

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED.)

253 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.
P. O. BOX 1138.

All communications intended for publication or notice should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director True Witness P. & P. Co., Limited, P. O. Box 1138.

The subscription price of the True Witness for a year, Great Britain, Ireland and France is \$1.50; Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, \$2.00; Canada, United States and Newfoundland, \$1.00. Terms, payable in advance.

EPISCOPAL APPROBATION.

If the English speaking Catholics of Montreal and of this Province consulted their best interests, they would soon make of the "True Witness" one of the most prosperous and powerful Catholic papers in this country. I heartily bless those who encourage this excellent work.

PAUL, Archbishop of Montreal.

SATURDAY.....JULY 30, 1898.

ST. VINCENT DE

PAUL SOCIETY.

We heartily congratulate the members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul upon the golden jubilee which they celebrated on Sunday last. There is indeed a noble work—the alleviation of the sufferings of the poor and needy—and the interesting event marked a half century of practical Christian charity performed by devoted Catholic laymen.

As this society is a very useful auxiliary to our clergy, it is desirable that conferences should be established in every parish in the city. We are sorry to note that there is no conference in some of our English-speaking parishes. Steps should at once be taken to found them. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul is a purely religious and charitable organization; and its introduction into a parish is always followed by considerable spiritual improvement. The benefits it produces are not merely confined to the poor and distressed. They are felt by the members of it, over whose lives it exerts an elevating influence, and by the pastors, who receive from its members much valuable assistance in their labors.

A CATHOLIC DAILY

NEWSPAPER.

It is with great surprise that we have read, in many of our American Catholic contemporaries, editorial articles opposed to the idea of starting a Catholic daily newspaper. Some of the reasons urged against the project are altogether too ridiculous to be noticed. The best answer that can be made to them is to point to the fact that thriving Catholic dailies are published in Dublin, Cork, Belfast, and other Irish cities, in not one of which is there nearly the Catholic population of either New York or Chicago; in Paris and other continental European capitals—nay, even in the town of Freiburg, Switzerland. The Catholics of those cities are not in any way different from their co-religionists of the United States; and the only difference between the editors of the Catholic dailies published there and those of their Protestant contemporaries is that of religious belief. Those Catholic editors are not at all endowed with the ideal attributes which some of our American weekly contemporaries, in their inexperience or innocence, to put it mildly, consider to be necessary qualifications. They are simply Catholic journalists, who have been trained on daily newspapers. Their faith and their training are the only qualifications which they have, and these are all that they require.

The secular press of the United States and of Canada is becoming so "yellow" and so accustomed to pry into and lay bare the sacred privacies of life, that, despite the inane opposition of several Catholic weeklies, the necessity of establishing Catholic daily journals will soon bring them into existence. Those who raise objections to their establishment now, especially on financial grounds, remind us of the young men who start in life where their fathers left off, and who would die from discouragement and dejection if they were forced to begin where their hard-working and persevering fathers began. The right to avoid the work and care, and anxiety inseparable from all enterprises is quite natural; but when the enterprise is a good and a noble one the wish can only be attributed to moral cowardice. It is creditable that there is not a single Catholic daily newspaper in the United States, where there are so many big cities which contain large numbers of

Catholics, some of whom are millionaires, and where the English language is almost universally spoken.

Montreal has already set a good example in this respect. Several years ago, when the English-speaking population of the city was but from 35,000 to 40,000, and when there were two well-conducted and enterprising English morning papers and two evening papers as well, not to speak of other Protestant daily papers which came into the city regularly from neighboring towns, The Post, a Catholic daily, was started and had a brilliant and successful career of ten years. The enterprise was launched with a subscribed capital of \$10,000, of which fifty per cent was paid up. That it dropped out of existence was due to the fact that the capital was not, as several Catholic business men had urged, \$75,000, so as to enable it to meet the rivalry of its secular contemporaries. To start a similar Catholic daily now would require only \$100,000 capital. The present is, we believe, an opportune time to launch such an enterprise, seeing the continued and increasing ostracism to which the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion are subjected, and the growing fondness for sensationalism evinced by the secular press. The history of the Post shows what courage, determination and enthusiasm can do, even in spite of the paucity of individual wealth.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS.

Some time ago a number of the prisoners in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary made both night and day hideous with their concerted howls because they had been deprived of their usual allowance of tobacco. While we believe that justice should be rigidly meted out to law breakers, we do not think that any useful purpose can be served by such severities as the withholding of a small ration of tobacco which to many an unfortunate prisoner is a real luxury. Treatment of this "up-to-date" description is apt, in many cases, to make the prisoners incurably morose, to increase their enmity towards society, and to interfere with the reformatory influence which incarceration is supposed to exert.

That this treatment may be carried too far, is evident from a description which the New York Herald publishes of a wealthy prisoner who is imprisoned in a Brooklyn jail as the result of a civil action. It was his eccentricity in regard to concealing his wealth that led to his being imprisoned; but the severe treatment which has been accorded to him in prison has now almost made him a lunatic. "He keeps the other inmates awake at night," says the Herald. "When they wish to say their prayers and go to sleep for the night the millionaire treads loose with screams and yells. A jangle of English noblemen shooting tigers with dynamite guns is breathless silence compared with the uproar of this rich Yankee. Fifty-nine years ago he was born in Connecticut, at Portland, they say. He was a lusty bane. Yet even in the convulsions of whooping cough he gave no hint of the vocal terrors he has displayed in Raymond Street Jail. The prisoners plug their ears when he begins. Warden Bergen says that the combined disorders of twenty-five years are child's play compared with the riot of this man White.

Why is the man imprisoned? It will naturally be asked. On grounds which are extraordinary. A few years ago his wife, who had considerable means, fell ill and died. Before their marriage Mr. White signed a document renouncing for ever all claim to her money. On her death, therefore, their only surviving son became heir, and the father became guardian and administrator by law. He declared the property to be worth \$30,000 and paid the tax on that amount. Legal investigation showed that the \$30,000 personal property, as scheduled by the father, was really worth \$150,000. Then the Long Island Loan and Trust Company was made guardian of the boy, and at once it began proceedings to compel the father to render a full accounting to the court. After a series of long and repeated delays, trivial and extraordinary, the court removed him as administrator of the estate, and Public Administrator W. B. Davenport became his successor. Thus the wealthy father was deprived of all legal control of his son and his estate. Still, neither lawyers nor detectives could discover the whereabouts of the missing \$120,000 worth of securities. He refused to turn over a book or a dollar to the administrator. Then the rich man was committed to jail for having cheated the tax gatherer out of the amount of duty collectable on \$120,000. It is a queer case.

The Courier de Soir, Paris, says that the council of the Legion of Honor has erased the name of M. Zola, the novelist, whose present whereabouts is unknown to the authorities, and now under sentence of a year's imprisonment and a heavy fine after conviction in connection with the now famous Esterhazy court-martial case.

CHAMBERLAIN'S HOME

RULE TREACHERY.

An article in The Strand Magazine by Mr. H. W. Lucy, the well known political writer of The Daily News, and The Observer, and the "Uncle Toby, M. P.," who for years has written the "Essence of Parliament" for Punch, throws an interesting side light upon a momentous episode in the history of the Home Rule movement, namely, the secession of Mr. Chamberlain and his followers from the Liberal party in 1886. It is written in a graphic style, and bears intrinsically evidence that Mr. Lucy is fully acquainted with the story of incidents which have been publicly described for the first time. Mr. Chamberlain and Sir George Trevelyan had resigned from Mr. Gladstone's cabinet, ostensibly on the ground that Under the Home Rule bill of 1886 the Irish members were not to be retained in the British Parliament. Sir George, we may add, returned to the Liberal fold afterwards, manfully declaring that further consideration had led him to believe that his secession was hasty and ill-judged. Mr. Parnell was opposed to the provisions of the bill which stipulated for the retention of the Irish members at Westminster; and on the Saturday which preceded Monday, May 10, 1886, when the second reading of the bill was to be moved, he had called upon Mr. Gladstone at Downing street and had told him that the Irish Nationalists insisted upon that clause being struck out. Monday came. The position was a critical one for Mr. Gladstone. The Irish Nationalists were prepared to accept a compromise as to a number of them sitting now and then, as a matter of form, in the British Parliament.

But, on the other hand, ninety-three Liberal members had declared themselves opposed to the bill. If they carried their objection as far as the division lobby it would be thrown out, and Mr. Gladstone and his Government must go with it. Many discerned the dire peril of the Liberal Party. (One perceived a way of averting it. This was Mr. Labouchere, who, whilst an uncompromising Home Ruler, at the time enjoyed the confidence of Mr. Chamberlain. He appointed to himself the task of renouncing the Radical section of the Liberal Unionists with what later came to be known as the Gladstonians.

In conference with his colleagues the Premier finally agreed to the adoption of provisions whereby the Irish members should sit and vote on questions of Imperial range, including matters of finance. On Saturday evening, the 8th of May, Mr. Labouchere, having obtained this assurance in Downing street, sought an interview with Mr. Chamberlain, who, after some hesitation, consented to accept this understanding as a basis of reconciliation. The agreement was put in writing, Mr. Chamberlain dictating the terms, Mr. Labouchere acting as scribe—an arrangement which recalls the circumstances under which what is known in history as the Benedictine Treaty, was committed to paper. Mr. Labouchere, having carried that flag of truce to Downing street, went off to the country for a Sunday's rest, which he felt he had well earned. Coming back to town on the memorable Monday, the morn of the day on which the second reading of the Home Rule Bill was to be moved in terms and upon conditions that would bring back to the fold the strayed sheep, Mr. Labouchere discovered that his patriotic labor was undone. A note from Mr. Chamberlain awaited him, bitterly complaining that Mr. Gladstone was backing out, an assurance based on what purported to be an authorized paragraph in one of the London papers, in which Mr. Gladstone was represented as protesting that he had yielded on no point connected with his Bill. Mr. Labouchere made haste to communicate with the Liberal Whip and learned what had happened whilst he was spending a peaceful Sunday on the banks of the Thames. It had been brought to Mr. Gladstone's knowledge that Mr. Chamberlain, after his interview with Mr. Labouchere on the Saturday, sent round to his friends a telegram announcing "absolute surrender" on the part of the Premier. A copy of the telegram reached Mr. Parnell, who at once sent it to Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. Gladstone sent to Mr. Chamberlain asking that gentleman to draw up, himself, whatever amendment he wanted to be inserted in the Home Rule Bill regarding the retention of the Irish members in the British Parliament after they had been given their own native parliament in Dublin. He himself would draw up a clause—to the principle of which the Irish leaders had agreed—providing that the Irish members should be permitted to vote in the British Parliament on imperial matters and on financial matters of imperial range. If Mr. Chamberlain were sincere, surely he would have accepted this invitation. He did not, accept it, however; but announced his decision to vote against the Bill, because Mr. Gladstone had agreed to a compromise with the Irish members, on the question of retaining them at Westminster. He wanted them to be retained and to vote on every bill that

should come before it—to be as much members of the British as of the Irish parliament. Nothing short of that would satisfy him.

Mr. Labouchere, industrious, indomitable, did not despair. All was not lost as long as the bill awaited the second reading. If Mr. Gladstone would only announce intention of dropping the bill after its broad principle had been approved by a vote on the second reading, it might be brought up again next session, with reconstruction of the 24th and 39th clauses meeting the objection of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends. On such understanding the fifty-five Radicals who followed Mr. Chamberlain would vote for the second reading, a crisis would be averted, the Ministry would be saved, the session might be appropriated for other business, and the work approached on safer grounds in 1887. On the eve of the motion for the second reading, Mr. Labouchere believed he had Mr. Gladstone's definite and distinct assurance that he would take this course.

But the Radicals below the Gangway sat straining their ears for the promised words of concession and conciliation. They were not spoken, and when Mr. Gladstone resumed his seat after moving the second reading of his Bill, it was felt that all was over. Mr. Labouchere, through the Whip, sent Mr. Gladstone a message on the Treasury Bench to inform him that the ambiguity of his phrase had wrought final and fatal mischief. Mr. Gladstone privily replied that he had meant it to be clearly understood that the Irish members were to sit at Westminster. Somehow or other the accustomed master of plain English had failed to make himself understood. Prepared to yield, he wanted things to look as little as possible like surrender, and so the opportunity of building the golden bridge sped. Mr. Gladstone suggested that Lord Herschell should have an interview with Mr. Chamberlain, when all would be explained. Mr. Chamberlain hotly replied that he would have no more negotiation, but would vote against the Bill.

What followed everybody knows. Mr. Bright was as bitterly opposed to the Home Rule bill as was Mr. Chamberlain, although, like the latter, he had for years ardently advocated Home Rule. Mr. Bright at first stated that he would abstain from voting on the bill, but afterwards announced that he would vote against it because one of the Irish leaders, Mr. Thomas Sexton, M. P., had "insulted" him. What an exhibition of puerility and temper for such a man! The "insult" had been an eloquent speech in which Mr. Sexton, having complimented Mr. Bright upon his magnificent past, had rebuked him for his inconsistency in opposing Home Rule, after having delivered scores of speeches in favor of it. As to Mr. Chamberlain's opposition to the first Home Rule bill because it did not keep the Irish members in the British parliament, the fact that he opposed Mr. Gladstone's second Home Rule bill, which passed the House of Commons, but was thrown out by the House of Lords—which actually provided that seventy or seventy-five Irish members should be kept there—proves that he was not sincere. But Home Rule for Ireland will come before many years pass, in spite of Mr. Chamberlain.

IRISH TEACHERS' GRIEVANCES

Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin, whose efforts in behalf of the teachers in the Irish National schools are well known, has again come forward to claim the redress of a fresh grievance from which they suffer. This grievance is the persistent refusal of the Treasury authorities to pay to the teachers the arrears due to them under the Irish School Grant. His Grace's statement of the case is characterized by his customary lucidity. The question of the payment of these arrears to the teachers has got mixed up with another question, from which it should have been kept altogether apart—the question of the willingness of the teachers to submit to the new set of rules promulgated last November by the Lord Lieutenant in reference to the teachers' Pension Fund.

The claim of the teachers to have the arrears of the School Grant paid to them would exist in all its force if the Pension Fund were not in existence at all. It is quite incomprehensible how it ever could have occurred to the treasury authorities to seek to make the payment of the arrears of the School Grant dependent upon an undertaking being given on the part of the teachers that they would submit to the increased deductions which were to be made from their salaries under the new Pension Rules. Either the treasury authorities regarded the new rules as valid or they did not. If they regarded these rules as valid—and it is to be assumed that they did—it is not easy to understand what was the meaning of their seeking to get from the Teachers' Executive Committee a formal undertaking that the rules would be submitted to by the teachers. On the other hand, if the treasury authorities did not regard the new rules as legally valid, there is

no ground on which they could succeed in justifying the effort they made to obtain such an undertaking. Archbishop Walsh thus sums up the whole matter: "Let us look at the case in the plain light of common sense. Was it intended, or was it not, some months ago, to pay this money to the teachers? If payment was not intended, then there was an indefensible waste of public money in getting ascertained, through a necessarily complicated, and, therefore, costly, series of calculations, the precise amount payable under this head to each individual, out of the many thousand teachers in Ireland. It is a matter of public knowledge that this cost has been incurred, and that the amounts payable in all these thousands of cases have thus been ascertained. If, on the contrary, it was then intended to pay this money to the teachers—and, in view of all that has occurred, it would be ridiculous, and, indeed, insulting to the Treasury authorities, to suppose that it was not intended—then a very plain question arises.

The question is this, and it is one that practically answers itself. The payment of this money to the teachers having been intended a few months ago, and elaborate and costly preparations for the payment of it having been made, can it even be suggested that anything has occurred since then to lead to a change of policy, and justify the withholding of the money?" The Archbishop calls upon the Irish Nationalist members to bring the question before the House of Commons; and there can be no doubt that they will do so.

A CATHOLIC PESSIMIST.

Under the heading of "Block Notes of a Pessimist"—a very appropriate non-deplume, by-the-by—a contributor to our Catholic contemporary, The Review, of St. Louis, Mo., airs his views on the subject of Catholic daily papers. He makes a ridiculously minute analysis of the contents of two American Catholic dailies, one German and the other French, and concludes with this brilliant peroration:

"I have brought out these facts simply and solely to show that we English-speaking American Catholics ought to emulate the zeal of the founders and conductors of those papers in doing their best to neutralize the influence of the bad papers printed in their mother-tongue, but that we have nothing to learn from these papers themselves, such as we find them to-day. They are all, or very nearly all, poor makeshifts, infinitely below the ideal which we should aim at."

Anonymous critics like this, who have not the courage to sign their names, always assume a dogmatic "know all" tone. Happily, they are few in number and wield no appreciable influence. Is it not time, though, that they saw the folly of indulging in narrow-minded fault-finding and carping criticism in regard to their own co-religionists, and turned their attention to the common foe outside our ranks?

PRIESTS WHO WRITE

FOR THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

A secular daily published in Niagara Falls, and edited by an infidel who has been sneering at Christianity in his editorial, recently received a forcible rebuke from the Rev. Father Gibbons, of St. Mary's Church, in that town. Amongst other appropriate reflections which the incident suggested to the able editor of the Catholic Union and Times of Buffalo, N. Y., is the following:—

The newspaper has become a new field of warfare against Christianity, and attacks on the Church are no longer confined to the Protestant pulpit. The columns of the daily and weekly journals are now the means by which bigotry and the spirit of unbelief do their deadliest work; and through this agency moral poison and insult are carried to Christian homes and spread broadcast throughout the land. To apply antidotes to such poisons and to resent such insults in the public press seems to be the special need to-day. The mission of the priest is no longer confined exclusively to the sanctuary. In view of changed conditions he must meet the foe in his new methods of warfare. Pen, as well as tongue, is now a necessary weapon; and, to quote the words of the luminous Pontiff still happily reigning, addressed to the present writer more than twenty years ago: "Priests cannot be engaged in nobler work than in defending Catholic truth in the public press." It is owing to the importance of such work that Leo XIII. has time and again blessed the apostolate of the Catholic press, and encouraged with special recognition those who conspicuously devote their pens to the defense of the Church.

Our local clergy could do a lot of good work in the cause of truth and the salvation of souls if they would each devote an hour or two every week to the writing of an article for the True Witness. We could name a Catholic newspaper, published in England, which from small beginnings has grown to be a powerful and influential and prosperous paper to-day, owing to the cheerful assistance lent to it by priests who contribute to its columns timely articles on interesting subjects, and who also furnish it with short and pithy reports of events that occur in their parishes and that are of interest to their flocks. We are well

aware that our local clergy have many demands upon their time and thoughts; but surely they could, if they wished, contribute to secure an hour or two every week for this good work. None can appreciate better than they the value and importance of such work.

HONOR TO WHOM HONOR IS DUE.

In the Ottawa Citizen of Wednesday, over the initials H. J. M., appears a well-earned tribute to the heroism of the Rev. Canon McIsaac, of Halifax, whose conduct on the occasion of the visit to that port of the plague ship England, in 1866, never should and never will be forgotten. H. J. M. was induced to write to the Citizen because of a letter which had appeared in its columns referring to the story of the England and coupling with it a very proper tribute to the humanity and heroism of Dr. John Slayter, then the health officer of the port, who died in the discharge of his duties, and of his companions, Drs. John and Frank Garvie, but omitting any reference to the splendid conduct of Father McIsaac, who volunteered his services to the Archbishop, and as soon as they were accepted, started off for the plague ship without waiting even to change his clothing. The good Father's arrival at the side of the ship was signaled by what most people would have regarded as a very bad omen, for as he was preparing to leave the shore-boat which took him alongside, a corpse was being lowered, and, the coffin breaking, the putrid body fell upon the good priest's head. Without murmur or complaint, he picked it up and placed it again in the coffin, and, climbing up the gangway as if nothing had happened, he proceeded at once to carry out the duties he had undertaken. How fearlessly and unceasingly he labored amongst the hundreds of sick and dying who were lying around him, from that moment till the last corpse was buried—how he acted the part of priest, doctor, undertaker, and grave-digger—is matter of history, and will not be forgotten by any who ever read or heard of the sad tale of the England.

Dr. Slayter died a martyr to his duty and a hero; his companions, Drs. Garvie, were equally true and brave as his assistants; and were they or Dr. Slayter alive to-day, there are no men who would more willingly endorse the tribute H. J. M. pays to the heroic self-sacrificing priest than they.

As the first account in the Citizen was incomplete, because of the omission to which H. J. M. has called attention, it thus would be almost equally so without referring to the noble conduct of Sister Mary Vincent and the two other Sisters of Charity who dared all the dangers of the terrible contagion that surrounded them, and with fearlessness, energy and activity did splendid service in the cause of humanity and religion on that sadly memorable occasion. Honor to whom honor is due; it was due to all here mentioned; let all share it.

We have every reason to congratulate ourselves upon the prompt manner in which a large number of our subscribers observe the rule of paying their subscriptions promptly. There are, however, a number who are always one or two years in arrears, and it is for the benefit of this class, who mainly through forgetfulness overlook the fact that their contribution is overdue, that we now pen these few words. The amounts in each case are very small, yet in the aggregate they reach a sum which would make life a little more pleasant for our office manager who has the management of the financial matters. We, therefore, hope our good friends who are in arrears will accept this little reminder and remit without delay.

The Montreal Police Athletic Association held their annual games on Wednesday last, and while there were representatives of the M. A. A. A. and French Canadian athletic bodies upon the committee of officials and judges, strange as it may appear, there was not a single representative of the Shamrock Amateur Athletic Association. Have the Police joined the little coterie who have been for years ignoring the Shamrock organization? In view of the enthusiastic support which the S. A. A. has given the police for many years, and the liberal treatment accorded to the "fleet," it is only just that some explanation should be given by the executive in charge of the arrangements.

We understand that an earnest effort is being made by several Catholic journalists in the United States to form a Catholic Press Association. One of the proposed objects of the Association is to adopt measures calculated to be of practical benefit to its members in conducting the newspapers with which they are connected.

There are rumors coming from Spain of alarming preparations by the Carlists for rising. They are now ready to begin directly the Pretender gives the signal. The Spanish authorities have received reports that all the Carlist leaders have gone to meet Don Carlos and his son Jaime, with a view to combining in a plan of campaign.