

l, the prin-  
ment are  
of a dem-  
ledge no  
ty in civil  
hat of the  
olic must  
ns of the  
He cannot  
of a dem-  
ision which  
of deduc-  
emises,

AS TO EF-  
C DOC-  
ATED

to abstract  
actical ex-  
would be  
ratiocina-  
nature of  
church of  
as shown  
tends for  
itude and  
church have  
anger and  
of Eng-  
shows this  
ge. The  
of Rome  
very other  
been to  
e scale in  
il-be des-  
mised ac-  
eh's pre-  
would-be  
he masses  
by, nor  
ation at  
f Rome,  
e masses,  
ulated to  
ariat. It  
nt years,  
Pope and  
he hier-  
l general  
ith dem-  
United  
e claims  
such de-  
erely as  
rchy ap-  
and the  
ey. The  
mocracy  
In an  
unity in  
the peo-

ple are Roman Catholics, the govern-  
ment is not a democracy. It is a  
theocracy—a government by the  
church, which is perhaps the most in-  
tolerable and rasping sort of tyranny  
now known. Stagnation and unpro-  
gressiveness, material and intellectual  
or turbulence and revolution, or all of  
them, are the distinctive character-  
istics of such communities. Quebec,  
and the South and Central American  
republics, may be cited as illustra-  
tions of the results of pseudo-demo-  
cratic government with the church  
of Rome in actual control.

### THE CHURCH OF ROME AND TOL- ERANCE.

It may be said that all these con-  
siderations might have weight in  
other countries, and under different  
conditions, but that in this country  
public intelligence is so high, the non-  
Catholic majority so powerful, and  
democratic institutions so firmly  
grounded, that there is not the  
slightest danger of the Church of  
Rome ever attempting to give prac-  
tical enforcement to the doctrines  
and pretensions alluded to. It may  
also be said that any apprehension  
on this score evinces the spirit of  
the "Orange bigot" or of the "zealot  
of the P. P. A." Just in this connec-  
tion let it be borne in mind that,  
while the leading spirits of this  
church (which has ever had at the  
head of its administration men of  
great diplomatic capacity) see the  
necessity for toning down and keep-  
ing in the background, those arbi-  
trary dogmas and claims which are  
antagonistic to the spirit of modern  
progress and popular government,  
not one of these claims has been re-  
nounced or receded from. On the  
other hand, we see an increasing and  
uncompromising warfare being car-  
ried on by the church in the midst  
of the most enlightened and freest  
communities of to-day, against the  
institution which is most essential to  
the safety and continuance of gov-  
ernment of the people by themselves.  
We see also professing non-Catholics,  
under the plea of a fatuous "tolerance"  
and even in the name of "liberty,"  
take up the advocacy and defense of  
the case of an organization whose  
doctrines and principles would ren-  
der tolerance on its part an incon-  
sistent farce, and whose claims at  
once fall to the ground if it can be  
shown that men have a natural right  
to liberty. We see expressions by

the leading ecclesiastics of the Catho-  
lic church in the United States, which  
are couched in conciliatory language,  
and are calculated to produce the im-  
pression that these dignitaries are  
imbued with the spirit of tolerance.  
There is reason to fear, however, that  
these expressions are prompted more  
by the superior diplomatic acumen of  
the prelates, than by any intention  
on their part to abandon any of those  
pretensions, in the light of which, the  
genuineness of their tolerance is at  
least open to suspicion. The more un-  
sophisticated members of the clergy,  
however, are not so diplomatic, but  
are more consistent. In an article  
in the Western Watchman, a Roman  
Catholic paper published in St. Louis,  
and edited by Father Phelan, the  
following passage appeared a few  
weeks ago:

"We would draw and quarter Pro-  
testantism; we would impale it and  
hang it up for crows' nests; we would  
tear it with pincers and bore it with  
hot irons; we would fill it with molt-  
en lead and sink it into hell-fire a  
hundred fathoms deep."

This chaste and beautiful passage  
is, as our readers may observe, redol-  
ent of tolerance and calculated to  
promote that sentiment of brotherly  
love which, we presume, it is one of  
Father Phelan's offices to inculcate.  
Another Catholic organ, the Boston  
Pilot, recently contained the follow-  
ing:

"No good government can exist  
without religion; and there can be no  
religion without an Inquisition, which  
is wisely designed for the promotion  
and protection of the true faith."

Now the reverend gentlemen who  
pen these morceaux, are doubtless  
quite sincere, and are much more con-  
sistent than their superiors, but their  
utterances could hardly be pronounc-  
ed as being pregnant of "tolerance."

No discrimination of any sort is  
attempted to be made against Cath-  
olics in Manitoba by the legisla-  
tion of 1890, but if such discrim-  
ination had been attempted the prov-  
ince might have been able to give  
some color of authority and sanction  
for the attempt. By the constitu-  
tion of Great Britain a Roman Cath-  
olic cannot occupy the throne. Why  
this significant discrimination? His-  
tory will show. The monarch of  
England must be a Protestant, be-  
cause he is the constitutional head of  
a state which asserts its absolute  
supremacy in the control of its af-  
fairs. In view of the nature of the  
pretensions of the Church of Rome, it  
is recognised that no individual who