

pistol and a revolver. He fell with two slight wounds in the head, and one in the region of the spine, from which recovery was manifestly impossible. His death was not immediate, and in a few days he was removed to Voree, where he received the devoted care of the lawful wife of his purer days, an estimable woman, who had rejected his gross "revelations," but clung to her personal belief that death alone could release her from the obligations of the marriage vow. He died on July 9, and was buried in a still unmarked grave in the "Cemetery of the Saints" at Spring Prairie.

The kingdom did not survive the assassination of the king. Some of the Mormons left Beaver Island on the boat which carried him to Voree, and the dying man advised a general removal; but before his followers had determined upon any defi-

nite plan of action, a band of exasperated and armed men from the mainland descended upon their settlements. The tabernacle was burned, the printing-office was sacked, and the king's library was destroyed, and his house pillaged. The faithful among the Saints were given but one day in which to leave the island with their movables and stock, and even then they were driven on board the boats without the property which they had brought to the shore. The invaders used the axe and the torch freely, but the homesteads and improvements of the exiles they seized and occupied. It was another banishment from Acadia, and demands for many of the houseless wretches driven forth on that day of retribution a pity as keen as the pathetic fortunes of the neutral French receive from the readers of "Evangeline."

THE NEW FRENCH MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

WHO is Paul Bert? Why is Paul Bert a member of the new French Ministry? Why does Gambetta signalize his accession to power by the choice of Paul Bert for his Minister of Public Instruction?

Let us see if we can not make a contribution toward an intelligent answer to these questions, for they are questions about which, as will presently appear, no part of the civilized world can afford to be indifferent. Paul Bert was born at Auxerre, in the department of the Yonne, on the 17th of October, 1833; consequently he is now forty-eight years of age. He studied medicine in Paris, was admitted Doctor of Natural Sciences in 1866, appointed Professor of General Physiology in the Faculty of Sciences at Paris in 1869, and in 1875 the Academy of Sciences awarded him a prize of 20,000 francs for a series of papers *touchant l'influence des modifications de la pression barométrique sur les phénomènes de la vie*. After the memorable events of September, 1870, he was named Secretary-General of the Prefecture of the Yonne, but resigned immediately upon the resignation of Gambetta as Minister of War. He was elected from Auxerre to the Assemblée Nationale in 1874, and again in 1876, and was one of the 363 Deputies who in 1877 refused to give the Broglie cabinet a vote of confidence. At the succeeding election, his constituents

testified their approval of his action by a re-election. In 1876 he was appointed on the commission *des travaux historiques et des sociétés savantes*; in December, 1878, he was chosen president of the Society of Biology, replacing Claude Bernard. Among the books upon which his fame as a scientist rests, the best known are *De la Greffe animale*, published in 1863; *Revue de Travaux d'Anatomie et de Physiologie*, published 1864-6; *Notes d'Anatomie et de Physiologie comparée*, 1867-70; *Recherches sur la Mouvement de la Sensitif*, 1867-70; *Leçon sur la Physiologie comparée de la Respiration*, 1869; *La Pression barométrique; Recherches de Physiologie expérimentale*, 1879. He has, besides, for many years, furnished the *Feuilleton scientifique* for M. Gambetta's journal, the *République Française*. He was educated at home by his father and aunt, has an interesting and devoted family, and is a great admirer of Gambetta, who, he says, is the only man who has ever tried to govern France through her heart: the only way, he thinks, she can be well governed.

Such, in brief, are the incidents and achievements by which Paul Bert is mostly known, where he is known at all; but they do not explain his selection by M. Gambetta for what, under the circumstances, is perhaps the most critical and difficult post in his cabinet. As in the

case of Lavoisier and of Arago in former years, the extraordinary abilities he has exhibited in technical science have had their weight in calling him to a position demanding extraordinary abilities; but there may be, and probably are, men in France more eminent than he as scientists. Why are they passed over to take a man

to which no portion of the civilized world can afford to be indifferent.

As a member of the national legislature, Paul Bert occupied himself especially in efforts to reorganize the educational system of France, with special reference to the secularization of instruction—that is, taking it out of the exclusive control



PAUL BERT.

still comparatively young, with inconsiderable experience in political administration, and whose name till within a year or two was scarcely known outside of scientific circles? We will give what we understand to be the explanation, and we think our readers will see in it our justification for the statement that in assigning to Paul Bert the portfolio of public instruction, M. Gambetta has taken a step

of the religious orders—and in rendering education obligatory, as in Germany.

On the 21st of June, 1879, the debate was begun in the Chamber of Deputies on a bill reported by a committee, of which M. Bert was chairman, providing for "the liberty of superior teaching," the now famous seventh section of which prohibited Jesuits of all grades, and the members of all other religious congregations not

recognized by the state, from engaging in the work of teaching. Paul Bert took the leading part in the debate in favor of the bill, and undertook to demonstrate, from a purely political point of view, the perils to the tranquillity and moral unity of the country to which the teachings of the Jesuits exposed it—"a sect" (to use his own language) "which, wherever it has found a home, has provoked civil war; a sect which at one time or another has been cursed and hunted out of nearly every country in Europe, and every member of which, under a strict enforcement of the laws of France, should be sent at once to the frontiers."

Some days later the Minister of Public Instruction of that day enforced the thesis of M. Bert by citations from the historical writings of the Jesuits, and furnished an occasion for M. Bert to return to the subject in a speech which he delivered on the 5th of July, in which he devoted himself more especially to exposing the immoral doctrines of the Jesuits from the days of Pascal to our own time, and demonstrating their continued persistence in teaching the odious doctrines denounced in the *Lettres Provinciales*, not only to adolescents, but to children of tender years.

The effect of this speech upon the Chambers and upon the public was extraordinary. It gave an enormous sale to every journal in which it appeared. The wrath of the Jesuits and of their apologists was proportionately inflamed. Every dialect in Christendom was exhausted for foul terms to apply to M. Bert. A Vienna medical journal in a lengthy biographical notice of Bert gave the measure of Austrian charity for him in the following terms: "The Catholic journals call him a libertine, a shameless materialist infected with all the vices and turpitudes of Paris, a reproach to the French tribune, a wretch, a debauchee, a *chenille*." There was but one possible defense that could have any weight in France against the charges of M. Bert—that was a prompt denial of their truth. The Jesuit party did deny them, and accused the orator of misrepresenting and falsifying the authorities he cited. They pursued precisely the same tactics which they employed some two hundred years before in traversing the immortal indictment of Pascal—a defense, however, which did not render it the less necessary for Pope Innocent XI. to denounce and

anathematize in detail pretty much all the doctrines of the Jesuits which Pascal had held up to public scorn. It was the same defense as that which they made to the report and decree of the French Parliament in 1762, but which did not prevent their order from being hunted like so many rattlesnakes out of every Christian country, even out of Rome, and their order placed under the ban of the Church by the memorable brief *Dominus et Redemptor* of Pope Clement XIV. in 1773.*

However, the only defense to be made to it was to traverse the whole indictment, and it had this advantage, that to the large class who could not read, and to the smaller though more influential class who were educated to deem it a matter of conscience neither to hear nor read anything to the prejudice of the order, it was ample. It served to cover their retreat, and as a basis of future operations. But M. Bert was determined that this defense should not serve them. He resolved to place before the public the evidence which every one who chose might verify, and which no one could contest, as he claimed, that for the last three hundred years the Jesuits had been corrupting the youth of all nations; that they uniformly taught as morals a set of doctrines that struck at the very foundations of human society; that they countenanced debauchery, theft, incest, robbery, and murder,

* One of the clauses of this brief ran as follows: "We forbid any one, after the publication of this brief, to dare suspend its execution under any pretext whatever, foreseen or unforeseen, for it is our will that the depression and annihilation of the entire society, as well as of all its officers, have from this moment full and complete effect, and in the way herein prescribed, under the penalty of major excommunication from us and our successors, to be incurred by any one who should dare offer the slightest obstacle, hinderance, or delay to the execution of this brief."

How, in the face of this, Clement's successors could restore the Jesuits to all their ancient prerogatives without impeaching the infallibility of the Pope who suppressed them, is one of those problems which only infallibility itself can explain. The problem becomes still more complicated when we reflect that the late Pope Pius IX., the official parent of the infallibility dogma, both suppressed the Jesuits and subsequently re-instated them during his own pontificate. If it were a question of removing window-shutters in winter and replacing them in summer, it would not be embarrassing; but it is the boast of the Jesuits that they can not change. In the language of one of their famous friends, "*Sint ut sint aut non sint*," and if they cumbered the earth in 1773, they must have cumbered the earth in 1778, and still more during the late pontificate, when they had become more numerous.

and recognized no civil nor political obligations to the state which were not subordinate to the interests of their order, of which they were the final judges.

Anticipating, however, the objection that might be made to the warming over of the old complaint against the Jesuits of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that those times are long passed, that to hold the ethics of to-day responsible for the ethics of Tolet, of Suarez, and of Fil-lucius is as unfair as to hold the French Revolution responsible for the crimes of the League, or the government of M. Thiers responsible for the crimes of the French Revolution. Besides, the books of that period are rare, and how can people prove that liberties have not been taken with the text? M. Bert determined to show not what the Jesuits taught in their schools two hundred years ago, but what they were teaching then, in the year of grace 1879-80, in France, and let the public judge how much indulgence their appeal from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century would entitle them to. He seems to have experienced little difficulty in securing his material. He selected the *Compendium Theologicæ Moralis*, in two volumes, and the *Casus Conscientiæ*, in two volumes, all by John Peter Gury, of the Society of Jesus, the last edition of which was published as late as 1875, and which has received the official approval of M. Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, which is highly commended by Father Matignon, of the Society of Jesus, and is in the hands not only of all the Jesuits, but of large numbers of the clergy of the Latin Church; for, according to the testimony of the Archbishop of Paris, this book enjoys the honor of having "happily transformed the spirit of the French clergy in the last thirty years."* Of this book, the author-

ity of which, as an exposition of the moral notions of the Society of Jesus, no one can contest, and which any one can easily verify, M. Bert proceeded to make a careful analysis, omitting only those portions lying within the domain of pure theology, and involving dogmatic rather than moral questions, and published the results in a volume of 665 duodecimo pages, with his three discourses on the subject in the Chambers, and a list of the sixty-five propositions in morals held by the Jesuits, which were condemned by Innocent XI. It is entitled *La Morale des Jésuites*. To these extracts M. Bert has occasionally added notes to show the persistent accord between the actual doctrines taught now by Gury and those taught not only by the earlier Jesuits, but by others of the order in our own time. To say that M. Bert makes out his case is to feebly describe the effect of his *exposé*.

It would be difficult for any one who has not read Gury's books, and verified the language quoted by M. Bert, to believe it possible that such doctrines as he will find there are not only printed, but taught in schools of theology by persons calling themselves Christians, or that there is any race of people so degraded in civilization as to listen to them. A few specimens of these teachings, we think, will show that we are not using the language of exaggeration. The first two volumes, of the *Compendium*, are theoretical and doctrinal. The remaining two volumes, entitled *Casus Conscientiæ*, present a series of cases of conscience or moral problems such as have arisen or are presumed to have been resolved in the confessional, with their solutions, corresponding *in foro conscientiæ* with the reports of cases heard and determined in courts of civil law. Thus, for each chapter of theoretic teaching there are cases in which the doctrines of that chapter are applied. By an infinitely elaborated system of definitions, classifications, divisions, and distinctions, every principle of right and wrong is so qualified and narrowed in the *Compendium* that little remains but a mass of petty aphorisms, which may be, and to all appearances are, employed as often to oppose as to sustain each other. Conscience, for example, is distinguished into right or erroneous, certain or doubtful. Then come secondary divisions into conscience vincibly erroneous and invincibly erroneous. These,

* "Father Gury was born at Mailleroncourt, France, in 1801. For thirty-five years he was Professor of Moral Theology, first in the seminary at Vals, and then in the Collegio Romano. He died in 1866. . . . No modern treatise can show a more formidable array of guarantees than Father Gury's *Compendium of Moral Theology*. It has been appointed in Roman Catholic seminaries in all lands as the standard manual of moral theology. It has been printed in every country and translated into every tongue. In the new issue of De Backer's *Dictionary of Jesuit Writers* there are enumerated no fewer than twenty-four editions. The one we quote from was issued in 1872 from the presses of the Propaganda at Rome." — *The Jesuits, their Constitution and Teaching: an Historical Sketch*. By W. C. CARTWRIGHT, M.P. London: Murray, 1876. (Note, p. 147.)

again, are divided into the invincibly erroneous that command, and the invincibly erroneous that permit. Again, a distinction is made between true truth, doubtful truth, and false truth. With the aid of such a system of distinctions sufficiently extended, there is no act which the ingenious casuist can not extenuate or condemn at his pleasure. At every instant one is reminded of the old sophism that pulling out one hair, or two, or three, does not make a man bald. How many may be pulled before the man becomes bald is thus left entirely to the discretion of the casuist.

No one will contest the fundamental principle that where there is no bad intention there is no moral delinquency. Let us now see how this principle is applied by the Jesuit moralists.

Adelbert, wishing to kill his enemy Titius, killed his friend Caius. Has he sinned, and ought he to make restitution?

Answer.—Adelbert ought to be held guiltless of the homicide if he had not been able to foresee the death of Caius, if, for example, he had sought to hit no one but Titius. The reason is that this exterior act is not prejudicial in principle to Caius, whom he has involuntarily killed; consequently he is not liable to make any restitution to his heirs.

Again: Blazius, wishing to injure his enemy Caius, determines to shoot his ass. He misses the ass, and kills the cow of Titius, sleeping behind a hedge unseen.

Question.—Is Blazius liable to make restitution for the ass which he missed or the cow which he killed? *Answer.*—He is not. Certainly not for the ass, which escaped; neither is he for the cow, since he had not foreseen this misfortune, nor been able to anticipate it.

Query.—What if the ass and cow had belonged to the same Caius? *Answer.*—Not even in that case would Blazius be held to repair the injury, since it was involuntary."

M. Gury's views of lying, Ananias and Sapphira would have thought liberal. He distinguishes lies into three classes: the prejudicial lie, which he thinks wrong in proportion to the gravity of the injury it does another; the officious lie, which is venial in principle, because it does not cause grave disorder; and the pleasant lie, which of course is still more venial. Mental restrictions, too, equivokes, and amphibologies, M. Gury thinks can not

be safely permitted to go into disuse. A criminal interrogated by a judge, if he thinks the question an improper one, may reply, "I have done nothing," understanding in his own mind, "about which I should be interrogated," or, "that I am bound to avow." "This mode of restriction," continues M. Gury, "may be employed by all public functionaries interrogated about matters confided to their discretion, such as secretaries, ambassadors, generals, magistrates, advocates, physicians, and all whose employments furnish reasons for concealing anything. For if secrets confided to these persons were to be divulged, great inconveniences would result to society."

Now for an application of these principles.

Theofried having inherited an estate, and concealed his wealth to avoid paying his creditors, replies that he has concealed nothing. At another time he denies to the judge who interrogates him that he had restored some money he had borrowed. At another time, to the question of the customs officer if he had any articles liable to duty, he replied that he had not.

Question.—Is Theofried to be condemned as a liar?

Answer.—Theofried has not sinned against truth in the first case, because in reality he concealed nothing in the sense of the interrogation, or in the sense in which he could be justly interrogated. So in replying that he has concealed nothing, it is as if he had said he had committed no injustice against his creditors, for it is only in that sense that the judge and the creditors could interrogate him. He did not sin in the second case, for the same reason, because they did not interrogate him but on his debt; if he had received borrowed money, and if he had not restored it. Nor in the third case, at least according to the probable and common opinion, which regards the laws relating to the transport of objects from one place to another as purely penal. So to say, 'I have nothing,' is as if one said, 'I have nothing to declare myself; it is for you to search, instead of questioning.' But ecclesiastics should be instructed to tell the truth, to avoid any scandal from such a denial, if it came to be known."

M. Gury shows how keeping a secret is as easy as lying. Here is his recipe:

Amand promised on oath to Marinus that he would never reveal to any one a

theft which Marinus had committed. Suspicions arising, Amand was called before the judge, and gives up the secret. "Question.—Ought Amand to have revealed the secret confided to him? Answer.—Amand ought not to have disclosed the secret. He should have replied, 'I know nothing'; that is to say, 'nothing which I ought to tell'—using a mental restriction. For a secret of this kind binds in all cases, except where the public is interested. A judge or a superior can not compel the violation of a secret. Here there was no public reason for giving up the secret, because society does not run so great danger from a theft which is not disclosed."

M. Gury is not less charitable toward thieves than toward liars. The laws which define the rights to steal are laid down with detail and precision. "There are two excuses for theft, he says: first, necessity; second, the secret compensation (*compensatio occulta*). The necessity which excuses theft is either *extreme*, *grave*, or *common*: extreme, if there is danger of death or a very grave misfortune; grave, when the disagreeabilities of life are serious; common, as in the case of habitual mendicants."

The doctrines of communism, which are so rife in all Catholic countries and communities, may probably trace their origin, as they unquestionably have their denominational sanction, in the Jesuits' confessional.

"A man may, in extreme necessity," says M. Gury, use as much of another's property as will relieve him, because it is no derogation from natural right to take from another what is demanded by extreme necessity. In such a case all becomes common, and then he who takes the goods of another appropriates to himself the common property as if there had been a division. Then he commits no theft.

"What is here said of extreme necessity may be said also of a very grave necessity."

"Question.—Can one steal from another not only for his own, but for the relief of others? Answer.—Yes, according to the common opinion, because he places himself in the situation of the indigent, and shows that he cherishes his neighbor as himself.

"Question.—In an extreme necessity, or almost extreme, whatever may be the cause of it, may one steal an object of

great value, or a large sum, if one has need of it? Answer.—There are two opinions. The first says no; the second, more probable and more common, says yes, provided the rich person is not thereby reduced to equal destitution, and the poor man takes only what he needs."

The American who visits the Latin states of Europe for the first time is apt to be shocked by a practice quite universal among servants of reserving to themselves a small commission upon everything they buy for their employers, and including the sums thus reserved in the price they pretend to have paid. The cook, who always does the marketing, never reserves less than five per cent. So the courier always expects the shop-keeper to whom he conducts his travellers to charge them and pay to him a commission upon everything they buy. Not a word ever passes between the servant and the master to authorize this sort of robbery, but it is so much a matter of course that it would be difficult to retain the services of a cook a week in any of the Latin states who was not allowed to purchase the daily supplies of his kitchen. Of course every commission thus taken is in principle a theft, and strikes at the very foundations of honesty and morality, not only of servants, but of the whole mercantile class, who are necessarily parties to their roguery. It will surprise our readers to learn that the confessional of the Jesuits is the school in which this form of crime is professed and licensed. It is what the Jesuit doctors term "secret compensation," one of their recognized methods of "lawful stealing." We will quote their doctrine as laid down by M. Gury:

"The secret compensation consists in recovering the thing which belongs to us by taking the thing which does not belong to us."

"Question.—Can servants who think they are not sufficiently paid have recourse to the secret compensation? Answer.—No, in general, for this proposition has been condemned by Innocent XI.; except, first, when the servant, driven by necessity, accepted lower wages than the master would have been compelled to pay to others; second, if the servant is overwhelmed with work which does not belong to him.

"Question.—A servant who does more than he ought, may he compensate himself? Answer.—Yes, if it is by the express or tacit will of the master that he labors to excess, because that he who works ought to be paid in proportion to his work. The value of this just compensation may be left to the judgment of the

servant, if he be modest, prudent, and distrustful of his self-love, which, however, rarely happens.

Illustration.—Sallust, the agent of a rich man, is charged annually with the purchase of the necessary clothing of the family, to a given amount, of a merchant by the name of Cyrille. But Sallust purchases of another merchant at lower prices. Sometimes he goes to another city to purchase cheaper goods. Whatever he saves from the sum allowed by his master he keeps for himself.

Question.—Can he keep the money thus saved? *Answer.*—Yes, because the gain which he realizes in going elsewhere and in purchasing advantageously is due to his labor and special skill. He need not disquiet himself on that subject."

What constitutes a theft and what constitutes a grave theft are questions which M. Gury has not neglected. There is nothing more curious in his book than the scale by which he differentiates a venial from a sinful theft, and the sinfulness of stealing large or small amounts from the rich, or from those who are in easy and from others who are in moderate circumstances. "Nestor, profiting by an opportunity, and tempted by the devil, steals sometimes from the rich and sometimes from the poor five or six francs. One day he takes twelve francs from a wealthy prince. At length, and after hearing an eloquent sermon, he makes a *sincere* confession, and asks whether in all these cases he has gravely sinned.

Question 1.—When is a theft grave?

Question 2.—Has Nestor sinned gravely in these cases, especially in stealing the twelve francs from the prince?

Answer to first question.—According to the common opinion, a theft is grave relatively but not absolutely; that is to say, it may be grave or light according to the higher or lower position of the injured party. A theft of five or six francs, according to the probable opinion, constitutes a grave matter taken from the rich. But a less grave matter will suffice for a mortal sin, if the individual injured is of an inferior condition. Thus a theft of a franc or a franc and a half from a poor man may constitute a grave matter. The theologians commonly pretend, says St. Liguori, that it is a grave matter when one steals a sum sufficient to nourish and support an individual and his family a single day. But this very obscure and vague rule not being applicable to all thefts, it is necessary to grade their grav-

ity to the different conditions of men. Twenty sous seems to be the limit for a poor person; sometimes less from those who are altogether destitute. Two or three francs from workmen who gain their living from labor, four or five francs from people in easy circumstances, six or seven from the moderately rich, and a little more from the very rich. This is the common doctrine.

Answer to second question.—From what has been said, the gravity of Nestor's sin may be determined. He has committed a mortal sin every time he has stolen six or seven francs, even from a rich man, and ten or twelve francs from a prince. For his other thefts it is necessary to interrogate him farther, and apply the rules just laid down. Besides, in practice, this gravity often can not be determined, and the confessor can not know if the sin of the penitent is grave or light. It is then necessary to leave his case to the Divine justice."

This is a pretty liberal construction of the eighth commandment as handed down to us by Moses. The crime, according to the Jesuits' dispensation, does not consist in appropriating another's property to our own use, but in taking too much at a time, or from too poor a man. If the thieving be carried on within conservative limits, it may become a perfectly legitimate business.

The distinctions drawn between thefts by children and by domestics are ingenious, and show a marvellous evolution of the eighth commandment in the last two thousand years.

"Romarius stole from his father, a rich man, eight francs at one time, and after a notable interval, ten francs in different little thefts, and expended all in play and drink. Quirinus, a domestic, stole six francs from his master, and after several months committed other little thefts of food and drink, all in the same month, to the value of eight francs.

Question.—Have Romarius and Quirinus sinned gravely? *Answer.*—Romarius can not be accused of a grave sin neither in the first nor in the second case. Not in the first place because that, according to the more common opinion, a theft by the child of an honorable family to be grave should amount to ten francs. Nor in the second case, because, if it takes ten francs to make a grave sin in Romarius, stolen at one time, it would require the

value of about fifteen francs to make a grave sin if taken in small thefts. As to Quirinus, he has sinned gravely in stealing six francs from his master. Such is the common opinion of theologians. But he has not sinned in principle in his small thefts of provisions, as has already been explained."

In the following case the accommodating doctrines just laid down are slightly enlarged. Albert, a servant, is engaged by Médard to enter his service. He accepts, leaving his rate of compensation to the appreciation of his master. After a year Médard allows him wages at a lower rate than he allowed to other domestics of his class. Albert has recourse to secret compensation to make his wages equal with those of the other servants.

"*Question.*—Was Albert right in thus securing for himself the rate of wages allowed to the other domestics? *Answer.*—In justice Albert ought not to be condemned, because in the absence of an agreement he had an implied right to at least the lowest wages paid to domestics of his class."

False swearing, too, according to M. Gury, appears to have been treated, like many other meritorious things in this world, with scant respect by the average Christian. The Jesuits can not be held responsible if such old-fashioned prejudices are not dissipated, and if a man may not swear to a lie occasionally where it would promote his interest or convenience. As for example:

Ferdinand owed Orelus a hundred louis. Before the debt fell due, Ferdinand, while making a friendly visit to his creditor, told him that on the following day he would send his servant with the money he was owing. Orelus, overcredulous, immediately gives Ferdinand a receipt. Ferdinand finds this a good occasion to secure a debt of a hundred louis which the father of Orelus owed his father; and when Orelus reclaimed his money Ferdinand refuses absolutely, affirming that he kept the money to discharge the debt of Orelus's father to his. Orelus appeals to the law, but the debtor Ferdinand affirms that he has paid him, and proves it by the receipt.

"*Question.*—Was Ferdinand right in keeping the money lent and in using the receipt in court? Was he right in swearing he had discharged the debt?"

"*Answer to first question.*—Yes, Ferdinand was right in keeping the money

lent, and in using the receipt, as he did so adroitly, to prove that he owed Orelus nothing, because the debts of the two parties, being equal, destroyed each other; and Ferdinand did not act wrongly in showing his receipt in court, because it only proved that the money borrowed by Ferdinand had been restored to Orelus, which was in conformity with the truth.

"*Answer to second question.*—Yes. Again: according to the doctrine of St. Liguori, Ferdinand can swear that he had acquitted the debt when he sees no other means of securing what is due to him. He swears according to the truth for a grave motive, since by his oath he affirms that he owes nothing, which is true, since reciprocal debts extinguish each other."

Liguori, be it observed, has been canonized as a saint.

Again: Galdinus, childless and seriously ill, gives to his wife one hundred francs, and his parole promise that she shall be entitled to three hundred more after his death. At his death the wife hastens to profit by his last wishes, but the heir of the estate cites the wife into court to make her swear that she had taken none of the property of the deceased.

"*Question.*—Can she swear that she has taken nothing? *Answer.*—Yes, for she has taken nothing but what belonged to her. No one has a right to question her as to the disposition of her own property. Then she can swear that she has received none of the property of the deceased; that is to say, nothing that did not belong to her."

In dealing with heretics, we are constrained to admit that the Jesuits are much less liberal and indulgent than when dealing with thieves, liars, and false swearers. We must content ourselves with a single illustration, and refer the curious reader to the original work for more abundant proofs.

Leocadie, a *religieuse* attached to a hospital, is asked by Quirinus, a Protestant, and seriously ill, to go for a minister of his sect to give him the consolations of his religion. Leocadie asks if she should obey.

"*Answer.*—No; the reason is evident: it would be holding communication with heretics in religious concerns, and having practical co-operations with them." This decision is justified by an opinion signed by the Secretary of the Inquisition, to whom the facts had been submitted, to the same effect.

In dealing with some of the infelicities of domestic life, the Jesuits certainly are entitled "to take the cake." We quote one case, from which the rest may be inferred.

Calpernia, the mother of a numerous family, desires the death of a new-born child, of another of five years, who is deaf and dumb, of a third of nine years, who is crippled in both legs, that they may enjoy a better life in heaven. She also desires the death of her marriageable daughter, who is unable to marry because of her poverty and ugliness, that she may not be exposed to sin.

These tender impulses of maternal affection raise the question in the confessional whether Calpernia had sinned, and how. "Answer.—Calpernia has not sinned in her desires in regard to her three sons and daughter, because she was not animated by an ill-regulated motive, but desired better conditions for her children. She has not, then, sinned against charity nor piety."

It would be very interesting to know just where the sin against charity or piety does commence among the Jesuits.

Filial obedience, too, M. Gury thinks, is a virtue which has been rather overworked, especially where it interferes with recruiting for the Church. To the question, May children embrace the religious state in spite of their parents? M. Gury replies: "Yes, in principle. The child will act with more wisdom if, feeling a vocation for the religious state, and believing that the parents will make unjust opposition, he conceals his purpose, and obeys the Divine will."

A very large proportion of the *Compendium* of M. Gury is too filthy and indecent to be more than alluded to, unless "in the disguise of a learned language." Those who desire illustrations of this feature must have recourse to the original work; we are unwilling to soil these pages or disgust our readers with details which are inconceivably shocking.

We return now to the question, Why is M. Paul Bert Gambetta's Minister of Public Instruction? Our readers will have anticipated our answer. Because he has had the courage to expose the moral leprosy which has for centuries infected the schools and society of France. Because no other man of equal ability had the disposition and courage to do it. Because there was no other man in France who

could so fitly be trusted with the power necessary to reorganize her educational system, and to deliver it from what, as these books demonstrate, are justly regarded as a pestilential influence—an influence which has proved fatal to all previous efforts to secure popular government in France, and which is certain to destroy her republican institutions unless destroyed by them. M. Bert is one of the half-dozen ablest debaters now in public life anywhere. For more than twenty years he has been in some way officially connected with public instruction; he has children, and he loves his country. He has never fallen himself nor permitted his family to fall into the toils of the confessional fraternity, and can be relied upon to prosecute the reform upon which he has embarked, until he shall have rescued the youth of France from the demoralizing influences with which the Jesuits have poisoned most of her seats of learning, or until a change of ministry shall show that he and his chief have underestimated the power of the Jesuits and of the religious orders who affiliate with them.

The fight M. Bert is making is a fight for freedom of conscience and purity of morals wherever the Jesuits have their schools, and wherever it is desired that stealing, lying, perjury, theft, criminal impurity of conduct, homicide, and parricide should be treated as crimes.

SHADOWS.

THE moon a light-hung world of gold,
Low-drooping, pale, and phantom-fair;
The fresh pomp of the summer leaves,
And fragrance in the breathing air.

Beneath the trees flat silhouettes,
Mute idiot shapes that shun the light,
Weird crook-kneed things, a fickle crew,
The restless children of the night.

In idle vacant pantomime
They nod and nod for evermore,
And clutch with aimless fluttering hands,
With thin black hands, the leaf-strewn floor.

Quivering, wavering there forever,
On the bright and silent ground
Meshed and tangled there together
While the rolling earth goes round.

And the gold-tinged aery ocean
Ripples light in many a breeze
O'er the sweet-breathed purple lilac,
O'er the tall and slumbering trees.

But comes the dawn,
The spell is done;
Weird spirits flee
At rise of sun.