

## SLAVES OF ROME.

An English lecturer, delivering a tirade at Brighton, against the Catholic Church, characterized the adherents of our Faith as "Slaves of Rome, subjects of Papal tyranny, and men trembling beneath the rod of the Inquisition." We will not bother at present with the Inquisition; we are dealing with that subject elsewhere, nor will we trouble ourselves about that meaningless and loud-sounding phrase, "Subjects of Papal tyranny." We will merely revive the words of the late Dr. Brownson on the question of all Catholics being "Slaves of Rome."

Away back in the fifties, some evangelical gentleman, called Rufus W. Clarke, delivered a lecture in Boston on the subject of "Romanism in America," and he took advantage of his subject to make use of expressions somewhat similar to those used by the Brighton lecturer of this year. So complete, so crushing, so concise, was Dr. Brownson's refutation of that person's remarks, that we could not do better than quote them in full. Perchance they might serve a twofold purpose; firstly, to open the eyes of some of our separate brethren as to the true teachings of Catholicity; and secondly, to give some of our co-religionists a ready weapon of defence whenever their faith is attacked at this particular point. To repeat the words of that great master of controversy, to unearth from beneath the dust of nearly half a century the gems of argument that fell from that powerful genius, seems almost like disinterring some splendid column from the ruins of Pompeii or some precious mosaic from beneath the lavas of Herculanium.

"The Protestant is fond," says Dr. Brownson, "of calling us slaves because we recognize the Papal supremacy, and forgets that he, unless he is fibbing, is, to say the least, as great a slave as we. He is no more at liberty to believe or to do anything contrary to the teachings and precepts of the Bible than we are to believe or to do anything contrary to the definitions and rescripts of the Holy Father. He is as much bound, according to his own confession, to conform in all things to the Bible as we are to the Church. He asserts, for all men and nations, states and individuals, an authority as supreme and inflexible as that which we assert. How, then, are we less free than he? The only difference between us in respect to authority is that he places it in the record of what God said by men of ancient times, and we in what He teaches and commands through the voice of a living Pontiff. If the authority we assert is human because it comes to us through a human organ, then must the authority he asserts be human, for that comes to him only through a human organ. The Prophets and Apostles were men in the same sense that the Pope is a man, and if God's voice, through them, is Divine and authoritative, it may be equally Divine and authoritative through him. If he holds that in believing and obeying the Bible he is believing and obeying God's word, so we hold that in believing and obeying the living Pontiff we are believing and obeying God. He asserts an Apostolic authority that was, and we an Apostolic authority that was and is. If we hold a doctrine incompatible with freedom, he holds one equally so, and every argument he uses to prove that the Papal supremacy is incompatible with freedom, civil or religious, and favorable to civil or spiritual despotism, may be urged to prove the same of the scriptural supremacy which he asserts."

Before the mental vision of many an honest-minded but unenlightened man there dances a fearful phantom, a hideous spiritual hobgoblin, a very night-mare creature in the form of the "Infallible Pope." He seems to these people like a great ogre in his enchanted castle of the Vatican, living upon the victims of his tyranny and glutted with the very life blood of his millions of slaves. We had thought that, with the advancement, inventions, rapid communications and electric wonders of this century, the fairies, giants, pygmies and Arabian Nights creations had all vanished; that people no longer believed in ghosts, and that nursery tales were laughed at by the simplest child. But we find we were mistaken; for up through the mist looms the fearful form of that "Infallible Pope," seated upon the seven hills and ready to chain these devotees of his faith to his foot-stool and ever holding over them the rod of an Inquisition. Well, as Dr. Brownson so forcibly tells us, we are not the slaves of a Pontiff any more than our separated brethren are the slaves of a volume. Not one of them claims for himself or for his church or denomination an infallibility in the interpretation of the Bible as the word of God; we claim an infallibility for our Pontiff, when speaking *ex cathedra*, and explaining the dogmas of faith—whether written or traditional. At very worst, our church can only be fallible; at very best their's cannot be more than fallible; so ours, at worst, is as good as theirs at best, with a chance of ours having something better in the infallibility of its head. If we are "slaves of Rome," we are slaves of the Church of Christ; if slaves of His Church, we are slaves to Himself, slaves of God. Now we scarcely think that even the cool audacity of a Brighton lecturer will carry him so far as to accuse any individual or denomination of being the "slave of God." The very terms would imply tyranny on the part of the Omnipotent and would be blasphemous. Space will not permit us to continue as we would like to do upon this topic; however, sufficient has been said to prove that there are no "slaves of Rome," but there are slaves of the power that contends against her.

## ANNEXATION.

In the Senate of the United States December 18th, 1894, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Gallinger submitted the following resolution:—

"Whereas we believe that the political union of the two great English-speaking communities who now occupy and control North America will deliver the continent from the danger of war and securely dedicate it to peaceful industry and progress; lessen the per capita cost of government and defense; insure the rapid development of its boundless natural resources; enlarge its domestic and foreign commerce; unite all interests in creating a systematic development of its means of internal communication with the seaboard by rail and water east and west; protect and preserve its wealth, resources, privileges, and opportunities as the undisputed heritage of all; immensely add to its influence, prestige, and power; promote, extend, and perpetuate government by the people, and remove for ever the causes most likely to seriously disturb cordial relations and kindly intercourse with the motherland: Therefore,

Resolved,—That we invite the Canadian people to cast in their lot with their own continent, and assure them that they shall have all the continent can give them. We will respect their freedom of action, and welcome them when they desire it into an equal and honorable union."

This resolution was ordered to be printed and we have to thank Mr.

Francis Wayland Glen, of Brooklyn, N.Y., for a special copy which he was good enough to send us.

All this is very kind on the part of our good neighbours across the line, and we certainly appreciate their kindly offer of so many inducements (upon paper) for Canada to enter the Union. Still we feel that it is an act of prudence on our part to calculate the chances and to inquire into the *quid pro quo* that Canada might expect in the case of any serious consideration of such a proposition. Let us briefly look at the situation from the standpoints of two questions. What would Canada receive that she does not already possess? What would she lose that she now enjoys?

First consideration; what benefits would Canada derive? We have, according to the New York "Commercial Advertiser," "the best and most extensive fisheries in the world," and "the white pine forests of Canada are alone worth more than her public debt." We desire to reply through the mouth-pieces of American opinion. We quote the same authority in each of our answers. Will the United States help to increase our territory, or will we increase their's? "Canada has 100,000,000 acres of wild lands upon which the best wheat can be successfully grown in the fertile belt in the North West." Will they add to or take from our national resources or our products? "Canada has coal of good quality in abundance very near tidewater upon the Atlantic and Pacific; unlimited supplies of high grade iron ore in all the provinces; the best and most extensive nickel mines in the world; extensive and valuable mines of copper; and immense deposits of agricultural phosphates in Ontario and Quebec; inexhaustible beds of marble, granite, sandstone and limestone in various colors for building purposes; mines of gold, silver, asbestos, and mica; unsurpassed herds of thoroughbred cattle, horses and sheep; three thousand cheese factories, from which she exports more than 100,000,000 pounds of cheese annually."

Will they improve our educational system? "Canada's public schools, colleges, universities, charitable institutions and public buildings are worthy of an intelligent, highly civilized Christian people, who govern themselves."

Will they furnish us with a better banking system? It is notorious that Canada possesses to-day one of the most solid banking systems in the world, and that amidst the commercial crashes that have recently shaken the United States, this Dominion stood firmly intrenched behind her magnificent monetary bulwarks.

"There is not a community in the world of 5,000,000 in numbers more free from objectionable elements than that of Canada." Would their system of government improve our condition, or from it could we learn anything? "Canadians are well versed in the art of self-government. They clearly understand that true liberty is not license, therefore, they have a profound respect for law and constitutional means and methods of government. They demand honest money."

Would they advance our railway systems? "Canadians have as many miles of railway per capita as we have, and they have common sense enough not to embarrass their railway systems with adverse legislation."

Here again is another American reference to our banking system. "The history of their (the Canadian) banking system is most creditable to their skill in finance. Their largest bank has \$12,000,000 of capital, \$6,000,000 of re-

and \$33,000,000 of deposits, and \$6,000,000 of circulation, or total resources of \$55,000,000."

We fail, therefore, to see what the United States can give us that we do not already possess? Not territory; they would simply over-run it and leave us as a fringe to the great banner of their nationality, a very ragged and torn fringe indeed; not resources, for we possess them all to ourselves, while by a union with the great Republic we would only be the nine-fifths proprietors and enjoyers of that wealth; not financial improvement, for we have an acknowledged better system than they have; not railway and navigation facilities, we surpass them—proportionately to numbers—in both; not an educational improvement, in that line we out-strip them by a long degree; not a better system of government, we have all the good points in their system and none of its drawbacks. What then, could they give us? Simply the honor, or pleasure of finding our country swallowed up by their Republic, without any reasonable return for the loss of national identity, and liberty.

With them we would be a State, bound to bear a very large portion of all their debts; as we stand, we are an independent nation, responsible only for our own obligations. With them we would be subjected to all the annoyance of war should such arise between the United States and any great power; as we are we can set our mind calmly to intellectual, commercial and national improvement, leaving our defense to Great Britain—the strongest arm we could have in the hour of need. With them we would have to commence and uproot the customs, manners, habits and systems that have been, for over a century and a half, in growth, and strive to accommodate ourselves to prejudices, idiosyncrasies, national forms and customs that have become during almost the same period of time identified with the rise of the American Republic. They certainly would not adopt our manners or systems; we could not—for some generations to come—accustom ourselves to their's. We would simply be going from under the protective roof of our Parent, to dwell a stranger in the numerous family of a stranger.

What would they take from us that we possess already? Our national identity, our protection by Great Britain, our resources, our great water highways, our boundless territory, our individuality, our customs and literature, our governmental and financial systems; in fine, the preference that Great Britain extends to us. During the past year our exports to England have increased £489,000, or nearly 5 per cent. as compared with 1893. Moreover, we think that this invitation (of the wolf to the lamb) comes at a very inopportune time, just when the recent magnificent action of Queen Victoria toward Canada and our dead Premier, has welded another link in the mighty chain of our union.

As the English cotton spinners are unable to compete with those of India, an attempt is being made to levy an excise tax on the Indian product that will destroy it for the benefit of the English.

With a view to averting a potato famine in Ireland the Government has decided to advance money, without interest, to the poor law guardians for the purchase of seed potatoes.

James G. Fair, the California capitalist and ex-Senator of the United States, died suddenly at the Lick Hotel in San Francisco last Sunday. He was sixty-three years old. His estate is estimated to be worth \$40,000,000.

The Pullman Car Company earned \$5,200,416 last year, of which \$2,300,416 were carried to reserve.