

have the debates of 1879 and 1880, the words of Ferry, Gambetta or Bert, to do with the evils of the Revolution that occurred a century before? Mr. Noble's quotation of a Paris correspondent's report in the London Times of an anti-clerical speech, in which the infidel speaker raves about medals and tells some grandmother's stories about teaching immorality, savors too much of the ex-nun, ex-monk, Mrs. Shepherd, Bob Ingersoll style of reasoning to be seriously considered.

In fine—just imagine this fearful specimen of the Brothers' instruction in France: "When our armies under an invincible chief went everywhere to spread terror and fright . . . then the country was great." Why don't he give us the whole quotation? And even as it is, what is wrong in it? Would it be wrong to say of England, "when our navy went forth under an invincible admiral . . . then Britain was great?" Then he quotes from a paragraph referring to the crusades. Does Mr. Noble—in his anti-Catholic hatred—side with the Saracens against England's Richard, as he sides with Voltaire and Gambetta against the Church of Rome?

One word more, and we leave Rev. Mr. Noble and his letter to whatever little immortality our columns afford them; he may call us Romanists if he likes, provided it pleases him; we won't feel any the worse, nor will the Church that has conquered the tempest of nineteen centuries be an atom less solid for that matter. He cannot "honestly call any visible Church a or the Catholic Church." The visible Church of Christ will be none the less Catholic because Mr. Noble does not "honestly" call her by that name. In saying *adieu* to Mr. Noble we desire to point out one grand distinction between Catholic and Protestant teaching. In closing his letter he indicates, as the result of ecclesiastical education in our Province, amongst other things, "increasing debt, oppressive taxation and ecclesiastical tyranny." Is not Mr. Noble attempting, in his own small way, and according to his opportunities and powers, a small ecclesiastical tyranny—a hate engendered one—of his own? What have increased debt and the taxation to do with Catholic education? In this Province these things are due to the different political parties that have been in power; not to the Catholic schools. And particularly are they due to the Treasury department under different administrations. And, again, that department has been under the control of a Protestant almost continuously since Confederation. What has this to do with Catholic schools? These are material, political, industrial, progressive questions—call them what you like—but they in no way relate to Catholic or non-Catholic religious education. Here, Mr. Noble, is the difference between our systems.

The Catholic is primarily taught to seek out the kingdom of God, and that all other things are secondary and will settle themselves in due form and time; the non-Catholic is primarily taught to look out for this world's goods and let the affairs of spiritual moment take care of themselves. Consequently, you attempt to prop up your fragments of a broken creed by flying into the political, commercial or any other domain, except that of Faith. You close with Longfellow's words: "Act in the living present, heart within and God o'erhead," we go further than the poet: "Act for the eternal future, love—not hate—in the heart, and God—not the world—o'erhead."

The Michigan Catholic says: "The St. Patrick's Day Souvenir number of The

TRUE WITNESS, of Montreal, is studded with literary and historical gems—and illustrated with consummate art. It reflects credit on the learning and discriminative power of its editor and on the enterprise of its proprietors."

GRAHAM VS. JESUIT.

On Sunday last the Rev. W. T. Graham made himself ridiculous before the Ministerial Association by his lecture on the Jesuits. He then advocated the conversion or expulsion of that order from Canada. After a most elaborate display of a most superficial knowledge regarding the history, rules, discipline, principles and teachings of the Jesuits, he virtually repeated, in free Canada, the Cromwellian condemnation—"to Hell or to Connaught." Not satisfied with this feat, Mr. Graham goes before an Orange audience, on Friday night, and actually improves upon his former effort. It is a pity that he should have contradicted the Daily Witness in his great anxiety to kill the Jesuits.

Mr. Graham said that "the Papacy is to-day entirely under Jesuit control. All the Roman Catholic Sees are to-day filled by Latin bishops, who are entirely satisfactory to the Jesuits."

The Daily Witness of Friday, the very same day, said: "Pope Leo the Thirteenth is a liberal. The chief care of his reign has been to checkmate Jesuitism, which he has the best reason to hate."

Which is right, Mr. Graham or the Witness? Neither of them. They know as much about Jesuits and the Pope's sentiments as they do about the alleged inhabitants of Mars. The only difference is this: While the Daily Witness has the tact to clothe its ignorance on the subject in acceptable language, Mr. Graham presents his in all its nakedness and deformity to the world. As a sample of how much he knows about Jesuits and the Catholic Church in general, we take the following:

"The Jesuit wants to control Mackenzie Bowell, but there is no probable opinion on which the Jesuit may act concerning that man. All he (the Jesuit) has to do in order to get an excuse for acting against the Premier or Government is to get Archbishop Tache to say that it is probably right to shoot down Mackenzie Bowell. The opinion of a single member of the Roman Catholic Church is all that is necessary to make it right for a man to do wrong." (Laughter and applause.)

No wonder that this sample of wisdom created "laughter." Even Orangemen must laugh at the superlatively ridiculous. A few, perhaps, as erudite as Mr. Graham, may have laughed because the fit was contagious. Archbishop Tache died last June, and the whole of Canada (except Mr. Graham and a few Orangemen) has heard of the consecration of Mgr. Languevin. Besides Mr. Graham argues that the Jesuits are a body of men that seek to govern the Church. If so they surely would not submit to Archbishop Tache's dictation, nor await his approval to act, if they were what these firebrands depict them to be. Again, Mr. Graham must be ignorant of the fact that Archbishop Tache was an Oblate of Mary Immaculate—as is his successor. What has a member of that Order to do with the Jesuit Order? Are then the Jesuits subject to the dictation of other Orders of the Church? If so, they cannot be very formidable. As well say that because a man is a Trappist therefore he is a Sulpician, or because a soldier in the British army is in the Light Infantry he belongs to the Cavalry and must be directed by the Admiral of the fleet.

We don't refer to this lecture in order to refute the slanders and a million-times refuted calumnies, we merely desire to point out the absolute absence of all

knowledge on the part of Mr. Graham—*et hoc genus omne*—concerning the Jesuits and their relations to the Catholic Church and society. We have a few questions to ask Mr. Graham, and unless he can answer them in the affirmative, for his own reputation and for the sake of non-Catholic training and instruction, he should forever be silent. Is he personally acquainted with any member or members of the Jesuit Order? Has he ever attended any of the classes, from elements up to philosophy, in a Jesuit college? Has he ever been inside a Jesuit institution? Has he ever inspected a novitiate? Has he ever heard any of the conferences, either in the novitiate, or in community? Has he ever attended a Jesuit church? Has he ever heard a Jesuit preach? Has he ever followed a course of sermons, in mission, retreat, or on ordinary or extraordinary occasions, delivered by Jesuits? Has he ever read the *Exercises of St. Ignatius*? Has he ever heard the Jesuits explain and develop those Exercises? Has he ever read the rules or observed their practice? In a word—has he ever come in contact, directly or indirectly, with the Jesuits? If not, he must either be demented or else imagine that his hearers are fools; if he pretends to know aught about the principles, rules, teachings—public or private—and practices of the Jesuits. And if he can answer these questions in the affirmative he is simply in bad faith, and he is striving to gain notoriety by fanning into a flame the smouldering embers of fanaticism and by playing upon the credulity of all who wish to listen to his nonsense.

INFALLIBILITY.

We have shown that the Pope is not infallible in any of the senses usually attributed to the dogma by non-Catholics. He is not impeccable, nor gifted with the power of miracles, nor above Divine Law. He is not infallible in virtue of any talent, or knowledge he may possess. He is not infallible as a man, a scientist, a theologian, a priest, a bishop, a primate, or even as Pope—in the plenitude of his supremacy. He is only infallible as Vicar of Christ, that is, as Supreme Head of the Church. Yet, he is not as such infallible in his capacity of supreme legislator, judge and ruler. Only as supreme teacher and guardian of Revelation is he infallible. And even in that capacity he is only infallible in certain matters—and in these matters only under very restricted conditions. So that his infallibility is a very simple and reasonable doctrine. In this issue we will examine the matters in which the Pope is infallible.

By reference to the Vatican Council's decrees it will be seen that four classes of matters come under the supreme authority of the Pope, as Visible Head of the Church. 1st. matters of Faith—what the Gospel commands us to believe; 2nd. Matters of morals—principles of right and wrong as prescribed by Divine Law. 3rd. Matters of discipline—which relate to public worship, liturgy, sacred rites, administration of sacraments, psalmody, election, ordination, appointment, manner of life, ecclesiastical processes, prohibitions, censures, penalties, ecclesiastical privileges, vows, fasts, feasts, divisions of dioceses, administration of church property, etc., etc. 4th. Matters of government—what relates to the form and course of church government and its laws.

In matters of discipline and government the Pope is not infallible. He is only infallible in the doctrines to be believed and the duties to be fulfilled—that is in matters of faith and morals. Therefore, all attacks made upon Infallibility,

founded on Bulls, Briefs, Constitutions, or Letters of Popes, or Decrees of Councils, dealing with any points of discipline or government, are irrelevant and of no consequence, since the Pope is not infallible in any of these cases. This will be found in Rev. Daniel Lyon's work on "Christianity and Infallibility."

To these classes, in which the Pope is not infallible, belong the objections based on the disciplinary decrees of the "Index" in the case of Galileo and that of Lasserre's version of the Gospels.

"Thus the office of infallible Teacher of faith and morals, clearly and of necessity, implies the right to define, with infallible authority, not only matters directly of faith and morals, but also all other matters which, though not directly of faith and morals, are yet so connected with, or so bear upon them, that the latter cannot be fully and infallibly expounded, without an infallible discernment of the former; that the office of infallible guardian of faith and morals also clearly and necessarily implies the right to proscribe and condemn all propositions and principles that are in any way at variance with the truths and principles of faith and morals, or in any way prejudicial to their unity, purity, or integrity. Otherwise, as is obvious, the deposit of faith and morals could not be inviolably guarded."

(See Franzelin, "De Tradition," pp. 121, 127, 176, 209; Mazzella, "De Ecclesia," nn. 805, 826; Hurter, "Theologia Generalis," vol. i., pp. 275, 283; Hettinger, "The Supremacy of the Apostolic See," pp. 120, 123; Manning, "Petri Privilegium," part iii., pp. 60, 78, 88, 89, 173; King, "When Does the Church Speak Infallibly?" pp. 49, 81 and Newman's "Apologia," p. 281 (2d edition, p. 257.)

"What matters, specially and in detail, appertain to the domain of Infallibility, it belongs to the Pope (or to the Church including the Pope) alone to determine finally, for he alone has from God the right to define authoritatively and infallibly the subject-matter of his jurisdiction, its extent, contents and limits. Nor is there anything dangerous, or startling, or new in this claim; it is (the infallibility of the decision apart) the claim of the court of final appeal in the State as well as in the Church."

We have yet another and all-important question to consider regarding the dogma of infallibility. We have seen that the infallibility is limited to the teaching capacity of the Supreme Head of the Church, and only in matters of faith and morals. Is, then, every utterance of the Pope, as Supreme Teacher, in matters of faith and morals, infallible? No, it is not. There are very stringent conditions which must be considered. In our next issue we will deal with the conditions under which alone is the Pope infallible. Before we close our non-Catholic friends will find that this mountain of infallibility is actually only an undulation on the level plane of dogma.

RECENTLY, Abbe Tolstoi—a relative of the Russian novelist—abjured the Greek Schism, and was received into the Roman, or rather United Greek Church. He is informed it would not be safe for him to go back to Russia. Meanwhile the Russian Government ordered him home to answer for his conduct. He was made to understand that if he did not go the Italian police authorities would hand him over to the Russian police. After writing his *apologia*, on the advice of the Holy Father, he started from Rome on his way to Russia. What will be his fate? Talk of Russian civilization and freedom of conscience. If the Abbe would come over to Canada he would be safe—provided the P. P. A. did not smuggle him back to Russia.