

are not a dead issue or an old controversy. This is certainly not the view entertained by those who framed its decrees. The language is to them plain, intensely important, and turned to practical account, acted upon in the most direct manner. Bishop Bourget, of Montreal, for example, carries out the judgment of the Council in his Pastoral of May 5, 1875, when he says, "We have first told you, our very dear brethren, with the full liberty accorded us by the sacred Ministry which we exercise, who are the candidates for whom you ought to vote on account of their good principles. We will now instruct you as to who are those who do not merit your confidence.

Assuredly, our very dear brethren, those do not deserve your suffrages, who show themselves hostile to religion and to the divine principles which it teaches; who advance and maintain in their speeches and writings, errors which the Church condemns; who in order to secure their election at all costs make use of corruption, lies, frauds and the excess of intemperance; who refuse their Cures the right to give instructions with regard to the conscientious duties devolving upon the candidates as well as the electors, pretending that they ought not in any way to mix themselves up with elections; who would have the Church separated from the State; who support doctrines which are condemned by the Syllabus; who oppose all intervention of the Pope, Bishop or Priests in the affairs of the Governments, as if these Governments were not subject to the principles that God has revealed to the Church for the good government of the people; who presume to teach that the Church has nothing to do with political questions, and that she errs when she meddles with them; who criticise and blame the Pastorals of the Bishops and the instructions of Pastors relative to elections; who in spite of their protestations in favour of religion, effectually favour and openly praise the papers, books and associations of men which the Church condemns," etc., etc.

— Thus the Bishop assumes the right to control elections, and recent events show conclusively that he is not alone in this conviction. His action in the notorious Guibord case is also most significant as to what he conceives to be his functions and those of the Church in relation to civil law. In its strictly religious aspect, this case was utterly destitute of interest to Protestants. We could feel in no way anxious to compel the celebration of certain superstitious burial rites known to be unscriptural. But in its civil aspect this case involved momentous issues, both to Catholics and Protestants. With respect to the former, the question was, shall the Church be allowed to enact Canons and Laws, and to place her people under them, and then, in defiance of all civil authority and solely at the instance of her caprice, to disregard these canons and laws in order to doom persons claiming and exercising personal freedom, to perpetual disgrace and infamy? With regard to all, the question was: shall the Civil Authorities of the Land and of the British Empire be supreme or must they submit to Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction?

This was a momentous issue; and the decision of the Privy Council, delivered Nov. 21, 1874, was adverse to the pretensions of the Bishop and the Church, and had, as is well known, to be carried out by military force. The spirit which rendered it necessary that the Queen's mandate should be enforced in this manner, and that the body of Joseph Guibord after five years' delay and litigation should be interred by armed men, cannot be mistaken. The *London Times* referring to this event, remarked:—

"Lower Canada, the scene of the quarrel, is noted for the tenacity with