretends that it is not on the shelves of its library. By what sort of moral or intellectual jugglery this extraordinary feat of having, and at the same time of not having, a book is accomplished, we cannot pretend to explain. We may form a shrewd guess as to how the trick is done; but we leave it as a puzzle for our reader's ingenuity. En attendant, we must continue our analysis of the Institut's strictly moral library.

In the catalogue we find amongst others, a long array of the works of George Sand in which are sung the praises of impure and illicit love, together with a fine assortment of the books of that very filthy old satyr, Paul de Kock. That our readers may form some estimate of the moral value of these works, with which the Institut adorns the shelves of its library, and whose perfect morality it maintained against the Bishop, we may mention that, in a celebrated Protestant literary Review, Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, the writer of the first is spoken of as the "Sappho of Adultery;" whilst the other is dismissed with the curt remark that the lascivious old beast is evidently so destitute of all moral sense whatsoever, as to be ignorant of the word decency. These, not to be tedious, were the works which the Bishop condemned as immoral, as highly unfit to be put in the hands, or placed under the eyes, of the jeunesse of Montreal, and which brought about the quarrel betwixt the Church and the Institut Canadien, which culminated in the excommunication of the members of that society.

Would Protestants for a moment divest themselves of their bitter anti-Catholic prejudices; would they for a moment grant that it is possible, barely possible, even for a Catholic Bishop sometimes to be in the right—we would fearlessly leave the decision in the case as betwixt Mgr. Bourget and the Institut Canadien in their hands. Nay! we would go further, and would confidently expect from every Protestant father, from every Protestant mother, from every man who respects the natural laws of chastity, of moral cleanliness, and of conjugal fidelity, a vote of thanks to the Bishop, Romanist though he be, who denounced as immoral, the works of one whom eminent Protestant authorities have branded as the "Sappho of Adultery," and of that low old reprobate Paul de Kock. As it is, the sympathies, we are sorry to say, of the ultra-Protestant and evangelical community have all been on the other side.

And yet the question here at issue was not one of dogma; was not indeed merely a question in the supernatural order; it involved not only the issue: Are the works of Voltaire without restriction—for even in Voltaire's works we must make a distinction—wholesome food for a community calling itself Christian, and against which the Christian minister of religion has no cause or right to raise his voice? But are the novels of George Sand, the aforesaid "Sappho of Adultery," are the tales of Paul de Kock, books fit to be put in the hands of any young person? Are they not morally corrupting? And is not he, or it, which lends his or its aid in making young persons acquainted with this peculiar style of literature, . . . ? Our readers will each one for himself, fill up the blank as his moral feelings may dictate.

They will at all events now see why the Church, speaking by the mouth of the Bishop of Montreal condemned the Institut, and excommunicated its members, until such time at least as its library should have been purged of certain works; and except amongst very evangelical Protestants of the Witness type, we fancy there will not be much difference of opinions as to the merits or demerits of the action of the much abused Bishop—who, as is a Protestant Bishop, is bound by his vows at Con-

Of course the Bishop could only judge of the contents of the library of the Institut from the Catalogue published by that body. Now in this the possession of the "Complete Works of Voltaire" is acknowledged; and therefore, by implication, of the Pucelle which is one of these works.

secration to watch over the faith and morals of his diocese, as one having to render an account of his stewardship to a strict and all-seeing judge. But enough of this matter.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council dealt with the case as lawyers not as moralists; and assuming that the slavish maxims of Gallicanism which obtained in France in the seventeenth century, when the Parliaments undertook to administer the sacraments at the point of the bayonets, and ordered the viaticum to be carried to the excommunicated sinner, betwixt a couple of grenadiers—were in force in Canada; they found therefore that the excommunication of Guibord was insufficient to exclude him from the privileges of ordinary Catholics, and adjudged that his remains be interred in the principal or unreserved portion of the cemetery, but without insisting upon the performance of any ecclesiastical rites or acts of worship over the body or grave of the deceased Guibord. So for the present the matter rests.

We cannot in concluding this brief history of the case, but express our regret that the very able counsel for the Institut should, in the course of the proceedings, have indulged in such very severe language against the Church and her ministers in Canada, as that which in the reports we find attributed to him. The cause of his clients did not require this of him; whilst good taste, and the memory of favors conferred, should have prompted him to soften down a little the asperity of his tongue. He should have remembered that, if today he stands before the public, as a prominent member of a learned and honorable profession, it is, under God, to the Church, to the Bishop, to the priests whom he is severe upon, that he owes his social and professional position, and other worldly advantages; that they, when he was in very humble circumstances, took him by the hand, brought him into their colleges, educating him gratuitously and out of their abundant charity giving him that intellectual life which he now devotes to the service of their enemies; that in fact, he is the creature of their bounty, and the work of their hands. It is no reproach to him that he was in his youth poor; it is no reproach to him that he was educated by the charity of the priests; but it is hard we think, very hard, that he should forget these things, and should turn so bitterly on the hands that had cherished him when young. The wounded eagle felt—so the fable tells us—her anguish redoubled as she reflected, that the arrow which had struck her was feathered or tipped with the spoils of her own wings; may not the learned counsel for the prosecution make a personal application of this fable of the Eagle and the Arrow?

A WELL MERITED TRIBUTE.

The Calcutta correspondent of the Times, from whom we have already quoted on the subject of "Indian Missions," reverts to the same topic in a subsequent letter, in which he pays the following well merited tribute to the glorious Jesuit Missionary, St. Francis Xavier, Apostle of the Indies; in honor of whom the Catholics of Calcutta are organizing a pilgrimage to his shrine at Goa, a distance which will entail a journey of between 3,000 and 4,000 miles. If "there are to be Christian pilgrimages," says the Times correspondent, "in India, there can be none to the shrine of a more devoted worker than St. Francis Xavier. The man who went bareheaded through India, sleeping and eating as he could, and dying at last more truly a martyr than many of the persons who were given to the wild beasts, is well worth holding up as an example to the missionaries of the East. Certainly there has been no man like him—no man at all approaching him—in those lands." Not amongst Protestant Missionaries most certainly, though humbly many Catholic Missionaries have followed in his footsteps. But then neither St. Francis Xavier, nor his Romish successors were hampered with wife, children, and nurseries. It would be a good joke to see a Protestant married missionary going bareheaded through India, and leading the life which Xavier led. True, he was only a misguided Papist, an emissary of the "Man of Sin," and a child of perdition; yet somehow or other he did manage to do a work of which the marks are to be seen all over the East even to this day.

ORDINATIONS.

On Saturday, 19th inst., in the chapel of the Grand Seminary, the following Orders were conferred by His Lordship the Bishop of Gratianopolis:—

- Minor Orders—MM. Z Auclair, J Callaghan, H Charpentier, A Lajeunesse, Montreal; T Casack, D McConlogue, Boston; J Grownay, Brooklyn; E Maloney, D O'Sullivan, Burlington; N Boudreau, T Phelan, Charlottetown; M Byrne, P McBlenny, J Phelan, Hartford; M McGrath, J O'Connor, T West, London; M Galvin, Portland; P Curlin, M Cooke, J Gleeson, T Grace, W Loneragan, J O'Sullivan, Providence; M Lynott, Scraggan; R Burke, Springfield; H McGill, St Jean; J Tori, St Paul; J Leffcock, Cong. Ste Croix. Sub-Diaconate—MM. Duckett, Montreal; G Walsler, Alton; P Sheely, Boston; M Larkin, Kingston; G Mahoney, Providence; F Leterte, St Hyacinthe. Diaconate—MM. J Brouillet, O Hebert, F Laliberte, Montreal; J Meagher, Albany; J O'Halloran, Alton; J Bray, D Murphy, Dubuque; P Donohoe, Hartford; T Beaven, Springfield; J Boyle, Springfield. Priesthood—MM. Z Allard, G Berard, O Harel, J McEvoy, Montreal; M Boylan, J Gibbons, T Lowney, Boston; J Hanselman, J Marrin, Brooklyn; E Bannon, Chatham; J Galligan, T Joynt, Hartford; A Lemay, Cong. Ste Croix.

On the same occasion the undermentioned received Tonsures:— Tonsure—MM. E Walsh, Kingston; J Quinlivan, London; J Clark, Providence; M Cassidy, Springfield; G Dion, E Desfosses, A Leblanc, Cong. Ste Croix.

THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH.—A Pastoral Letter by His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, has been issued, reminding the faithful of his diocese of the claims upon them of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

ECCLIESIASTICAL.—On Friday, Christmas Day, at 3 p.m., the Rev. M.M. Joseph Seguin, Louis Mongeau, and P. Casimir Dufresne will be installed as Canons of the Cathedral of Montreal.

MR. GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET.

(CONTINUED.) The definition of Papal Infallibility stands to the modern world in somewhat the same position as the delivery of the Decalogue did to the old—Mr. Gladstone we suppose will grant that murder was always a crime; we know that it was a crime in Cain's time. Now if it was always a crime, it surely did not become a new crime, when Moses brought the tables of the law down from the Mount. What would Moses have said to the Gladstones of his time, think you, if on his coming down, they had met him with Ah! High Priest! your religion is only a day old! Would he not have answered them think you "Ye brood of vipers! ye know not what ye say." Some people appear to think, that the decalogue was a new departure; that it was a new religion; that it was something added to the world's previous knowledge of morality. And yet this is a grave error; just such an error as Mr. Gladstone has fallen into with reference to Infallibility.

But even supposing for the sake of argument that Mr. Gladstone has sustained his charge—to what does it amount? In what does the Infallibility decreed by the Vatican Council differ from the Infallibility accepted by the Catholic world previous to that decree? This is an important question, because perhaps after all we shall find that Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet is a mere Machiavado-about-nothing. The discoverer of the origin of the cart wheel may after all prove to be an equally apt discoverer of mare's nests. The history of Infallibility is this. For the decrees of a General Council to be valid, or in theological parlance irrefragable it was always held that the council should have been presided over by the Pope either in person or by legate; in other words that for the acts of the body to be valid, it is necessary that they should have the consent of the head. But to this proposition there is a converse and it was asked; if the acts of the body require the consent of the head, do the acts of the head require the consent of the body; in other words are the decrees of a Pope binding before the assent of the whole body of Bishops has been received? There is no doubt that the Catholic Church as a whole has always maintained the affirmative that such decrees are binding. In recent times however there rose up a clique, (we can call it nothing else) a small section of a national church, which denied it. Nor indeed that they denied the whole proposition. By no means, for while they acknowledged that a papal decree which was accepted as it were by default, i.e., that was not absolutely opposed was irrefragable; they yet required that the assent of the Bishops at least through silence and lapse of time was necessary. They did not require that the Bishops should be assembled in order to give their consent; all they required was that dispersed over the whole world in their various sees, they should not object. In other words they granted, that the acts of the head without the body, were valid acts so long as the body put in no formal protest. From this it will be easily seen how extremely narrow was the question at issue; narrowed to begin with by being the action of a clique, and narrowed also by the fact that this narrow clique admitted almost the whole question. The greatest controversy of the day! wrote a Protestant paper the other day. "A Mare's nest," says the Catholic Theologian.

It should always be borne in mind that definitions of councils are nearly always judicial, that is to say are nearly always directed against some particular error, just as in the world of morals the decalogue was ten moral definitions directed against ten classes of immoralities which in those days obtained in the world. If then definitions of councils are judicial, they cannot be said to be changes of doctrine, but are in reality protests against change. Papal infallibility always existed as a doctrine in the church though not as a defined doctrine; and it would undoubtedly have remained (though still a doctrine) had it not been for the Gallican error. Mr. Gladstone should not be illogical. The British Constitution undoubtedly existed before the laws of England existed. The laws of England are emanations from the British constitution, and if the British constitution had not existed, the laws of England would not have existed or at least would have taken a very different form. It would be illogical therefore to assert that the British constitution has changed merely because laws in accordance with the British constitution are being daily enacted. And it is equally illogical in Mr. Gladstone to assert that the constitution of the Catholic Church has changed, because of the several definitions made by different councils.

Mr. Gladstone is making history. The denial of St. Thomas confirmed past adventure the Resurrection of Our Divine Lord. The denial of Tertullian confirmed the Supremacy of the Chair of Peter. Mr. Gladstone's denial will only confirm to all time the Papal Infallibility.

But let Mr. Gladstone beware. History is a solemn warning, whom it is dangerous to despise. To no institution in the world do those words of the Scottish motto "nemo me impune lacessit" apply more infallibly, than to God's church. The men who smeared the early Christians with pitch, to set them on fire, to serve as torches where with to light the public squares and imperial gardens all paid the penalty of their cruelty and hatred of the Christian faith, by unhappy deaths. Lactantius gives us a list of these miscreants, beginning with Tiberius. He might have begun with Herod the Tetrarch, who thirsting for the blood of the Infant Jesus and hoping to compass his death by the slaughter of the Innocents was stricken with a loathsome disease from which he vainly sought to escape by attempts upon his life. Pilate too, the hand washer, was stripped of his dignities and thus degraded, dishonoured and in exile, died in Southern Gaul. And Herod Antipas, the murderer of John the Baptist, who by favor of Caligula had been made King, died also an exile. Let Mr. Gladstone beware. No one injures my Spouse the Church, unpunished, says Jesus Christ through the infallible voice of universal History.

BIRTH.

In Toronto, on Thursday, Dec. 10th, the Globe, of a joke.

We congratulate the Globe on the safe delivery of its decennial joke, and regret that we cannot so honestly tender our congratulations on the general appearance of the bantling. So grim its visage, so clumsy its figure, that we almost wish—even at the risk of offending the dotting maternal parent—there had been a mis-carriage fatal to the offspring. Lest anyone should think us fastidious, we invite all to take a peep at the "little stranger" lying in its swaddling clothes.

"Well may the Archbishop of Toronto say in his letter, read during the service, and addressed to our Protestant friends; 'we have not attacked any Protestant doctrine as such'; on the contrary, his attacks have chiefly been levelled at the doctrines of his own Church; not shall we be surprised to hear that there has been a large sale of Bibles amongst the Roman Catholics, and that their Church in Canada has lost a distinguished ornament, who will have passed into the Protestant ranks, thus balancing the grievous loss of the Marquis of Ripon."—Globe of Dec. 10.

What ghastly deformity! We don't approve of infantile in general, but were we unfortunate enough to be the parent of that job, we would struggle it on the first opportunity, and risk the consequences here and hereafter. —The M.S.W.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS. SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS.

No. 66.

"I GO AND YOU SHALL SEE ME, AND YOU SHALL DIE IN YOUR SINS." (JOHN VIII. 21.) I doubt me, my brethren; whether in the whole body of the sacred Scriptures there is contained denunciation more terrible than that comprised in the words of my text. It was addressed as you know by Our Divine Lord, to the city of Jerusalem—which, about to crucify the Son of God, was to be destroyed in its impenitence, until not one stone of that once most magnificent of cities was to remain upon another. It was a terrible denunciation! and it has had as terrible a fulfilment. Utterly lost amongst the cities, it has never after eighteen centuries been able to regain a shadow even of its former grandeur—whilst its temple, which was at once the mighty heart of the Holy City and of a whole nation, (whence arose to the Throne of God the aspirations of his chosen people) is to this day an enigma and a search to the scientific world. It has betrayed its God—its Judas has sold its Saviour for thirty pieces of silver—and its God has handed Judas and Jerusalem—the one to eternal reprobation—the other to oblivion and the most utter destruction.

But it is not as a threat against the once Holy City of Jerusalem that this denunciation takes the full force of its awful significance. There is another Holy City—another Jerusalem—another Temple wherein by baptism the Holy of Holies has dwelt—against which alas! this threat is held out by Our Divine Lord. That once Holy City—that Jerusalem—that temple—is the soul of the impenitent sinner—the soul of the impious man who says "To-day I will sin—to-morrow I will repent." The Psalmist tells us "The fool has said in his heart 'There is no God.'" Mark well the words!—they are those of the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of Truth! He does not say in his mind—in his reason that there is no God; because never yet was infidel however abandoned, who could to his his reason, deny that there is a God. Not one of them has been able to stifle in his reason, that all pervading all those atheists and infidels, whom the devil, has sown like tares upon the earth has ever yet knowledge of God. Though they may have written volumes on volumes, as they have done, in a vain attempt to prove to others that "there is no God"—that they may have laboured with fiendish malignity to rob God of his existence with others themselves, because they have never come from conviction—it is only their bad heart—their own vile passions, which have said "There is no God." But tho', my brethren, there are none who from their reason—from their intellect have dared to say "there is no God" yet how many thousands, nay millions are there, who have with the fool of the Psalmist said in their heart, that "there is no God." The impenitent sinner—going on in his sins—unwilling to abandon the occasions or the partners of his sins—living according to the dictates of his passions, and neglecting those Holy Sacraments, which are the most powerful means of grace—he, it is, who as a fool, says in his heart "there is no God." To him in his sins—"there is no God"—to him in his impenitence—"there is no God"—to him in his blasphemous presumption—"there is no God." In the present ordinary dispensation of God's providence, the Almighty no longer drives the rebel Israelites into the yawning abyss—he no longer speaks to the impious and abandoned debauchee by the handwriting upon the wall "Mene, Thecel, Phares." He no longer throws the Jezabel headlong from the window. But if to the abandoned sinner there is no God at present—if the Almighty restrains his wrath for the moment—if he neglect to punish on the instant it is only in order that his punishment when it does come, may be more severe, and in order that the measure of the sinner's iniquity may be fully filled up. Adam's transgression may have been expiated by his expulsion from the garden—Cain's murder may have been atoned for by his ceaseless wanderings and the universal execration of mankind—the sins of an impious world may have been washed out by the waters of the deluge—but the sins of the impenitent sinner, whom God allows to go on unreproved in his sins, can only meet the utter reprobation expressed in the words of our text "I go, and ye shall see me and ye shall die in your sins." I, the Lord thy God, will abandon thee—ye shall at length seek me in order to repentance, but I will laugh at your destruction as you shall die in your sins.

It is in the second part of our text—"ye shall see me"—that is contained the most terrible part of the denunciation. It does not strike the work with wonder to see the impious sinner cut off by an offended God in the midst of his sins—to see Baltazar summoned before the tribunal of a just and all powerful God by the handwriting on the wall the very night on which he has defiled the sacred vessels of the temple, to see a Jezabel fall from the window of the moment after she has sought by the immodesty of her dress and lascivious postures to raise lustful thoughts in the heart of the King—to see a Judas hang himself in despair after he has sold his Lord. These judgments tho' terrible—are just and the most abandoned acknowledge their fitness and look upon them as the proper effects of the crime. It is the silent condemnation of the sinner implied in those words "ye shall see me" that proves the most terrible punishment of all. "Ye shall see me"—ye shall perform everything in appearance requisite to real conversion—ye shall confess your sins—ye shall sigh and implore forgiveness—ye shall be overjoyed at the seeming happy change—they shall confess that though your life was immoral, your end was most holy—and ye shall die in your sins. My brethren, do not stand in this apparent rigor! It is Divine Justice—its impartial justice of that God who has declared that "he will not be mocked" and that "what a man sows, the same shall he reap." Oh yes, alas! my brethren, the sinner who in the day of his strength has been in the habit of mocking God shall himself be mocked, when from the bed of sorrow, raises his dying voice in supplication towards brazen sky. He shall find there engraved in letters of fire "they shall call upon me, and I will not hear." The impious sinner, who in the midst of his crimes has said—"I will sin now; but when death approaches I will repent"—will alas! find to his cost how miserably he is mistaken. What he has to time to send for the minister of God's church? what tho' he confess? what though he be afflicted and tho' to all outward appearance he be fulfilled all that is necessary for a good and holy death; who shall ensure him the inward dispositions necessary; above all these? Tho' he may make a confession, who shall ensure him that the confession shall be a good one? Tho' he may pray who shall ensure those prayers being heard? He cannot obtain forgiveness by force. Mercy is to be snatched like the fire of the Greek God, God can grant it—that God who has declared that "he will not be mocked"—that as the tree leans shall it fall—that the seed that is sown, the sower shall be reaped—this is the God "a jealous God from whom this forgiveness can alone be sought, and from whom it can alone be obtained. Who, ye think you, O sinner regain the lost friendship of God, without his permission? And do you expect to obtain it on your death bed from Him, who has declared "that you shall see him, and ye shall die in your sins." Will you snatch grace from that hand which is armed with the thunder, who you steal mercy from that throne, whence he sends forth his lightning bolts?

SERMONS.