

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Author of "Missions of Modern India."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and Montreal—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rules of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and should reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Advance must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., August 2nd, 1890.

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

In a special manner does Divine Providence guide the Catholic Church, else she would not exist to day with her vitality unimpaired, but would long since, as human institutions, have fallen a prey to the ravages of men and time. She, as her Divine Founder, commenced her career amongst men in abject poverty. Her chief pastors had the independence of martyrdom only, and possessed no other riches save the wealth of Catholic hearts who recognized them as the Vicar of Christ. Centuries elapse, and the successors of St. Peter wield the sceptre over a grateful and united people, and the crown of thorns, ever piercing their brows, is consecrated by a kingly diadem. How this was brought about by Divine Providence may well be the subject of an interesting and instructive dissertation. We will first consider how the way was paved for the temporal power and how the Pope, not by usurpation, nor by effusion of blood, but by the unanimous voice of a grateful people, acquired sovereign authority.

To regenerate mankind Christ, the only Son of God, came upon earth and assumed human nature. For thirty years He lived in seclusion at Nazareth. He then came out of His retirement and announced His doctrine to the world. To prove that He was no self-deluded enthusiast, as some modern writers assert, but was God, as He proclaimed Himself to be, He wrought many and astounding miracles. At His call twelve fishermen of Galilee ranged themselves around Him. One of them, Peter, was appointed chief of the Apostolic college. On him Christ built His Church, that it might preserve its unity, and that the faithful of all generations might ever have an unerring guide in matters of faith and morals. He enriched him and his successors with the gift of infallibility. Our Divine Saviour commissioned the Apostles to convert a world given over to every species of degradation, "to be the instruments of the mightiest moral revolution that has ever taken place in the annals of time." Well might they—poor unlettered men, destitute of every element that the world considers necessary for success—have shrunk from the task. But they have implicit faith in the words of their Master: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world," and they enter upon their work full of confidence and courage, bearing an only weapon to withstand the onslaughts of their enemies—the cross. St. Peter advanced towards Rome, where, under a divine guidance, he was to fix his seat. Owning nothing save his faith, he entered and saw for the first time the city of the masters of the world. He beheld about him tokens of a vigorous power, grown up into a definite establishment, formed and matured in its religion, its laws, its civil traditions, through the history of many centuries. He beheld a nation hallowed in its obsequies, and the impulse of disordered passions. And, with cross in hand, he proclaimed the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth. "Be merciful," he said to Roman lords who valued the lives of their slaves as men value the meanness of money. "Be pure," he said to Roman matrons who scrupled little of violating the most sacred obligations of wife and mother. "Renounce the worship of your false gods, and give place in your hearts, laid waste by stormy passions, for the reign of the 'Prince of Peace.'" The Roman world laughed at the audacity of St. Peter. But when it saw "the fisherman of Galilee," "the follower of One Crucified," as they contemptuously styled him, winning men to the new gospel, it arose in all its strength to crush the daring Apostle. All the mighty forces of a great empire were exerted to annihilate the Christian name. "Every element of pagan society was leagued against the cross." For three centuries was the sword unsheathed against the Church. Even the men of letters had no better way of counting popular favor than by the dissemination of atrocious calumnies against the Christians, and men believed whatever was laid to their charge,

just as in the present day thousands of persons, well-informed in most respects, will, without examination, believe whatever absurdity is uttered against Catholics. In contemplating the sufferings of the early Church we may ask why God did not enthrone His Church in majesty and splendor and give to St. Peter that power necessary for his independence? God willed that His Church should pass through the ordeal of ten persecutions, to show the world that her propagation was not the work of any human power. Her supreme Pontiff, were the victims of violence and injustice, that men might understand how necessary it was that the Father of Christendom should be placed in a position which secured his independence. God, indeed, might, in the beginning have bestowed on the Pope the attributes of kingly power, and restrained the tyranny of the rulers of this world, but this would not have been in accordance with the usual laws of His government, God, having seen fit in His general providence, to act by ordinary means, even for the accomplishment of supernatural ends. The waves of three centuries of persecution rolled with irresistible fury over the infant Church. But God's hands were slowly and surely paving the way for the temporal power. At the end of the tenth persecution the Roman Empire was disputed among several competitors. Constantine, a wise and liberal prince, aspired to the coveted honor. Marcellinus, a tyrant sullied with every vice, desired also to ascend the imperial throne, and avowed himself ready to support his claim by force of arms. Constantine, who commanded an army far inferior in number to that of his opponent, earnestly besought the assistance of the true God, and the Almighty heard his prayer, as He hears every prayer that comes from a sincere and upright heart. As he was marching into Italy he saw in the sky, just over the sun, a luminous cross with the following inscription: "In this Conquer." His army, as well as himself, beheld the prodigy. Having for a standard a cross, he confidently entered the conflict, and came out of it triumphant and master of the Roman Empire. The Church was then raised from the depth of persecution to the height of honor. Magnificent temples sprang up in every quarter, and liberty of worship was proclaimed throughout the land. You will say that the victory over idolatry was complete. Yes, by the defeat of Maxentius idolatry received its death blow; but a great many Romans, pampered in luxury and debased by vice, could not brook the severe maxims of the gospel, and remained obstinate pagans. God, however, was preparing avengers to punish the sins of the guilty city. The barbarians of the North swept down, year after year, one band after another, upon the rich and attractive Province of the Empire. The Goths, the Vandals, each in their turn, drove back the Roman legions, who, at this time, were shadows of their warlike ancestors, and made Rome a wilderness of ruins. The characteristic of all these invasions is that they seemed to be directed against pagan Rome. The churches were spared, when the temples of the false gods were overthrown. Gradually a new Rome had been rising by the side of her haughty rival, and so, when pagan Rome went down before the barbarians, the Rome of the Popes—the Rome which St. Peter had founded five hundred years before—survived the common ruin. Do you not see in all this the workings of that Divine Providence which "recretheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things wisely." By what reason can we explain why Constantine did not make Rome his place of abode, but took for his capital Constantinople on the banks of the Bosphorus? True, there was also an Emperor of the West, but none of them made Rome their place of residence. Various reasons are assigned. The true reason is that God kept them away; for, otherwise, it would have seemed natural that they should make the most glorious, as well as the most delightful, city of their dominions their principal abode. He foresaw that if the imperial power chose Rome as its principal city, the spiritual power which He had there established would enjoy but a precarious independence. A way then from the Eternal City lived the Emperors, so that the Pope might, without interference of the civil power, preside over the destinies of the Church of Christ.

Let us now enquire how the Popes became possessed of the temporal power. You have doubtless heard that it was the fruit of usurpation—that the Popes, by manifold craft and cunning, wrested it from the Emperors of Constantinople. A slight study of the real historical facts of the case will convince us that the Pope's title to his temporal domain is as pure and stainless as the ermine which borders his robes of office. Making abstraction from the fact that the early Christians, as the Acts of the Apostles tell us, sold their houses and lands and laid the price of them at the feet of the Apostles, let us examine how the influence of the Roman Pontiff was merged, by force of circumstances, into sovereignty. After the departure of Constantine the Romans remained sub-

ject to the Emperor of Constantinople, who governed them through an Exarch, residing at Ravenna. This Exarch, or Lieutenant Governor, was generally distinguished for rapacity, and used his power to oppress, or, in the words of an historian of these times, "to suck the very blood from the veins of the Italians." Italy was overrun by barbarians, and yet this officer saw with an eye of indifference the provinces he was sworn to defend laid waste by fire and sword and the people entrusted to his care led away into captivity. In vain did they appeal to the Emperor for succor. In vain did the Pope send letter after letter year after year urging them to protect their dominions. All was unavailing. The Roman people, reduced to such a state of misery and desolation, supplicated the Roman Pontiff, who, more than once, had stemmed the tide of barbaric invasion, to protect them from the fierce invader. It was then that the Pope really took their stand among the kings of the world. Then it was that the inhabitants of Rome, beset by enemies, and deserted by their rulers, transferred their allegiance to the Roman Pontiff. The justice of such a transfer cannot for an instant be called into doubt. Had not the people a right to transfer their allegiance to one who was willing to protect their liberties? The cruel Emperors of the East, by coniving at the tyranny of their chief officer, and by basely refusing to succor their subjects in their hour of need, had forfeited every claim to their loyalty; for it must be remembered that if subjects owe obedience and fidelity rulers owe protection, and if they cannot afford that protection they are bound to allow their subjects to take measures for their own safety. In 754 an event occurred which established the temporal power on a sure and lasting basis. The king of the Lombards, a fierce and unscrupulous savage, called Astolphus, invaded Italy, threatening the Romans with universal slaughter unless they submitted. In this great peril Pope Stephen earnestly besought the Emperor of Constantinople to take measures for the safety of the Italians. But his appeal, as in the preceding years, awakens no feeling of compassion in a heart grown callous to everything but sensual gratifications. Pope Stephen, seeing that no time was to be lost, crossed the Alps, and, despite the treacherous Lombards, arrived safely at Paris, where he prevailed upon the king of France to put the blood and treasure of his people at the service of the Romans. The pious king instantly set out for Italy, defeated the Lombards, and placed Pope Stephen at the head of the conquered Province. Charlemagne augmented the temporal domain by the donation of some additional territory. What can we find to censure in the conduct of the illustrious sovereigns? It is a principle of jurisprudence that a country conquered in a just war is at the disposal of the conquerors. The French kings wrested the Province from the hands of the Lombards, and bestowed them on the successor of St. Peter; but sanctioned the free choice of a people whom they had redeemed from slavery.

TO BE CONTINUED.

THE NEW ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN CREED.

The new creed of the Presbyterian Church of England which was recently adopted has not given universal satisfaction. The new articles of faith are certainly very different from and incompatible with the Westminster Confession, yet the latter is still retained as the Confession of Faith to which the Church adheres. The inference which many draw from this is that the Church has one set of doctrines for her own use and another set more in accordance with the general belief of Christians, which she sets before the world as her belief. It has been asserted by some Presbyterian writers that the Church has deliberately prepared the articles for the purpose of attracting those who were repelled by the repulsive features of Calvinism, which are so strongly set forth in the Confession.

The doctrine, which is variously known as pretension or reprobation, is not found among the new articles, though the Confession proclaims it in the following terms: "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." The new articles, though they seem to be purposely obscure on this point, appear to be intended to convey the idea that the Church believes that the offer of salvation is made to all men, and that it is within the power of every one "through the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit" to repent and believe the gospel and to confess and forsake his sins, and thus obtain free pardon on the ground of Christ's atoning sacrifice. The articles are certainly ingeniously worded, but ingenuity may be carried to excess. The object of the ingenious wording seems to have been, in the present case, to produce a "creed so

ambiguous that Protestants of almost any of the forms of belief commonly called Evangelical might imagine that their own views are expressed in them. It was certainly not the purpose of our Lord, when He commissioned His Apostles to teach all nations "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," that they should conceal His teachings under an ingeniously ambiguous form of words; and the Councils of the Catholic Church, from that of Nice in A. D. 325, down to that of the Vatican in 1870, have always aimed at discovering a form of words which could not be misunderstood or misinterpreted, rather than to utter ambiguities under pretence of promulgating the real doctrines of Christianity. That the Fathers of Nice desired to assert clearly Christ's divinity, against the Arians, is evident from the unmistakable manner in which they proclaimed this doctrine.

It was the aim of Arius to appear to believe the doctrine of all antiquity, and for this purpose he was willing to employ forms of expression which had been used by those who were truly orthodox, but, by distorting these expressions and giving to them a meaning which they were not intended to convey, he endeavored to make it appear that they did not actually imply Christ's divinity and His equality with the Father. It was for this reason that the Fathers of the Council of Nice prepared a formula which all the efforts of ancient and modern Arians have not been able to misinterpret, and later Councils of the Church have spoken with equal clearness in defining doctrines of faith.

The purpose of the Presbyterian Assembly differs in this respect: from that of the Councils of the Catholic Church, and by an ingenious use of the pronouns *us, us, etc.*, it has made it absolutely impossible to tell whether Christ's death was intended to benefit all men, or only the few who are Presbyterians, or the elect. The Presbyteries of the Church have also under consideration the question of revising the Directory of Public Worship. The principal objection which seems to have weight in influencing the movement for a change in this is that the liturgy now in use resembles too closely that of the Church of England, and in the London Presbytery it was freely stated the liturgy of the Church of England is spreading the leaven of Romish doctrines through the kingdom. If there were no Romanism for the ministers to abuse it would appear that they would have nothing to guide them, either as to what they should believe or what they should practice. They owe to what they are pleased to term "Romanism" a debt of gratitude which they are very slow to acknowledge.

POLITICAL PREACHERS.

The Rev. Dr. Hunter, who is one of the most extreme fanatics of the Province, has recently been following the example of his politico-religious brother, the Rev. Dr. Carman, by devoting his pulpit to the treatment of political questions instead of to preaching the word of God, which some people are still old-fashioned enough to think ought to be the subject treated of in the pulpit of a Christian church on Sunday evenings. We find the sermon reported in the Canadian Nation of the 3rd inst.

The doctor seems to have had a remote suspicion that he was out of place with his political harangue, and he gave the following defence of his course: "I have a right to criticize anything and everything the moment it touches the question of right and wrong. Here I stand, and I put God's measure, the golden rule of the sanctuary, on your politics, your commerce, your amusements, and I am not meddling. Nothing is good for the individual, nothing is good for the country, that is not right. And I am not going out of my profession. I am not going one step beyond it in meddling with these things. I have a right to deal with them. Not because I am a minister. Not because I have been ordained, but because I am a citizen; because I am a man; because I undertake to judge by the law of God, by the law of everlasting rectitude."

Certainly we do not deny that every citizen has the right to deal with the political questions of the Province, whether he be priest, minister, or layman, yet when clergymen descend to the practices of strife and contention which usually characterize the word politician, and which, by the way, even crept into the general Methodist Conference held last year in New York, they degrade the Church to which they belong. Besides, citizens generally do not claim to have the right to deal with such subjects in the pulpit, and to choose Sunday evening, when they have before them a congregation assembled to listen to God's word, as a fit occasion for disquisitions on such subjects as the Rev. Dr. Hunter dealt with.

Dr. Hunter belongs to a sect which professes to entertain a great horror for any "desecration of the Sabbath." Would he not have been more in accord with his subject, and with his meretricious manner of dealing with it, if he had delivered it on the twelfth of July on an Orange platform? But this meddling fanatic covers his in-

appropriate essay on Canadian politics by giving it a religious coloring forsooth. And what is religion in his estimation? Is it the doctrine of peace and good-will to men? or of charity towards all mankind? Not at all. The religion he introduces into his politics is a tissue of falsehoods against his Catholic fellow-citizens, and the politicians who rule the ship of State. And this is his excuse for bringing politics into his pulpit. He says:

"When you say that clergymen have no right to meddle with public affairs, if you mean class clergy you are right. But these are the very clergy who do meddle with public affairs. They drive their people to the polls like sheep and tell them whom to vote for."

To whom does the master in Israel allude thus covertly? He tells us in his next sentence:

"No Protestant clergyman tries to do that."

His meaning is, therefore, that the Catholic clergy have unduly exercised influence in driving their flocks to the polls. He is guilty of deliberate falsehood in making such an assertion, but from Dr. Hunter we could expect nothing else. The leopard does not change its spots at will. Even at the last elections, when the very existence of Catholic rights was the main issue at the polls, we believe it cannot be asserted that a single Catholic priest in Ontario made use of his position to influence votes as Dr. Hunter did before the same elections; and we must look upon his desecration of his church, if it be capable of desecration, as like the whining of a whipped cur, because of the collapse of the Equal Rights fanatics, of whose cause the Dr. constituted himself the champion.

It is equally false that no Protestant minister attempted to drive their flocks of sheep to the polls to vote in accordance with their will. It is notorious that Alderman Moss's meetings in Toronto were composed of persons in great proportion, and that the Rev. Messrs. Austin, Orme, Caven, Fulton, Wild, Sutherland, Laing, Carman, Hunter and others did scarcely anything else than preach politics for months before the contest came off. It will not readily be forgotten that Dr. Carman had to be snubbed by the Methodist Conference for his unseemly preaching of politics in presence of the Conference the very evening before the election.

We have said that we believe the like was not done by a single priest in Ontario. We are aware that the Equal Rights organs, such as the Toronto Mail, declared that public prayers were offered up or sermons preached in the Catholic churches throughout Ontario to ensure the success of one of the political parties, and that the same assertion was repeated by an anonymous, and therefore cowardly, scribbler calling himself Gnaeus; but the assertion was simply one of the many falsehoods by which these parties made themselves conspicuous.

We repeat what we have before stated, that the Catholics of Ontario were able of themselves to judge of the principles of the men who presented themselves before them for election, and they voted accordingly. In a few cases some of the newspapers accused priests specifically of having made political sermons, but in every instance they had to eat their words. Dr. Hunter also attacks the Separate school system, and wishes it to be abolished. And what would he have in mind? He would rob Catholics who are willing to educate their own children, by making them pay a second tax for educating those of other people. Such is the honesty which he teaches in his pulpit, under pretence that "he judges by the law of God and the law of everlasting rectitude."

We have had enough of such hypocritical cant. We have said that Dr. Hunter believes also the political leaders of the country. He says: "The two great political parties of this Dominion are vying with each other in their subservency to a hierarchy that holds in its hand the corporate vote of a Church which claims superiority over the State, etc." This subservency is merely Dr. Hunter's dream. It supposes that Catholics have received favors to which they are not entitled, which is contrary to truth. Catholics have neither asked nor received any such favors.

"CHRISTIAN UNION."

The great change which has recently taken place in prevalent Protestant opinion on the nature of the unity of the Church of Christ is highly illustrative of the mutability of the whole system, and consequently of the fundamental error upon which it is based; for truth is immutable, whereas error changes its teachings according to present circumstances.

This question is still violently agitating the Protestant community, more, perhaps, in Canada than elsewhere. It has been a common theory held by Protestants that the unity which should exist in the Church of Christ is simply a unity of membership in an invisible Church which acknowledges Christ for its Head, and through Christ expects salvation. In vain, as far as these theorists are concerned, has it been

pointed out by Catholics that Christ established on earth a visible Church which teaches everywhere the same doctrine, and recognises one visible head. We have been told that neither is it necessary that the Church should hold the same doctrines at all times, nor in all places, and that the claim of St. Peter's successor to be the divinely appointed supreme head of the Church on earth is a mere usurpation which destroys the liberty of individuals to believe and practice what seems good to each one.

The movement towards a union of several Protestant denominations appears to have changed entirely the views of those who maintained that only a general faith in Christ as our Redeemer is requisite to make a good Christian. It is now acknowledged by Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian ministers alike that the intention of Christ in instituting a Church was that it should be one body. We have seen many examples recently of how this view is gaining ground, but we shall merely quote here the words of Rev. Mr. Carry to this effect. Mr. Carry is at present engaged in writing a series of letters which are intended to foster the movement which proposes to unite the various Protestant denominations. He is speaking of the passage in Ephesians, iv. 3, 6, wherein St. Paul exhorts the Church at Ephesus to "endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." The Apostle continues: "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in the hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in you all."

Rev. Mr. Carry says:

"It is indisputable that the Apostle does not think here of any such thing as the unity of an invisible Church. The maintenance of that mysterious unity wrought by the might of the spirit of God in bringing into one communion and fellowship in the visible Church men of different nations and manners he insists on as a present and urgent duty, and this unity, he implies, may be lost or injured without our 'endeavoring to keep' it, or, as in the revised version, 'giving diligence.'"

Concerning the theory of an invisible Church, Mr. Carry says:

"I must notice a certain view which is frequently urged, and which seems calculated, if not sometimes designed, to discourage the rising desire for unity and repress the zeal of its promoters. . . . It is urged we already have unity, as all good Christians are one in the membership of an invisible Church; and therefore any other unity is to be held of small or of no consequence, or actually to be deprecated."

As we have seen above Rev. Mr. Carry strongly repudiates this view, and he quotes against it several leading and prominent Protestants, among whom is John Calvin himself. Yet it is a doctrine which was invented for the express purpose of showing that Protestantism possesses two marks which in the Nicene Creed are attributed to the Church of Christ—Unity and Catholicity.

Rev. Mr. Carry is undoubtedly correct in saying the unity which is spoken of by the Apostle in the above passage is a visible unity of a visible Church. But Mr. Carry, in common with the rest of the negotiators for bringing about a union of Protestant sects, closes his eyes against an essential feature of the unity which Holy Scripture attributes to the Church. The very text with which he is dealing exhibits the Church as having one faith, and the 14th verse immediately following the passage he quotes declares that the purpose for which the Church has been established by Christ is "that henceforth we be no more children carried to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men;" and it is for this purpose that a hierarchy of "some Apostles and some prophets and other some evangelists and other some pastors and doctors" has been given by Christ. (verse 11.)

This as well as numerous other passages in Holy Writ points out that the Church is not only a visible organization, but that it is a teaching body, exercising authority to repress error and make law. This is similarly expressed when our Lord directs that when an offending brother cannot be corrected by private reproof and advice, we must "tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican."

It is well recognized that the Methodists, Anglicans and Presbyterians, if they unite at all, will do so, not on the basis of truth, but on a compromise of doctrine. To this all the negotiations which are going on tend. The Anglicans are not disposed to give up what they call "the historic Episcopate," which is claimed to be of divine institution, and the only medium through which ordinations to the ministry can be made. The Presbyterians are equally firm to the principle that every Presbyter is a full fledged Bishop, and their clergy will not submit to be re-ordained by the "historic Episcopate" lest they thereby acknowledge that their Church has taught error for two or three hundred years. On this point the Methodists will naturally go with the Presbyterians, for though some

Bishops they certainly have none except such as were made by ministerial election. John Wesley, indeed, professed to make a bishop by laying hands on Mr. Cope, but no one pretends that he was himself a bishop.

It is therefore necessary for Methodists, equally with Presbyterians, for mere consistency's sake, to maintain that Apostolical episcopal succession is unnecessary, and they do so accordingly.

There are other substantial doctrinal differences between these denominations, and it is evident that to effect a union one of two courses must be adopted. They must either effect a compromise of doctrine, or they must agree to what they themselves call a Confederation which will tolerate diversity on the most essential doctrines of Christian Revelation. It is the latter alternative which meets with most favor. But, without ill-feeling against our Protestant fellow citizens, we feel ourselves under the obligation to tell them that such a patching up of irreconcilable Churches into one confederate Church can never constitute the Church of Christ. From the nature of Christ's Church, as an organized body, established by Him from the beginning to correct and suppress error, itself could never fall into error, and the error must always be where there is a refusal to submit to the authority of the always existing Church which has lasted since the days of the Apostles, the Catholic Church, which alone preserves succession from the Apostles. The confederate Church proposed by the advocates of union can never make itself the Church of Christ, because its component parts differ so radically from each other that neither altogether nor separately can they themselves claim this title.

THE QUEEN AND THE JESUITS.

The official correspondence between His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla and Sir J. L. A. Simmons, ambassador and plenipotentiary at Rome, has been published by an order of Her Majesty and laid before both Houses of the British Parliament. By written instruction, dated at the Foreign Office, August 1st, 1889, Lord Salisbury makes known the object of the embassy with which Sir Lintorn Simmonds is entrusted. The latter is informed that questions have arisen affecting the internal government of the Island of Malta in respect to which it is necessary to enter into communication with the highest ecclesiastical authorities at Rome, and Her Majesty has been pleased, the letter says, "in view of your complete familiarity with the circumstances of that dependency, to select you as her representative for that purpose." The chief heads of discussion mentioned as: 1st, those which affect the nomination to vacant bishoprics on the island; 2nd, the steps necessary to be taken to insure a better and more thorough education for ecclesiastical students; and, finally, a perfect understanding between the Holy See and the British Government in the matter of the full validity of marriages properly contracted in Malta, and also "the course that should be established in respect of mixed marriages, dispensations and other similar cases."

After some correspondence had taken place between Cardinal Rampolla and Sir L. A. Simmonds, it was decided that "His Holiness, although he cannot consent that the right of nominating whom he chooses to vacant sees be curtailed, yet feels disposed to treat Her Majesty's Government with all that regard and consideration which are compatible with that right and that liberty." Wherefore every time that the British Government may be pleased to announce to him officially that a vacancy in said sees has taken place, or that a vacancy is probable, the Holy Father will receive these official announcements, provided he reserves to himself, notwithstanding any communication which may have been received, full liberty to take the initiative in those arrangements he may consider necessary and opportune to the occasion. As to the rest, before proceeding to the official nomination of the titulars of the said sees, the Secretary of His Holiness will not omit in future to give previous notice of the same to the English Government according to established practice.

As to the declaration that the Government of Her Majesty will make that any communication regarding spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs between the Bishops, clergy and people on one hand, and the Holy See on the other, shall not depend in the least on the consent of the said government but shall be entirely free—a declaration which is in complete harmony with the political system that does so much honor to Her Majesty's Government—the Holy Father will receive it with full satisfaction recognizing in such liberty one of the indispensable conditions of the life of the Church.

Thus we see that the Holy Church reserves to herself the right to nominate to vacant sees, and appoint whom he selects as Bishops, without

any communication regarding spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs between the Bishops, clergy and people on one hand, and the Holy See on the other, shall not depend in the least on the consent of the said government but shall be entirely free—a declaration which is in complete harmony with the political system that does so much honor to Her Majesty's Government—the Holy Father will receive it with full satisfaction recognizing in such liberty one of the indispensable conditions of the life of the Church.

Thus we see that the Holy Church reserves to herself the right to nominate to vacant sees, and appoint whom he selects as Bishops, without

any communication regarding spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs between the Bishops, clergy and people on one hand, and the Holy See on the other, shall not depend in the least on the consent of the said government but shall be entirely free—a declaration which is in complete harmony with the political system that does so much honor to Her Majesty's Government—the Holy Father will receive it with full satisfaction recognizing in such liberty one of the indispensable conditions of the life of the Church.

Thus we see that the Holy Church reserves to herself the right to nominate to vacant sees, and appoint whom he selects as Bishops, without

any communication regarding spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs between the Bishops, clergy and people on one hand, and the Holy See on the other, shall not depend in the least on the consent of the said government but shall be entirely free—a declaration which is in complete harmony with the political system that does so much honor to Her Majesty's Government—the Holy Father will receive it with full satisfaction recognizing in such liberty one of the indispensable conditions of the life of the Church.

Thus we see that the Holy Church reserves to herself the right to nominate to vacant sees, and appoint whom he selects as Bishops, without