

in a pastoral letter dated January 12, 1901, thus stated the claim of his Church—

"The Church, a complete society, which has received from Jesus Christ all power for the government of its members; if it judges expedient, it subordinates the validity of marriage to certain conditions relative to the contracting parties, or to certain exterior formalities, and can in consequence, declare null all marriages contracted outside of these conditions or without these formalities. . . . The State cannot establish invalidating impediments to marriage between Christians, neither can it grant dispensation from impediments established by the Church."

### NO COMMUNICATION WITH HERETICS.

The decree of the Fifth Council of Quebec reads—

"Catholics, unworthy of the name, dare sometimes to present themselves before heretic ministers, in the capacity of ministers of religion, to contract marriage. Therefore, we warn all the faithful of this province that it is a mortal sin, an enormous scandal, a kind of apostasy, to communicate thus, in Divine things, with heretics, in the affairs of the Church."

An inevitable consequence of Home Rule will be that the validity of the marriage tie will be made dependent on the requirements of canon law. When Quebec was united to Ontario there was no pretension that the King's Courts were inferior to ecclesiastical Courts. Withdraw the Green Isle from the protecting arm of Great Britain and what is now done in Quebec will be done in Ireland. civil law will be subordinated to canonical law, and the Judges on the bench give secular effect to decrees passed in the chambers of Episcopal palaces.

Take another illustration from a different sphere of life. There were newspapers which

expressed disapproval of the subserviency shown to the new claims set up by the bishops. This brought out the novelty of the ban. The offended bishop would issue a pastoral letter commanding his people neither to buy, read, nor keep in their houses the newspaper he condemned. In a Catholic country this was a serious matter even to a professedly Protestant paper. Catholic papers had to suspend or make their peace on humiliating terms. At last one newspaper resolved to appeal to the courts to find out whether there was no redress for ruining a legitimate business, and entered an action for damages against the bishop. Testimony was produced that what had been alleged in the columns of the newspaper was true, that the bishop had condemned it without hearing what its proprietors had to say in defence, and that, as a result of the ban, their business had been ruined. The answer of the bishop was that he had acted within his canonical right, and in the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions he was not amenable to civil courts. The Judge upheld this contention. The newspaper appealed to a Higher Court, but in vain, the decision of the lower being confirmed. The newspaper owners retired beggared from loss of their property and law costs. Ever since there has been no opposition to the exercise of the ban. When pronounced against a newspaper it disappears. The result is, that the Press of Quebec is the most servile on the American Continent. With one honourable exception, that of the "Montreal Witness," it fawns upon the priesthood with fulsome deference. A free Press has become an impossibility in Quebec; it will be the same in Ireland should the restraining hand of England and Scotland be withdrawn.

Where there is not freedom of the Press there is not freedom of speech. A candidate for Parliamentary honours or for any public office who spoke his mind regarding