finally made was for the delivery of 10,000 shares of stock to be delivered by instalments by Mr. Stockwell to the Company. This I learned from Mr. Stockwell, and probably soon after he had made his agreement which appears to have been in October.

Q. Do you recollect at the time whether the release called for by that agreement was actually delivered to Mr. Stockwell? A. I was in California. I left for California on the 17th of December.

Q. Had the Congressional Investigation then taken place? A. No, Sir.

Q. Do you recollect while at a meeting of the directors a check for about $130,000 drawn by the Panama Railroad Company in favor of Stockwell individually was brought up, which the Pacific Mail Directors discovered had been charged on the books of that Company? A. I do not. Mr. Houston called my attention after I came to California to the fact of a check at that time, and I think very soon after I returned. I was elected President of the Panama Railroad Company, and on the 12th of December, very soon after my election, I went to California, and very soon after my return, in discussing this investigation that had been going on during my absence in Washington and in the Board, he called my attention to the fact of that check of $130,000, and the inquiries that had been made in regard to it.

Q. Your resignation as Director of the Pacific Mail Company had not taken effect then? A. Certainly; not only that, but the vacancy had been filled before I returned.

Q. Do you remember that Mr. Stockwell, among the securities that he had delivered to the Pacific Mail Company, delivered a mortgage deed upon the Howe Sewing-machine Company in Bridgeport? A. A mortgage deed, I understood it.

MR. STOCKWELL'S PRETENDED SALE OF STOCK.

Q. Do you remember a new agreement was made by which that was to be surrendered? A. My recollection is this: That some time before the month of May, I should think—certainly before the month of May—negotiations had been had for the settlement of the differences then existing, as far as I knew or heard of them, between Mr. Stockwell and the Pacific Mail Steamship Company; those differences I understood to be that the Company held, I think, $800,000 balance due on the mortgage on Bridgeport property; I don't wish to be certain as to figures; my impression is that the first mortgage was $1,000,000, to be paid by instalments of $100,000 each; I think instalments had been previously paid, leaving $800,000, and Mr. Stockwell defaulted in the payment. The Company claimed against Mr. Stockwell $6,500,000, and also claimed from him a sum of money for claims in repair certain ships that had been purchased by the Company from Mr. Stockwell, known as the Welsh ships of the Australian line. Those were the only matters of difference that I remember. The facts, as I learned them from both parties, were that at some time—I don't know and anything to do with either company, and while Pacific Mail stock was up to par or above, the Company authorized him to sell Pacific Mail stock at about 27,000 shares at par; that Mr. Stockwell, immediately after the vote was taken, carried to the Board that the stock was sold at par, and the next day they returned checks for the amount. The Company owned a certain amount of Panama stock, and Mr. Stockwell had called upon the Vice-President of the time to deliver to him this Panama stock without any sale or knowledge, as I understood it, of the directors, and explained to Mr. Bellows, the treasurer at the time, that he wanted that stock to put up as a margin to the extent of 10,000 shares of Pacific Mail stock that he had reported as sold, but in fact had not sold. This was a reason for having reported it as sold that he did not want the public to understand that there was that amount of stock that was liable to be sold, because it would put the market down. The stock went down below the hundred, and he could not sell it under the resolution at par, and he wanted the Panama stock to put up as a margin. Mr. Bellows, without any action of the Board, delivered the Panama stock. That was before I had anything to do with it. The statement I got from both parties.

Q. Do you remember when you obtained this statement from them parties? A. Some time between the month of March and May of the same year, 1873.

Q. Did Stockwell reveal it to you first? A. I think so: I am not certain about that. I may have got it from some of the directors.

Q. Did he ask your advice in regard to it? A. He did, and I advised him in regard to it—after it was discovered that Mr. Bellows had delivered this Panama stock. Some time after it was delivered, I mean, the directors called Mr. Stockwell to an account. I don't know when that was.

Q. That was after your election? A. No; before my time. This is what I heard and happened.

Q. This statement was made to you before your election? A. Yes, Sir; Stockwell settled for this Panama stock that he had delivered to Bellows by giving this mortgage to secure him not on this Bridgeport property, in other words, he gave his lease, as I understood it, and the Howe Sewing Machine Company gave their mortgage.

MR. PARK'S ADVICE TO MR. STOCKWELL.

Q. That agreement was dated Oct. 22, same year? A. I was not in mind about agreements, I was talking about this mortgage.

Q. That was dated Oct. 22, 1873? A. No, it was dated before; I had anything to do with the Company; before I knew Mr. Stockwell. Mr. Stockwell claimed that he should not be the loser from this depreciation of stock. The Company claimed he was estopped, having reported the sale, from denying it. No question arose as to the legality of the mortgage to secure the individual debt of Mr. Stockwell. Stockwell advised with me about Mr. Barlow was Mr. Stockwell's counsel, also. Mr. Prescott was the counsel of the Company at that time, and I don't know but yourself (looking to Mr. Bennett). That was the question that I presented back for a statement, and it was on that question and only that question that my advice was asked. On that question I met each with different directors. I know I talked with Mr. Hatch, and Mr. Sage and Mr. Smith, I think. I talked with Mr. Alexandre, and more with Mr. Garrison than anybody else.

Q. During this period were these conversations had? A. Between the months of March, 1873, and May, 1873, before my client left. It was finally suggested that an amicable suit should be brought by Mr. Stockwell to recover the difference between the stock at par and what he received for it; but if he did so, and complained he did not get what he paid for it, he must in his agreed statement of facts to the public, then as agreed submitted to the Court, in fact to put a value upon the stock.

Q. At whose suggestion was this amicable suit instituted? A. I don't know who first suggested it. I think it was approved by everybody connected with it.

Q. You among the rest? A. Yes, Sir; I went down at Mr. Stockwell's request and saw Mr. Barlow about it. He was the counsel for Stockwell; I talked with Mr. Hatch about it. The sense of the Board seemed to be that in their financial condition they had better have a smaller sum of money than to have a larger sum at the end of an expensive and doubtful litigation, and opinions differed as to the legality of Mr. Stockwell's claim—whether he was estopped by having reported this sale as made.

Q. Would those conversations be going on if it was suggested that you be counsel as such for Mr. Stockwell? A. I don't know that it was; I was not to become a director or counsel on that; I don't remember now that any person who had notice of my election spoke to me about it except Mr. Hatch.

Q. Mr. Stockwell? A. No; he may have done it; I know Mr. Hatch did; perhaps somebody else did.

Q. During this time Mr. Stockwell advised with you and you advised with him in regard to this settlement? A. In that manner; in consequence of it a suit was brought in the name of Mr. Stockwell by Mr. Barlow; the amount was fixed; whether they went further and agreed upon a statement of facts, I don't know; then the question came up about appointing a referee and let the referee decide. It was to have a speedy decision, and let that go to the Court to be passed upon and finally, and say that there should be no delay. As to the Company got, it was admitted there was something due the Company by somebody. I say here were assurances that the money should come if judgment was rendered. Then Mr. Fierrepont, as I understood it, objected to agreeing on counsel to refer this without instructions from the Board. The Board, I understood, declined to instruct him because they didn't want it to appear upon the record. There the matter stood until this last agreement was made, which resulted in the settlement, so far as I know.

Q. Now, during all this time did n't you record yourself, and do you not now, as the confidential adviser of Mr. Stockwell? A. I don't know how I was known. That I cannot answer. I am now regarded myself as having advised with him in regard to it, not confidentially, because I refused to accept any retainer. I have not practiced law nor accepted a retainer for over ten years, and I told him so. He wanted me to, but I told him anything I could do to get a settlement no I would do. The advice I gave I would give again to-day.

Q. Do you mean to say you acted in the double relation of friend and adviser of Mr. Stockwell and of the Pacific Mail Company? A. No; the Company didn't ask my advice; all I mean is that I advised Mr. Stockwell just as to what I thought was right and the best move to dispose of it, and it had any conversation with the directors, as I know I had with some of them—I didn't seek them out to talk with them—I had been what I had advised Mr. Stockwell and what I thought was best.

* * * * * * *

Q. Now from the time that Stockwell advised with you as you have stated up to the close of the year 1875, have you not had more or less pecuniary transactions with Mr. Stockwell? A. I have; I have loaned him money and indorsed his paper; I have procured discounts for him from others, and have had no other pecuniary transactions than this.

* * * * * * *

Q. When was your attention first called to the negotiations that were going on with Mr. Stockwell after you entered the Pacific Mail Directory? A. I never had any negotiations with him after I entered.

Q. Was it the agreement actually carried out after you entered the Board? A. It was before I knew it; that is I didn't know anything about the delivery of that stock.

Q. Were you connected with the Board at the time that the check was sent from Mr. Hatch and Mr. Scott to the Secretary demanding that their clause be not delivered to Mr. Stockwell? A. I was in Connecticut then.

Q. Didn't Mr. Stockwell explain to you that the delivery of that release cost him a very large amount of money? A. No; I never had a word of talk with him about the release; he told me that the expenses and lawyers of the litigation and this whole matter had cost him a great deal, and he wanted to get out of it and settle, and my advice was good to both parties that there should be a settlement, but in no other connection.

Q. Didn't he complain to you that he had to pay and did pay large sums of money? A. No, Sir. This talk was after we were all clear of the adjustment by the suit setting the time we were having those conferences.

Q. While you continued to act as director of that company, did you hold any office? A. No, Sir.

Q. Didn't a great many questions at that time come up affecting the interests of the company with the Panama Railroad Company? A. There were some questions, but I abstained from voting on those. I don't remember of any coming up as to which the two. It was more as between the two lines combined and the Union Pacific.

Q. Didn't the question of the prosecution of Mr. Stockwell come up while you were present as a director? A. Not to my knowledge.

THE CHECK FOR $130,000.

Q. Didn't this check of $130,000 come up? A. No, Sir.

Q. When was the existence of that check first brought to your attention? A. After my return from Panama, from Mr. Houston.

Q. Have you taken any steps to collect that check from Stockwell? A. No, Sir, because we believe Mr. Stockwell does not owe it to us; because we believe the Pacific Mail owe it; it was an interchange of checks; it is a question between them and Mr. Stockwell.

Q. Don't you know that at that time a check could not be drawn under the by-laws of the Panama Company without the signatures of two separate officers to the checks? A. I don't know about that; I know the whole thing was irregular on both sides; they brought us a check of $130,000 for Pacific Mail, and at the same time took a check of $35,591 81.

Q. At the time the Panama Railroad delivered that check to Stockwell, or at least upon its date, don't you know that the Panama Company owe not owe Mr. Stockwell any such amount of money. Didn't the books show it? A. I never examined the books.

Q. Didn't you know it? A. No, I never examined the books. I never was in the office on a matter 1874.

Q. Haven't you been curious enough to find out whether they have or not? A. No; I traced out that check business.

Q. As between Mr. Stockwell and the Panama Railroad Company you have made no discoveries or attempt at discovery? A. I might have discovered some things.

Q. Have you made the discovery whether the Company owed Mr. Stockwell on that day the amount of that check? A. I never looked at Stockwell's account in my life.

Q. State whether it is the fact? A. I have made no such examination.

Q. Do you know the fact I ask you? A. Well, I could not know the fact without making the examination or hearing someone say about it; I was not a director at the time or in the office; I know the history of the check.

Q. Do you know this, whether it was one of the by-laws of the Panama Railroad Company, when that check was drawn, that every check for over $500 given by that Company must be drawn on the order of the person to whom it, the check, or amount of money represented by it, was due? A. I do not think I ever read the by-laws of the Company.

Q. Are you not sufficiently familiar with the by-laws of the Company of which you are President to state whether that is one of the by-laws? A. No, Sir.

Q. Were you not sufficiently acquainted with the transactions of the Company to know whether or not, on the day that check was drawn, the Panama Railroad Company owed the amount for which the gave the check? A. I never knew about Mr. Stockwell's account with them.

Q. Did the fact that Mr. Stockwell made you this payment of $34,000 for your loss on the Panama stock, and also the further fact that he paid your entire losses on the pool in which you say your interest formed 30,000 shares, have anything to do with your friendship and fidelity with Mr. Stockwell? A. I think they did; it gave me a good opinion of the man. I thought he was bound to pay me both sums in honor; but all men do not do what they are honorably bound to do, and it gave me a good opinion of him. I appreciated it, and I was willing to do him a good turn, and have done a good many of them.

Q. And you went into the Board of Directors of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, and took your seat there prepossessed in favor of Mr. Stockwell? A. I went into the Board not believing that Mr. Stockwell was as bad as he was counted in that case.

Q. You have had no reason to change that belief? A. No, Sir.

Q. During this period in which you were elected a director and acted as director of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, were you not interested in several other transactions other than this you have mentioned? A. No, Sir, never a dollar.

Q. Did you bond any contracts in the shape of "puts" or "calls?" A. No, Sir.

Q. Was your attention ever called to the agreement which I now show you, and which I want to give you an opportunity to explain? A. I understand Mr. Johnson testified that this was, a portion of it, in my handwriting; I never saw the agreement until this moment; there is no part of it in my handwriting, and there is no part of it that resembles my handwriting.

Mr. Park was then cross-examined by Mr. Goodwin. In reply to his request that the witness would state any facts in relation to the release given to Mr. Stockwell, Mr. Park made a long answer, going over much of the ground covered by Mr. Bennett's questions. A large part of this answer was in substance a repetition of what he had said on the direct examination. He said, with other things, the following:

As to the release, I never saw it, was not present when it was delivered, did not negotiate, and did not have anything to do with the negotiation of the contract. The release, as I understood it, was delivered and executed after I left for California, and I had nothing to do with it at all. That was an accomplished fact, and the question as to those claims never came up in the Board for action in any form at any time while I was in the Board. The testimony that I met the directors of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company at their office—Mr. Johnson so testifies, and he says that he supposed I was negotiating with them for Mr. Stockwell—that was a draft on a very vivid imagination on his part. I certainly never had any meeting for that purpose. There never was a question in the Board while I was there in relation to the Stockwell matter, as Mr. Johnson states. There never was any reconciliation between Mr. Hatch, Mr. Sage and myself, because there never was any quarrel. And there never was an intimation on the part of anybody living to me of any exposure or anything to expose, or any other fact, in the most indirect manner, either in my presence or hearing. I want to explain another thing, and that is as to this $34,000 that Stockwell paid me on the Pacific Mail stock. The facts are these: After it was discovered that there was this sum lost in closing up that transaction of 30,000 shares, Mr. Hatch informed me that Mr. Stockwell had been selling the same stock—what they call on the street "unloading"—to ourselves, a way in which Mr. Stockwell had treated me in the matter of the Panama stock. So when I saw Stockwell the first time I met him after that, I said: "Mr. Stockwell, Mr. Hatch tells me you 'unloaded' on us on that 30,000 shares pool, and sold us the stock, and the very same stock bought for you and delivered to you you sold right back to us." He hesitated a moment and then says: "That isn't true. It is true that I sold stock during that time. I did not sell it as Mr. Hatch says I did, and I don't think I did right in selling at all." Two or three days after he said he had been tumbling over that stock matter, and said: "I think I ought to pay you that loss." But he said he had not got the money and would give me the notes. He gave it in three notes, but it had no connection in the remotest manner with anything else.

In regard to that matter of the overdraft of the San Francisco agency, I once said to Stockwell: "What does this overdraft of some $100,000 mean? What is your explanation?" He said it was claimed to be, or else that it was—I won't be cer ain which—money that was expended to buy off opposition and to procure a subsidy. That is the only conversation I had with him on that subject, consequently, I never had occasion to give him advice in regard to it. I recollect asking the directors if they believed Irwin spent the $750,000 in Washington. Mr. Sage and Mr. Hatch said they did not believe he had. I said: "What do you suppose became of it?" They said: "We think we have traced a good deal of it. We have found out that Mr. Irwin up to that time purchased a large amount of property in Philadelphia in the name of his sister, and Mr. Bennett and Judge Pierrepont are instructed to look it up, and are examining it now, with a view of taking legal proceedings." The talk was to institute proceedings to hold Irwin to account, and Mr. Bennett was to bring suit against Irwin on account of it. At that time, of course, the Company had the opportunity to sue Mr. Stockwell when Mr. Stockwell was here, but they did not make any motion or talk about it in my presence. As to my stating that it was bad faith to proceed against Mr. Stockwell for the alleged defalcation, and my opposing it, there is not a word of truth in it, for the reason that no question of that kind ever arose while I was in the Board. I never heard anything about $100,000 being received by any one of the directors for the delivery of the release to Stockwell. I am charged with making a midnight contract at Mr. Stockwell's house. I was not there when such contract was made, did not take part in any such contract, and never saw it. There never was, as Mr. Johnson claims, any indignation meeting of the Board.

* * * * * * *

Q. When did you leave for California? A. Dec. 17, 1874, I suppose you mean; I returned some day in April.

Q. Were you not a director then in Pacific mail when you returned? A. No, sir.

MR. PARK'S STATEMENTS IN WASHINGTON.

Q. Didn't you state you were before the Congressional Committee? A. No, Sir.

Q. Didn't you go before the Committee on Post Roads and Offices in Washington? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Did you know then that Stockwell had depleted the Company to the extent of $2,000,000? A. I know somebody had.

Q. Didn't you know Stockwell was called to account for it? A. No.

Q. Didn't you say then that Mr. Stockwell gave two explanations? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Didn't you say then that you didn't believe either of them? A. I said I did not believe the money had been expended.

Q. Didn't you say then, before the Committee, that you did not believe either of these statements of Stockwell's to be true? A. If you ask whether I believed that he meant to tell the truth, I will say yes. You can't put me up in any such way as this. You just read what you have got.

Q. Did you use this language (reading): "He (Stockwell) made those different statements, but I never believed either of them?" A. Yes, Sir; that is, I didn't believe the money had been expended in the way he had stated.

Q. Then you knew the explanation he gave you was false? A. Yes, Sir, but not necessarily that it was meant to be false.

Q. Didn't that disturb your confidence in him? A. As a business man it was irregular, of course, even if he believed it to be true; I am not here now to justify Mr. Stockwell at all, nor have not been.

Q. You stated before the Congressional Committee that you had only been in the Pacific Mail Steamship Company "since last June;" then you were a director, or at least you said you were a director, in June, 1873? A. I don't read so, and I didn't say so; I said I had only been there since that time; I don't remember making that remark.

Q. Didn't you say "I was interested in the Company previously only indirectly?" A. I presume so.

Q. What did you mean by "indirectly?" A. Because of the Company's connection with the Panama Railroad, with which I was connected very largely.

Q. In whose capacity did you go or in whose interest did you go before the Committee on Post Roads in the month of April, 1874? A. Did you not see in the interest of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company? A. No, Sir. A member in Congress hearing I was there invited me to go before the Committee.

Q. You made a speech there as a representative of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company? A. I don't remember any speech.

Q. Do you recollect at whose instigation the resignation of Mr. Sage as President of the Panama Railroad Company took place? A. Well, I had as much to do with it as any one. I was the largest stockholder and I thought the directors wanted a change. I thought it was the general desire and I made the request to Mr. Sage.

Q. Were you then a director in each Board? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Were there any threats made by any one in case Mr. Sage refused to resign? A. Well, I don't know that there were; there was a letter read which reflected on Mr. Sage, and Mr. Hatch make some threats, but the nature of them I have forgotten; it was dealing simply in generalities; he said he did not think any one who dealt in "puts and calls" and the like should be President.

Mr. Bennett—That is all, Mr. Park.

Mr. Park—Well, if that is all, I am glad to have got off so easily.

The investigation was then adjourned until 10:30 a. m. to-day.

SUNDAY TEACHINGS.

WORDS FROM METROPOLITAN PULPITS.

SERMON BY THE REV. C. D. HELMER, D. D., AT THE TOMPKINS AVENUE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN BROOKLYN—DISCOURSE OF THE REV. DR. PRESTON AT ST. ANN'S ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH—THE REV. DR. JOHN HALL AT THE FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—SERMON BY THE REV. DR. HURST AT ST. JAMES'S METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Yesterday, one of the few pleasant Sundays of this Winter, was well adapted for church-going, and that the opportunities it offered were well improved was shown by the throngs in the neighborhood of the churches, both before and after service. In Brooklyn the Rev. C. D. Helmer, D. D., who has recently been called from Chicago to the care of the Tompkins Avenue Congregational Church, preached to his congregation on the proper method of sustaining church life. At St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church in this city the Rev. Dr. Preston delivered a discourse replying to the objections offered against the Catholic faith. The Rev. Dr. John Hall, at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, preached on the subject of learning the will of God. At St. James's Methodist Episcopal Church the Rev. Dr. Hurst, President of Drew Theological Seminary, delivered a sermon upon the necessary preparation for the reception of Christ's teachings.

TRUE CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

The Rev. C. D. Helmer, D. D., at the Tompkins Avenue Congregational Church, Brooklyn.

At the Tompkins Avenue Congregational Church, at Tompkins-ave. and MacDonough-st., Brooklyn, yesterday, the pastor, the Rev. C. D. Helmer, D. D., preached to a large congregation. His text was I. Thessalonians, v., 14: "Now, we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men."

It has been often remarked, he said, that it takes all sorts of people to make up a world. Diversities of character, disposition, habit, mind, and heart, are required. This is also true of a Christian church. The command of Christ was to preach the Gospel to every creature. A church is a gathering of candidates for salvation, who constitute a school or family. Scholars and children are not trained alike. The training must differ according to different characters and temperaments. So with a church. It is a matter of much consequence to get the right principle by which the moral policy of a church should be conducted. It is noticeable that almost nothing is said in the New Testament about ecclesiasticism, but much is said about the moral instruction of men. The moral is the foundation of all human association. The moral culture is the highest part of man's constitution. It is better to control men by moral power than by bayonet and cannon, or sheer force. The police control the order of a city because there is the moral sentiment of the people behind them. In a family, love must be the controlling force. Much more in a church should there be free on from arbitrary power. When people come into a church, you can't say that all can pray alike, and work alike, and walk alike. God loves to make things different, and He didn't intend the Church to be a mold where should turn out characters alike.

If it be maintained that the Church is destined chiefly for aggressive action, the members of the Church should be strong, or at least those who are strong should have preeminence. Then it is a church militant for the subjugation of the world. Is that the idea? Do you want a fighting church? I have heard that idea advocated in the church by prominent men in ecclesiastical councils. What does that mean? It means the strong classes—the unruly, the feebleminded, the feeble, and the weak. If you are strong, remind the feebleminded that he is out of the rank in an affectionate way; those well-grounded persons you have in control or to speak to soothingly. They who are weak, who have undisciplined moral powers—those you must hold responsible in the end. There never has been a year since Christianity was founded when there were not bad men in the Church. The power of God is to work through the strong to the helping of the weak. In a church as everywhere else, the strong are capable of taking care of themselves, measurably, at least. It is the weak who specially need help. The Church was never ordained to be a court of law. The true theory is to bring you can't save one who is afflicted with a moral influenza of any sort. The essential principle of Christ's teaching was the gaining of the man who has committed an offense. The theory of the Bible is contrary to the practice of the churches of our time, of casting off members and here letting them go for the sake of the Church's object is not to save itself, but to save those who are sinful. It is not a civil tribunal. The foundation law of all church discipline, is the salvation of those who need it. It is not by sheer force that we are to take care of those who are in the power of evil. We must take upon ourselves the infirmities of others. I don't object to examination, but the real object of the scrutiny, and even of examination, is to save. It would be a misfortune if a church should be composed entirely of strong men, or that each member should be an independent unit.

The secular method is the heathen method, which lets the infirm and weak go last. Christ has taught mankind the lesson of strength in the service of weakness. "He that is strong, let him be the servant, the slave of all." We are to learn patience in the school of Christ. Therefore is not a spiritual schism for society to exist. It is an admission of helpful power. If heresy is poor in its influence, it is to be exercised in that way. It is not in harmony with the natural man, but we are not called to follow Christ in the easiest way.

STABILITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Rev. Dr. Preston at St. Ann's Church (Roman Catholic).

At St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church in Twelfth-st., yesterday, the Rev. Dr. Preston delivered the sermon, taking his text from Matthew viii., 23-26: "And when He was entered into a ship, His disciples followed Him. And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves; but He was asleep. And His disciples came to Him and awoke Him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish. And He saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then He arose and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." The discourse was mainly as follows:

It is a common objection against the Catholic Church that she meets with every kind of disaster and distress, and that our Lord seems to leave her continually alone; that she has been suffering since the day of her birth, and is perhaps at this moment suffering even more than heretofore. On every side rises a clamor of enemies. If she be the Church of God as we say, why does the Lord leave her in this way, and seem to be utterly careless whether she be persecuted or not? Why is she left by the Almighty God. He may only to will it and there is an end of persecution. There is, perhaps, more of error than of truth in the objection; for after all the Church of God does succeed, and the very fact that she lives notwithstanding the difficulties that surround her, is a proof of her divine nature. But after all her life is a sacrificial life, and the Lord permits it. For her the victory is not yet. Her promotion goes before her glory.

The same objection will apply to every epoch of Christianity, and if Protestants will urge this objection against the Catholic Church it will recoil still more upon themselves. What do they say in regard to their difficulties? For although they have settled to the number of their believers, although they have left the communion of the Christian Church, yet they have gained nothing, it would be an increase of unity or of moral strength. The growth of Protestantism has been its division and subdivision, and the elimination of all the articles of its former creeds. It is only necessary for the divided hosts of that Christian y opposed to us to increase in order to decay. The same objection holds good also in regard to the principles of natural religion. For before Christ came, natural religion had this conflict, and seemed to be defeated, though it never had the thousandth part of the life which the immortal Church of God has had. But the true answer to this objection is, after all, this: that faith is the religion of Christ; that faith demands a trial; and that the trials of faith are not only necessary in the very nature of faith itself, but they are necessary for the purification and ennobling of man; and that by these trials man rises, is lifted up more himself and prepared for that greater, brighter, and more glorious time when his purified eyes shall be able to look upon God, and truth itself shall come out of a cloud.

The apostles could testify emphatically to the reality of faith. We fall back upon the words of God, who cannot deceive or be deceived, and His word we believe, and we know that that which appears to our senses in the Holy Eucharist to be only bread is for us the veritable body of Christ. The testimony of the Incarnation presents the same sublimity. For had we seen our Divine Lord in the flesh, how would our natural senses have been affected in that day? Would we not have been prepared to see in Him anything different from any other? If God were now from the supernal light to send the secret of truth to our hearts to diminish our understanding, He could compel our assent to the truths of faith. There need be no responsibility; there need be no discussion; should that word down that flesh which would strike down our opposing intellects, and compel assent to all the mysteries of revelation, but where would be the merit, where the credit, where the justification of the intellect that comes from submission to the Word of God? Where would be the reality of the unbelieving heart that will believe in spite of itself? Where would be the reality of the believing heart that will believe in spite of the intellect? Where would be the reality of the believing heart that will believe in spite of the intellect? Where would be the reality of the believing heart that will believe in spite of the intellect