

been deemed politic to allow any responsible ecclesiastic to compromise the Church by proclaiming them from the pulpit. Of course we see the loopholes which are left for casuistical interpretation. We know that the "supremacy of the Church over the State" is to be confined to ecclesiastical questions. But what questions are ecclesiastical is to be decided by the Church; and history tells us plainly enough what the scope of her decision will be.

In the political eddies caused by the meeting of these two hostile tides of ecclesiastical opinion sank Sir George Cartier, and probably he sank to rise no more. Neither he, at least, nor any other man in his place, will ever again occupy the position of the political leader of the National Church of French Canada. The result of the conflict between the Gallicans and the Jesuits cannot be doubtful. The Jesuits have all the influences of the hour in their favour, and they will triumph in this case, as they have triumphed in all the Roman Catholic communities of Europe. Their triumph is in fact the inevitable consequence of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, proclaimed in their interest, and through their machinations. There will come, and probably at no distant time, a struggle between the Ultramontane Church of French Canada and the State.

That struggle offers a great part to any public man who is young, who is hopeful, who is strong in conviction, who is not afraid, politically speaking, to take his life in his hand, who aims at something above the prizes for which hack politicians scuffle with each other on the hustings, who desires to win the position which can be won only by becoming the champion of a great cause. The old parties have no such man. We shall see what young Canada can produce.

Turning to Ontario, we find, as a matter of course, the appointment of Mr. Mowat to the Premiership unreservedly lauded by one party organ, and condemned with equal

energy by the other. If the two journalists, instead of serving their parties, were speaking the truth frankly over a dinner table, both would probably agree that the appointment in itself is a very good one—Mr. Mowat being a man of undoubted character and ability—but that the transfer of a judge from the bench to a political office, if it was necessary, was a necessity much to be deplored. In a country like ours, the integrity of the judiciary is at least as important as that of the executive or the legislature; and the integrity of the judiciary can be preserved only by keeping the bench of justice entirely distinct from the political arena. The precedents cited from the English practice by the defenders of Mr. Mowat's appointment, even if they were relevant, would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. But they are not relevant. The combination of the office of Minister of Justice with that of Chief Judge in Equity in the person of the English Chancellor is, like the judicial function of the House of Lords, a relic of a very ancient state of things anterior to the separation of the judiciary from the executive, or of either from the legislature, and it is rather retained by the national conservatism, than approved by the national judgment. Probably a separate Ministry of Justice will be among the coming legal reforms. Meantime, the Lord Chancellor does not try controverted elections, and it is scarcely possible that any political question should ever come before him in court. That Lord Ellenborough was taken from the Chief Justiceship of a Court of Common Law into the Cabinet is true; but the measure was generally repudiated at the time, and it is certain that it will never be repeated.

The recall of Vice-Chancellor Mowat to political life is a proof, on the one hand, of the dearth of leading ability in the Ontario Legislature, caused by the narrowness of the parties, and on the other, of the inadequacy of judicial salaries, which are insufficient to retain the services of a first-rate man.