

THE CATHOLIC RECORD
Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY.

STILL RAMPANT.

The Mail still persists in maintaining that the Jesuit Estates Act confers upon the Pope a temporal authority in Canada which encroaches on the rights of the Crown, and last Saturday's issue states that "the Jesuits will, without doubt, evolve startling corollaries from the surrender they have just imposed on us."

"By allowing the Act to go in force, the Federal executive and Parliament endorsed the principle referred to; while to place the matter beyond cavil, our Ultramontane Minister of Justice went out of his way to proclaim it good constitutional doctrine."

We suppose it must be conceded that neither the Jesuits nor the Church had a legal right to the property which was seized by the Crown. The Crown has a knack of legalizing its own acts, and it has the might of enforcing its claims against all comers. The Jesuit Estates Act, therefore, states in its preamble that the Pope has no legal right to the estates in question. It cannot be said, then, that the Act proclaimed any right on the part of the Pope which did not exist. But it cannot be denied that the Jesuit Order owned the estates before the spoliation, and if by the spoliation the Crown made itself the legal proprietor, this did not constitute it morally the owner. The laws of honesty are binding on the Crown equally with individuals, and the moral right of the Jesuits, or their representatives, survived the act of spoliation.

The Estates were conferred on the Jesuits partly by the King of France and partly by private donation for the purpose of enabling them to continue the noble work in which they had been engaged, of civilizing the savages and of educating the youth of the Province.

When Canada was conquered by Great Britain, the British monarch became possessed of the sovereign rights of the King of France, and was entitled to take possession of all public property, but the law of nations does not authorize the conquering power to take possession of private property. In the present case special provision was made that the property of religious communities and of priests should be preserved intact. The terms of capitulation, read by the Minister of Justice in his able speech in Parliament contain this clause:

"All the communities and all the priests shall preserve their movable property, the revenues of the seigniories and their estates which they possess in the colony of what nature soever they be, and the same estates shall be preserved in their privileges, rights, honors and exemptions."

This clause was unequivocally granted by the conquerors, and when the Jesuits' estates were afterwards claimed to be Crown property, it was in direct violation of this treaty, entered on by both parties while their arms were still in their hands. The noisy talkers who are so loudly insinuating upon the rights of the Crown over these Jesuits' Estates are compelled to claim that the penal laws of England, including the Act of Supremacy, were in force in Canada. The Act of Supremacy was of such a character that the practice of the Catholic religion was utterly impossible under its operation. It is absurd to say that such an Act could be in force while religious toleration was promised to the people, and the same is to be said of the penal laws of Great Britain. They had not and could not have force in Canada in the face of the agreement made in the Treaty of Paris, and the Imperial Act of Parliament which confirmed that treaty,

granting Catholics the fullest right to practice their religion.
From all this it follows that the Act of the crown in taking possession of the Jesuits' Estates, and diverting them from the purposes for which they were given, was an unjust Act, and the hierarchy of the Province constantly protested against it.

We have said that we do not propose to call into question the merely legal right of the Crown to take possession of the property, but that legal right, if it existed, was a moral wrong, a huge iniquity.

The moral right of the Jesuits is conceded by the Government and people of Quebec. Now, it is customary with every paternal Government to take moral right into consideration in the distribution of property which has been even legally forfeited. Within the last few years several cases of this kind have occurred in Ontario, where the moral claim was far more dubious than in the case of the Jesuits' Estates. We may instance the allotment of the Mercer Estate by the Ontario Government; and the Parliament of Canada was actuated by similar sentiments of just and even benevolent dealing in indemnifying those who lost property by the rebellion of 1837 and by that of the Canadian North-West.

The language of the Pope, on which the Mail is so fond of harping, amounts to no more than a declamatory statement of his proprietary rights. The Jesuits and the hierarchy are agreed on this that the Pope is their Superior, and that they are bound by his decision. Who is there, then, that can so well settle any dispute between these two bodies as to the proper disposition of the funds? And with whom could the Government of Quebec better settle terms, than with the authority who is recognized as supreme by all the claimants? We have no hesitation in saying that the Quebec Government could not do a wiser thing than make their settlement with the Pope, who alone could give the assurance that the settlement would be final and satisfactory to all concerned.

It is a small matter for the enemies of the Jesuits to make so much noise because the Pope "is pleased to grant his permission for the sale of the property." It must be remembered that the Pope while saying this speaks as the owner in equity of the property. He speaks as one whose equitable claim is recognized, but even if he considered himself the legal owner it would be a contemptible plea for the Government to rest thereon for a pretext to deprive him of his moral right.

The permission which the Pope grants the Quebec Government is nothing more than the lawful owner of the property may very properly give. No one else could give such permission, and it is absurd to say that such a permission granted is an encroachment upon the prerogatives of the Crown.

The Mail says that the natural result of this admission of the Pope's authority will be that he must next have "tribunals of his own wherein to try questions of person, property or conduct, in which ecclesiastical discipline is at stake." We may inform the Mail and all concerned that as far as the interior discipline of the Church is concerned the Pope has already such tribunals. This is a matter which concerns the Pope, and not the State. But neither in the permission which he gives the Quebec Government, nor in any other act of the Pope, does he claim any administrative function which belongs to the civil government.

When the Ontario Government thought proper to compensate parties having more or less of a moral claim against it, and even when it thought proper to make property grants to the various denominations in Algoma, the people of Quebec never dreamed of disputing their right of so doing. It is therefore as ungracious as it is impertinent for Ontario fanatics to attempt to interfere with the autonomy of Quebec in regard to the Jesuits' Estates legislation. The plea that public policy requires such interference is but a hypocritical pretence. This plea is based upon false charges of immoral teachings and conduct of the Jesuits of ages gone by. We would not need to go back two or three centuries to find evil teachings from Protestant pulpits, and to find evil conduct among Protestant clergymen, even in Canada. We have no desire to recall very recent examples of this, but we would remind the Ontario fanatics who are so fond of making these charges that as their own glass houses are so near at hand, they might well refrain from the stone throwing which has been of late their favorite pastime.

The Mail need not be alarmed lest the Jesuits will "evolve startling corollaries from the surrender they have imposed on us." There has really been no surrender imposed at all, and in the past the Jesuits have been, indeed, a body of priests doing much good for the country, both by missionary and scholastic work, but they have shown no such desire to domineer in the politics of the country, as the Presbyterian, Methodist, and

Congregationalist clergy have been so offensively manifesting for several years past, not only on the question of disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act, but on other questions of public policy. There is much more danger to be apprehended from the meddlesomeness of such men as Professors McVicar and Cavan, and Drs. Wild and Sutherland, than from Jesuits, who are known all over the country as exemplary priests, fulfilling their duties in an unassuming manner, and minding their own business. Their maligners would do very well if they only followed the example of the Jesuits in this as well as in other matters.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

The Rev. Morgan Dix recently advised his hearers to protect themselves against the sin of anger by "masking the sign of the Cross upon their breasts where the passion is raging, and on their lips before the angry words fly thither from their hearts." Dr. Dix is a well known Protestant Episcopal Minister, and it is a pleasing sign that Protestants of any denomination are beginning to hold the sacred emblem of the cross in veneration. A very short time ago even Episcopalians, or members of the Church of England, by which name that denomination is known in this country, detested the sign of the cross, although its use is commanded by the Ritual of the Church in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, but it is now a rare thing to see a new church erected for that denomination which is not surmounted by a cross. We remember that on one occasion a Protestant bishop refused to exercise episcopal functions in a church not far from this city, until the rector removed a cross which had been erected in honor of the bishop's visit. The bishop was expected, if we remember right, to administer Confirmation in the church. The sign of the cross is now constantly used by thousands of the clergy, and by the laity who receive instructions from them, and even in St. Paul's church, London, the symbol of the cross is erected in an honorable position. It is surely a sign of returning Christianity when Episcopal Ministers are beginning, like St. Paul, to glory in the cross of Christ.

CHARITY VS. PHILANTHROPY.

The latest whimsicality in the direction of separating morality from religion comes to us in the way of a cable report stating that a largely attended meeting was held at Anderson's hotel last Friday for the purpose of discussing the feasibility of founding an "Elmerian Church" which shall be free from dogma, and bend its energies to finding the millennium on earth, leaving the next world to take care of itself. The proposition is to name the new institution the Christian Ethical Church, and it was decided to erect a building for purposes of worship in London. Benevolent works are certainly worthy of commendation, and if the new society relieve, even temporarily, prevailing distress, the general condition of the people will be so much improved; but the only true basis of charity is love for God, and when this element is eliminated, real and permanent success cannot be expected. There is no sufficient motive for loving our neighbor, where there is not love for God, and this must be lacking where it is proposed to leave out all Christian dogma. The success of the Catholic Church in conducting institutions of charity arises from the fact that they who engage in such work are animated by the true principle of Christian charity.

In such undertakings as are proposed by the London meeting, the principle of Christian charity, as explained by St. Paul, is altogether overlooked:

"If I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." (1 Cor. xiii, 3.)
Mere philanthropy, which substitutes humanity in the place of God, can never do the work of charity. It has not the qualities which make charity successful. "Charity is patient, is kind; charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely, is not puffed up, is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil."

"FAR AHEAD."

We have received from Rev. Theo. Speitz, of St. Jerome's College, Berlin, Ont., the following kind letter in reference to the CATHOLIC RECORD:
Editor of the Catholic Record:
REV. AND DEAR FATHER—We are all highly pleased with your defence of the Church and the Jesuits in the RECORD, and hope you may long continue to keep that paper at the head of Catholic journalism, as undoubtedly it is far ahead of any paper I know in Canada or the United States.

Yours truly,
THEO. SPEITZ, C. R.

MR. P. BOYLE OF BRANTFORD.

A letter over the signature of "Patrick Boyle," which appeared in the Toronto Empire on the morning of May 3rd, is entitled to a few comments at our hands. The name Patrick Boyle at the foot of a long letter in one of the great Protestant dailies would naturally arrest attention, and make the reader exclaim, "hello! a letter from an Irish Catholic!" Great was our surprise as we proceeded to read the letter to find that the author, Mr. P. Boyle, was not a Catholic. The next question suggested was, what is he? He does not seem to be an out and out Protestant, for he declares that "for about eleven years he taught as master in the Catholic separate schools of Ontario." Probably, then, he is a Jansenist in disguise, or an Arian, or an Iconoclast, but it is very certain that whatever he may profess to be, or pretend to be, he is not a Catholic. It is utterly impossible that any Catholic, either by conviction or profession, would be guilty of the disloyalty, the disrespect and utter contempt for papal authority that is so defiantly expressed in almost every line of this contemptible letter. "The old pretensions of Rome," he says, "had been extinguished by the wars of the Reformation, and the French Revolution, never, we trust, to be reconstituted, and the thunder bolts, hurled nowadays from the Vatican, are as harmless as they were formerly terrible, and, in some instances, unmerciful and iniquitous." This wanton display of historical ignorance on the part of Mr. Boyle, this daring and unjust commentary on the action of God's Church in times past, by an ambitious pedagogue, could scarcely be surpassed, though it might be equalled, in sacrilegious audacity by the most rabid of Methodist or Presbyterian controversialists. It is most fortunate for the Catholic population of Brantford that its rising generation has been withdrawn from the pestiferous influence of this daring iconoclast. "Rome's thunder-bolts" he says, "indicting to carnage and destruction and setting one nation against the throat of another, have died away with the times that witnessed them." We challenge any of the fanatical brood of insane proselytizers to formulate a more wicked and malicious arraignment of the authority of Christ's Vicar on earth than this passionate and ignorant display of lofty independence and contemptuous pomposity on the part of Patrick Boyle. If these were his sentiments, if these were his teachings concerning the visible head of the Church, concerning the heavenly-appointed representative of God upon earth, it is no wonder he was adjudged an unfit and improper person to fulfill the duties of a Catholic teacher in a Catholic separate school. The mystery is how a man, with such rebel principles against ecclesiastical authority, could have been allowed, during eleven years, to poison the minds of Catholic children, and sow broadcast the seeds of schism and heresy in the midst of a Catholic population. But the mystery deepens as reading further on we discover that Mr. Boyle is an opponent of Catholic separate schools in toto, and that his real object is to have them obliterated by amalgamating them with the common school system. We have reason to believe that there exist some so-called Catholics in this Province who share in the Godless views of Mr. Boyle, and who like him blame and condemn the Mowat Government for having introduced amendments to the Separate School Act which facilitate its operation. "Where was the Globe," asks Mr. Boyle, "when the Mowat Government introduced and made the law of the land those amendments to the Separate School Act, which have done more to enlarge and confirm the power of the Pope of Rome in Canada than dozens of your Jesuit Bibles." It is well that Mr. Patrick Boyle has spoken out and exhibited the cloven foot. The Catholic ratepayers of Toronto and other cities may now easily see in what direction is tending the action of those malcontents who give so much annoyance and public scandal at school board meetings, and who oppose every effort to enlarge the operation of separate schools and promote their efficiency. Their object is evident to all who take time to reflect on their conduct. Patrick Boyle's letter has let the "cat out of the bag." As the Protestant fanatics, rather than put up with Catholic Quebec as an integral portion of the Dominion, are willing to smash up Confederation into its original fragments, so it happens that those pig-headed Catholics who would dictate to priests and bishops and lay down laws for the guidance of the Pope himself, are anxious to see the separate school system all go to smash and become part and parcel of the common school management, where priests and bishops would get scant courtesy from men of the Patrick Boyle stamp, but where, he tells us, Presbyterian ministers would be found "considerate, kindly and sympathetic." Presbyterian ministers will be ever found kindly and sympathetic with Catholics, teachers or others, who are in rebellion against Church authority. The Presbyterians opened its arms wide to receive Chiniquet in his

apostasy from the priesthood; and it should not surprise us that they exhibit a kindred and sympathetic feeling for the Irish Catholic apostate, who deplores the increase of Catholic schools, for the reason that such increase, as he tells us, "would enlarge and confirm the power of the Pope of Rome in Canada."

Rev. Dr. Ryerson, who put every trammel his bigoted mind could suggest against the smooth and easy working of the separate school, is lauded to the skies by Mr. Boyle for having made it necessary that every Catholic should send in a written declaration to the city or town clerk that he is a Catholic and a supporter of the Catholic separate school. And the Mowat Government is condemned for relieving him of this necessity, and for allowing the city assessor to do this for him. Again, he asks what right had the Mowat-Hardy Government to take away the rights of the Roman Catholic rate payer, guaranteed him by the Ryerson Separate School Act? Who asked for this change? It is a great pity Mr. Boyle was not consulted by the hierarchy and the ministers of state before any change for the better could be made in the provisions of the Separate School Act. It often happens that Protestants living near a separate school are anxious to send their children there, but they have no liberty to do so unless they make a declaration that they are Catholics and anxious to be supporters of the Roman Catholic separate school. Why should Protestants be deprived of their liberty, and be compelled to abandon the faith of their fathers if they wish to support separate schools? No such inability is imposed on Catholics. They are not asked to declare themselves Protestants. All that is required of them by law, is merely to hand in a written declaration stating their willingness to support the common schools. Practically all they do is to tell the assessor that they send their children to the common schools. But the Toronto Mail, of infidel persuasion, and Patrick Boyle, the self accused enemy of Rome, exclaim that the Catholic parent is debared of his rights and robbed of his liberty, because he is asked to move at all in the matter. Under Ryerson's system hundreds of Catholic parents send their children to Catholic schools while being assessed for the common schools. They were strangers to our law, either from Ireland or from the United States, the fathers were employed on railroads, the mothers all too busy at home. The school trustees had no time to hunt up those families. When they located them after many attempts, it took several visits to find the head of the house at home and explain to him the law. Thus for years sometimes Catholic children were being taught in our schools, while Catholic moneys were being paid into the common school fund. It is this infidelous system that Mr. Boyle blames Mr. Mowat for destroying and that he wants reintroduced, with other disabilities and vexatious conditions that would result in the utter collapse of Catholic education in Ontario. It is very fortunate, however, that Mr. Boyle has come out boldly and exposed the tendency and the wishes of those liberal Catholics, who, for their own selfish ends, and to carry favor with certain political aspirants to place and power, are willing to create disturbance and confusion in the Catholic body and to smash up our Catholic separate school system, to which both Protestants and Catholics point with pride in proof of the liberal spirit of our institutions and of the loyalty all Catholics owe to enlightened and impartial government in this free Dominion.

The ministers and Orangemen of Hamilton are making preparations for a great anti Jesuit meeting to be held in the city. They propose to protest against the Pope's interference in Canadian affairs and to sympathize with the Protestant minority in Quebec who do not ask their sympathy.

It is stated that Col. O'Brien, on discovering that the disallowance medal is an advertising dodge of a newspaper, has returned, or is about to return to the donors the gold medal which he received as the chief of the "noble thirteen" members of Parliament who claim to have a monopoly of patriotism, inasmuch as they alone voted to refuse restitution to the Jesuits for the property of which they were unjustly deprived by confiscation.

The Orange wing of the anti Jesuit party do not seem to be getting along very cordially together. The Lindsay Warder has been reproaching the Mail for advising the allowance of the Jesuit Estates Act, as it was within the power of the Quebec Legislature. The Mail explains that though it stated that it was within the powers of the Legislature, it nevertheless advised disallowance because it was contrary to the general advantage of Canada. The truth is that the Mail, while acknowledging it to be *intra vires*, stated that it could not be disallowed except on the ground of its being against public policy. This is quite a different thing from recommending dis-

allowance. The Warder seems to have the best of the argument.

The petition of the advocates of disallowance of the Jesuit Estates Act concludes by asking the Governor-General to dissolve Parliament, if there be no other means by which he can obtain the support of Parliament to justify disallowance. The Globe very properly points out that this clause of the petition is arbitrary and unconstitutional, and a direct blow to responsible Government, so that no Liberal can sign it. The Globe asks, therefore, that this clause be struck out. Of course our opinion will not be asked in regard to the proper course which the petitioners should pursue, but we will state it nevertheless. As they are asking the Governor-General to take an arbitrary and unconstitutional course, and as they want to make the Government responsible to the Orange lodges and the persons, instead of the representatives of the people, it is quite fitting that their petition should manifest the small respect which its framers hold for the constitution of the country. By all means let it be worded arbitrarily and unconstitutionally, for this is the kind of wording that best suits the Orange promoters of the movement. Orangemen does not want any measures which fall short of being arbitrary.

IRELAND'S STRUGGLE.

The complexity of the Government in the Times' forgery was once more clearly brought out by a question put to Chief Secretary Balfour in the House of Commons just after the Easter recess, by Professor Stuart, M. P. for Sherbrooke. The Government are not fortunate in keeping from the eyes of an inquisitive public their secret circulars, but this time one came to light which was marked "very secret." It was intended only for the confidential eyes of the chiefs of police, and it directed them to ferret out "very discreetly" any information they could procure which would connect National Leaguers or the National League with agrarian crime, and to state what witnesses could give evidence on the subject and what each witness could prove. Of course the object of all this was to procure evidence for the Times in its accusations against Mr. Parnell and the League, a thing which up to the present the Government denied point blank that it had done. The consternation that Mr. Balfour may be imagined when Mr. Stuart demanded to know whether such a circular had been sent, and whether information thus acquired had been placed in the hands of the solicitor for the Times newspaper. Mr. Balfour was fairly cornered. It has been his custom to deny unpleasant facts, but well he knew that if he denied the circular, so he positively refused to answer. He said "if a circular was sent out it has been betrayed by a breach of confidence, but I cannot say whether or not it existed." On being pressed further he said: "neither deny nor affirm it." Thus, as United Ireland puts the matter, he sheltered himself under the privilege of a criminal of the Old Bally. "I am not bound to criticize," Mr. Parnell, in a most scathing speech, commented on the conduct exhibited by the Government, and the cowardice of the Secretary—the brave Balfour as he has been called—in refusing a straightforward answer.

In Cavan a number of especially barbarous evictions took place on the 26th March. Mr. Townsley, Sub Sheriff, with a number of bailiffs and a body of police, commenced operations on the Singleton estate in Maudabawn. The possession of evictors numbered thirty. Mr. Moyduff was the first visited, where two orphan girls became easy victims, there being no opposition. Lisnacles was visited next. Here Patrick McKitterick, aged ninety years, was hurled from the home of his ancestors because he was unable to pay an increased rent. Tom Rhee, of the same name, was the next to be thrown out of his home, and was raised the paltry sum, and was readmitted. Mary Reilly, of Drumlum, was cleared out, but re-admitted by paying two years' rent. Last in turn was Joseph Parker, of Lislogher, a blind man; when the army, after half a day's work, ceased here, and proceeded to the Annesley estate at Shercock. Next day, at Cotehill Quarter Sessions, Mr. Wynne took out fifty-seven ejectment decrees.

A despatch from Melbourne says a monster meeting of Irish sympathizers was held on 30th April. John Dillon made an address which created great enthusiasm. One thousand pounds was subscribed for the Irish cause.

IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE OF AMERICA.

Toronto, May 7th, 1889.
To the friends of the Irish Cause:
Allow me to thank you and all the friends in your locality who have so generously contributed to the various funds of the Irish National League. In making grateful acknowledgment, I beg to inform you that a Convention of the American Branch of the League will be held in Philadelphia July 9th and 10th, to which are invited delegates from all friendly societies that have contributed aid through this organization. It is confidently expected that this Convention will surpass all others hitherto held of the Irish people in America, both in point of numbers and influence.

It is very desirable that this Province, which has so largely contributed, should be well represented. I would therefore ask you, and those associated with you, to select as early a date as possible a delegation of one, two or three to attend, and forward their names and addresses to me. It is our intention to try and arrange for a return ticket at a reduced rate, and to do this it will be necessary to have an approximation of the number going. Your prompt action is respectfully urged. Believe me to be, Yours truly,

B. E. TERRY,
Delegate, Ontario,
56 Gloucester street,

CONSECRATION OF O'CONNOR.

SERMON OF HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP OF LONDON ON OCCASION.

We are pleased to be enabled before our readers this week a of the beautiful and impressive preached by His Lordship the of London on the occasion of the of Right Rev. Dr. O' Bishop of Peterburg.

"Take heed to yourselves and neck wherein the Holy Ghost in you Bishops to rule the Church which he has purchased with blood."—Acts xx, 28.
MY LORDS, REV. FATHERS AND BRETHREN—The occasion together to day cannot but have found and absorbing interest for and people of this diocese, and might any of the entire ecclesiastical witness the sacred rites and cere which a priest is raised and con the sublime office of the Catholic. The ceremonies upon prayers offered, the solemn made by the consecrating to the Bishop-elect, the sacred the form itself of consecration full of meaning, instruction au tion, and speak most forcibly of august and sacred character of p office, of its tremendous resp and obligations, of the power a it bestows, the authority it conf and govern by wise and salutary teach and preach and shepherd of Christ, feeding it with the sacra sation, nurturing it with the grace, preserving it from the p tures of sin and vice, and gi against the destructive arra teachers, who, in the words of Ch like ravelling wolves to catch the sheep of the fold, and like steal and kill and destroy (J 12). The episcopal order is the of the priesthood of Christ, it e raising principle of His myst and the channel of all the sa grace. The episcopal order is through which the Holy G directs and illumines the "The Holy Ghost bath pl Bishops to rule the Church is his voice is the voice of Christ His revelation to mankind, heareth you heareth Me." Bishop who raises ordains priest perpetuates the priesthood. B Bishop who rules the Church w copel order. It is the Bishop w the Christian character and gr sacrament of Confirmation. It consecrates the holy oils, whi visible sign of the invisible m Holy Ghost in so many sacra consecrations; in a word, accorda ties of St. Cyprian, "the Chure Bishop and the Bishop in the The Bishop in his consecratio the plenitude of sacerdotal p with it also receives that seal ter from the eternal priesthod which neither his own conduct seductions nor human hostility can destroy, and which will m forever. But, although the Bish the plenitude of priestly pow consecration, he cannot put them, he cannot put them into oration for the salvation of sinners in accordance with disci ment without the mission and that appoint him to a diocese and a flock, and that mission and au obtains not from consecratio the apostolic and sovereign p authority of the Holy See. T alone has the right to o ceases and appoint Bishops of c When the apostle died the authority did not die with them, they are still in the vided by the will and appoi God in the mystical body of Ch is His Church, and was cons concentrated in the See of Pet the death of the last apostle, S is only the Roman Pontiff successor for the time being, enjoyed the apostolic gifts of infallibility in teaching vernal mission and jurisdiction this rock," said Christ to I will build My Church, and it hell shall not prevail against it lows, therefore, that the Catho pte in communion with its and it alone is apostolic in its and that it alone has lawful jurisdiction. We will dwell p ject for a time, because, altho utmost importance in the dom and having an intimate bearin an essential connection with our eternal salvation, it is ignored, if not entirely lost sight religious world around us.

The Church of Christ must be its ministry and its mission, the there must be in the Church a p Bishop and uninterrupted suc Bishops from the apostles do time and down through all the consummation of the world. before His ascension gathered around Him, organized them as body or Church, clothed them own power and commissioned organized living body of His m teach His doctrine and disp mysteries for all time. "All p He, "is given to Me in heaven an going therefore, teach all nation ing them in the name of the of the Son and of the Holy G ing them to observe all things I have commanded and behold you all days down to the con of the world." (Matthew xxvi 20.) The commission is to b body, and it alone is as a b body, as universal as mankind lasting as time. The evident the commission is that the apol try should last in the world to doom, that though the apostles as do other men, they would live successors, and the apostolic created and chartered by the S would continue forever. In teaching the doctrines of Christ administration of His ordina as there lived men to be taught to be saved. But a constant, succession of pastors, although is not of itself sufficient to co true apostolic ministry, othe Ancient heretics, such as the N