

Suddenly a huge cross of electric lights flashed into sight as if by magic to mark the spot where the Pope's delegate was reciting the prescribed service. As he viewed the hillside black with kneeling forms he must have realised how, by crafty Constitutional changes, a British colony can be transformed into a Papal appanage, and find confirmation for the words he uttered at a meeting of the Congress—"Why should I not express this hope? Am I not permitted to evoke the wish that this nation, daughter of France, which was called New France, the Canadian nation, I say, may give to Jesus in the Eucharist an incomparable triumph and obtain the Divine clemency for this country."

Of the theological side of the Congress it is not my place to speak here—the numerous papers read, addresses, sermons, symposia, to magnify the Eucharist—I confine myself to its secular aspect, its bearing on civil rights. Let Unionists note this—that among the most active, the most prominent in taking advantage of the public positions to which they had been called, whether municipal or Parliamentary, to magnify the Papal cause, to give it all the authority their official position could bestow, and to appropriate the taxpayers' money to defray its expenses, were Irish Catholics—the Guérins, Dohertys, Murphys, M'Shanes, O'Connells, Purcells, &c.—men who subscribe when Redmond and Tay Pay come begging, and tell the men of Ulster they have nothing to fear from Home Rule.

When Quebec was united with Ontario such a demonstration would have been impossible. Forty-five years of Home Rule explains how it came to be possible. Such a Congress could not be held in Belfast to-day. Let Ulster be torn from the protection of Britain, and in forty-five years every feature of the assemblage at Montreal can be reproduced in its capital.

THE NEED FOR CAUTION. VI.

The man who wishes to think well of his fellows, the man who holds the world is growing better, wants to believe there has been a change in the Church of Rome, that it is not what it was in past history, that there is no longer cause to fear its predominance. To invoke the record of the seventeenth or eighteenth century as applicable to the twentieth, such a man makes light of. Times have changed, the Church has changed; there is no longer any risk, he says, in giving its priesthood a free hand. The experience of Quebec contradicts that, and investigation will prove that, from the very nature of the Papacy, in whatever country it obtains sovereign power, government by the people and for the people becomes impossible. This is why? The Papacy asserts it is a perfect society, drawing its authority directly from God and that it represents Christ upon earth. It stands above all secular governments, and all other Churches are pretenders. The charge that the Papacy claims to be superior to all secular authority is often met by the assertion that there is a limitation, that it is only in the Church's allotted sphere it asserts its supremacy. I am not going back to dusty times to quote the letters of Popes or the dictums of theologians to disprove this. Enough for me the declaration of the Canadian hierarchy in their Pastoral Letter of 1896—"If the bishops, whose authority issues from God Himself, are the natural judges of all questions which touch upon the Christian faith and morals; if they are the acknowledged heads of a perfect condition of society, sovereign in itself and standing above that of the State, it follows that it is in their province, when circumstances render it desirable, not merely to express generally their views and wishes