

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY. —GRAND— ANNUAL CONCERT

—IN THE—
MONUMENT NATIONAL (St. Lawrence St.)

—ON—
MONDAY EVENING, MARCH 18th

THE HON. WILFRED LAURIER,
Orator of the Evening.

Choruses by St. Patrick's Choir (under the direction of Prof. Fowler); Miss Marie Hollinshead; Madame Villeneuve; Mr. Chas. Kelly; Mr. Egan, (St. Mary's Cathedral, Hamilton); The St. Cecilia Orchestra and Mandolin Club, (Miss Tetrault, directress); Miss Le Bouthillier; Misses and Messrs. Tetrault; Double Quartet: Messrs. J. J. Rowan, E. F. Hewitt, W. P. Clancy, G. A. Carpenter, W. J. McCaffrey, J. Penfold, James Murray, and W. J. Crowe. Numerous other attractions as well. Prof. J. A. Fowler will preside at the piano. Reserve seat tickets, 75c., for sale at Messrs. Kelly Bros., 1891 Notre Dame street. General admission, 50 and 25 cents.

S. CROSS, Rec.-Sec.



WEDNESDAY.....MARCH 18, 1895

ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

As the St. Patrick's Day celebration is the only occasion in all the year when our Irish Catholic Societies have an opportunity of uniting and appearing together in public, it is of the greatest importance that every effort should be made to have the demonstration as representative as is possible. No person should remain behind. The members of the different bodies should muster in as great numbers as they can. There is another special reason this year for extra efforts being made; the celebration takes place on the 18th, Monday, and as a consequence many may be inclined to keep away, on account of it not being a holiday, and Sunday being the seventeenth. We trust that every one will remember that the religious phase so blends with the national one in this great feast, that they have become for all time inseparable. We must bear in mind that the procession to the Church is an act of faith as well as one of patriotism, and that strangers judge our nationality more by the appearance on that occasion than by any other means. We just throw out this hint in the hope that it may serve to increase the attendance on Monday next and thereby add to the *clat* of the demonstration.

THE COMING SEVENTEENTH.

This week our St. Patrick's Day Souvenir is out. In our next regular issue we will give full reports of all the proceedings, ceremonies and entertainments in honor of our Patron Saint. It may not, however, be untimely to pass a few remarks this week upon certain reports which come to us from the neighboring Republic, and which affect in a way the present prospects of Ireland's cause. It appears that at the Cooper Institute, in New York, when the Emmet Anniversary was celebrated, the orator of the evening, Rev. G. C. Botts, an Episcopal minister of Passaic, N.J., delivered a very peculiar address. It is reported that he gave expression to the sentiment that passive resistance was a failure, and that Irishmen had spent enough on parliamentary agitation. He believed that Nationalists had come to the conclusion that swords should hereafter be their pens and cannon balls their punctuation marks. The resolutions to which he spoke said: "We declare the use of any and every means of warfare against Great Britain as justifiable under

the circumstances, and Irishmen should not hesitate to use them when necessity demands it or opportunity shall present itself."

In plain English, we consider this the best example of "blatherskite patriotism" that we have, for a long time, heard. The fact is, that men who assume such a tone and give expression to such sentiments are generally of that category of persons who are more endowed with zeal than gifted with common sense. Happily, an isolated case of this class can have little effect upon the ultimate prospects of any cause. Still, it is well that the general public should not be deceived, nor left under the impression that these fiery outbursts are the echoes of Irish sentiment in general. We have our unfortunate divisions, and to them alone can we now attribute the delay in the advancement of Ireland's legislative interests. Were our leading constitutional agitators a unit, Home Rule would long since have been secured. But, when men come to talk of armed enforcement of rights, they must consider the age in which we are living. There was a time when it was heroic to appeal to physical force arguments. Everyone pauses in admiration before the noble attitude of Meagher when delivering his "Sword Speech." But Meagher was surrounded by very different circumstances from those of the present; and Meagher was not afraid to use the sword of which he spoke so eloquently—he proved his earnestness on many an American field of battle.

Men may exist to-day equally as daring, and equally as ready to put their words into practice; but what effect would all their patriotic heroism have upon the prospects of Ireland? Just glance at the history of the last fifty years. There was more union, determination and concentration of talent in 1848 than at any other period during this century. Yet, the result was a dismal failure. Why? Because the enthusiasm that was created by the great revolutionary wave that then swept over Europe, and the patriotic fervor that was kindled by the distress in the Old Land, had blinded the leaders to the fact that they were contending single-handed, so to speak, and comparatively unarmed, against a power—however inimical it might be—that had them firmly in its grasp. Quarter of a century later another physical force effort was made, with less prospect of success than the first one and with more emphatic failure as a result. Why so, again? Because there was a lack of faith in those leaders, a lack of discipline in the ranks, a lack of sympathy from the more experienced patriots, and a lack of support from any external power. When Stephens, fresh from Kilmainham, landed in America, what did he find? The O'Mahony section at war with the Roberts section. He was distrusted by the former and unrecognized by the latter. On the other side matters were still worse. The event of February 18th, 1867, ended in General Burke's capture and the scattering of his followers. The event of the Canadian expedition ended in a regular break up, and in a perfect evidence that the very powers depended on were opposed to the movement.

It was only a decade later on that real and practical work was done—and that in the form of constitutional agitation—for the better government of Ireland. From 1886 to 1892, under the generalship of Parnell—a cool, calculating, determined organizer—more was done to awaken sympathy the world over for the cause, and to advance the interests of the race, than during five times the same number of years before. To-day the prospect may seem somewhat cloud-

ed; but, as we remarked already, that cloud is created by the divisions in the ranks of Home Rulers. Do you want to destroy, for another hundred years, any chance of securing legislative autonomy for Ireland? If so, go abroad spouting thunder and dynamite!

Go down to the shore and watch the tide making. Stand at a particular spot below high-water mark. You will see a small wave coming up and then receding; another comes a few inches nearer and in turn recedes; a third and a fourth—ever coming nearer, ever receding. But remain there half an hour, and, in spite of all those receding waves, you will find that the tide is rising around you, and, if you stay too long, you will eventually have to run away from it. So is it with the Irish cause. Every little wave that recedes is but an additional strength to the great, powerful, irresistible tide that is coming in. Men of narrow views, who look only upon the surface, grow excited, become desperate, lose all patience, when they find that the waves are constantly being checked and rolled back; but they cannot see that the grand *ensemble* of those waves is rising gradually higher and higher, and that eventually the feeble power that would resist the incoming tide must make way or sink beneath it.

We give way to no man, to no body of men, in our anxiety and desire to see Ireland happy and prosperous; we will go as far as any rational patriot in advancing the cause of our long-suffering race; but we do not believe in ravings or follies of any kind—no matter how sincere the dreamers may be. Moreover, we would be long sorry to have the stranger believe that such sentiments as those expressed, so recently in New York, were re-echoed by the advocates of Irish Home Rule. Because we grow enthusiastic over the brilliant and glorious career and death of Emmet, is no reason why we should lose sight of the fact that the great and ever-to-be-remembered patriot acted and spoke a century ago. Were Robert Emmet alive to-day, he would be found in the foremost rank of the agitators who are seeking to secure, by constitutional means, the boon of self-government for the land of his love. Emmet would not feel grateful to any person—no matter how well meaning he might be—who would jeopardize the prospects, ever brightening, of Ireland, for the sake of any enthusiastic or hot-headed course that a moment's irresolution and excitement might suggest.

The world has grown small of late; the facilities of communication between continents has brought the nations more in touch with each other; no civilized government can possibly perpetrate any act of tyranny that will be long tolerated; the spirit of Democracy is in the ascendant; and, the very trend of general events indicates that Ireland's future is secure, provided her sons become united and are unceasing in their efforts to carry Home Rule.

DALTON MCCARTHY says that "the present schools, in Manitoba, are non-sectarian. That is not the question. As far as Protestantism is concerned they may not be under the control or influence of any particular sect; but no matter whether Anglican, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, or all combined, they are none the less non-Catholic. Non-sectarian means "not belonging to any one sect, not subject to the teachings of any particular religious sect, or section of Protestantism." They may be non-sectarian and at the same time anti-Catholic. The Catholic Church is not a sect; it is a religion from which the sects have separated. Therefore, the Catholics do not object to the schools because they

are sectarian or non-sectarian, but because they are surrounded with an anti-Catholic atmosphere, and indifference and final objection to the Faith may be the result of children living in and breathing the purely Protestant air of those schools. Mr. McCarthy's Catholic ancestors knew this well. Had it been otherwise the present Dalton would be a Catholic instead of a persecutor, a hater and misrepresenter of the Church of his forefathers.

INFALLIBILITY.

This week we will consider the origin and cause of Infallibility. The origin of this dogma is in the express promise of Christ to the Church and to its visible Head. The source of the doctrine is to be found in the recorded words of Christ: (Math. XVI. 18; XXVIII. 18-20, Luke X. 16; XXII. 31-32, John XIV. 16; XVI. 13; XXI. 15-17.) The cause of Infallibility is the presence and assistance of the Holy Ghost pledged through these to *abide with them forever; to guide them into all truth.* (John *ibid.*) Thus basing our selves upon the word of Christ we discover that Papal Infallibility did not originate in the Vatican Council, in July, 1870. It dates back to the day of Pentecost. All that the Council did was merely to promulgate the dogma; that is to authenticate the fact by a formal definition. We also see that Infallibility is not a natural but a supernatural endowment—it belongs to the order of grace, not of nature. Moreover, we conclude that it does not consist in the learning of man, but in the *power of God.* (1 Cor. Chap. II., 4, 5, 13.)

The Pope is not infallible, therefore, because he is talented, wise, learned or prudent; simply because he is supernaturally assisted by the Holy Ghost, according to the promise of Christ. Infallibility is entirely independent of the knowledge or ignorance, the wisdom or unwisdom, the virtues or the vices of the individual man, who happens to occupy the Papal throne. There is no more learned man living than Leo XIII; yet, he is not infallible on that account. Seventeen years ago, the Pope was as gifted as he is to-day; he was even fresher, and younger; he was a poet, a writer, a theologian, a statesman—but he was not infallible. And had he never ascended the throne of Peter he never would have been endowed with infallibility; not even were he ten times as gifted and learned as he actually is. On the other hand there were several Popes whose talents were comparatively limited, and who displayed very little of the dazzling qualities that go to make up the world's "great men;" yet they were none the less infallible for that.

While, then, the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, is infallible, he is not *inspired*. Cardinal Hergenrother, in his work "Anti-Janus," says: "No Pope has ever attributed to himself inspiration, but Divine assistance only." In Perone's "De Locis Theologicis," we find the statement that: "Never have Catholics taught that the gift of infallibility is given by God to the Church, *after the manner of inspiration.*" And Cardinal Newman says: "The inspiration of the Pope or the Church, in the sense in which the Apostles were inspired, is *contrary to our received teaching.*"

What does the gift of inspiration imply? According to Catholic theology, it implies four things. (See Cardinal Franzelin, "De Traditione," and Cardinal Mazzella, "De Virtutibus Infusis.") The first is "A Divine Illumination of the mind of the teacher, in which the truth to be taught is directly and immediately communicated." The second is "a divine impulse