

the dominant Church would not have the slightest chance of success even in nominally Protestant constituencies. The rule of the Church is an iron absolutism, under whose withering influence all those attributes of freedom which Britons claim become shadows.

It may be argued that while the Papacy acts thus in the Province of Quebec, there can be no danger of its ever obtaining the same supremacy in Ireland—that conditions are different, that Catholic Irishmen would not have a Parliament dictated to by clerics, or hand over any of its administrative functions to the bishops; that they would not allow canon law to be placed above civil law, or the King's judges to sink so low as to be the servants of ecclesiastical courts in executing its decrees. This is equivalent to alleging that the relations of Catholics towards their Church differs according to nationality, that what the French Canadian bows his neck to in Quebec is no ground for saying that Catholic Irishmen would do the same in the Green Isle. Does the Papacy not exact the same obedience, exterior conditions being the same, from her people wherever they may live? Has she one rule for Quebec and another for Ireland? It is not what laymen like Redmond say, but what their Church says, what it demands, and what it acts where it has the power. All such argument is unnecessary, however, for the point has never been settled by actual demonstration. There has never been a Quebec Legislature that did not include Irish Catholics, there has never been a period when there was not one or more Irish Catholics on the Quebec bench. Comparing them with French Canadians, the Irish Catholic members and judges were the more servile to the priesthood. The experience of Quebec will be Ireland's should it submit to bring into existence a Parliament in College Green.

## THE POWER OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

### IV.

When in a country the majority of whose inhabitants are Catholics the bishops obtain control of the Legislature, they draw heavily on the public purse. Professing to represent Christ, they demand as a right support for what they deem necessary for the maintenance of His cause. It has already been shown that, under the name of education, they draw £80,000 a year from the Quebec Treasury. In the name of charity, £7,000 is divided among 130 convents. Under the pretence that they maintain classes for teaching farming, seven monastic Orders have £3,000 divided among them each year. One of the Orders which draws a subsidy for teaching agriculture is the Trappists, whose rule of silence and maceration of the flesh is an outrage on humanity. Over a thousand convents and monasteries receive yearly subsidies from the public chest under the heads education, charity, or agriculture. Not only has the Legislature handed over the education of the rising generation to the Church of Rome, but the care of the insane. Two Orders of nuns receive yearly for that purpose £70,000. To male Orders £12,000 goes yearly for reformatories. The objection that lies on the surface, that paying public money to support monastic institutions is an outrage on the conscience of those who disapprove of such institutions, can be seconded by considerations of another nature. For instance, the Legislature loses all control over their management. Suggestions as to improvements in methods are resented as impious attacks inspired by bigotry. The accidental visit of two English doctors to the largest asylum revealed that the nuns were treating the insane as they were treated in France a century ago. A Government that gives over