

of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, just as he (the most rev preacher) had himself received it 50 or 60 years ago. People said, "Oh, yes, this is the teaching of the Catholic Church now, but it was not always so." There was no foundation for this statement. He had taken up a number of catechisms which he owned, bound together in a large volume, and some of them in different languages, and looking into their teaching respecting indulgences, he had found it precisely the same. These catechisms belonged to the 18th and 17th centuries. If they went back to the time of the Council of Trent, they found the doctrine of the Church, authoritatively laid down in works published then, exactly that which he had placed before them. It was the same throughout the history of the Church, the same with regard to the council of Florence, the same with regard to the council of Nice. The teaching of the Church had always been the same. There had never been a tittle of change. He would ask again, what did an indulgence mean? An indulgence meant the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin after the guilt of sin itself, and its eternal punishment were remitted by sincere repentance. No man could gain an indulgence whilst in sin. He must be in the friendship of God. He must be free from the guilt of sin, and have a determination by the help of God's grace never more to offend Almighty God. It was a gross calumny to say that an indulgence was a license to commit sin. If a man were resolved to commit sin he could not gain an indulgence. This had always been the doctrine of the Catholic Church from the first days of Christianity until to-day. An indulgence could only be gained if a man were truly penitent, and, through the merits of our Divine Redeemer, had obtained pardon for his sin. He must confess his sins, if mortal; he must be truly sorry for having offended God, determined to sin no more and to avoid all dangerous occasions of committing sin. He must do penance when he had confessed his sins with sorrow and with a resolution never again to offend God. An indulgence would be of no avail to a man whose mind was made up to commit sin. How, therefore, it might be asked, was a contrary statement made in English histories. That, the most rev speaker said, he did not feel called upon to explain. All he knew was such statements were calumnies and lies. There was no foundation for such statements. Wicked men who had rebelled with the object of robbing the Church, as an excuse for their plunder, propagated these lies. And to-day these lies formed part of what was known as the Great Protestant Tradition. History for the last 300 years had been a huge conspiracy against truth. All genuine students of history knew this to be the fact. Some of the more honest among Protestant historians who had studied original documents, expressed themselves disgusted at the lies and calumnies that had been unblushingly published. They had declared, moreover, that nowhere had this been done so much as in England. The huge lie had held its own although refuted thousands and thousands of times. Catholics had protested over and over again against it, but no attention had been paid to them by the Great Protestant Tradition. The lie was still unblushingly told. It was told up to that hour. Money was taken out of the pockets of Catholics to teach their own children this lie, and to teach their neighbours' children to hate and loathe them. How could they do otherwise when they were taught these calumnies and lies? When Almighty God forgave sin the economy was that those who were truly and sincerely repentant obtained the remission of the guilt and eternal punishment due to their sin. But a temporal penalty remained to be paid either in this life or the next. An indulgence had nothing to do with the guilt of sin. Remission of the eternal punishment must be obtained before any advantage could be gained from an indulgence. He would give them an example—every one knew that King David was the friend of God—but, yielding to a strong temptation, he committed a grievous sin, and added to his guilt that of murder. He remained impenitent for nearly a year. Then the Prophet Nathan came to him, and, under another appearance, placed his own case strongly before him. David's sense of justice was aroused and he became indignant. But the Prophet said "Thou art the man." David saw his fault and, yielding to the grace of God repented. Nathan, therefore, was authorised to announce to him the forgiveness of his sin. The eternal punishment, together with the guilt due to it was remitted, but a temporal penalty remained. The child, whom he dearly loved, died. David was deeply grieved and did penance and bewailed his sin. But Almighty God did not take away his temporal punishment—that he was obliged to bear. The temporal punishment due to sin, was, however, sometimes remitted. The Ninivites furnished also an example of this. There were other illustrations of the truth that Almighty God when He remits the eternal punishment due to sin reserves the temporal punishment. Long and terrible penances, in the early ages of the Church, were imposed to obtain pardon for the temporal punishment of sin as well as to make reparation. The Church sometimes came to the assistance of the penitent and granted him an indulgence. This was the practice of the early ages—of the days of persecution. In the first three centuries of the Christian era public and long penances were frequent. Penitents who were anxious to obtain a remission, were in the habit of meeting the martyrs as they were led to execution and begging from them a word of writing for the bishop to lighten their penance. This

the bishop often did out of consideration for the merits and satisfaction of Christ and the martyrs. Such was in virtue of the communion of saints. The teaching of the Church was that in the Church there was a treasury consisting of the merits of our Divine Redeemer and of His saints. Not that the merits of our Divine Redeemer required any addition, but the merits gained by the saints through His merits were placed in the common treasury. The Church formed the body of which Christ was the head. Our bodies were composed of many members, but a property owned by one member was possessed by all—what the head owned belonged also to the hands and feet—and so it was with the Church, the mystic body of Christ. What belonged to our Divine Redeemer belonged to the Church. Any act of the humiliation suffered by Christ would have been sufficient, and more than sufficient, for the salvation of the world, or of a million of worlds. His merits were super-abundant. These merits had not been lost. They were the property of the Church. Our Divine Redeemer had said to His Apostles: "What ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and what ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." He had also said to them: I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In virtue of this, the successors of the Apostles were the dispensers of the mysteries of God. By the power of the keys, by the dispensation of our Divine Redeemer, His merits, His super-abundant merits were applied by them to the remission of temporal punishments. But it was said this was making things easy. To obtain the remission of sin was not making things easy. Catholics had to do more than other people did. They had to confess their sins. This was not easy. It was a severe and humiliating discipline, a great sacrifice of feeling, to avow their guilt to a fellow-man. If they had done wrong or injustice they must repair it. Consequently we sometimes found a Catholic priest making restitution on the part of a penitent. Catholics must do penance, pray, and fast, and give alms. But let them consider what the members of other churches did. They had no confession, not much fasting, not much restitution, or at least not much was heard of it. They put themselves into an excited state, aroused their feelings, and something told them they were forgiven. If they died, they believed they would go straight to heaven. Which was the easier way? If once they obtained the conviction of pardon, they believed they could never lose grace. The subsequent guilt neither of murder nor adultery nor anything else would be an obstacle in the way of their going to heaven. Their doctrine was that they could not fall from grace. Was it not a wonder that people who held such a doctrine and proclaimed it should calumniate Catholics respecting indulgences? It was told in history that Cromwell, when he was dying, asked a minister who stood by his bed if it was true that a man could not fall from grace. On receiving an answer in the affirmative, he declared himself confident of salvation, as he said he knew he had once been in a state of grace. All his wickedness, all his slaughters had gone for nothing. Yet men who taught this doctrine held up Catholics to scorn as if purchasing licenses to commit sin and pardon for their sins. The most rev preacher went on to protest against the manner in which Catholics were forced to contribute to the support of schools in which such calumnies on them and their Church were taught. They were told that the country could not bear the expense of sectarian teaching. Catholics did not want it to do so. They had no scruple in taking the money of Catholics to give their own children sectarian teaching. They had no scruple about taking money to teach godlessness. But that was not sectarian? That was all right and proper. He, the most rev speaker, would make an offer. Let them remit the £400,000 that education cost on the customs dues, and let every denomination support its own schools. Catholics would accept that willingly, and then there could be no pretence of paying by public money for the religious instruction given in their schools. If that were done Catholics would not be behind hand in the work of education. The professed love for education would then be tested. These secularists had never made any sacrifices for education and were not prepared to make such sacrifices. But they would take the money of Catholics to teach the children of the colony—their own if not those of Catholics—that the Pope sold indulgences. Nothing could be heard of so monstrous or so unjust. The most rev speaker repeated that there was not one word of truth in the calumnies to which he had referred. What the Church taught now she had always taught. He did not deny that abuses had existed. There were abuses probably now somewhere or another. But the Church was not responsible for them. Abuses were introduced into the college of Apostles by Judas—who when he sat at the table of the last supper had been plotting his crime. They need not be surprised that abuses existed wherever poor human nature was to be found. The Bishop declared in conclusion that he had done his best to explain the matter clearly and distinctly. If he had failed, or if he had left any point obscure he said he would be happy to return to the subject and endeavour to explain it better and more plainly.

The recently-appointed Hungarian Primate has been nominated a Cardinal by the Pope.