

Even if the Messrs. of an apparently breach of strict law, be persecuted or punished, under the circumstances, they are placed.

BE UNION.

sure in publishing the of the Hon. J. J. ed in Toronto after the of Mr. T. D. Sullivan, the words of the hon. l have due weight ish party at home. A ability rests upon the ose who have caused the ranks of the Irish Party. They are work- same line as were have come down to friends—but real ene- country, performing fully the work of those it is to keep the Irish tion and in poverty:—

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The speech of Earl Rosebery at Bradford, in which the future policy of the Liberal party was foreshadowed, was a remarkable one in many respects, but in no way more so than in the fact that the determined assault made upon the House of Lords as an anomaly in Legislation should come from a member of that body of hereditary Legis- lators. He did not hesitate in his position nor attempt to evade the issue which is to be put before the people at the next election, and that issue is the restriction of the veto power of the Lords, and the supremacy of the House of Commons as a legislative body. He declared that it was the rejection of Home Rule for Ireland which had brought this issue into prominence. Before the Home Rule Bill was passed by the popular House the Lords repre- sented a certain balance of parties, and their opinions had some weight, but by their rejection of the Bill they declared themselves uncompromisingly a Tory body, opposed to all popu- lar aspirations. They were willing to compromise on other questions, but on the important question of breaking the power of the landlords over the Irish people there is with them no com- promise possible. They are immutably against conceding any measure of jus- tice to Ireland. A Liberal Govern- ment, therefore, can no longer hope for support for Liberal measures from more than about 5 or 6 per cent. of the Lords. This anomaly, Lord Rose- bery declares, must be ended, if the boast that Great Britain is a free coun- try has any truth in it. The policy of the Liberals is to maintain popular rule, and to do this the abolition of the veto power must be brought about. It will become, therefore, the fixed policy of the Liberals to effect this abolition, and Home Rule will inevit- ably follow.

IC BOODLING IN TORONTO.

undoubtedly a prosper- a worldly point of view. rsts part it has progressed pectation in population its boundaries have been as to embrace several icipalities, and with all prosperity it appears to equally in self-esteem argated to itself the e title of "Toronto the those living outside its has been a perplexing the city became entitled of being thus desig- izing from the preva- associations as the P. P. A., ngland, Orangeism, and objects are to destroy the ion and even to deprive the means of livelihood, n, it is very doubtful if superior goodness has any ation than that of the o thanked God that he the rest of men."

the very moment when ness of self-righteousness ight, an investigation is the making of a contract Railway Company, and come to light that it was wholesale purchase of the rmen that the contract ough. The investiga- ight this corruption into ight that the people have confidence in the present is is plainly expressed in swanlock's letter of resig- seat. He says:

ic sentiment of the city much inflamed against the public usefulness of of 1894 is over, and I gn my seat as alderman

Hewitt has also resigned d both resignations were the Council as a matter of out debate.

ence to the same subject, ligan, preaching in St. esbyterian Church said, Dec. 2nd:—

ent municipal evils have t upon us by the apathy he portion of the people, by es of political partizan- the wiles of the fortune-

hunter, the time server and the job-ber."

The fact is the people of the city have so devoted themselves to the task of securing a triumph for P. P. Aism that they closed their eyes to municipal corruption and brought upon them- selves probably the most corrupt munici- pal regime which has ever disgraced the city.

Dr. Milligan continued in his sermon:

"The man who unwisely dubbed our city 'The Good,' must have known very little about the vermin around our City Hall."

If the people of Toronto are led by the revelations made during the investi- gation, to set a higher value on the good character of the Aldermen they choose, and a less value on their fan- aticism, and the vigor with which they cry out "No Popery," the lesson which has been taught them may be a useful one.

DIocese of Hamilton.

On Sunday afternoon, 2nd inst., His Lordship the Bishop visited Lor- etto and officiated at a reception of the Children of Mary. After blessing and distributing the medals the Bishop gave an interesting instruction on the dignity and duties of the Chil- dren of Mary, after which followed Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

DE LA SALLE ACADEMY.

On Wednesday evening a literary and musical entertainment in connection with this institution took place at St. Mary's parish hall, which is thus referred to by the *Spectator*:

"Many entertainments have been given by the boys of St. Mary's school, but the success of the one held under the auspices of the Christian Brothers in St. Mary's hall, last evening, sur- passed all previous ones. There was a large attendance. Prominent among those present were Bishop Dow- ling, Rev. Father Coy, superintendent of the schools; Rev. Mgr. McEvay, Chancellor Craven, Rev. Fathers O'Reilly, Hinchey, Bady, Mahoney and Lehmann."

"The programme contained four- teen numbers, and the various par- ticipants acquitted themselves credit- ably. The opening address was de- livered by Master J. Sullivan; solos were sung by E. Marks and W. Murray; the latter also sang a duet with J. Koubler; a duet and chorus, 'Fair Canada,' was sung by J. Brydges, J. Koubler and a juvenile choir composed of pupils from the first to the fifth forms. The choir also sang three choruses, 'Ode to Leo XIII.,' 'The Emerald Banner,' and 'The Isle That's Crowned With Shamrocks.' The soloist later was sung by T. Sullivan. A dramatic sketch entitled 'A Scene in Court' was enacted by H. Mullin, T. Sweeney, J. Gillespie and J. Willibee, who respectively represented the judge, counsel for the plaintiff and defendant, and clerk of the court. A drill was given by the Hamilton Catholic Cadets, under the direction of Commander John Duffy; a piano solo was played by John Cleary; as fine an exhibition of sword drill as could be desired was given by John Smith, J. Percy, M. Green, W. Kelly and J. Duffy, under the captaincy of Lewis Vizard; and a recitative trio was contributed by Harry Mullin, J. McMahon and John Willibee, who also gave a recitation entitled 'The Ivory Crucifix.' The accompaniments were played by John Cleary."

FEAST OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

As the cathedral is dedicated to God under this title the festival is annually celebrated with great solemnity. This year solemn Mass, with deacon and sub-deacon, was celebrated and solemn Vespers in the evening.

ST. ANN'S WING OF ST. JOSEPH'S HOS- PITAL.

In the afternoon the new, beautiful and commodious wing lately erected as an addition to St. Joseph's Hospital was solemnly blessed by the Bishop, assisted by all the city clergy. A pro- cession was formed in the chapel, headed by cross-bearer, acolytes, chanters and clergy, passing through the several corridors and wards of the three stories and returning to the chapel for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. A description of St. Ann's will be furnished at another time.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL'S SOCIETY.

The several branches of this chari- table society held their annual meeting for the reading and adoption of the annual reports on Sat- urday afternoon, 9th inst. The society is doing a great and meritorious work for the city poor. The Bishop and Mgr. McEvay were present and deliv- ered congratulatory and encouraging addresses in favor of the good work.

At 4 in the afternoon the Sodality assembled in St. Mary's chapel for the reception of probationary members. The Bishop officiated, blessed and dis- tributed the medals and addressed the Sodality on the duties of their station in life. His Lordship afterwards officiated at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

In the evening at solemn Vespers at the cathedral Father Lehmann officiated. The Bishop presided at the throne, and immediately before the "Magnifi- cat" preached the sermon of the Patron feast of the cathedral, on the Immacu- late Conception.

Instructive evening sermons, at- tracting large congregations, are de- livered during Advent not only in the cathedral, but also at St. Patrick's, St. Lawrence and St. Joseph's churches.

LECTURE FOR THE POOR.

Rev. Father Doherty, S. J. (one of the Jesuit Fathers who conducted the recent mission here), will deliver a lecture, at Vespers, in St. Peter's Cathedral, in aid of the poor of the city, under the auspices of St. Vincent de Paul Society, on Sunday, December 16,

THE SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS.

The Belfast *Irish News*, having in its issue of the 16th inst. published the extraordinary letter from Mr. Michael Davitt from which we quote elsewhere referred in its leading columns to the action of that gentleman in the follow- ing words:

This School Board election has given rise to very serious, and in some re- spects very unfortunate, controversies the extension of which might, as we conceive, lead to controversies, if not fresh dissensions, at home. Mr. Davitt is not an advocate of dissensions. He is a wise and prudent leader, and knows the evil which dissensions breed. We beg to assure him that it was our high admiration for him as a valued Nationalist leader that called forth that expression of regret on our part. When Mr. Davitt speaks it may be said that Ireland speaks and acts be- hind him; such is his acknowledged position.

Under these circumstances, His Emi- nence Cardinal Logue addressed the following letter to the editor of the *Irish News*, in which paper it was pub- lished upon Monday last:

Armagh, 16th November, 1894.

Dear Sir—The letters of Mr. Davitt in your issue of to day and some ex- pressions in reference to them, which occur in your leading article, force upon me a duty from which I would very willingly be exempted. Besides the natural repugnance I have to writ- ing in newspapers, I do not believe their columns are a fitting medium for giving expression, at least as a rule, to the views of a Bishop. Hence, had this London school board controversy been kept among those whom it im- mediately concerns, and who are well able to deal with it, decided as my opinions were on the question, I would not have felt called upon to interfere. But when it is brought, as it were, to my door, in the pages of a paper which circu- lates largely among my people, silence on my part might be taken for acquies- cence in what I regard as a very mis- taken and very lamentable proceeding.

Above all, there is one expression of opinion in your leading article which I could not let pass without protest. You tell your readers "that when Mr. Davitt speaks it may be said that Ire- land speaks and acts behind him." I have no objection to any compliment you may pay to Mr. Davitt within certain limits. You could not admire more than I do his earnest patriotism, his honesty, his singleness of purpose, the generous spirit in which he is ever ready to sacrifice his private interests for the public good. But unfortunately Mr. Davitt, from time to time, favors the public with pronouncements in reference to which I should be very sorry to think that, when he speaks, Catholic Ireland "speaks and acts behind him." Mr. Davitt seems to think that, as a Catholic, he is quite safe and free to speak and decide as he pleases so long as he steers clear of a con- demned proposition, or does not run tilt against an article of faith. The danger is that his tendency to dog- matizing and to skimming as close as possible along the confines of orthodoxy may some day land him in an unpleas- ant position. But apart from all this he should remember that there are cer- tain safeguards of the faith and certain outworks of religion an attack on which comes with very bad grace from a sincere Catholic, such as I believe Mr. Davitt to be. One of these is respect for the Head of the Church, and a filial interest in all that is necessary to secure his independence, rights, privilege and immunities. I fear Mr. Davitt must have lost sight of this when, some months ago, he penned a certain re- grettable letter to a correspondent who, though he may not have intended it no less effectually set a snare for his un- wary feet. A little reflection would have taught him that the temporal power of the Pope has very little con- nection with Home Rule in Ireland, and that the Pope is progressive enough for safeguard not less inti- mately connected with the preservation of the faith is the religious training of our children. This I fear Mr. Davitt and some of his colleagues do not appreciate as they ought, when they advise our Catholic people to make common cause, in school affairs, with English secularists and free-thinkers, even throwing the full weight of their influence into the balance in favor of gentlemen who are known to have voted against all Christian teaching in Board Schools, and against all aid from the taxes to voluntary schools where religious instruction could be im- parted.

It may be all very fair to enter into a political alliance with these gentlemen for political ends; but when we are asked to sacrifice our religious or edu- cational interests in return for their help, a point is reached where every Catholic must stop. And, disguise it as they may to themselves and others, this is precisely what Mr. Davitt, and more recklessly still some of his colleagues, would have the Irish Catholics of Eng- land to do in the forthcoming School Board elections. Gratitude for help rendered to us in our endeavors to realize our national aspirations is laud- able, but gratitude which involves a sacrifice of principle—above all a sacri- fice of religious principle—can neither be rendered by us nor reasonably ex- acted by helpers. Their political aid can be repaid in kind, as, up to this, it has been abundantly repaid; and I am firmly convinced that if this payment were not the chief consideration, neither sympathy on their side nor gratitude on ours would long secure us their aid. Any return beyond this, especially a compromising return, would argue not that independent alli- ance of which Irish Nationalists so often

boast, but the subjection of slaves to their masters.

Of course I know what is said of Tory designs and Tory intrigues, and no doubt they would make capital even out of this casuistry if they could, but I would not insult the intelligence of my fellow-countrymen in England by supposing that they could not vote for the dearest interests of their little children at a School Board election, and vote for the interests of their country at a Parliamentary election. The issue in either case is clear, distinct, and well defined, and our countrymen generally are not stupid.

I am at a loss, therefore, to know why you have thought it necessary to be so apologetic in your article deal- ing with Mr. Davitt's letter. I can understand how you should be respect- ful to a gentleman whom you all re- spect; but, if I know the mind of our readers, I believe they would have wished you to take the stand which the great body of them would expect of you as a Catholic journalist, and voice their views on a question of such importance. It is right that public men should be told clearly what is thought of their action. It is well for them to know that there are some interests too sacred to be tampered with, or sacrificed to political ends however desirable. I know you are anxious to avoid whatever might foment or intensify dissension, and you could not abhor dissension more heartily, or desire perfect union among our public men more eagerly than I do; but timidity in probing a wound may leave it to fester till it is past healing. It is my honest conviction that the attempt of some politicians to bring the political interests and aspira- tions of our people into conflict with their religious instincts and Catholic feelings will do more to discourage patriotism, paralyze national action, destroy cordial union, and even break up the National Party, than all the causes of division which we have had to lament in the past. I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

—MICHAEL CARDINAL LOGUE.

A correspondent in London sends us the following specimen of a hand-bill issued in the interest of the Progressive candidates, such as Mr. Michael Davitt's friend, the Rev. Stewart Headlam. We have felt obliged to omit one absolutely blasphemous pas- sage referring to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrament of Pen- ance:

ENGLISHMEN!

PROTESTANTS OF ALL DENOMINATIONS DO NOT BE HUMBUGGED.

By the Church party on the School Board they are wilfully throwing dust in your eyes when they ask you so plausibly to vote for Christian Education.

Their Christian Education means Popish, priest ridden, dishonest, denominational Education! It means putting Religious Education in the hands of men who take the pay of the Protestant Church and teach and practice Popery, and who dam all Dis- senters.

These are the men who are working hand and glove with Popish priests, speak of them as "our brethren," and who curse all Non-conformist followers of Jesus Christ, and with contemptible arrogance put them out of the pale of His Church.

Englishmen! remember that England's greatness is its Bible Christianity, and that its simple truths as placed before the chil- dren under the present compromise, is better than all the bitter sectarian dogma the clericals want to ram down their throats.

Englishmen! if you love your God, and your country, and evangelical truth, and want your children to grow up Protestants, vote only for men who will oppose the Church- priestly rule at the November Election.

Englishmen! if you let Ritualistic and Popish priests rule the education of your children, you are unworthy of your country and your privileges as free men, and you tell what your forefathers laid down their lives to win for you—Civil and Religious Liberty.

NOTE ONLY FOR

PROTESTANT PROGRESSIVE CANDIDATES.

The printer of this abominable pro- duction is Mr. John Kenist, who is him- self a Progressive candidate in opposi- tion to the Duke of Newcastle.

THE FATAL FLAW IN ANGLI- CAN JURISDICTION.

London, Nov. 8, 1894.

The Anglican Archbishop of York has just spoken of Cardinal Vaughan as "an Italian Cardinal who calls him- self Archbishop of Westminster." In the first place, Cardinal Vaughan is not an Italian. Next, Italy has had nothing whatever to do with his creation as Cardinal or Archbishop. And, thirdly, Cardinal Vaughan was not called by the Sovereign Pontiff for that office, and was appointed to the See of Westmin- ster, not by himself nor by a Prime Minister, but "out of the plenitude of the Apostolic authority." We are accustomed to indefiniteness in Angli- can controversy, but really a little pre- cision should be affected in statements as a matter of fact. The Archbishop of Canterbury, like his brother of York, has a taste for misleading phraseology. He has adopted a catch-phrase, as loose as it is irrelevant, which was invented by the late Dr. Littledale, who thought he could crush the Catholic Church in this country by speaking of it as "The Italian Mission." Rome is unquestion- ably a town in Italy, and therefore "Italian" sounds well. But if the Pope were to be driven out of Rome to- morrow, and were to take up his abode in New York, his missions could no more be described as American than they can now be described as Italian.

It is, perhaps, natural that the Bishops of the Establish- ment, who derive all their spiritual jurisdiction from the Govern- ment of Great Britain and Ireland, should look upon orthodoxy as a geo- graphical accident, and upon author- ity as state born or insular. For three centuries Anglican Bishops and Arch- bishops have been created by the First Lord of the Treasury, or by some correspondingly potent official. "I made him a Bishop, but I forget his

name," was Mr. Disraeli's pleasant jest to a friend. And no doubt Mr. Dis-raeli could impart spiritual jurisdiction quite as well as the King or the Queen. Where no one can give spiritual juris- diction, it does not matter who affects to play the Pontiff. On the same day in England a new Bishop and a new postmaster will be appointed by the same court official. And the jurisdic- tion of the one is the same as that of the other—so far as Divine authority is concerned.

A good deal of controversy has been going on lately as to the validity of Anglican orders, in consequence of Cardinal Vaughan having emphatic- ally stated that Anglican orders are not valid. And naturally the question of Anglican jurisdiction has come in for some share in the controversy, since High Church men suspect that all true jurisdiction must be an integral part of Catholicity—both having their pledge in Divine Authority. Yet the way in which this question is argued by Angli- cans is confusing to the point of dis- traction. I have quoted the Arch- bishop of York, who says that "an Italian Cardinal calls himself Arch- bishop of Westminster," and I have quoted the Archbishop of Canterbury, who speaks of the Catholic Church as an "Italian Mission." Now let me try to state what is the Anglican theory in regard to the whole subject of jurisdic- tion, so as to show where it clashes with common sense, as well as with the Catholic Faith.

High Churchmen know that Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth both repudiated the Source of Jurisdiction. There arose therefore one of two alternatives: either to affirm that there was no such thing in Christen- dom as "the plenitude of apostolic authority"; or that, if there was, it resided in each separate State, in the Sovereign, in the Parliament, or in convocation. But, at least in Eng- land the convocation of clergy has had nothing whatever to do with jurisdic- tion; on the contrary, every one of the Anglican dignitaries has received his jurisdiction from the Crown. Every Anglican Archbishop and every Bishop has been appointed to his See by the temporal power; so that the present Archbishop of Canterbury is head of the Church of England by the divine authority of Queen Victoria or of her Ministers; and whatever the jurisdiction which he can impart to others is thus derived through the temporal power alone. Here then we have a question which, while collateral with that of orders, is of a significance which is but little inferior. And how do the High Church clergy "get out of it?" They do not like to say that there is no such thing as jurisdiction, for, if they did, no Bishop could license a curate; or, what would be worse, each Anglican Bishop might rule over a neighboring diocese, or might even supplant His Grace of Canterbury or of York. So they treat jurisdiction precisely as they treat the Catholic faith; they make it national, geo- graphical, and therefore divisible; affirming that an Englishman who is given a diocese by Queen Victoria has the same right of spiritual jurisdiction as, say, a Spaniard who is given a diocese by the Holy See; and thus deny- ing the spiritual origin of jurisdiction, while affirming the spiritual rights which it confers.

Now it is curious that Anglicans do not see that this fatal fallacy renders the commission of the sin of schism an impossibility. For schism is not a question of believing in this or that doctrine, but of obeying the central authority of Christendom. And obedi- ence being only possible where the recognition of divine authority is as clear as is the assertion of that author- ity, it follows that, for an Anglican, the sin of schism must be imaginary because there is neither assertion nor recognition. It is just here that juris- diction becomes the sovereign test—the litmus paper, as it were, which probes schism. Manifestly, jurisdiction, which is the right of government, must be co-ordinate with Holy Order, which is the right of administration; for other- wise every Bishop might rule where and how he liked; every priest might preach where and what he liked; and every layman might dispute with every pastor as to his right to presume to exercise any authority. Anglicans, feeling the *cruce* of this dilemma, have invented a new Protestant jurisdiction; which, taking away the source of spiri- tual government from the Supreme Pontiff, lodges it in the hands of each separate State. Thus schism becomes an accident of nationality. If the Archbishop of Canterbury should desire to be a schismatic he must dispute the apostolicity of the Marquis of Salis- bury; and if a Ritualist clergy- man should wish to indulge in the same enormity, he could only do it by affirming that the Government of Queen Victoria is not endowed with the Pontifical plenitude of jurisdiction. Schism, therefore is not a spiritual but a political sin. No sooner did Henry VIII. (and afterwards Queen Eliza- beth) establish the new Protestant principle that the *jus civile* was hence- forth to be the *jus divinum*, than jurisdiction, which had been Catholic and Pontifical, became royal, parlia- mentary, and political; just as heresy, which had been the indulging private judgment, became the obeying the very authority which condemned it; and schism, which had been revolt against God's Vicar, became the not bending the knee to the temporal power.

But do not Anglicans admit the Catholic principle? Yes, they do, at the same time that they reject it. The Archbishop of York, who repudi- ates Cardinal Vaughan's jurisdiction, charges his heraldic shield with St. Peter's keys; and the Archbishop of

Canterbury, who talks about the "Italian Mission," charges his heraldic shield with the Roman pallium. Both these relatives therefore admit that the Holy See was the fount of jurisdiction to the Church in England.

THE ANGLICAN DILEMMA.

And they admit that the Church in England acknowledged this; just as they admit that Pope St. Gregory gave jurisdiction to St. Augustine to become the first Archbishop of Canterbury; and that the successor of St. Gregory gave jurisdiction to Bishop Vaughan to become Archbishop of the Catholic See of Westminster. Here then is their inextricable difficulty. We have to ask them—but we know that we can get no answer—who is that Supreme Arbiter who can now dictate to the Sovereign Pontiff, who can un-make his divine office and prerogative? Some one must be much greater than the Pope. A lesser authority cannot take away from a greater authority; a temporal authority cannot take away from a spiritual authority; even an episcopal authority cannot take away from a pontifical authority. Yet the Archbishop of York has intently informed us that because the audacious and murderous Henry VIII. was excom- municated by a Pope for his crimes, therefore the Roman Pontiff has lost all authority, including, of course, authority of jurisdiction. Henceforth the supreme authority became lodged in a national sovereign (we are not told the exact facts of this revelation whether it was delivered from Mount Horeb or from Windsor Castle); so that William of Orange, the Four Georges, William IV., or Queen Victoria have given spiritual jurisdiction to their prelates out of the plenitude of their own purely lay authority. But "out of nothing nothing comes." A King is not pontifical nor even episcopal; he is not even diaconal nor subdiaconal, and just as he cannot excommunicate, he does not possess Holy Order, so neither can he impart spiritual juris- diction because he does not possess any to impart.

The Catholic principle of jurisdiction is very simple. As St. Thomas Aquinas said, "spiritual power is two- fold, one sacramental, the other jurisdic- tional." And, to quote a Protestant Bishop, who has expressed the same truth very well, Dr. Horsley, said, "The power of order is properly a capacity of exercising the power of juris- diction, conferred by a competent au- thority." The whole question, then, for all kinds of Protestants, is "what is the competent authority?" The Cath- olic Church answers, in the words of St. Ambrose, "*Ubi Petrus ibi ecclesia*." In other words, jurisdiction flows from St. Peter's successors, who are the only "competent authority" to grant the rights of a spiritual govern- ment, and they can decide also, ulti- mately, on matters of faith. From the time when Pope St. Gregory conferred on St. Augustine jurisdiction "over all the Bishops of Britain," to the time when Henry VIII. first profanely assumed the pontifical spiritual power of jurisdiction, all Englishmen ac- knowledged the supremacy of God's Vicar, not only as to faith but as to government. Indeed the two could not possibly be separated. Both Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth proved this truth to demonstration. Directly they assumed spiritual jurisdiction, they assumed the right to decide upon mat- ters of faith, and to inflict a new religion upon a new Church, a new Minis- try, a new worship, a new prayer- book, a new everything upon their unhappy and cruelly persecuted sub- jects. The right of spiritual govern- ment and the right of spiritual teach- ing were thus proved to be, practically, inseparable. And to this day the temporal power is in England, the Supreme Pontiff "in all matters civil and ecclesiastical." The Arch- bishop of York and the Arch- bishop of Canterbury, whose careless words I have taken for a text, are both creatures of the civil power in the doctrine which they teach, as much as in the authority which they exercise. How true is the foresight of that Archbishop of York, who in the reign of Elizabeth, as Strype records, told his brother Catholic Bishops what would happen, if they forsook the old Catholic jurisdiction. "By forsaking and fleeing from the See of Rome," said the Catholic Archbishop Heath, "you must first forsake and flee from all general councils; secondly, all canonical and ecclesiastical law; thirdly, the judgment of all other Christian powers; fourthly, the unity of the Church; and by falling out of sisterhood, hazard yourselves to be drowned in the water of schisms, sects, divisions." This is what was to come and this is what has come from the new Protestant theory of jurisdiction. Even supposing the Anglican Bishops were true Bishops, and the Anglican priests were true priests—a supposition which both historically and morally is equally impossible and profane—they would still be, in point of juris- diction, as absolutely outside the Catholic fold as the general and officers of the Salvation Army.—A. F. Marshall in Boston Pilot.

THE CATHOLIC ALMANAC

OF ONTARIO FOR 1895.

Published with the Approbation of the Archbishop and Bishops of Ontario

By the Sisters of the Precious Blood, Toronto

Contains Complete Clergy List, Directory of Parishes and Societies, Locations for every Month, Short Stories, Biographical Sketches, etc.

Can be obtained from the Sisters of the Precious Blood, 113 St. Joseph St., Toronto, and at the office of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London. Price, single copies, 25c. 50c a