

THE TRUE WITNESS

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

No. 761, Craig Street Montreal, Canada.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION:

Country.....\$1 00
City.....1 50
If not paid in advance: \$1.50 (Country) and \$2 (City) will be charged.

Subscribers, Newfoundland, \$1.50 a year in advance.

TO ADVERTISERS.

The large and increasing circulation of THE TRUE WITNESS ranks it among the best advertising mediums in Canada.

A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS at 15c per line, first insertion, and 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special rates for contracts on application.

All Business letters, and Communication intended for publication, should be addressed to D. M. QUINN, Proprietor of THE TRUE WITNESS, No. 761 Craig street, Montreal, P. Q.

WEDNESDAY.....JULY 19, 1893

A PROTESTANT POPE.

Our sage friend the Daily Witness, in Thursday's issue, gives a pretty fair sample of its knowledge of and methods of dealing with certain important Catholic dogmas. It tells its readers that "many thinking Roman Catholics saw in the declaration of Papal Infallibility a possible danger to the Church." And it then asks, "what if a Protestant Pope should arise?" After these wise utterances our religious contemporary says that "infallibility has, however, distinctly declared that it is possible and permissible for Roman Catholic children to be brought up at common schools." And further it wonders how that can be reconciled with the views of the general Catholic clergy on the subject. Terrible dilemma, indeed!

In the first place, as far as the dogma of infallibility is concerned the Witness is either completely and entirely ignorant on the subject—in which case it should let it alone,—or else it intentionally and maliciously misrepresents the question—in which case it betrays its Christian professions. In order, once for all, that our contemporary may have no excuse for misconstruing the meaning of infallibility, we will, in a few words, repeat the exact signification of the term as applied to the Pope of Rome, and if, in future, the Witness attempts to ignore a simple and plain statement we will be justified in attributing bad faith to that organ.

Papal infallibility is not, as supposed by our Protestant friends, of this century alone: it has existed ever since the hour when Christ confided to St. Peter and his successors the care of His Church. The definition of the dogma did not create the infallibility; the infallibility gave rise to the definition. There are many dogmas of the Church undefined; and they will remain so until time, circumstances, and the requirements of the age render it necessary to have them pronounced. Infallibility existed just as certainly before, as it does since, the official promulgation of the dogma by Pius IX. He merely declared it a certainty, that an age of doubt and misrepresentation might no longer have any misgivings on the subject. In the second place infallibility exists only in matters of fundamental doctrines—or dogma; and only when the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, and as Head of the Church, speaking *ex-cathedra* declares in favor of the decisions of the sacred College of Cardinals. In matters of discipline, such as the School Question, the Pope does not pretend to infallibility. Any degree of infallibility he may possess is merely due to his superior education, knowledge, abilities, or

information on the subject. In issuing his written communications to the faithful he is not necessarily infallible, provided such communication be not the promulgation of a fundamental doctrine. Surely this is clear enough. If the Pope were not infallible in matters of Faith, he would not and could not be the Vicar of Christ; to deny his infallibility in such cases, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, is tantamount to a denial of the infallibility of Christ. Consequently, it was not as an infallible expression of the Divine doctrine that the Pope wrote regarding the question at issue; but as a peaceable and fallible, yet supremely wise ruler and director of the Church's discipline that he expressed himself.

The term Protestant rope is a contradiction in itself. It is a childish and foolish expression. How could a man be the Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church, and at the same time protest against his own rights, privileges, prerogatives and powers? Again, the idea of an "American Pope," is as silly as the other. As well say that Canada is likely to have a Canadian sovereign, because the Queen of England is represented here by the Governor-General. To say that the Papal Alegate is another Pope, is as ridiculous as to say that each parish priest is an Archbishop because he represents the Archbishop in a section of the diocese. Such talk is mere clap-trap. But on the really serious question of the infallibility we would respectfully ask the Witness to either learn the meaning of the dogma or else cease dealing with a subject upon which it is evidently ignorant in the extreme.

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

On Wednesday last Lord Derby—now ex-Governor-General of Canada—bid good-bye to the Capital; on Thursday he said farewell to Montreal, and on Saturday from old Quebec, he went on board the "Sardinian" and, amidst the boom of cannon and the cheers of thousands, he waved *adieu* to our Dominion. He came here, almost five years ago, as Lord Stanley of Preston, he left us last week as the Earl of Derby. Although the term of his office was not marked by an exceptionally striking events in the sphere of his duties, still both he and his amiable lady, won their way to the hearts of the people, and by an unostentatious kindness, a constant attention to the requirements of all classes in the Dominion, and by a calm, yet determined, exhibition of toleration and justice, Lord Derby gave evidence of abilities and qualifications eminently calculated to elevate the office he held in the estimation of the public.

It must be remembered that when Lord Derby assumed the control of affairs in Canada, and became the representative of the Sovereign in one of the most important of Great Britain's colonies, he was called upon to walk in the path trod by such eminent men as Lord Dufferin and the Marquis of Lorne. And yet, in his turn, the ex-Governor gave proof ample and irrefutable, of the wisdom of the Imperial Parliament in its selection of men to fill the high post that fell to his lot. Next to the Viceroy of India, the Governor-General of Canada is the most important representative of the mother country that is sent abroad. The solid constitution of Great Britain furnishes a trinity of Government, consisting of the three important elements, the Sovereign, the Lords and the Commons. Each is a check upon the others, and each has its necessary part to play in the affairs of the nation. The Commons represents the people; and from that people every act of legislation ori-

ginates. Tyranny cannot exist, simply because no law can emanate from the sole will of the Sovereign, nor yet from the Lords; it must come from the people through their representatives in the Commons. Then all anarchy, revolutionary legislation and communistic indoctrinization are rendered impossible, because the law coming from the people must pass through the hands of the representatives of the privileged classes in the House of Lords. And all action on the part of the Lords that might tend toward injustice regarding the people is checked in the person of the Sovereign, whose person is invested with the power to sanction or to *veto* any act of legislation. Thus in the three branches are the people guaranteed against autocratic rulings and tyranny, while the state is protected against extreme or revolutionary popular measures.

Our Canadian constitution being based upon that of the Mother Country we here enjoy the same safeguards. The people are represented in our Commons; the Lords are replaced by our Senate; and the Sovereign exists in the person of the Governor-General—who is responsible only to the Imperial Power, and who is, therefore, above all party feelings, inclinations or prejudices as far as Canada is concerned. The consequence is that, at times, the holder of that office is called upon to decide in weighty matters affecting the peace, prosperity and interest of the general public. Lord Derby, during his term, had a few very important duties to perform and they demanded a certain amount of delicacy as well as firmness, both of which qualities he manifested in a striking manner and to the entire satisfaction of the country. At the moment certain elements may not have been in accord with his views, but time has justified his course and proven beyond all dispute the wisdom of his actions.

During his term Canada lost one of the most eminent men of the age and certainly the foremost colonial statesman of the empire, in the person of the late Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald. It fell to Lord Derby's lot to make choice of a successor to the one whose personality had been so long identified with the public affairs and the destinies of Canada. In so doing, under most conflicting circumstances, the Governor-General displayed sound judgment and great foresight in the choice that he made. And before the close of his career in the Dominion he was once more called upon to select a leader of the Government, this time to replace Sir John Abbott. Again, and even more pronouncedly, did Lord Derby give evidence of his deep knowledge of men, the requirements of the people, and of the best possible means of calming the troubled waters on the sea of politics, when he chose the present able and distinguished Premier of Canada.

Now that Lord Derby has left us, and that he returns to his ancestral home and to his seat in the House of Lords of England, we have one request to make of him. Basing his future course, in the great arena of Imperial politics, upon his experience of Canada and the blessings that our people enjoy under the safeguards of our free constitution and native legislation, we would ask him to put into practice the broad principles which he not only advocated but exemplified while amongst us, by using his influence in the House of Lords, in securing the passage of the great Home Rule measure for Ireland. When that Bill comes before the House in which he, as the new Earl of Derby, will sit, his successor, Lord Aberdeen, will be hailed by the Canadian people as the friend of liberty, the advocate of justice, and the

personification of liberality towards the children of a long suffering land. Were Lord Aberdeen at home, and in the House of Lords, his voice would be raised, and with no uncertain sound, would he demand the passage of a Bill destined to bring peace and prosperity to the land he once governed so well and to which he and his noble lady have rendered such incalculable services. But as he will then be silenced, as far as Imperial politics are concerned, and will be actively engaged in continuing in Canada the good works commenced by Lord Derby, it would be highly proper that the latter should take the stand in the House of Lords which Lord Aberdeen would have taken were he not cut off from all participation in the affairs of legislation at home. No living man has a better idea than Lord Derby of the advantages that Canada has reaped from the possession of self-government, and no person has a grander and more timely opportunity of utilizing such knowledge for the benefit of a whole people.

By taking that stand in the House of Lords, his experience from which he can freely speak, and the weight of his influence which is considerable, must necessarily serve in a great measure to tide the Bill over that most dangerous of all the shoals it has to meet. Doubly dear and doubly beloved would he become; in Canada the admiration and affection of the people would be increased many fold, and in Ireland, as well as wherever an Irish heart beats, his name would be cherished with a gratitude that would be undying. Should these lines, from an humble source, ever come under the eye of Canada's last Governor-General, we hope and trust that they will cause him to ponder seriously over his past successes in winning the good wishes of those he governed, and his future possibilities in gaining the hearts of an entire race.

We have received quite a number of communications, from varied sources on the question of "school inspectorship." From the bundle we have selected a couple which we publish in this issue. The reason we have chosen these two is because the writers both seem to have seized our idea and express very clearly and concisely their views on the subject. As to the others, the writers of them will understand that to publish their letters would occupy such a space that we would have little room left for other important matter.

A LADY correspondent has sent us some very wise and very timely suggestions regarding the training and education of young girls. We have been wavering between giving the text of the admirable letter or basing some articles upon it. As her correspondent marks the communication private we do not feel at liberty to make use of it as a letter; and as the ideas expressed therein will be the source of any articles we may publish on the question, we wish that the lady referred to should receive credit where credit is due. As soon as we can disentangle ourselves from a heap of subjects that have been awaiting fair treatment for some time past, we purpose taking up again this important matter of "education for the girls." In connection with this subject we might remark that at the session of the council of Public Instruction held on the 17th May, 1893, it was moved by His Honor, Judge Jette and seconded by His Grace, Mgr. Begin, Archbishop of Cyrene, and resolved, "that this committee recommends that Calisthenics be practised in the girls' schools, and gymnastics in the boys' schools." This is also a question which comes under the heading and upon which we hope, before the vacation is over, to have something to say.