

direct, that it would seem that it were only necessary to mention the organization and the work to induce the formation of Chapters throughout the Dominion. It may be quite true, as was stated by one of the speakers in the Synod of Montreal, that organizations are over numerous, but such an objection we fancy cannot apply with any force either to the Brotherhood of St. Andrew or to the 'Daughters of the King'; both being so thoroughly in accordance with the Baptismal obligation and so conducive to the upbuilding of The Church.

DAUGHTERS OF THE KING.—A week or two ago we referred to the formation of a Dominion Brotherhood of St. Andrews on the lines of that existing in the United States. Since that time the organization has been formally brought before several of our Synods, and in the Diocese of Montreal it may be said was virtually accepted through the resolution adopted at the last meeting of the Synod. A society akin to this for women has been formed under the above name of "DAUGHTERS OF THE KING" and it also seems to have widely extended itself through the Sister Church in the United States. Its constitution is almost identical with that of the Brotherhood of St. Andrews; its sole object being "to spread Christ's Kingdom among young women, and for the strengthening of Parish life." Every woman who becomes a Daughter of the King obliges herself to observe the rules of the Order so long as she remains a member; such rules being only: (a) To pray daily for the spread of Christ's Kingdom among women; for God's blessing upon all members of the Order, and for the prosperity of the Parish to which her Chapter owes allegiance. (b) To make an earnest effort each week to bring at least one young woman within hearing of the Gospel of Christ, as set forth in the services of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to offer at all times such aid to the Rector or Minister in charge of the Parish as he may deem necessary for the furtherance of the cause of Christ.

These rules and obligations are simple enough and ought to recommend themselves by reason of their simplicity. As in the case of the Brotherhood, Chapters of not less than five may be formed in any parish or mission with the approval of the Rector or Minister in charge, the members accepting the constitution and agreeing to wear the badge of the Order.

The Corresponding Secretary of the Association is Miss Elizabeth Ryerson, 520 East 87th street, New York, from whom further information may be obtained.

THE April number of the *Church Review*, N.Y., has only just reached our table, having been delayed by the late arrival of some of the articles in the great discussion on *Christian Reunion*, now appearing in its pages. The delay is fully compensated, however, by the character and value of the articles which it contains. A glance at the names of the distinguished writers will show that this is probably the first time since the Reformation that the views of representative men of the several denominations outside the Church on a topic so absorbing as this, have been formulated, or have appeared in a strictly Church magazine. The reply to these articles (several of whom and specially those of *Methodist* divines, are by no

means favorable to re-union on the basis of The Historic Episcopate) will be from equally representative men of The Mother and Sister Church: and amongst these are mentioned Bishops Littlejohn, Doane, Seymour, Perry and Coxe. All who are interested in this great question of Reunion *organic* should secure these numbers of the *Review*. The editor is the Rev. H. M. Baum, 1 Union square, New York.

ROMISH ASCENDENCY.

The right of precedence accorded to Cardinal Manning has again been made the subject of discussion in the public press, and has awakened amongst British Protestants feelings of dissatisfaction and indignation. A correspondent of the *Times*, writing under the initials 'D. McL', has directed attention to the fact that the Lord Mayor, in signing his name to a public document after the signature of Cardinal Manning, has sacrificed his right to be considered the first subject of the Crown within the City, and has allowed Cardinal Manning to take the first place. The writer further emphasizes the significance of the act, by pointing out that in the City the Lord Mayor is entitled to precedence even before the Prince of Wales himself.

Be this as it may, the reply made by the Lord Mayor in defence of his action in this matter not only increases our sense of dissatisfaction, but raises considerations which, we believe, are of very serious importance. Speaking at a committee dinner of the Corporation, on the 9th inst., the Lord Mayor said, 'that since the loss of the temporalities of the Holy See, Cardinals had been regarded all over the continent of Europe, except in England, as deposed Princes; that this position was recognized in England in 1884, when Cardinal Manning was appointed a member of the Commission for the Housing of the Poor; that Mr. Gladstone then carefully considered the bearings of the case, and, with the full concurrence of Lord Salisbury, recommended the Queen to place the Cardinal's name immediately after that of the Prince of Wales, and before that of the present Premier.'

Is this statement correct? Is it a fact that the claims of the Papacy to have its Cardinals ranked as Princesses have been recognized as well in England as on the continent of Europe? And have the leaders of the two great parties in this country joined together to effect the degradation of England by thus acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope and recognizing his power to nominate to position of ranks and dignity within the British Empire?

We are informed, on the authority of the Lord Mayor, that this surrender to the claims of the Papacy was made in 1884, when Cardinal Manning was appointed a member of the Royal Commission for the Housing of the Poor. Referring to the protest against this appointment made by the Protestant Alliance at the time, we find that the subject was on that occasion brought under the consideration of the House of Lords by Lord Oranmore, and that the Government then stated that the appointment had been made in accordance with precedents already conceded in the case of the Irish Roman Catholic Prelates, especially upon the grant of the Charter of the Royal University of Ireland in 1880, in which the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin was named first, then the name of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin followed, and afterwards the name of the Lord Chancellor; but was this a recognition of the Papal claim that Cardinals should rank as Princesses at the Courts of the several Sovereigns of Europe, and this, notwithstanding that the Papacy has been deprived

of all Temporal Power, and that this power has been transferred to the King of Italy, the ally and friend of England?

What does the granting of such precedence involve? Cardinal Manning is a Prince of the Court of Rome, and holds his foreign title and rank of Cardinal by appointment of the Pope. The Archbishops and Bishops of the Romish Church hold their territorial titles and rank by the same authority. Such territorial titles are declared by the statute law of this country to be illegal; and, further, according to the laws and constitution of Great Britain, a title given by a foreign potentate to a citizen of the realm cannot be lawfully assumed, much less can it be held as carrying precedence or rank, unless express permission to that effect has been obtained from the Crown. If Cardinal Manning, in consideration of his foreign title of Cardinal Prince of the Court of Rome, is to take rank next after the Royal family, and if the Romish Archbishops of Dublin, holding such territorial titles by Papal appointment, are to be ranked above the highest dignitaries and nobility of the realm, then it follows that all Romish ecclesiastics must be *graded* according to the rank and title given them by their Head at Rome. Cardinal Manning and the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops have sworn at their consecration: 'From this time forward I will be faithful and obedient to our Lord the Pope and his successors. . . . Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our Lord, or to the aforesaid successors as far as possible, I shall persecute and attack.' Is this an oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, or such as to justify the recognition of the foreign title and rank of these prelates? And it may further be asked, how far does such recognition acknowledge the supremacy and authority of the Pope in the United Kingdom?

At the coronation of the Sovereign of this realm the oath taken by the King or Queen is that he or she 'will, to the utmost of his or her power, maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law.' By the Thirty-second of the Articles of Religion it is further affirmed that the King or Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in the realm, and that the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in the realm of England. Cardinal Manning claims to be a Prince of the Court of Rome, a member of the College of Cardinals; one of whom, in the event of a vacancy, must be selected as the rightful heir to the Papal throne. The Cardinal is the emissary of a foreign Power, a Power which has been for centuries notoriously fomenting 'sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion' in this and many other lands. By Romish Canon Law it is declared (*Bull Super Soliditate*) that 'the Pope has an indirect power over all Kingdoms,' and that 'he can deprive kings of their empires and subjects of their allegiance.' This same Canon Law (*Bull Cana Domini*), be it remembered, excommunicates all Protestants as accursed heretics. Neither should we forget that in bygone days the Cardinals were Princes of the Roman Empire, and in that capacity took rank and pre-eminence, even among the members of Imperial and Royal families.

How is it that no information was given at the time that Mr. Gladstone's Government, with the full concurrence of Lord Salisbury, had agreed to recognize the rank of Cardinals as such Princes of the Court of Rome? The Lord Mayor authoritatively makes this assertion. Will Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury contradict it? And if not, we venture to ask, in the words of the protest of the Protestant Alliance: 'Is such recognition consonant with the duties that Ministers owe to the State, or can it be reconciled with the principles on which the constitution, the greatness, and the safety of this Protestant Empire are founded? Will such an alliance with the Papacy bring a blessing upon the cause which it is sought to advance? Or is such a course consistent with a right sense