

The Catholic Register.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY. OFFICE 40 LOMBARD ST., TORONTO. SUBSCRIPTIONS PER ANNUM \$2.00. Approved and recommended by the Archbishop, Bishops and Clergy.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1900.

NOTICE. All communications intended for publication in the Catholic Register, should be in the office not later than Tuesday of every week.

Reviewing the Century.

Reviews of the last century continue to appear in many of the leading journals, and quite a number of them linger around the subject of the Reformation religions, which have had, during the past hundred years, it must be admitted, a fair field and much favor.

Even Protestants cannot hide from themselves the fact that Protestantism is weaker at the end than at the beginning of the 19th century. What might have been and was expected from the very beginning, has come to pass.

One New England Bishop says that his clergy do not hold themselves bound to believe in the truth or efficacy of their own service prayers. In England, the split between the two Church parties grows wider and the scrimonious warfare between them goes on without interruption.

Presbyterian ministers in the United States openly declare that the Bible is not the inspired word of God, and therefore not a safe and sufficient rule of faith.

Writing in the Nineteenth Century, Mr. Henry R. Percival takes a gloomy view of the condition of Protestantism.

It's not too much to say, he observes, "that positive religious belief is dying out, and that its professors are, for the most part, able to continue in its ministry only through some device of casuistry, which, in any other matter, would be considered by themselves, as it is in their case, by almost everyone except themselves, dishonest and dishonorable. It is manifest that this state of things cannot go on, and that the only final result of progress in this direction, so far as faith is concerned, must be unbelief, and, as far as organization is concerned, decay and dissolution."

Last week we quoted Mr. Mallock and Professor Hodgwick, and others whom the world looks upon as thinking and far-seeing men, and the conclusion seems inevitable that the twentieth century will witness the collapse of the Protestant system.

Two alternatives will be before the disorganized, doubting, abandoned masses—a return to the one true Church or a further relapse into the deepening abyss of infidelity.

The position of things in the United States is ably described by the Boston Republic as follows:

"We see in the every-day life of the present generation the destructive effects of Protestantism and religious indifference. The divorce will be gradual, but surely and soon. Immoral plays are put upon the dramatic stage, and men and women crowd each other in a mad rush to get the best seats from which to witness these demoralizing and degrading productions. A carnival of crime and corruption is in progress.

in the world desirable for we have and social position and the recognition of the masses. It is useless to take account of the numbers of elements of national decay which a pursuit of the daily press discloses. The Catholic Church alone stands immovable, as it has always stood, in defence of honesty, purity and the sanctity of the home. It resists all appeals in favor of a modification of the strict rule against divorce, and it preaches against all forms of social corruption and public and private dishonesty. It is to day the only saving, the only conservative force in the nation. And if the nation is to avoid from dissolution it can be saved only by the Catholic Church. Protestantism is unable and unwilling to stem the tide of evil that is carrying us to ultimate wreck and ruin.

A Protestant View of Catholic Education.

A prevalent but erroneous idea among many Protestants is that Catholics want to keep the Bible out of their schools.

They imagine that Catholics do not read it. They believe that Martin Luther was the first to bring it into the light of day, so that the people might read it, and that the Catholic Church has ever since been doing its level best to drag it back into obscurity. On the contrary the Church has always encouraged her children to read the Scriptures. Before the invention of printing, books were scarce; but the Bible was far away the commonest and most in demand. The art of printing had developed and spread considerably about the time of the Reformation and this gave the Reformer the aspect of having opened the Sacred book to the public. But as soon as printing came in Bibles were published and Catholics were encouraged to read them.

Dr. Maileand, a distinguished Protestant clergyman, Librarian at the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Fellow of the Royal Society says.

"To say nothing of parts of the Bible, or of books whose place is uncertain, we know of at least twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible printed in Germany, only before Luther was born" Bockendorf, the biographer and admirer of Luther, confesses in his "Commentaries on Lutheranism" that three distinct editions of the Bible translated into German were published at Wittenberg in 1470, 1483, and 1490.

Now, Luther was born in 1483, so that, in all, about seventy editions of the Bible, translated into the vernacular tongues of Europe, were published before Luther had got out one copy of his German Bible.

The Bible Luther found was a Latin Bible, and yet in the face of these facts, he had the audacity to say in his "Table Talk" that he was twenty years old before he saw the Scriptures. Either he was a gross liar or he was blind; strict justice precludes any other alternative.

The Catholic Church desires her children to read the Bible; but she also desires them to read it reverently, without twisting the meaning of its texts to suit their own fancies or fads, by construing the more difficult passages to mean what they have been understood to mean by learned and enlightened commentators. Catholics in Ontario have objected to the reading of the Bible in schools attended by Catholic children, because the Bible used was the Protestant Bible, and not looked upon by the Catholic Church, which surely has as much right to its opinion as any other authoritative body, as authorized or in all respects a correct translation.

It also rejects certain books which the Catholic Church considers as the word of God, and is therefore not the whole Bible. Besides, the Church is opposed to having the Sacred Book, which in many places is hard to understand, read out to children and young people by those who have no real acquaintance with or reverence for it. Experience proves that such reading tends to destroy respect for the Bible, and even leads to light and irreverent comment and joking on Biblical terms and Biblical stories.

There was a story sent out last week by the Associated Press of the sensational suicide of a nun belonging to the Sisterhood of St. Mary, of Kenosha, Wis. The suicide was caused by some love affair, but the Press forgot to state that the unfortunate woman was a Protestant and a member of an Episcopal community. The impression to be gained from the despatch, whether intentional or not, was calculated to mislead the reader into the belief that she was a Catholic.

Growth of Catholicism.

We clip the following paragraph from our esteemed contemporary, the Canadian Baptist:

"A Romish bishop, at the opening of a house in Dundee, declared that the growth of Romanism in Scotland had been very great. In 1800 there were but twelve churches and a handful of priests; now there are two archbishops, two bishops, 420 priests and 850 churches. He, however, did not allege that this growth was due to conversions from Protestantism but to immigration from Ireland. 300,000 in Canada the increase in Romanism is through the influx of the French, so in Great Britain it is because of the profusion of the Irish."

We might remind the Canadian Baptist that it is always polite to call even those who differ from it in religion by their proper names and the religion they profess by that which is accorded to it by all enlightened nations. It is an open confession of ignorance and spleen to call a bishop of the Catholic Church a "Romish bishop" and the Catholic Religion, of which the Pope is the recognized head, "Romanism."

And what does the writer mean by "the opening of a house?" Was it a religious house properly so designated or did the writer imagine that it was some Baptist convalescent home which a bishop of the Catholic Church had strayed? Time was when by a statute which disgraced the blue books of England Catholic places of worship, and if we remember aright, Baptist places of worship too, were forced to be content with the humbler name of "chapels." The statute covering the point, we rather think, is still un repealed, though the contemptuous ignoring of it by those whom it affected, has long since rendered it inoperative. The fact of the matter is, in Scotland as in England, in 1800, there were many Catholics and many more that did not openly profess their faith during the days in which the penal laws were in force, who were nevertheless ready to obey the voice of the Catholic Church as soon as it was again asserted in the land. Hence in 1800 the churches and handful of priests in England and in Scotland did not truly represent the Catholic population of these countries.

But when the Catholic hierarchy was established, missions were founded, churches built, and in a very few years thousands of Catholics walked in the open and thousands of others rejoined the old faith.

It is true that immigration from Ireland has helped greatly to swell the numbers of Catholics in the great towns of England and Scotland, but it is likewise true that the Catholic Church in rural districts as well as in the towns has, during the last century, made extensive gains by conversions, and, judging from the disorganized condition of the English Church at the present day, is likely to make much greater gains during the coming century.

The Canadian Baptist argues that the increase in the number of Catholics in Great Britain is due to the profusion of the Irish, just as the increase of Catholics in the Dominion is due to the profusion of the French-Canadians. Are not the Irish too in Canada just as prolific as those of the motherland? Some time ago, a discussion was maintained in many Canadian papers showing clearly and unmistakably that not only were the French-Canadians prolific but the Catholics generally throughout the Dominion.

A further consideration of the subject would demonstrate that profusion is a virtue not solely confined to the French-Canadians and the Irish. It is found in a very eminent degree among English Catholics also, who have contributed their full share of children to the Catholic Church.

It might also repay research to investigate the cause of the continued diminution of the old families of New England, for instance, and the rapid, phenomenal growth of the Catholic population of the United States. The true inwardness of it all lies in the faithful and uncompromising attitude of the Catholic Church towards the duties and obligations of the married state. Catholics are taught to look upon matrimony as a sacrament, as a sacred institution, ordained by the old law, elevated and refined by the New Law, and as the means of working out God's wonderful plans with reference to mankind on earth and the completion of His own eternal kingdom in Heaven. "Unless the Lord build the house,"

said the Psalmist, "they labor in vain that build it."

And again, "Blessed are all they that fear the Lord; that walk in His ways. For thou shalt eat the labors of thy hands, blessed art thou and it shall be well with thee. Thy wife as a fruitful vine, on the sides of thy house. Thy children as olive plants, round about thy table."

French-Canadian Loyalty.

We have seldom met with a more dignified, yet withal touching appeal to the minds and hearts of fair-minded people, having the welfare of the Dominion at heart, than is M. Monseigneur Beguin's letter to M. Monseigneur Bouches, touching the recent angry and uncolled for outburst of a large section of the English press against the loyalty of the French-Canadians. "Loyalty for the children of the Church of Christ" says his Grace of Quebec, "is not a matter of sentiment, or of personal interest; it is a serious and strict duty of conscience, derived from a sacred principle, immutable, eternal as the Divine Law-maker. Let them, therefore, reassure themselves, as regards the attitude of the Catholic clergy on similar occasions; the past has been beyond attack, the future will likely be so, because our Catholic principles never change." Going back a century, His Grace recalled the attitude of a Monseigneur Plessier, who in 1807, "reminded his flock that it was impossible to be a good Christian without being a loyal and faithful subject, and that they would be unworthy of the name of Catholics and Canadians, if they manifested disloyalty, or were indifferent when they had to perform the duties of subjects devoted to the interests of their sovereign, or to the defence of their country."

It is the fact—the Catholic Church counsels loyalty, preaches loyalty, compels loyalty to the flag under which her children live, and the history of a century and a half shows in deeds how faithful to the call of duty in respect of loyalty the French-Canadians as a people have been.

The wonder is that under the taunting provocation which on occasions they have been subjected to, they have remained loyal, and such an occasion has, during the past two months offered itself, and been basely utilized to the detriment of the peace, stability and welfare of this fair Dominion which we all profess to love.

Because a section of the French-Canadian Press has, for reasons into which we shall not inquire, thought fit to speak warmly upon the subject of the war, and let it be said, in condemnation of it, the whole French-Canadian people have been vilified, tried, and condemned as disloyal subjects of the Queen. Supposing they did condemn the war as unnecessary—have not some of England's most conscientious statesmen done the same—and that without being branded as rebels? Supposing they were opposed at the beginning of the war to sending a Canadian Contingent—are there not many people in every province of the Dominion who still look upon that event as a doubtful experiment? On that ground alone, the French-Canadians were most assuredly not the only rebels in Canada. There are others—even if the general sentiment of Canadians, against which at present we have not in favor of criticism to offer, was in favor of the experiment. The imperialism which has inundated this country does not appeal to all in like measure, and yet those who look upon it with distrust or jealousy, may be just as good and loyal Canadians as those who throw up their caps and shout.

Realizing the fact that the Canadian people is a mixed people with two elements in it that obstinately refuse to commingle, except in the common aims for the progress and welfare of the Dominion, when will our people of all nationalities and creeds recognize the importance, nay, the absolute necessity, of the duty of forbearance and fair consideration towards all classes of the community? Let it be acknowledged fairly that it is the duty of the government to carry out the will of the people as a whole, conscientiously with the safeguards of minorities as guaranteed by the Constitution, but it is a fratricidal policy to condemn and count out of the commonwealth any section thereof, merely be-

cause it differs in opinion from the bulk of the people.

Tolerance and mutual forbearance may succeed in making the rough places in the nation's life smooth, violence or even threats of violence, such as have been bandied about of late in the public press—never.

A Base Attack on Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

In a general onslaught on an entire section of the Canadian people, it was to be expected that individuals too would come in for a share of the abuse which has been flung around so recklessly.

For the much discussed article that appeared in "Le Sennine Religieuse," Archbishop Beguin was blamed and held up to public view as a disloyal subject—condemned unheard. It is often said that the postscript to a letter is more important than the letter itself, and so it was with Monseigneur Beguin's nearly-omitted Postscript.

"I was about to forget," he wrote, "to tell you that following the example of my predecessors, I have no newspaper as my organ, and that I do not hold myself responsible for any writing not signed by my name."

Since the publication of that remarkable postscript, the Archbishop's accusers have evinced a disposition to leave him alone, perforce. The only way in which they could meet him would be to prove him a liar—which would not be so easy or so inexpensive as to call him a "Papier rebel," as a scornful "Brother" of a Western Orange Lodge is reported to have called the distinguished Premier of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

As reported in several of our exchanges, at a meeting of the Orange Order, held in Britannia Lodge Room, 14th concession of London Township, County of Middlesex, on 8. Mark Roberts, Worshipful District Master, delivered a written-out address in which the following contemptible passage occurred:

"In many ways we have reason to feel ashamed of our Federal Government at Ottawa, headed as it is by a French Papist, and dominated by another, by name Tarte, and both of whom are, I believe, rebels in their hearts."

Whatever may have been the motive that inspired such an uncolled for and utterly gratuitous assertion, we recognize the one unmistakable fact that it is a glaring insult not only to the Premier of Canada, but to the intelligence of the electorate that placed him in that exalted and most honorable position. It is doubly insulting to every Catholic citizen in every Province of the Dominion.

"We can feel safer," continued this Bro. Roberts, "when we know we have so good a sentinel as he (Hon. Mr. Clarke Wallace) is on the watch tower."

All that we can say is that if the Hon. Mr. Clarke Wallace endorses such condemnable sentiments—even when uttered by one of his own devoted followers,—he should be ashamed to look across the floor of the House, or on himself as a gentleman of the Commons. Such a violator of the ordinary courtesies of life, or even of the not-so-closely defined customs of party strife, as Bro. Roberts is a menace to the community, and should be bound over to confine his wild deliveries to the narrow confines of the Lodge Room.

Anybody who has watched the distinguished career of Sir Wilfrid Laurier knows, must know, that the charge of disloyalty, apart from the inanity of his faith, is utterly groundless. Not only in his public speeches, but by his vote and acts, he has ever stood at the sacrifice of personal and even religious feeling, for the integrity and what he, along with his English-speaking compatriots, deemed the best interests of the Dominion.

The fact of his occupancy of the position of Premier, obtained at a critical time in the political history of this country, renders it superfluous to cite instances of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's devotion and loyalty to Canada before everything.

Were it not for the agitation against the French-Canadian as a body, aroused and fostered by such irresponsible fire-brands as this Bro. Roberts, the loyalty of the Premier would never have been questioned in this province.

Whatever view of the Premier's alleged hesitancy or delay in carrying out the will of the bulk of the Can-

adian people, as expressed in the public press with regard to the despatching of a Canadian Contingent to South Africa; whatever opinion may prevail with reference to Mr. Tarte's attitude taken on constitutional grounds towards the sending of that contingent, it is the height of presumption and the depth of religious bigotry to make so serious a charge upon no foundation in fact.

Bro. Roberts calls Sir Wilfrid Laurier a "French Papist" and a "rebel at heart." He is known to respectable people throughout the length and breadth of Canada as a Catholic, a French-Canadian gentleman and a loyal son of his native land—and as such and not from any party or political motives, we resent this unscrupulous attack upon him.

The Philippines—A Second Invasion.

We may take it for granted that the abjuration of the Filipinos is nearing completion, also that the United States means to hold what it has acquired by purchase and won by the sword. The warring sects now purpose invading those islands, with the aim of forcing their "evangelical enlightenment upon the minds of the inhabitants who, for so many generations have been receiving Christian training at the hands of Catholic missionaries. Of course, a matter of such high and holy import is calculated to stir up the evangelical world to a sense of the situation, and we were, therefore, not surprised to find a Canadian Protestant contemporary, of an unusually honest character taking a shot at the persecuted Filipinos, and offering some sage advice to certain sects in the United States on the methods to be adopted towards the evangelisation of Aguinaldo's people. But it is at the outset confronted by a quandary—the crucial quandary of evangelizing Protestantism—as follows:

"President Schurman, of Cornell University, who spent some months in the Philippines as a United States Commissioner, has recently stated his conviction as to the great need of Protestant missionaries in the islands that have been nominally Christianized by Rome, and has expressed the hope that when we send missionaries we will decide beforehand on one form of Protestant Christianity. The ground for this opinion expressed is the danger of continuing the kind of the presentation to them of different types of Protestant Christianity. "Send only one type of missionaries" is his urgent advice."

What President Schurman? But which type shall it be? Shall it be Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or what? Best send out specifications, call for tenders, and put the job up to competitive examination. A pretty position in very sooth, but one which nullifies, so far as the unsuccessful candidates for the mission arc concerned, the scriptural injunction, "Go teach ye all nations."

What an imposition upon the Filipinos such a novel arrangement would be—but it would be interesting to be present at the competitive examination.

In view of the importance of the mission to a people only "nominally Christianized by Rome," it might be necessary to waive all individual sectarian claims and evolve a new creation in Protestantism, having unity of belief and deriving spiritual jurisdiction from the President of the United States. Surely McKinley is as pleasing to the Almighty in the nineteenth century as Henry VIII. was in the sixteenth. At any rate Schurman's advice.

"Send only one type of missionary" seems to us most reasonable, if impracticable, as our contemporary in its next paragraph somewhat mournfully admits:

"Of course a recognition of the desirableness of Christian union both at home and abroad is no new thing. It would be difficult to find an earnest Christian anywhere who does not bewail the divided condition of evangelical Christianity. The hindrance to the health of people growing out of rivalry among the denominations in their efforts to win them to Christ has long been recognized and lamented. But until evangelical bodies can reconcile their differences at home, and reach a basis for health on every forward mission work to any considerable extent on a neutral basis as regards denominational differences."

This honest expression of opinion, coming from a Protestant source, is one of the best and most constructive arguments in favor of the Divine mission of the Catholic Church to teach all nations that we have met with for some time. It brings sectarian Protestantism face to face with