

challenger stipulated that the verdict should be given by a jury of Catholic and Protestant university professors. The sequel of the challenge is told in a recent issue of the American 'Messenger.' It says:—

'Count Hoensbroech, the ex-Jesuit and apostate Catholic, came forward and affirmed to have peremptorily proved that the Jesuits taught the doctrine, and published a pamphlet in which the proof was supposed to be found. In the meantime Father Dasbach had failed to obtain his jury, as the Protestant professors refused to serve. Then the Count sued the priest for the reward in the civil court of Trier. The court decided that the case was not actionable according to the German law, as it was of the nature of a wager, and consequently dismissed the case with costs. From this sentence the plaintiff appealed to the Supreme Court of the Rhine Province, in Cologne. This court rendered its decision on March 30. First of all, the sentence of the lower court was set aside, on the ground that this was not a wager, but a real prize problem. Then the court declared itself competent to deal with the controversy on its merits without any need of theological experts or specialists. Whoever claims the reward offered by the defendant, says the court, must have clearly proved that in any one passage of Jesuit writings the general principle is expressly enunciated that any action, though in itself morally bad, becomes licit when used as a means to compass a good end. The plaintiff asserts that in his pamphlet, "The End Justifies the Means," this proof is contained. The court, therefore, has only to deal with this pamphlet and not with any Jesuit works, the fidelity of the citations being accepted by both parties. The court then proceeded to the examination, one by one, of the passages alleged from Sa, Toletus, Mariana, Vasquez, Sanchez, Becanus, Laymann, Delrio, Castropalao, Escobar, Tamburini, Voit, Gury, and Palmieri, and after discussing them arrived at the conclusion that in not one of these texts is the general principle affirmed that the end justifies the means. The plaintiff therefore has failed to prove his point and is not entitled to the reward. His appeal is rejected.'

The learned Protestant divine mentioned above (Rev. Dr. Starbuck) showed in the 'S.H. Review' in 1899 that the man who really promulgated the immoral principle mentioned above was no other than the great 'Reformer,' Dr. Martinus Luther.

Notes

Not Very Enlightening

A correspondent sends us a lengthy report of a Bible-in-schools debate that took place recently at Levin. The members of the local Young Men's Christian Association flung sundry chunks of old red sandstone arguments at each other in a friendly way, and, perhaps, did as well, in the circumstances, as could be reasonably expected of amateur debaters, who usually, on such occasions, are often handicapped by youth, and 'nerves,' and superficial acquaintance with their subject. If—through the kind offices of some of our readers—a few of the speakers had assimilated the substance of the manifestoes of our Hierarchy on the subject, there would have been 'bone' enough in the debate to make it be remembered in Levin.

Carnegie

In the last work that came from his pen, Max O'Rell wrote down every millionaire as an impostor, and (by implication) a fool into the bargain. Yet Carnegie may, without any Pharisaical self-conceit, lay the flattering unction to his soul that he is not quite like the rest of millionaires. He has, for instance, a goodly measure of saving common-sense, and his ideas of wealth are close akin to those which prevailed in Europe in pre-Reformation days, and which were restated in terms of much power by Leo XIII. in his Encyclical on the Condition of Labor.

'The other day,' says the 'S.H. Review,' 'it became known that Carnegie's niece had married a poor coachman. "Better a poor, honest man than a worthless

duke," commented Carnegie.' Again: one of the social principles introduced at the Reformation, and widely prevalent ever since, was the idea of absolute ownership in property. Then, for the first time in Christian history, and in defence of the sacrosanct 'rights' of 'property, property, property,' laws were passed which treated poverty and crime as indistinguishable. The old and more Christian idea regarded ownership in property as a stewardship. And such seems to be the substance of Carnegie's idea—apart from the question as to his manner of putting it into practice. His recent gift of £2,000,000 to pension American professors and teachers brings up the total of his money benefactions to some £25,000,000. To put it on the lowest ground, a man with a million pounds cannot eat or drink or multiply his wants and enjoyments a million times more than the man who has only one pound above his needs. Max O'Rell expresses this bit of homely philosophy by the rough mouth of a Whitechapel toper: 'If I was the bloom-in' Dook o' Westminster, I couldn't be—more—drunk—'n I—am.' Carnegie would give all his millions to have the hale and business-like stomach of a Scottish ploughman. But his mountain of dollars cannot buy him good health, which is the best kind of wealth in the physical order.

However, he has the good thought to spend his surplus shekels for the good of others. 'If,' said Leo XIII., in the Encyclical referred to above, 'the question is asked, How must one's possessions be used?' the Church replies without hesitation, in the words of the same holy Doctor (St. Thomas): "Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need." When necessity has been supplied, and one's position fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over. It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity.'

ARCHDIOCESE OF WELLINGTON

(By telegraph from our own correspondent.)

June 13.

Members of the local branches of the H.A.C.B. Society attended early Mass at St. Mary of the Angels' Church on Sunday and received Holy Communion in a body. The Mass was celebrated by the Ven. Archdeacon Devoy, who congratulated the society on the excellent attendance. After Mass the members, to the number of nearly 80, marched in regalia to Carroll's rooms, where breakfast was laid. His Grace the Archbishop presided, and was supported on the right by Bro. C. Foley (president) and on the left by Bro. B. Doherty, P.P. Amongst those present were Ven. Archdeacon Devoy, Rev. T. O'Shea, and Messrs. J. J. Devine, Bro. M. Hodgins (Lower Hutt branch), Bro. J. J. Casey (Newtown branch), and H. McKeown (secretary of the Federated Catholic Young Men's Societies).

His Grace in a brief address expressed the hope that succeeding functions of this nature would be as successful and even more so than the present one, which was their first. The H.A.C.B. Society had his entire support, and he was delighted at the progress made by the Society, especially in Wellington. The good work they were doing had his blessing, and he would like to see every Catholic a member of the society if possible.

The Rev. Father O'Shea, chaplain to the city branch, congratulated those present on the magnificent profession of their faith which they had made that morning.

Mr. J. J. Devine, in referring to the early struggles of the society, said that great praise was due to those early pioneers to whose efforts the present satisfactory condition of the society was largely due.

Mr. Michael Bohan, the first district president of the H.A.C.B. Society in New Zealand, which was established thirty-five years ago, gave several interesting reminiscences of the society, the remarks of this aged officer being received with hearty applause.

Bro. P. J. Kelleher, stated that three years ago there were in the Wellington district only three branches of their society, with a membership of a hundred and seventy; to-day there are six branches, with a