

in regard to religious matters, but also to indicate to the faithful the best means of attaining the spiritual ends in view."

With the bishops claiming the sole right to define what falls under their authority and what does not, how can it be denied that the rule they seek is sovereign? No body of laymen dare define the limits of their power, no Parliament question their right to dictate what it should do. Wherever the Church of Rome has a free field, it becomes supreme. Remove the check upon her claims in Ireland, afforded by union with Scotland and England, and her bishops will get the mastery, the Dublin Parliament will be their creature, judges and Courts will enforce the decrees of canonical tribunals—the supreme object not the welfare of the people, but the enriching, the aggrandising of the Papacy. Home Rulers scoff at such assertions as the outcome of ignorance and prejudice. I have heard Catholics on platform and hustings make profession of the widest tolerance, the most ardent attachment to the principles of civil and religious freedom as embodied in the British Constitution, yet who, when they had become members of Parliament or been elevated to the Bench, stultified their words. I do not say these men were insincere, that they were seeking support under false pretences; far from it; I am assured they felt as they spoke. Conditions changed with them when they came to fill official positions, and they learned that not their will, but that of their Church was to prevail, and I pitied instead of blaming them, for I knew they were doing what they would not do had they been left to themselves. The danger of Sacerdotalism is not realised in this regard. If you, my reader, were convinced that one of your fellow-men was endowed with rare spiritual power, that he was the medium through whom God spoke His will and Christ conveyed His benefits, that this man held the keys that would ensure your salvation, and

was your Divinely-appointed guide, you would have to accept the counsels of that man without reserve. Indeed, you would count it as an act of merit to stifle your own inclinations and yield him implicit obedience. Individual responsibility is loosened, and not God, but a fellow-mortal is made master of the conscience. When a Catholic occupies a place where he holds the destiny of his country in his hand, he is not free to act according to his judgment, for when an order comes from the bishop's palace he will obey it, no matter how distasteful. The loyalists of Ireland should keep this in mind, that in respect to the Home Rulers they are not dealing with men standing on the same plane as themselves, men able to make good their promises, but with men who have given the control of their wills into the hands of a select caste, and whom they have either to obey or be pronounced by them anathema. It is possible to live with Catholics not only in peace, but in warm friendship, to exchange neighbourly kindnesses, and abide together in growing mutual respect, but it does not do to give them, without sufficient check, the government of those who are of another creed, for the simple and perfectly intelligible reason, that they will not govern according to their individual judgment. Their Church will take the reins and rule through them. In the case of Ireland, Union with Great Britain is the sufficient check, and that check the Unionists are justified in fighting to maintain to the last gasp.

### THE USELESSNESS OF GUARANTEES.

One of the prominent men of the Confederation era was Sir Alexander Tulloch Galt, distinguished alike for ability and character, the best Finance Minister Canada has known. His home was in the Province of Quebec, and he knew its people as only a resident can. When the proposal was made to separate the two Provinces, giving