

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)

953 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.

P. O. Box 1138.

MS. and all other communications intended for publication or notice, should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director, TRUW WITNESS P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1138.

The Subscription price of THE TRUE WITNESS for city, Great Britain, Ireland and France, is \$1.50.

Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, \$2.00. Canada, United States and Newfoundland, \$1.50. Terms payable in advance.

New subscriptions can commence at any time during the year.

Money for renewal and new subscriptions should be sent to Managing Director, P. O. Box 1138.

You may remit by bank cheque, post office money order, express money order or by registered letter. Silver sent through the mail is liable to wear a hole through the envelope and be lost.

We are not responsible for money lost through the mail.

Discontinuance.—Remember that the publishers must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid.

Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name on our books unless your post office address is given.

The date opposite your name on the margin of your paper shows you up to what time your subscription is paid.

We recognize the friends of THE TRUE WITNESS by the prompt manner in which they pay their subscriptions.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.

When you wish your address changed, write us in time, giving your old address as well as your new one.

If you fail to receive your paper regularly, notify us at once by letter or post.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1896

PROTECTION TO CANADIAN WORKMEN.

A debate of considerable interest took place last week on the occasion of the second reading of Mr. Taylor's Alien Labor bill and in connection with Mr. Maxwell's proposal to raise the anti-Chinese tax from \$50 to \$500. The two discussions thus covered the whole question of protection to Canadian labor. Of late, there has been a lull in the opposition to Chinese immigration. In this city it is really remarkable to see the extent to which the Chinese laundrymen are patronized by the working classes. Although their shops have multiplied so amazingly during the last ten years, there still seems plenty of custom for the new comers. And what is most surprising is that, while this increase of custom must surely be a corresponding loss to the native laundries, no protest strong enough to reach the public ear has as yet been provoked. It must, of course, be borne in mind that the city is growing in population and that even in the lower ranks of industry the tendency of combination has made itself felt. At any rate, the Chinese "colony" in Montreal has expanded until town and suburbs are fairly pitted with the heathen Chinese. A dozen years ago had any one predicted such an addition of workmen of Mongolian origin to Montreal population, he would have been regarded as a rash prophet. At that time the movement eastward was only just beginning; the completion of the trans-continental railway gave it the impulse of which we see the results. There is another possible cause of the influx. It may be recalled that in July, 1884, a commission was issued to the Hon. (now Sir) J. A. Chapleau and the Hon. Judge J. H. Gray, to enquire into and report upon the whole subject of Chinese immigration. The circumstances that led to the issue of the commission were not unlike those that provoked the short discussion at Ottawa last week. A motion had been made in Parliament urging the expediency of enacting a law prohibiting the ingress of Chinese into Canada, and the Premier (the late Sir John Macdonald) not deeming his Government justified in sanctioning so extreme a step, promised that the fullest investigation of all the pros and cons of Chinese immigration would be instituted without delay. Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin was appointed secretary to the commission and the report and evidence were duly published in a blue-book of nearly 700 pages crown octavo.

The Commissioners did not confine themselves to Canada, evidence being taken at San Francisco, Portland (Oregon) and other Chinese centres in the United States, the records of the courts being consulted as to Chinese crime in both countries, and the opinions of clergymen, consuls, police superintendents and other officials, being obtained as to their general morality. The commissioners reported separately. The report of the Hon. (Sir) J. A. Chapleau contained an excellent outline of Chinese history, so that the reader's mind might be prepared for an impartial appreciation of their position from a social and ethical as well as industrial point of view. Commissioner Chapleau was inclined to think that the Chinese, as a rule, appeared to advantage or disadvantage according to the treatment they re-

ceived—a statement confirmed by a comparison of their condition in Victoria, B.C., and in Portland (Oregon)—where the hostility to them on the part of a few was tempered by fairness and consideration on the part of the general public,—with the state of Chinese in San Francisco, where they were loaded with contempt and even the more kindly disposed were afraid to take their part. He thought much of the odium to which they were exposed would be modified, if it did not disappear, were they to assume the garb of western civilization. The Japanese is not unwelcome because he adapts himself to the habits and dress of the people among whom he settles. This rigid adherence of the Chinese to their national costume, which makes them so glaringly conspicuous amid Europeans or Americans, is in singular contrast with their wonderful facility in learning every process of industry to which they set their minds and hands. Mr. Chapleau was against restriction or Chinese immigration where it had proved useful and (as in some cases) essential to the prosperity of certain enterprises, unless there was more assurance than the results of restrictive laws in the States gave reason to expect for such European immigration as would employ their places. The working of restrictive legislation in the States had also been attended by difficulties which, in Mr. Chapleau's judgment, Canada ought carefully to avoid.

Judge Gray summed up his report by indicating three phases of opinion on the Chinese question as prevailing in British Columbia: First, there was a well-meaning but strangely prejudiced minority that would be satisfied with nothing less than absolute exclusion. Secondly, there was an intelligent minority which held that, in this as every other industrial or commercial question, the matter would be allowed to regulate itself by the rule of supply and demand. Thirdly, there was a large majority in whose opinion moderate restriction, based on sanitary, police and financial principles, was the best plan for settling the question.

Mr. Maxwell, M. P. for Burrard, B.C., who would raise the tax from \$50 to \$500, seems to represent a class whose opinions range between the first of these plans and the third, with no evident leaning to the first. One thing is certain: the present law does not keep the Chinese away from Canada. It is noteworthy that Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière, who was the Government's chosen representative to greet Li Hung Chang, feels bound in honor to resist any policy that would impair the Viceroy's good opinion of Canada's dealings with his fellow countrymen.

The other phase of the labor question calls for no less delicate treatment at the hands of the Government, and is all the more difficult of solution owing to the principles that Mr. Laurier and his colleagues have professed. Happily, regard for the public interests prevented that marshalling under party banners solely for party ends which has so often stood in the way of wholesome and needed legislation. The Prime Minister, while reasonably objecting to a course which, *per se*, he could not help condemning, as interfering with freedom of contract and being out of keeping with that harmony which should prevail between neighboring nations, was regretfully obliged to admit that, as Mr. Taylor had shown very clearly, the United States had, in dealing with Canadian workmen, been unfriendly and harsh. Even while making this admission, he disapproved of retaliation. Sometimes, however, nations, as well as individuals, had to do in self-defence what, under other circumstances, they would shrink from doing, and, in view of what Canadian workmen, on the borders adjoining the United States, had suffered from an unjust and one-sided law, he was disposed to favor the legislation that Mr. Taylor proposed. He thought, nevertheless, that before taking that final step, and thus, as it were, accepting the challenge to an undesirable combat, it would be well to try, by careful inquiry, whether some milder course were not possible. After examining the correspondence on the subject he would be able to tell whether any alternative existed, and if not, he would no longer oppose Mr. Taylor's bill. Sir Charles Tupper, leader of the Opposition, agreed with the Premier, if practicable, they should avoid retaliatory measures. What they needed and desired was the establishment of friendly and cordial intercourse with the United States, and he hoped that Mr. Taylor would accept the Premier's suggestion, so that the difficulty might, if possible, be rewarded by diplomatic means. Notwithstanding this agreement on the part of the leader, further discussion revealed a strong feeling in favor of immediate action, on the ground that Canada had long enough endured the humiliation and injustice of the American alien labor law. Finally, Mr. Laurier recognized and accepted the sentiment of the House, and gave assurance that, if the examination of the correspondence made it clear that no relief was to be expected from the United States, he would sanction the adoption of Mr. Taylor's bill during the present session. If, on the contrary, there should

be any prospect of a return, on the part of the Washington authorities, to more friendly relations, he would ask that the measure be deferred till next session. The Premier's avowal gave general satisfaction in the House and has doubtless been received with still greater approval by the thousands of workmen who have suffered by the operation of the American Act.

TO SPOUT OR NOT TO SPOUT!

With just how much of the right of a citizen's interest in public affairs a member of the Civil Service should part in order to retain the confidence of his temporary employers, is always a delicate question. Some recent discussions have given it exceptional interest. According to the rule that has prevailed, and so long as human nature remains what it is, is likely always to prevail, appointments to office will go mainly by favor, and favor generally depends on the complexion of the candidates politics. We may be almost certain that the applicants for Government positions at any time at least profess to hold the views of the party in power. There are few ministers so public spirited as to make inquiry before filling a vacancy whether the best man for the place may not chance to be found in the ranks of his opponents. It may happen, of course, that a young man who desires to place his abilities and energies at the disposal of his country's rulers may have a friend at court who holds opinions different from his own, but that fact is not likely to be mentioned in his recommendation. The case is probably too exceptional to be taken account of. It is as a politician or a friend of politicians belonging to the party in office that every position worth having—and every position is supposed to be worth having to the would-be incumbent—has been filled in the past or is likely to be filled in the future. Is it reasonable to expect that whereas the office-seeker bases his claim to recognition in part on his adherence to certain principles of policy and administration, the office-holder must be a mere automaton, going from day to day through a certain routine of talk-work, but utterly indifferent to the questions in which he was formerly interested, or, if not indifferent, obliged by convention to profess the indifference, and forbidden, on pain of dismissal, to express a wish for the success of what he deems the right or the failure of what he deems the wrong cause? Generally speaking, self-interest, and a provident sense of the uncertainties of office under popular government, prompt members of the Civil Service to be reticent and discreet. It is not a usual thing for a state official, whether he be high up or low down in the service, to make himself conspicuous as a partisan. He may still hold his honest convictions and may have the courage to express them, if necessity arises for doing so. In private life he can give utterance to them when and how he pleases. But he will not fail to remember that, whatever his views may be, he can best serve his country by a faithful discharge of the duties of his position and a respectful demeanor towards the head of the department, whatever party may have triumphed. If it should happen that in his official capacity he becomes aware of something glaringly wrong for which the administration might reasonably be held responsible, how he ought to proceed would be a delicate question in casuistry. If the administration happened to be that of his old opponents, he might ask himself whether prejudice did not magnify his character, or whether he would be equally shocked if his own party were in power. If it were something really to be condemned—something of which the public, were it known, would disapprove—is it his duty to protest, or must he resign in order to do so? In such a case the less conscientious public servant would have the advantage. As for questions of policy, that are not morally wrong, a public official of sincere political convictions, may some times be tempted to raise his voice with the opposition, but that is hardly required of him. Parliamentary Government, if we believe in it, ought to be sufficient for such emergencies. At any rate, the case would be extremely exceptional that would call for the intervention of any gentleman of the Civil Service. If the duties of his position were so alien from his principles that he could not conscientiously discharge them, there would always be the same alternative that is open to *nous autres* in like circumstances. If, however, instead of resigning, he deemed himself justified in appealing to the public, either through the press or on the platform, that is a matter for the Government of the day to take into consideration.

But such theoretical cases are rare in actual life. It is not with the ministry of the day that the official politician comes in conflict. It is mostly the Opposition that he is down on, and then when by an unforeseen combination of events and conditions the Opposition is suddenly converted into the powers that be, the situation is awkward. In such circumstances what is the right course for the transformed Opposition to take? We know what the usual course has

been. We can imagine a more effective course, and one more creditable. But unhappily precedent is sure to be sought, and not in vain. It is not vindictiveness. Public men can forgive much when it suits them. But when expectant supporters await at their doors the promised reward of merit, leniency is out of the question. The spoils system so far as it implies a wholesale turn-out and turn-in is no longer ours. As a rule it only exists so far as necessary new appointments are concerned. These are far too few to satisfy a tithe of the applicants, and therefore where deposition is justified by custom there is no escape. The new minister cannot go to the official who was ill-advised enough to take him to task and say: "Well, my friend, the tables have turned, you see! I hope that in the course of time you'll form a better opinion of me and my policy, and I also trust that you will give me an opportunity of forming a good opinion of yourself and your work." A mild rebuke seasonably administered is more effectual than threats of vengeance, and no rebuke is more powerful in some cases than undeserved forgiveness.

Unfettered politicians deal each other blows which the amateur champions of the Civil Service are incapable of delivering. In Parliament they use language to each other which spoken elsewhere would provoke lawsuits. Yet they outlive their resentment and sometimes become friends. To imitate such unseemly and often cowardly conduct is forbidden in any case to the official—prohibited not by any rule but by the laws of decency that all men who do not speak *cum privilegio* are bound to obey. But to pretend to impose formal rules of reticence on any set of men is inconsistent with our free institutions. Public servants must have opinions like other men and the boon of free speech, like other men. As for their use of their rights of citizenship—that must depend on their own courage, delicacy, sense of proportion and becomingness and the discretion that is sometimes "the better part of valour."

THE CELTS AND CIVILIZATION.

What may be called the Celtic renaissance—to one of the leading features of which we have already called attention—is of more than ordinary interest to the Irish race. Notwithstanding that the Celts, under various names, once occupied a great part of Western Europe, both insular and continental, and even extended across and beyond it to Asia Minor, there is at the present day no mention, wholly or mainly Celtic, enjoying the full rights of nationhood and self-government. Although the Celts have contributed to the growth, greatness and power of some of the most important nations of modern times—France, and, to a less but still appreciable extent, Italy and Spain, as well as Britain, owing some of the most fruitful characteristics to their Celtic blood—it cannot be denied that this lack of distinctive and independent existence is a drawback to Celtic prestige. The Teutonic family is represented by several nationalities—the German Empire, with its constituent parts, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, &c.; the Kingdom of the Netherlands; the Scandinavian realms; the German communities in Austria, Teutonic elements in France, Spain and Italy, and the Anglo-Saxon contribution to the British Empire and the United States. The Latin element—originally akin to the Celtic, as indeed the Celtic languages clearly show—is represented by three nationalities in Western and Southern, and by Roumania in Eastern Europe. The Hellenic element, which is related to the Latin on one side as the Celtic is on the other, has after nearly four centuries of eclipse, been once more endowed with partial independence, the Kingdom of Greece representing the Greek-speaking population of Europe, Asia and the interjacent islands. The slaves, emerging from long thralldom to the Turks, have, after a terrible struggle, succeeded in breaking their fetters, and Serbia and Bulgaria (which is largely Slavonic in spite of its name) have been able to follow Montenegro's example in asserting their independence. Poland has never, it is true, received her freedom and integrity, and there are other Slav communities that still remain in subjection to powers of other races. It is doubtful, however, whether the Poles of Slavonic Russia, with its Orthodox creed, are more contented than their brethren in Austria or Protestant Germany. There is one Slavonic community which, in recent times, has recovered not only a large measure of self-government, but has also furnished one of the most remarkable instances on record of the revival of a national language by purely patriotic effort. We mean the Bohemians, who have in the Emperor of Austria a legitimate sovereign, from whom they have for years been asking the privilege of addressing him as such. The Emperor Francis Joseph stands in just the same relation to the Kingdom of Hungary, only that there His majesty is officially recognized as King as in the western section of his domain he is acknowledged as Emperor. There is no more complete example of a successful compromise than the settlement effected

in 1867, when Francis Joseph was solemnly invested with the crown and other insignia of St. Stephen and swore fidelity to the ancient constitution of Hungary. The Bohemians demanded a like recognition of their claim to be an ancient and independent monarchy, with their own crowned King, their own constitution and their own language. The latter they have succeeded in winning. Indeed, there is no better example than Austria-Hungary of the principle that diversity of speech is no real bar to national or imperial unity, and that two or more States may have perfect equality of self-government and still be strongly united under a common sovereign. Hungary's position is unique in one respect. Now that the Turk is doomed to relax his hold on south-western Europe, it is the only nationality outside the Aryan sisterhood that has a recognized name and rank in western civilization. The Bulgarians, who retain but little trace of their non-Aryan origin and the Finlanders, who are largely Scandinavian, are the one communities (save the Turks) that furnish parallels to Hungary; but for the reasons indicated they are differently situated, and Hungary, with its ancient constitution, its language, its literature and national rank, is virtually unique. The Basques of France and Spain are also, it is true, non-Aryan, but although they have kept in a manner together and have withstood any encroachments that would rob them of their language, they have never succeeded in forming a distinct autonomous nationality. It remains for us to mention the greatest of the Slavonic nationalities—the Empire of Russia. If we call the non-Aryan element Allophylia (of alien stock), we shall find the Western half of Europe and the great bulk of America to be divided among communities of Latin, Teutonic and Celtic origin, the Basque provinces in Europe and the aboriginal African and Asiatic elements in the new world being Allophylia or alien. Eastern Europe, again, is divided in unequal proportions among Slavs, Greeks and Allophylia—the latter being, however, mainly civilized and Christian.

It is only when we turn back the pages of history till we come to the formative period that we are able to estimate with justice the part played by the Celts in the making of Europe. We find, it is true, considerable diversity of opinion as to the ground they covered. Some others in the last century took the extreme view that the Celts were the original stock of all the peoples of Europe. Among these were writers of great learning, some of whom thus anticipated the discovery of the common origin of the Aryan nations. For, finding by comparison that there were evidences of relationship in their vocabularies and grammatical forms, and learning by the names of mountains, rivers and districts that the Celts once occupied a great portion of Western Europe, that they had invaded Italy and Greece and even Asia Minor (for it was to a Græco-Celtic people—the Galatians—that St. Paul wrote one of his Epistles) they not unreasonably concluded that they were the original inhabitants of Europe. But since then the study of philosophy has made great advances and the investigation of the relics of early man and his works has considerably enlarged our knowledge of the past. The recognition of the kinship between Sanskrit and its sister and daughter tongues in the East on the one hand, and Greek, Latin, Celtic, Teutonic and Slavonic on the other, gave the key to many puzzles. For nearly a century it was taken for granted that the original Aryan stock, having its home in Central Asia, had sent forth colonies in a distant part, but at different periods, and that these offshoots were generally divisible into two great branches or groups—the Sanskrit and Iranian in the East and those that we have already enumerated in the West. Of the latter it was believed that the first to break away from the old Central Asian home was a group which from the forms that it afterwards assumed might be called the Celto-Græco-Italic family. The Celts started at a good pace and never rested till they spread over all Europe to the very ocean. The Italic family ultimately overtook them and, indeed, so did the Hellenic, for Marseilles was founded by Greeks some six centuries B.C. It is with the Celts, however, that we are especially concerned, and there is no doubt that as far back as historic records and primitive nomenclature carry us, they were masters of a great part of Western Europe and had left traces all the way from and to the shores of Asia. A recent school rejects the theory of a Central Asian origin and of successive movements and makes the European Aryans (Celts, of course, included) virtually indigenous. For our present purpose, it makes no difference which theory we accept. The fact of the presence of the Celts from the shores of the Atlantic to a considerable distance inward and of Celtic expeditions to Rome, to Greece, to Asia Minor, still remains. There is reason to believe that they had overcame a race of earlier settlers of whom the Basques are the survivors. They consisted and still consist of two dis-

tinct families of diverse speech—the Gael and the Cymry. Only the latter are represented on the continent, the Armorican or Breton language being closely allied to the extinct Cornish, and somewhat lies closely to the Welsh. Irish again and Scottish Gaelic are near akin, while Manx, owing to various influences, is less like the parent stock. Each branch has its characteristic literature. But this, much as its study has revealed, only discloses a part of the Celtic contribution to European thought, poetry and civilization. British historians have been most unjust in withholding recognition of its share in the nation—its life and growth and work. But the more fully and impartially the question is examined, the larger and more important is that share proved to be. And of this from time to time we hope to lay some evidence before our readers.

FREE PARISH SCHOOLS.

Archbishop Ireland Issues a Regulation To that Effect

The Catholic Columbian says: On account of his stand on the public school question and his advocacy of what is known as the Faribault plan, Archbishop Ireland's position in regard to parochial schools has been misunderstood in a great many quarters. His aim is to establish free schools for Catholic children, and since experiment has proven that the public schools are not Christian schools, then the Christian schools must be made public or free schools. In accordance with this determination on the part of the Archbishop, he has issued the following circular letter to be read in all the diocesan Churches:—

Throw Open the Doors.

Brethren: We beg leave to make known to you some regulations which, upon the advice of our clergy, we have resolved to put into force in regard to parish schools.

A serious obstacle hitherto to the growth and prosperity of parish schools has been the payment of a monthly stipend by the pupils. True, children unable to make this payment were exempted from it. But this very exemption brought into the school a distinction between pupils. The schools have suffered in many ways from the requirement that even those who are able to do so, should pay for their children's tuition. And then, after all due efforts made in collecting the stipend, the amount received during the year fell far short of the amount which had to be expended for the maintenance of the schools, and pastors were compelled to have recourse to extraordinary measures to make up the usually large deficit.

Henceforward the parish schools in English-speaking parishes will be free to all pupils attending them. No stipend will be exacted or received from any pupil.

We are confident that this regulation will be pleasing to pupils and to parents, and will result in a notable increase in the attendance upon our schools. Parents will see in this regulation a new evidence of the zeal of their pastors for Catholic education, and of their willingness to do all that is possible to meet the wishes of the people.

From this regulation we except the Cretin School for boys under the charge of the Christian Brothers. This school is less a parish school than a general school for the boys of the whole city of St. Paul, and for this and other reasons must be treated differently from our other schools.

HOW EXPENSES WILL BE MET.

Of course, the expenses of maintaining the schools must be provided for in some way. Pastors will take the amount of those expenses from the regular church receipts of the parish, or will rely upon extraordinary measures which their own judgment may commend. Catholics will, we are very sure, co-operate with their pastors in maintaining the parish school. The proper view to be taken of the Catholic school is to regard it as a great religious work, in which all are concerned, whether they have or have not children attending it. The Catholic school,—the future will prove it beyond a doubt,—is the most fruitful of all institutions for the preservation and perpetuation of the faith of this country, and the Catholic who takes a deep and abiding interest in his religion will love the Catholic school and prove his love for it by his generosity towards it.

FOR POOR AND UNPROVIDED PARISHES.

Not a few of the parishes in the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis have no schools, and are for the present so situated that they cannot hope to have any for some time to come. This fact, however, does not absolve parents living in those parishes from the duty of giving their children a Catholic education, nor does it absolve the pastors of those parishes from their duty to urge parents to provide for children the blessing of a Catholic education. Hence this second regulation is made, and will be enforced. Existing parish schools will be open, free of charge, to all children, in whatever parish these may live. Pastors having no school of their own will urge the children of their parishes to attend the schools in the neighboring parishes. The members of the Diocesan School Board will ascertain what sum should be paid by a parish in which there is no school, for the tuition of its children in a school of a neighboring parish, and that sum must be duly paid over to said neighboring parish. All parishes, in other words, must provide for the education of the children within their limits, either by building up schoolhouses of their own, or by contributing in aid of the schools in which their children are instructed.

THE GOOD STANDING OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. We take the occasion to pay a just tribute of praise to our parish schools, and to the devoted and self-sacrificing Sisters who are in charge of them. Of the efficiency of those schools there is no doubt. The teachers are thoroughly equipped for the duties which they as-

CONTINUED ON EIGHTH PAGE.