

It is here that the extracts which Sir Alexander Galt has given from Bishop Fessler are specially to be borne in mind; for they show the dangerous bearing of the principle of minimising. During the Emancipation agitation Rome kept quiet. At the present time Bishop Fessler and Dr. Newnan are minimising, but those in Quebec who are "more Catholic than the Pope" are probably right after all, and may at any time be justified in their interpretations. It is hard for Protestants to sit silent when the whole foundation of their civil rights is being sapped by dogmatic decrees which at one time are explained one way and at another time are explained another way by scientific Roman theologians. These ultra Romans are the *avant courriers* of public opinion. Let such doctrines go unchallenged—let the public mind get familiar with this once foreign language—let the youthful mind be imbued with it in the schools, and it will soon reach the Bar, the Bench, and the Senate, and we shall wake up one day to find that we need all our safeguards, and that we too have been overcredulous in listening while *scientific* theology placed a meaning upon words which their ordinary sense would not justify.

This restlessness on the part of the Roman hierarchy is the more inexcusable, because the Bishops admit, in the decree quoted by Sir Alexander Galt, that their Church is freer here than in any other part of the world. Yet they are not satisfied; they hope to attain still further (*deinceps*) to an ideally full and perfect freedom, by means of the favour of our civil rulers. Now this full freedom of the Roman Church is the complete subordination of every other Church, or sect as they would say. Not only is the Roman Church now free, but it has this advantage over the State Churches even of the Empire, that the sword of the civil power collects its tithes. O, Reverend Prelates of the Council, why seek to bind upon this country burdens which neither we nor our fathers were ever able to bear?

During the superficial discussion lately elicited in the House of Commons and in the press, it seemed to appear that all Roman Catholics are Ultramontaners. We venture to think that a fallacy underlies the use of this word. They are doubtless Ultramontane in the sense that they accept the recent definition of the infallibility of the Pope.

The word is used evidently in opposition to the word Gallican, which has now become almost a term of opprobrium. But it does not follow that in giving up the most salient of the Gallican doctrines, that they give them all up. They may cease to be Gallicans, and yet may not—and we believe most of the laymen do not—hold to the power of the Pope in temporals, or even in mixed matters. It is true that the position is logically difficult. Cardinal Manning shows that an infallible authority must define its own limits. In any conflict between Church and State, the fallible State must yield to the infallible Church, from the very nature of the terms employed. The latent premiss once admitted, the logic is irresistible: and for all who value civil liberty the outlook is gloomy. When we see, as Sir Alexander Galt has shown us, that infallible authority has made its first appearance on our Statute Book, we can only hope that our civil rulers will carefully remember in the future that the rights of conscience are superior to the rigid deductions of scholastic logic; for it is in the wielding of the temporal sword, under the dictation of the spiritual sword, that the conflict is likely to arise. If Sir Alexander Galt's pamphlet does no other service, it will compel the politicians to turn their attention to this question, and to form definite ideas as to the true relations between Church and State in Quebec.

The liberties of the Gallican Church, concerning which so much has of late been said, are summed up by Fleury under two maxims: 1st. That the power given by Jesus Christ to His Church is purely spiritual, and extends neither directly nor indirectly over temporal matters; 2nd. That the fulness of the power which the Pope has, as Chief of the Church, should be exercised conformably to the canons received by the whole Church; and that the Pope himself is subject to the judgment of a General Council in the case pointed out by the Council of Constance. These propositions, with the addition that the laws, manners, and customs of the Gallican Church should be preserved inviolate, were proclaimed as "maxims received from their forefathers," and embodied in four Articles drawn up by the hand of the celebrated Bossuet. These Articles were unanimously adopted by the Bishops in 1682, homologated by the Parliament, and sanctioned by

Not
to be
used