

to his will which directly and efficaciously determines him to write or speak." The third is "a divine direction," to insure that the inspired agent faithfully teaches all that, and only that, which God wishes him to teach." And the fourth is "a divine assistance to the end, that the truths supernaturally conceived are, without fail, correctly expressed." Infallibility only implies a *divine assistance* which guarantees against all liability to err when officially teaching the Universal Church. Thus Infallibility implies only one of the four things necessary to inspiration. While inspiration presupposes and includes infallibility, infallibility does not necessarily presuppose nor include inspiration.

On this Father Knox says: "The infallible teacher, as such, receives no interior revelations or suggestions from God. The Holy Ghost does not dictate to him what to say. It is only his external utterances which are overruled, so that he cannot in his official character teach the faithful anything at variance with truth." Cardinal Manning says: "Some have thought that by the privilege of Infallibility was intended a quality inherent in the person, whereby, as an inspired man, he could at any time, and on any subject, declare the truth. Infallibility is not a quality inherent in any person, but an assistance attached to an office; and its operation is not the discovery of the new truths, but the guardianship of the old ones." The word used by the theologians of the Church to express the doctrine is more accurate than the one we employ in English. It is *assistencia* from *ad-sistere*, to stand by. Our word assistance implies help or co-operation; but the Latin word and the doctrine that it expresses imply no such meaning. The dogma merely calls for the presence (or standing by) of the Holy Ghost. Thus does the Rev. Daniel Lyons, from whose treatise we quote the above, conclude: "In the case of inspiration the Holy Spirit informs the mind, excites and moves the will, and directs and guards the tongue and pen of the teacher; in the case of infallibility he does not act at all, except by his ordinary grace, on the whole mind. He merely guards the tongue and pen of the teacher, so as to secure him against the possibility of error when officially witnessing, proposing, defining and defending the Christian Revelation. In the case of inspiration the action of the Holy Spirit is *positive*; in the case of infallibility it is wholly *negative*; in the case of inspiration the Holy Spirit directly *reveals* or *suggests* the truth; in the case of infallibility He directly *prevents* error; in the case of inspiration there is a question of an *inherent* quality; in the case of infallibility there is question of an *external* relationship."

Therefore, infallibility is not, and cannot be inspiration. Consequently, since the Pope is not divinely inspired his decisions on faith and morals, when committed to writing, do not and cannot form part of Holy Scripture, or be considered as so much more Holy Writing. Infallibility does not imply the gift of miracle. The Pope is protected from error by a supernatural, but not a miraculous, assistance. There is nothing extraordinary in it—it is but an ordinary Providence.

Thus we see that Papal Infallibility is derived from Christ, is established upon His promise, is based on Scripture, and that it is an ordinary and natural protection on the part of Providence in favor of the Church of God, the teacher of Divine Truth. It does not imply impeccability, inspiration, nor miracle. It is so self-evident that it seems to us a mere blasphemy to assert that an in-

fallible Christ could leave a fallible teacher to continue the work of salvation, a fallible exponent of truth, a fallible interpreter of His Word.

We thus see what Infallibility is not; what it is; what its origin is; and, in our next issue, we will treat of the object or aim of Infallibility. Let it be remembered that we merely rush over the subject on account of our limited space and opportunity to develop the same. But we quote from the best authorities and the arguments we use are more the fruit of study than any original conceptions of our own. In fact the work on "Christianity and Infallibility—Both or Neither," contains them nearly all.

"SEMPER EADEM."

Such the heading of a very important and significant editorial in last Saturday's Daily Witness; it contains the germs of a great deal of unpleasantness and sounds like the key-note of a tune that no true Canadian is anxious to hear. At different points of the horizon small clouds have appeared, and we trust that the great breeze of common sense will prevent them from collecting in one tempest. We are more inclined to look on the bright side of every picture; but when the power of circumstances, which we cannot control, turns the darker side to our face we cannot ignore its presence. We wish to approach this subject with calmness and fairness, and feeling that those, whose views the Witness represents, are animated with the same spirit, we ask them to lay aside all prejudice and to consider the present situation from the standpoint of Canadian citizenship. We do not purpose entering into the legal, constitutional, political, or even religious merits or demerits of any of the important issues before us. We simply desire to point out a great danger that menaces the future peace and prosperity of our fair Dominion.

It is easy to drop a match on the prairies; a small fire is started. Another person to protect himself against the element sets fire to a second spot; and so does a third. At last the different fires meet, swell into a mighty and ungovernable conflagration. Nothing can prevent the destructive sweep of the flames, and while terror precedes the advancing destroyer, ashes and ruin remain in its track. Finally, when all the harm is done, men begin to learn that had a little care, a slight degree of forethought and consideration been exercised, the whole catastrophe might have been avoided. It is so with the different sections of our cosmopolitan community to-day. Small fires of prejudice, of religious animosities, of conflicting interests are being lighted on many sides, and it is now the hour for all impartial and honest-minded citizens to stamp them out; otherwise each move will add new fuel to the flames, and the result will be far more disastrous than may, at present, be imagined.

The question of the Manitoba School Act has awakened a certain amount of antagonism between the supporters of the Greenway contention and those of the Roman Catholic one. Mr. Dalton McCarthy has not, by his method of arguing the case, done anything to efface that feeling; rather has he increased it by the bitterness of his course. Heretofore one of the very strongest arguments in favor of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, has been the similarity of their position with the Protestant minority in Quebec—as far as separate schools are concerned. Since the hearing of the case, last week, by the Privy Council at Ottawa, and the notorious failure of Mr. McCarthy to meet the solid arguments of Mr. Ewart, and especially the triumphant reply of the latter to

Mr. McCarthy's plea, it has become evident that the present Government, or whatever Government may be in power, cannot escape granting the prayer of the Roman Catholic petition.

Such being the case it became absolutely necessary for the ultra-Protestant section to look around for some practical argument wherewith to defeat the cause of the Manitoba minority. Aware that the existence of the Protestant separate schools in Quebec stands out in grave contrast with the non-existence of Catholic separate schools in the West, the more determined amongst the anti-Catholic element found it expedient to prove—if possible—that the Protestants were persecuted in this Province, that they were deprived of their rights, that they were the victims of Roman Catholic tyranny. Strange to say, that, at the very moment when such a contention was sought to be raised, the Government of Quebec, in one case, and a Catholic priest, in the other, furnished these gentlemen with the weapons they required. Immediately do they seize upon them and brandish them with all their might. The Ministerial Association of Quebec and the generally accepted mouth-piece of Protestantism, the Daily Witness of Montreal, aided by extremists, lash themselves into fury, and dash into the arena, evidently bent upon "war to the knife."

The time for sharp criticism, hasty words, meaningless attacks, and, above all, for abuse or insult, has long since gone past—in fact such have always been untimely—we must approach and grapple with this situation in a rational and unprejudiced spirit. As far as the Beauport Asylum and Provincial Cabinet questions are concerned they are the business of the Quebec Government. With the electorate that Government may settle these matters as best it can—we have nothing to say regarding them. As far as the alleged utterances of Rev. Father Portelance go, if it be true that he delivered himself of such a statement, advice, or order, we must frankly express our deep regret. We cannot, directly nor indirectly, palliate such a course nor condone such expressions. But we certainly must claim, in all justice, that the Church never ordered a priest to take a course so hostile to the spirit that animates Catholicity. It would be very unjust were we to hold Protestantism in general, or our Protestant fellow-citizens, responsible for the untimely, thoughtless, or even intentionally injurious expressions of every minister who chooses to heap insult upon our people, our creed, and upon all that we hold sacred. Equally unfair is it of the Witness and its correspondents to state that the unauthorized expressions of a priest are merely the teachings of our Church conveyed more plainly than the Church would like to have them stated.

It was surmised that a certain doctor in St. Sauveur, who has a good practice and who is a Protestant, was specially aimed at in Father Portelance's address; then it was proclaimed a certainty that he was the object of the remarks; finally, it was proclaimed that he had lost his practice, was ruined, was a martyr. Now this is simply going to extremes, and trying to make the most out of the godsend circumstance in order to prop up a very weak case in another sphere. Much as we disapprove of any man—priest or layman—carrying the spirit of intolerance to a degree of injuring others, still we do not sympathize with the agitators who magnify, beyond all possible reason, the effects of such action, for the purpose of creating further division and animosity. The Witness harps upon what it calls the "conspiracy of silence" on the part of the French

press of Quebec, on these subjects. We know nothing about the motives which actuate that press, either in giving expression to its views, or in refraining from so doing; but we do know that there is no "conspiracy of silence" on the part of the Witness, of Rev. Mr. Noble, *et hoc genus omne*. We are not afraid to express our disapprobation of the priest's course, if it be such as has been depicted by the Witness; no more do we hesitate to stigmatize as unfair the action of the Witness in attempting to saddle a whole body with the responsibility of one man's expressions. If such were Father Portelance's teachings, we can tell the public—both Protestant and Catholic—that they are not those of the Church. But this is not all.

The asylum, the cabinet representation, and the doctor boycotting questions are merely side-issues, raised suddenly to draw away the popular attention from the real, original question of the rights of Roman Catholics in the matter of the Manitoba schools. We admit that they come in very timely for the parties whose case has been so weak, and who have been carrying their high-handed measures with an impunity that could not last. But, nevertheless, they are foreign to the issue now before the Dominion. When a lawyer (like Dalton McCarthy for example) has a bad case, he knows the old advice, "abuse your opponent." When no excuse can be given for an act of injustice, the perpetrator generally tries to prove that the victim has been guilty of the same wrong. The "you're another" style of argument is raised. "Two blacks will not make a white;" nor will one act of unfairness excuse another one. No matter how the Quebec Government deals with the asylum business; no matter whom the Government takes into its cabinet; no matter what this, that, or the other priest or minister may say in his pulpit; no matter how much the Witness and its correspondents abuse Catholicity and Catholics, the question of the separate schools is not thereby affected. The fact of the Protestant element enjoying full rights in matters of education for their children in Quebec, and the other fact of the Catholics being deprived of the same in Manitoba, are not changed. The great issue now before the country, and which all politicians seem to shirk, still remains to be solved. Consequently all peace loving and fair-minded citizens will be anxious to avoid all friction and to smother rather than fan the embers of religious animosity in the land.

DON'T forget that "Fitzgerald, the Outlaw," will be at home in St. Ann's Hall, on Monday evening, the 18th March. Doors open at half-past seven, and the famed Fitzgerald will make his bow at eight o'clock. We anticipate a grand success for this drama, because we have unbounded faith in the talents of the actors and entire confidence in the excellence of Mr. Martin's last effort. All who can possibly go should make it a point to be there.

THE people of St. Gabriel's parish will certainly be pleased to learn that on the occasion of their coming concert, when the Rev. Father Salmon will deliver the lecture of the evening, another old friend of the parish, one whose name was dear to the children of ten or twelve years ago, will also be present. We refer to Rev. Father Cullen, formerly of South Framingham, but recently appointed pastor of Watertown, Mass. It is not improbable that Father Cullen might be induced to address a few words in that neat and elegant style so characteristic of his public utterances, and so familiar to hundreds of St. Gabriel's parishioners.