

mere, another of Mr. Andrew's appointments. The people are prepared to do all they can so far as work and material are concerned—but there must necessarily be the expenditure of money, and this they have not got. From fifty to seventy dollars would go far to supply this lack—who will forward the first contribution for this object?

It may not be out of place here to say a word regarding this particular department of church work in other parts of the field. On the 4th inst. Dr. Cochrane (D.V.) opens the new church at Huntsville. The church at Emsdale which has been unavoidably delayed—(though by no means for the reason stated in the "Globe" some weeks ago) is under way and will be opened later in the month. In September we hope to have the church at Maganetawan also opened, and when this is done we shall then have twelve new churches erected in this section of our Home Mission Field during the past two years. Thus is the wilderness and the solitary place being made glad, and as the gospel in its purity and with faithfulness is proclaimed in these humble buildings erected for the advancement of the divine glory, we may hope, with His blessing that "the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

#### ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—XIII.

His Grace says that it is lukewarm Christians who go to Purgatory. But he also says that they can by their prayers and merits help the saints in heaven and on earth. Now, Christ says he will spue the lukewarm Christian out of His mouth (Rev. iii. 16.) The idea of Peter or Paul in bliss being helped by the prayers and merits of a lukewarm Christian who, by being tormented in the flame of Purgatory, is suffering the due reward of his deeds!

If his Grace be in the right, Paul has made a mistake in Eph. iii. 15, where he says, "Of whom (Christ) the whole family in heaven and earth is named." He should have said "in heaven, earth and Purgatory."

"It is want of due appreciation of the infinite sanctity of God, and the purity of those who shall enter into His glory—to suppose for instance that there is only one step for the criminal from the gallows into heaven" (p. 40.) "It is want of due appreciation of the infinite value of Christ's blood to suppose that any one must be tortured in a most fearful manner in Purgatory before he can enter into heaven. "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth (or purgeth) us from all sin" (1 John i. 7.) Though one's sins be "as scarlet," it can make them "as white as snow;" though they be "red like crimson," it can make them as wool" (Isaiah i. 18.) This, your Grace, is the true Purgatory. Preach it to your people. Bid them look for salvation "to the blood," instead of water, bread, oil, and fire, of which your Church makes so great account. He who grasps the truth referred to concerning Christ's blood, can, without fear, look forward to the time of his departure from earth. He knows that Christ has saved him from hell, and that Purgatory is only a fable. He can, therefore, say in holy defiance, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55.)

Several years ago, a man named O'Leary was hanged at Toronto for a very brutal murder. On the scaffold, he read a speech to the spectators. Father Rooney stood beside him. Perhaps he wrote the speech for him, as the poor man could with difficulty read it. At any rate, there can be little doubt that he saw it before it was read. Well, towards the close, O'Leary said that he was sure that he would "share in God's glory before the setting of that day's sun." His spiritual adviser said not one word in disapproval thereof. Here then, we have a murderer going, we may say, at one step from the gallows into glory. If he were ever in Purgatory, the time he staid there was so short that it is not worth taking into account. But poor Pius IX., though he died in "the odour of sanctity," is still in Purgatory and—for aught we know to the contrary—may be there for ages.

"There is an example of the thief on the cross, one that none may despair, and only one that all may fear" (p. 40.) This is a quotation, but not a very correct one. The last three words should be, "none may presume." The sentence originally refers to the folly and danger of delaying to seek salvation till the "eleventh hour." Of course, it is based on the doctrine that when the last breath is drawn, man's character and condition are for ever fixed. His Grace must, however, mean it to apply to Purgatory, other-

wise it is utterly out of place here. He might, in the latter case, as well have said, "Canada is a part of the British Empire." Here then, is what his Grace must mean. "There is an example—that of the penitent thief of one who went to heaven without going through Purgatory, one that none may despair of being able to do the same, and only one that all may fear that they shall not get to heaven so easily." This sounds strange but it is a fair interpretation of the Archbishop's words. Well then, according to him, the penitent thief is the only one spoken of in Scripture who went to heaven without having first to suffer in Purgatory. Then Stephen the first martyr—though just before he died he saw the heavens opened and Jesus standing at the right hand of God—went to Purgatory. So too did Paul, though he believed that the moment he would depart, he would be with Christ. So too, of course, did Peter "the first Pope," John the beloved disciple, and Joseph, one of the Romish Trinity, of which Christ and the Virgin are the other two. It seems then that the penitent thief before leaving the world "fully satisfied the justice of God on account of his sins committed during life," but the others, whose names I have mentioned, did not. The other thief perished, I suppose, because he had no friends to pay for masses for him.

Dr. Scudder, speaking of the hells of the Hindoos says, "Those persons whose sins are too great to be forgiven in this world, must be sent to one of them." Of several of these he gives a description, which, however, is too long for quotation here. Suffice it to say that the sufferings in each, as in Purgatory, are of a physical kind. They do not, however, last for ever. After the inhabitants have been punished for a longer or shorter time, they return to earth. Here, they may live so as afterwards to go to one of the heavens of the gods or to one of the hells. As regards those who are sent to them, the nature of the sufferings endured in them being physical, and these sufferings being only for a time, Purgatory and the Hindoo hells agree. The great difference between them is this, those who leave the former go to heaven, whereas those who leave the latter, come back to earth, and live their lives over again.

I come now to what his Grace says about infallibility. For a reason which, for the sake of shortness, I shall not explain, I must go back a few pages. On pages 18, 19, he thus speaks concerning councils: "General councils with the Pope at their head are infallible in their decrees; particular councils of Bishops are not. Christ would not have said to His Apostles, 'He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me' (Luke x. 16.) if the pastors of the Church as a body would lead the people into error. Councils cannot invent any new doctrine; they only can define what was the belief of the Church from the beginning, and define it as a dogma of faith, to be implicitly believed. They make however new decrees of discipline according to the exigencies of the times."

According to the foregoing, it is only general councils which are infallible in their decrees, and they are so, only when they have the Pope at their head. Of course, then, they receive their infallibility through him. How can "the pastors of the Church as a body" be infallible, if, as individuals, they be fallible? How can a general council truly say that a certain doctrine has been believed by the Church from the beginning, if some of her most distinguished writers have rejected it? This is true, for example, of the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception, and the Pope's Infallibility.

"The Archbishop says, "Councils are held by denominations outside the Catholic Church, but their decrees are not considered even by themselves irrefutable or binding on the conscience" (p. 19.) Of course, then, he considers the decrees of general councils of his Church of the kind already described, irrefutable or binding on the conscience.

To the question, "What is meant by the Infallibility of the Pope?" his Grace gives the following answer: "It means that the Roman Pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is when in discharge of the office of Peter (Pastor?) and Doctor of all Christians by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that this Church should be endowed for her defining doctrines regarding faith and morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irrefutable of

themselves and not from the consent of the church" (pp. 19, 20.) This is simply a translation from the Latin of the definition of the dogma of Infallibility as given by the late Pontiff himself. It is just a piece of "rigmarole." The explanation here given of the phrase "*ex cathedra*" needs itself to be explained. The best that can be given of it, is just "*ex cathedra*." It is here said that the definitions of the Pope *ex cathedra* are "irrefutable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church." According to this, the Pope is, in himself, infallible, and therefore, can act independently of a council. What need then is there of a council? No more than there is of bringing together all the fire engines in the Dominion to put out a—farthing candle. It is cruel to make old gentlemen travel thousands of miles to do what one person can do, and what he alone has a right to do. It would be far better then to have henceforth no more councils, and let the Pope do all himself. Of course, steamboat and railway companies, and hotel keepers would oppose this arrangement as three ropemakers in England once signed a petition against the abolition of capital punishment. The statement that the definitions of the Pope *ex cathedra* are "irrefutable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church," implies that the Pope and the Church are distinct from each other. But in other parts of this definition, we are told that the Pope is infallible, and the Church is infallible. According to these then, the definitions of the Pope are those of the Church. Therefore, the Pope is the Church, as Louis XIV. said of himself, that he was the State. His definitions are, therefore, irrefutable not from his own consent. Therefore, according to this infallible definition, the Pope is distinct from the Church and is the Church. Even the famous Lourdes water would not enable one to see any harmony between these two propositions.

His Grace further says: "Now as the teaching Church, that is the Bishops of the Church conjoined to the Pope as their head form an infallible council, so the Pope as head of the Church must enjoy that infallibility but only in certain cases when exercising his prerogatives as universal doctor and teacher" (p. 20.) According to this, the Pope is infallible when he is at the head of a general council, because he is at the head of it. He, therefore, receives his infallibility through it. What we have been considering of his Grace's teaching on infallibility, can, therefore, be summed up in the following propositions: (1) A general council is infallible when the Pope is head of it, because he is the head. (2) The Pope is infallible when he is head of a general council, because he is the head. (3) The Pope is in himself infallible, and has no need of any council.

Of course, his Grace must here speak about the Church being built on Peter. He says, "That infallibility Christ has conferred on Peter and his successors for the proper direction of this Church. The words of Christ to Peter are: 'And I say to thee, Thou art a rock,' etc." (Matt. xvi. 18, and Luke xxii. 32.) (p. 20.) Heretics would like to have proof that Peter ever was in Rome, and if he were, that he was Pope. His Grace seems to look on it as a work of supererogation to take any notice of these points.

He says "The Pope is not impeachable (a misprint no doubt for 'impeccable'), he can commit sin like other people ('thru for you, your Grace'), nor is he infallible in his private capacity, in his discourses or in his governments" (p. 20.) Here he distinguishes the Pope's discourses and governments from his private capacity. They must refer then to his public capacity. Therefore, according to Archbishop Lynch, the Pope is fallible in his private capacity, and in his public capacity. Take away these two capacities from the Pope and as little of him is left as there is of the shadow of the Apostle Peter.

Be it remembered that his Grace was a member of the Vatican Council—a pro-infallibility one.

I have not yet done with his Grace, but I shall be fore long.

Metis, Que.

T. F.

#### OUR HOME MISSION WORK.—III.

MR. EDITOR,—I shall now state as briefly as I can the action which, I believe, our Church might wisely take in this matter.

The proposal which I am about to make is not offered without due consideration, and it is not made, I trust, in ignorance of the difficulties which would be met in carrying it out.

It is respectfully submitted as a possible and prac-