

clergyman has never disgraced the entrance either of the Church of St Gudule or of any other church of Brussels or of the whole country. They further declare that they have never even suspected for one instant that permission to sin could, for any possible motive, be granted, nor that anyone could ever obtain remission of his sins for money. Such a doctrine they repudiate with indignation, as it is and always has been repudiated by the whole of the Catholic Church. 'This declaration is signed Brussels, April 2, 1851.' (Lectures on Catholicism in England, pp. 105-6)." "The exposure," says Newman in conclusion, "happened in March and April; but Protestantism is infallible, and the judgment of its doctors irreversible; accordingly in the following June, the newspaper I have mentioned thought it necessary to show that the Tradition was not injured by the blow; so out came the Tradition again, 'though brayed in a mortar,' not at all the worse for the accident, in that emphatic statement which I quoted when I opened the subject." Nor have we the slightest expectation that the "Tradition" has been silenced in Dunedin. Nay, had not the *Evening Star* charitably, as we have seen, and with a timely abhorrence of the *odium theologium*, concluded the correspondence on the publication of this reply to the quotations from Moseley, it would, no doubt, be still publicly asserting itself. But wait awhile. We shall have it all over again on the first opportunity. Whatever may be the conclusions of evolution, we may remark by way of a concluding postscript, in our time the bray of the doukey, for instance, has not altered in the least.

THERE is one disadvantage—we speak under correction—at which from her very position the CONSIDERATION Church seems to be placed in dealing with non-Catholic people. She makes her statements on her own authority, and knows of no higher tribunal to which she may appeal. If they contradict her, she can but point to her own decisions and her own doctrine as the rule by which she requires them to judge—and, if they cannot understand or will not accept these, she can do no more. Compare these accusations respecting pardons and indulgences brought by rabid Evangelicals and Free-thinkers against the Church, with some, for example, constantly brought against the Jews. The Jews, from time immemorial and up to the present moment, have been and are continually accused of killing Christians, particularly Christian children, to use their blood in certain of their ceremonies. When they deny the charge, passages from their sacred books are produced, in which unlearned and incompetent people find irrefutable proof of the truth of the charge. Moreover, murders have undeniably been committed by Jews and have been ascribed to such motives. A very notable murder of a Franciscan missionary, for instance, took place some years ago in Damascus, the late M. Crémieux being charged with defending the murderers out of religious sympathy with them. A couple of years since, again, a little boy was murdered, under very piteous circumstances, in the same town, and Jews undoubtedly were the criminals. No cause for the crime being assigned, in either case, it was concluded that it was due to the religious requirements alluded to. The Jews, however, besides their protests, and the explanation of their true doctrine, had a tribunal to appeal to—they appealed to the Pope, or to prelates of the Church. By the command of the Sovereign Pontiff their case has been more than once inquired into—the last time by Cardinal Ganganelli, afterwards Pope Clement XIV.—and on such authority they have been pronounced completely innocent. In our own days, we have heard the late Cardinal Manning pronounce strongly in their favour. For a Catholic to believe the accusation in question, therefore, would be an act on his part of presumption and disobedience. Whether the Jews acknowledge the services thus rendered them by denouncing in their turn gross charges brought against the Catholic Church—or whether, in some instances, they lend their aid to the promotion of such charges, it is not for us to say. We have quoted their case simply as an illustration, if we may venture to say so, of the disadvantage, so far, at least, as the conviction of unlearned and incapable or ill-disposed non-Catholics is concerned, at which the Church is placed in having no tribunal apart from or higher than herself, to whose decision she may refer her accusers.

RELIGION AND CRIME. In our late review of Mr William Douglas Morrison's "Crime and its Causes," although we gave a tolerably copious reproduction of the writer's arguments, there was still a point or two which we were obliged, for the time at least, to pass over. Mr Morrison, for example, in referring to the comparative immunity of India from crime, with the exception of infanticide, which he gave sufficient reason for omitting, remarked as follows in a note. "For the high percentage of infanticide in England see the evidence given before the House of Lords last July (1890) by Judges Day and Wille"—a consideration we may add, which must be taken into account in relation to those assertions that crime in England is decreasing, and which Mr Morrison disproves. Mr Morrison does not enter into the religious bearings of the matter—although we may gather from his condemnation of a merely intellectual training that he is not indifferent to it. One

passage however he does give us in which the subject is mentioned and from which, perhaps, his disposition may be more clearly divined. "Some Italian writers," he says, "make much of the religiosity of delinquents; such a sentiment may be common among offenders in Italy; it is certainly rare among the same class in Great Britain (p 196)." A bigot, we know, might reply, "Behold the difference between Catholic and Protestant criminals." But what then would become of the assertion that Irish Catholics throng the prisons of England and Scotland? This assertion, as we are aware, is false and grossly misleading. The excessive proportion of Irish Catholics returned in the prison statistics of Great Britain, as well as in those of these colonies, is arrived at only by leaving out all question of everything but the number of convictions, and comparing the Irish labouring population, heavily handicapped as they are among a vast majority who constantly provoke, discountenance, and repel them—not with a population only situated like themselves, which indeed is hardly to be found, but with all the inhabitants, including the wealthy and aristocratic classes, of the several countries. As is the case in the colonies too, Irish prisoners in Great Britain certainly form the proportionate majority of minor offenders—so that, all things considered, statistics give little information as to their actual or comparative numbers. Nevertheless Irish Catholic prisoners are unfortunately common enough to afford Mr Morrison means to judge as to the state of their religious sentiments. His judgment, we see, is adverse. But who are the Italian writers who, as Mr Morrison tells us, make much of the religiosity of delinquents? Unprejudiced men on whose word we may rely? On the contrary, they are men of violent prejudices, atheists, and doctrinaires, bent on stamping out Christianity and reforming the world on the basis of their own fads. Let us take one of them, for example, that is, Signor Ferri, of whom we find special mention made elsewhere. Ferri denies the existence of such a thing as remorse among criminals, or even the possibility of it. We take our information as to all this from an article by M. Arthur Desjardins, of the Institute of France, published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of January 1, 1891, and to which we referred a week or two ago:—"Except delinquents carried away by a burst of passion," he says, "malefactors, by the effect of an insensibility proper to them, feel no more remorse after having committed the misdeed than they felt repugnance before committing it."—What trace of religiosity is to be found in this, we should like to know? The principle of Signor Ferri and his colleagues, however, as we have said before, is an absolute denial of free-will. Anything connected with religion they will not admit of. M. Ferri, says the writer from whom we quote, consents to recognise the existence of "psycho-anthropological" rules—but on condition of first removing the "uncertainties of theology and metaphysics"—that is to say, the soul and God.—Necessarily M. Ferri answers for it that prisoners in Italian prisons are extremely religious, but who is to answer for M. Ferri?—That he is a *savant* capable of remarkable feats of the imagination, as well as of some accommodation, we may conclude from what M. Desjardins tells us concerning certain of his speculations. He finds, for example, that in certain Italian provinces the homicide has long arms, that in others he has them short—and yet again, that there are others where he has them sometimes long and sometimes short—"Rêti, bouilli—même chose." Is it not evident that M. Ferri can discover whatever he is in search of?—We have, in a former note, alluded to the doctrine touching crime taught by M. Ferri and his colleagues—and also to the measure they propose—not reformation, not education, not intellectual or moral training, but elimination—the special proposal of M. Ferri.—We have also referred to the methods by which they would bring it about—preferably the gallows or the surgeon's knife, or the transportation of the criminals to a savage country where the natives would enslave them—but failing all this, asylums where they should be permanently shut up. M. Desjardins, an authority whose opinion deserves some consideration, in contrasting the methods adopted in civilized countries with those which these *savants* propose, allows us to gather that he has some faith in religious influences. "Humanity, he tells us, has thought it possible to organise a system of penalties, correctional as well as punitive; that is to say, of speaking to the soul of the convict, of amending while chastising him, of conquering his habits of idleness, of giving him a professional apprenticeship, and instruction both moral and religious. It has not despaired of converting him." M. Desjardins evidently recognises the place of religion in the correctional methods necessary. M. Ferri finds Italian prisoners religious, as he finds his Italian homicides long armed or short armed, or both indifferently, to suit his purposes. A scientist of the period, bent on also eliminating God and the soul, could hardly do otherwise. Mr Morrison, we have little doubt, would find Catholic prisoners in Italy as he has found them in Great Britain.

The Church of St. Columba, of Cologne, enjoys the privilege of having attached to it the oldest priest in the archdiocese, the Rev. Peter Scuter, who completed his ninetieth year on the 13th inst. He was ordained priest in 1825, and is still in the enjoyment of good health, saying Mass every morning at nine, and eleven o'clock Mass on Sundays.