

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

THE CATHOLIC REGISTER PUBLISHING COMPANY

Subscription rates: Single copies 5 cents; 3 months \$1.50; 6 months \$3.00; 1 year \$6.00.

Office: 25 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Advertising rates: Single lines 10 cents per week; 10 lines 1.00 per week.

Telephone 489.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1900.

NOTICE.

City subscribers who do not receive their paper every week will confer a favor if they will notify us at once by Post Card or otherwise.

The Register should be received in all parts of the City on Thursday, or at the latest, Friday, of each week.

Telephone 489.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1900.

Imperialism.

Throughout the English speaking world the title of Imperialism is used to express a leading tendency in politics. What is the exact meaning intended to convey is difficult, and depends upon the portion of the aforesaid world. In its primary significance imperialism is defined as: "The system of a government by an emperor, the spirit of empires." In these modern times when people are not bound by fixed terms and when ideas change like shifting sand imperialism may mean anything you wish. What's in a name? The roseate sentiment of increasing affection in Canada towards England would be just as sweet when called by any other name. It surely has little in common with anything Imperialistic; for the spirit and form of English government are directly opposed to such autocracy as is peculiar to an empire. Nor would any free-born Britain willingly adopt imperialism if he thought it was to impress itself as a stamp upon that kingdom which has ever prided itself in the freedom of its institutions and in the democratic form of its government. Imperialism may signify among us preferential trade, closer approach to Mother Country; deeper love of England, but these ideas are far removed from the dangerous undercurrent in the ocean of imperialism.

The word across the border has assumed more definite form, and is about to be the principle rallying cry of the Democratic party in the coming presidential election. Bryan, in the eloquent speech which he made when accepting the democratic nomination, said:

"Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to conceal imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and in plain language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: 'If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest.' And again he said: 'Conquest is not in our principles: it is inconsistent with our government.' The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into States as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The Democratic party does not oppose expansion when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time enlarged the republic, and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory, already more densely populated than our own country, and to force upon the people a government for which there is no warrant in our constitution or our laws.

Even the argument that the earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it, and have the physical power to acquire it, cannot be invoked to justify the appropriation of the Philippine Islands by the United States. If the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there and till the soil. The white race will not live near the equator,

Other nations have tried to colonize in the same latitude. The Netherlands have controlled Java for 400 years, and yet to-day there are less than 60,000 people of European birth scattered among the 20,000,000.

After a century and a half of English dominion in India, less than a twentieth of one per cent. of the people of India are of English birth, and it requires an army of 70,000 British soldiers to take care of the tax collectors. Spain has asserted title to the Philippine Islands for three centuries, and yet when our fleet entered Manila Bay there were less than 10,000 Spaniards residing in the Philippines.

A colonial policy means we shall send to the Philippines a few traders, a few task masters, and a few offenders, and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people, who rule the natives.

After advancing arguments from various points he views the position from a religious stand and says:

"If true Christianity consists in teaching out our Bally-bes the teachings of Christ, who will say that we are commanded to civilize with dynamite and proselytize with the sword? He who would declare the Divine will must prove his authority either by Holy Writ or by evidence of a special dispensation. The command 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature' has no gassing gun attached to it.

When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive Him, some of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from Heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them and said, 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' Suppose He had said, 'We will thrash them until they understand who we are,' how different would have been the history of Christianity. Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the golden rule and the commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'

Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifices for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart. A missionary recently told me that the Stars and Stripes once saved his life because his assailant recognized our flag as a flag that had no blood upon it. Let it be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty; let it be known that instead of being the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help and uplift, having their loins girt about with truth and their feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, wearing the breastplate of righteousness, and carrying the sword of the spirit; let it be known that they are citizens of a nation which respects the rights of the citizens of other nations as carefully as it protects the rights of its own citizens, and the welcome given to our missionaries will be more cordial than the welcome extended to the missionaries of any other nation.

That is persuasive language. But we must not be carried away with it. Any great nation has a foreign policy and a home policy. It is the case with the United States. And imperialism is easing its way into both of these policies. Whilst the United States Government, virtually the Republican party, is carrying imperialism abroad into the Philippine Islands, the governments of various Southern States—Democratic States too—are depriving negro citizens of their franchise.

What is the difference? Where, in the latter case, is the inviolable principle that bases government upon the consent of the governed? The Republicans are forcing the Philippine Islanders to submit to the United States as a conquered people; the Democratic States of the South are legislating against the colored race. Both parties are thereby creating the necessity of a large standing army.

Whether are they drifting? Party politics are neither logical nor philosophical. That is the one conclusion. Imperialism is in direct opposition to free institutions, and is a dangerous idea to be advocated by freedom-loving citizens. That is another conclusion. The theory that government rests upon and is proportionate to the consent of the governed is false. It is Rousseau's social contract in a new garb. Such a principle is not abiding. This is our last conclusion, and the threatening policy of imperialism proves it. This principle is, of course, open to much more serious objection, but enough until we see if free-born American citizens will support what their forefathers fought against.

Church and State.

There was held on Sunday last in the Elm Street Methodist Church one of those religious meetings which, however serious they are intended to

be, most call forth a smile by the various thoughts suggested. The occasion was the reopening of the building which had just been renovated. Amongst the speakers was the Hon. G. W. Ross. This is where the smile comes in. That the Premier should be invited to speak is quite significant. Even in the country are better speakers. But a Presbyterian standing on a Methodist platform, and surrounded by Methodist preachers, would naturally feel somewhat out of place. Such seems to have been Mr. Ross' embarrassment. He deemed it appropriate to discuss the purpose of the Church, its place in and effect upon the secular world. He did not mention which church he referred to; it was the Church in general. He insisted that there should be no denominationalism in the schools—no Methodism therefore, nor Presbyterianism. After rejoicing that there have been no entangling alliances in this country between Church and State—forgetting the Clergy Reserve question amongst others—he said:—"The Church in order to exert its proper influence in the State should not at all detract to the State or to any political party as to what should be the policy of the government." Strange doctrine! His Methodist brethren no doubt took a note of it. Furthermore:—"When the churches (mark the plural number) come to the State and ask for certain favors it is generally expected that they will return a quid pro quo; that having given a certain support they will receive something in return." What a truly religious sentiment! Out came the Methodist note-book again. Finally the Premier regarded "the tendency to claim positions in the Civil Service, or in the Government because a man belonged to a certain denomination as all wrong." That is very sound theology. It was a gentle and well-deserved reminder to aggressive brethren of the Methodists that they must not press the Government and demand the province. When we come to think, it was really a happy thought of the Elm Street Methodist Church to invite Hon. Mr. Ross. As a theologian, the honourable gentleman hardly ranks with the Christian politician who was formerly Premier of Ontario; but his early attempts show great zeal—at least for his party—but a learning that is more dangerous than dogmatism. We concur with the Premier when he states that he wished to treat the subject "suggestively rather than exhaustively." Exhaust the relation of Church and State! He certainly did not exhaust it. But he did suggest many a thought when he accepted this invitation and proposed to touch upon such a subject.

Protestants and the Bible.

Catholics hear so much of Bibles and Bible reading from their Protestant neighbors that they have almost come to believe that they spend most of their time in studying what portions of the word of God they have. As a matter of fact they do very little reading of the bible as a body—and by a "body" we understand the reading portion of the sects not the illiterate. Many begin to read the Bible through curiosity; others read because they feel it a duty to be able to say that they have read the Bible through and through so much in the same manner as they do Milton's great classic works—it is a labor but it must be done. The New Testament is pretty much read by the church goes but the Old Testament is neglected and it is but few Protestants who can truthfully say that they have ever read it through and through. By reading is not meant study, critical analysis but reading in its ordinary sense of perusal. Of critical study there is so little, either of the Old or New Testament that the bulk of Protestants never lay claim to any such distinction. There was a time when Protestants could string off texts at one by the yard; when their knowledge of the Bible, as a matter of memory, was simply wonderful, but that time has passed away, and in its place we find one that knows no Biblical lore, no long strings of Biblical quotation. It is a sign of the times. Protestants are neglecting the Bible; they are not even reading it as a body; they are turning to mammon more every day to the utter neglect of religion. Young men and young women are growing up among them whose reading tastes tend toward trashy novels to the total exclusion of the Bible.

Other than that, when the Bible is opened at all it is not from a sense of religion but from curiosity or worse. Often than not the young men of to-day have no such thing in their possession as a Bible. Years ago, a young man who did not have his Bible, and who did not make a good use of it, was looked upon with suspicion. How is it now-a-days? Catholics are much more familiar with the Bible than their Protestant neighbors. Scarcely a reading man or woman in the Church but has read and read carefully every line in the Old and New Testament, notwithstanding the Orange Sentinel's prohibition. It would be interesting to take a census of the Orangemen of this country and find out not only how many of them have read the Bible through carefully, but also how many of them have Bibles at all. These "defenders of Protestantism" we venture to say never read a Bible at all as a rule; probably fifty per cent. of them have not one in their possession. We venture on the assertion that fully seven-fifty per cent. of them have never seen the inside of a Bible for private perusal within the last twelve months. Surely this is a deplorable state of affairs in this grand and glorious bulwark of Protestantism and Christianity. It is no great wonder that Protestantism is a failure with such defenders as the Orange order at its back; it is no wonder that Protestantism is melting away under such powerful protection from the attacks of Rome.

Mixed Marriages.

One of the greatest evils of our day is mixed marriages. Our people do not seem to realize to the full what they mean; they do not seem to understand what an evil they really are in the Church. A great many Catholics look upon the law of the Church forbidding these marriages as something tyrannical. They imagine that such affairs should be left to the affections or whatever one likes to call them. They are inclined to grow a little peevish at any restraint being placed upon their freedom in this matter. It seems to be a matter that should be left to the individual as they think. Such people do not stop to think of the consequences of such marriages; they do not go into the question at all apart from a worldly standpoint. The fact that marriage is a Sacrament escapes them entirely. Mixed marriages are an evil. God himself forbade the Jews intermarrying with the Gentiles, and the purpose to-day is the same as that of the time of Moses. God knew that the intermarrying of Jew and Gentile would mean the creeping in of false worship and of the final absorption and extinction of the Jewish race, and religion. So too is it to-day in the Church. The marriage of Protestant and Catholic in a country like ours means the contamination of doctrine; the absorption and extinction of Catholicism. Thank God, there are but comparatively few such unions, but those few are sufficient to show any true Catholic what they mean. It may not affect the beliefs and practices of the Catholics in this or that case, but it is extremely likely to do so; it may not produce family jars, but they are usually the result. The very fact that a Catholic inlets upon marrying a Protestant is an evidence, in the vast majority of cases, that the Catholic is not by any means a loyal child of the Church. He knows that it is against the laws of his Church, and yet he insists upon the union, and if it will not be performed within the Church it is more than likely it will be performed outside the pale. It is a bad sign in itself of the earnestness of the Catholic party to the union, and it argues but ill for the verities of that marriage on the future practice of his religion. There is a sign of indifference there, and it is more likely to grow than to be eliminated. It is not, however, with the parties to the union themselves that the great trouble arises; it is with the children. They are bound in nine cases out of ten to grow up, if not Protestants, at any rate with an excellent start toward that goal. They are, as a rule, brought up with little or no religious home-training, simply because any attempt at such would result in a family row that would not only cause disagreement in the household, but would also produce very conflicting teachings. They are breathing a mixed indifferent atmosphere, and cannot

but be poisoned with it. So they grow up. One of the two parents is sure to be in "florant on religious matters, and that example is amply sufficient to give the growing boy a start from the path of performing his religious duties.

It is scarcely necessary to go into the details of these marriages in detail—every neighborhood has one or more examples to bear out this contention. The objection is raised that the association with Protestants sometimes produces feelings that cannot be overcome. They can be overcome in the beginning—there is no necessity in associating with Protestants to such a degree as that. At the first indication of danger such friendship should be cut off, for it is a danger and a growing one. There are Catholic friendships to be formed and Catholic associations ready to hand. Sometimes one hears the childish plea raised that there are no Catholics in the neighborhood who are the social equals of such a family. That is often true, but there are other neighborhoods and social equals are to be found among Catholics in them, and that with little or no trouble in locating them. Oftener than not, this "social equality" cry is the result of a pride that is as foundationless as it is silly. The persons who raise it are not a whit better than any others in their parish, nor are they considered so by anybody but themselves. They are aristocrats in their own estimation only, and are the laughing-stock of the community. A good Catholic husband who is obliged to work for his living with a pick and shovel is far preferable to a Protestant, who is supposed to be somebody. The home is the happier for the Catholic atmosphere; you know what you are getting besides. You can make your own social standing if you are capable of doing so, and if you are not your husband's position cannot keep you in the swim. If there is anything in you it will receive recognition, but in the vast majority of cases of the kind of people we are speaking of, there is but little brain and less soul. They are shallow, and good for little but to pose. A point that seems to escape Catholics in dealing with this question is the necessity of Baptism before the reception of any other Sacrament. There can be no Sacrament conferred without the previous reception of Baptism. Few Protestants are Baptized now-a-days and the number is growing beautifully less year by year, as the following statistics will show: "The Congregationalist refers to the statistics of the Presbyterian body in the United States as 'rather a curious commentary on the neglect of infant baptism.' Of 67,000 received on examination, nearly 22,000 were baptized. This means that nearly one-half of these had not been baptized in infancy. Coming chiefly, as we must suppose, from the families of their members and adherents, it does show a neglect long continued. The infants baptized last year is a further evidence of the continuance of the neglect. With a membership of over a million, there were only 20,000 children sprinkled, or one to each thirty-nine or forty members. If all the infants were sprinkled, there would be at least one in ten." Thus we see the danger of Catholics intermarrying with Protestants. In such cases, where the Protestant is not baptized, no Sacrament of Matrimony has been received, and the couple are simply living in a state of adultery. It is something awful to contemplate, and will give food for reflection.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is well for The Orange Sentinel that The Irish Canadian and O'Connell exist. The editor is in no difficulty in finding matter for editorials. As a matter of fact it quite takes up his time in repelling attacks. It is well. We are glad to see that the Bible is the "Blessed Book" with The Sentinel, yet it is not so with hundreds of his co-religionists. As usual, the editor speaks whereof he knows not, but then anything will do for his readers as long as there is enough rot about "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion." It makes but little difference whether the truth is tampered with or not—the main point is to attack the Church and do it loudly. As we said last week, and we repeat this, for the delatation of our contemporary, Catholics are not only permitted to read the Bible, but are exhorted to do so. There are no "rules

and regulations curtailing the right of Catholics to read the Bible in Toronto or anywhere else. The Catholic must interpret in accordance with the teachings of the Church, but so too must the Methodist, as the recent trials in that sect against persons holding heterodox beliefs clearly shows. The Sentinel gives The Registrar a bit of advice thus: "The Registrar should pursue a policy of silence on subjects it cannot discuss frankly," and while thanking the editor for his evident kindly feelings toward us, evidenced by the fact of his giving advice, we cannot refrain from returning advice for advice, and suggesting to The Sentinel that the proper course for him would be to "pursue a policy of silence" on subjects on which he is sure to display a total, depraved ignorance, as, for instance, the Catholic Church, her teachings and history. A word to the wise is sufficient.

The Sentinel says: "What would Romanists say if the head of the Anglican or Methodist Church were to issue a letter protesting against the liberty of worship given to Roman Catholics?" What a gorgeous amount of nerve the editor of that paper has to be sure. What indeed! The Anglicans and Methodists and all the rest of them are issuing protests all the time. If they paid as much attention to their own affairs as they do to protesting against Catholic liberty they would find more time to look into the spiritual condition, or rather lack of that necessary quality, of their people. It is only last winter that a terrible hubbub was raised in Montreal because Catholics were about to give missions to non-Catholics in that city.

The action of the Pope in warning his clergy against the Protestant Propaganda in Rome is surely nothing to be wondered at. He has the care of the Catholic souls, and it is his duty to put his people on their guard against Protestantism, its vagaries and its methods. Getting at the Catholic poor through the soup-kitchen is the method in vogue in Rome; abusing the Church shamefully, and with the same groundless assertions as are used by Margaret Shepherd the notorious, is a popular mode of working conversions. The result has been rioting, and it is no wonder. Freedom of worship does not include impunity from mob attacks, and the propagators of Protestantism have been subjected to these latter and deservedly so. They have lied in abusing the Church, and have made statements that no people with any common manliness about them would listen to in silence. Protestantism has as much chance of succeeding in Italy as they have of burning the ocean. It is not the effort to introduce Protestantism that the Catholics of Rome protest against, but it is the methods employed in the attempt. Moreover, the Pope did not protest at all; he instructed and exhorted, at the same time expressing his regret at the way in which Protestants were stirring up actual strife in Rome.

Says the London Christian Commonwealth: "After Mass the celebrant left the chair, and at the sedilia changed his chasuble for a black cape with yellow ophrys, and then headed a procession with a crucifix; the katafalque was sprinkled with holy water, and incensed, while petitions were mumbled for the souls of the deceased." One would imagine after reading the above that it was a ceremony of the Catholic Church, but no it was one performed in an Anglican Church in England. Surely the High Church party is taking long strides toward the only true Church; truly it is a sign of the times. Transubstantiation, confession, the communion of saints—these are certainly Catholic articles of Faith, yet we find them growing in favour daily throughout England. Praying for the dead has been one of the most decided articles of our belief, and now we find Anglicans borrowing our most consolatory—from a human standpoint—doctrine. It would appear that there is but little left for this strong party in the Anglican Church but to come over en masse to the religion that their ancestors abandoned for the sake of gain and position. These are but little taken into consideration now-a-days in this party of the English body, and there is little left to hold them back now but pride.

Most people are under the impression that Bibles are distributed free gratis by the Anglicans and the other