

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)
255 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, TRU WITNESS P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1138.

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 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 postal.

Subscribers in arrears will please examine the date on the address label of their paper and kindly send us the amount necessary to advance the figure another year or two.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1896

AN UNCALLED-FOR CONTROVERSY.

The City Clerk of Montreal appears in a new role—that of *ensor episcoporum*. For more than two centuries Canada has had the privilege of an Episcopate. For nearly a century and a half after the Abbé De Montigny, a scion of one of the noblest houses in France, was announced in the Letters Patent of the great Louis as "le Sieur de Laval de Montigny, Evêque de Pétrée," there was no cleric or episcopal grade north of the Gulf of Mexico, save his successors in New France. A few years afterwards Mgr de Laval was created Bishop of Quebec and Quebec became a city. For more than half a century before New France was placed under episcopal supervision, there had been in Canada clergy of at least three religious Orders, and ecclesiastical history has kept the record of no more deserving servants of God and man. Recollet, Jesuit, Sulpician—by whatever name they were known—they were all true to their high profession and to some of them were awarded crowns of martyrdom. The story of the labors, perils and tortures of those devoted missionaries has been a subject of admiration to even Protestant writers. Nor were their successors unworthy of their example. The Bishop and clergy of Canada have a record of honor that reflects credit on the Church in this part of Christ's Vineyard, and the fruits of their cares and toils are before the world.

It will soon be three centuries since that record began on the iron-bound coast of Acadia, which witnessed so much of the heroism and romance of those far-off beginnings of a nation's annals. A charming little book, which bears the title of *Les Servantes de Dieu en Canada*, deals with the equally honorable history of the religious communities of women that have labored for God's glory and man's good. It is not the only record of the kind, but its title is so comprehensive that it may be said to represent the rest of its class. Surely, it may be said with some confidence, that the Canadian Clergy of all orders has not been engaged in its Divinely appointed work during all this lapse of time—within a few years of three centuries, during half of which there was no Bishop north of Mexico but the Bishop of Quebec—without having learned, by experience as well as precept, what its mission and its work should be.

It was with some surprise, therefore, that we were told some time ago that our versatile City Clerk was bringing out a manual to instruct the Right Reverend Bishops and Reverend Clergy as to their functions and the manner in which they should be discharged. Can it be possible, we thought, that at this late day—after so many generations of Canadians have enjoyed the advantage of being instructed, guided, warned and comforted by their spiritual pastors—after knowing the blessedness of their sympathy and succor from the time when priest and people were alike exposed to the truculent savage, to these years of less bodily, but greater spiritual peril—our bishops and priests have profited so little by this long course of God-sent experience as to require the instruction of Mr. L. O. David? Yet that is the inference to be drawn from the title and contents of Mr. David's book: *Le Clergé Canadien: La Mission, son Œuvre*. Two questions reasonably suggest themselves on reading this title. Do the clergy know, or do they not know, the mission they have received and the work they have to do? Now, *prima facie*, it seems not unreasonable to conclude that the Canadian

clergy have not been engaged in that mission and in that work for so many generations without knowing why they were sent and what they have to do? The general conclusion reached by historians of Canada is that they not only knew their mission, but have done their work with fidelity and far-reaching results. Even if it be allowed that there were exceptions to the honorable rule, through the shortcomings of individuals, such exceptions mean nothing more than that the dispensation under which we live is still subject to the drawbacks of human imperfection. In the grand triumphant *tout ensemble* of the Church's work in Canada such individual shortcomings are mere moles in the sunbeam.

But supposing, for argument's sake, that the contrary is true, and that instead of knowing their mission, its source and character, and the kind of work that is in harmony with that mission, the Bishops and Clergy of Canada have been ignorant of the one and have neglected the other, how are we to be assured that such is the case? On what authority are we to rely to reach so significantly sad a conclusion? Need we say that it is no slight thing to circulate broadcast a pamphlet with a title which implies so grave a charge against the chief pastors of the Church in Canada as that they have ignored and neglected their mission and work.

That such a charge ought not to be brought rashly without authority no one will deny. It is not any first comer who has a right to sit in judgment on the Canadian clergy, and, with all due respect for the City Clerk, that functionary is, in our opinion, scarcely fitted for so responsible a task. There is, indeed, something absurd in the idea of a civic official—however talented and respected—assuming to teach the Archbishops and Bishops of Canada what their duties are and how they are to discharge them. In order to show his fitness for that task, Mr. David gives a brief *synopsis* of his theology and a compend of ecclesiastical history. Having thus established his orthodoxy, proceeds to speak dogmatically of the limits of the authority of the priesthood. "They have a right," he says, "to look for the guidance of the Holy Spirit when they speak from the heights of the spiritual world, but not when they descend to the arena of human controversy. They lose their strength when they come in contact with the earth and provoke conflicts fatal to their priestly character."

On several occasions, according to Mr. David, this melancholy effect has been produced. He does not directly condemn the Clergy for rejecting the invitation of the American Congress in 1776, but he does so indirectly by approving of the course of the American Clergy (not Bishops) at the same crisis. "What would have happened," he asks, "if the Catholics, ill-advised by their priests, had kept aloof from or deserted the banner of the patriots?" In Mr. David's opinion, they "would have been deemed unworthy of liberty." And yet Mr. David is not unaware of the fact of liberty that Congress interdicted to offer to French Canadian Catholics. If Mr. David writes his pamphlet in French and not in English, he owes that privilege to the firmness and foresight of the Clergy of that time. Mr. David is willing to keep his share of the glory of Chateauguay, and so has nothing to say against the demeanor of the Clergy in 1812. It is when he comes to deal with the crisis of 1837-38 that he finds most cause to condemn his spiritual pastors. We have no intention to open up the question of the Rebellion. Everyone admits that there was great provocation on the part of the Bureaucrats of that day. But, even if the provocation had been still more glaring, the Clergy, with the alternatives before them, were wise and patriotic and true to their sacred calling when they did all in their power to dissuade their flocks from an appeal to arms. Their condemnation is, however, only preliminary to the real purpose of the pamphlet, which is to create a public sentiment hostile to the action of the Bishops on the Manitoba school question. It is only the Canadian Bishops and Priests that Mr. David would restrain from touching the things of the earth. The American prelates he cites with admiration, however earthly be the affairs with which they deal, so long as they are in agreement with Mr. David's political views. Those who make use of the utterances of the Bishops and God has set in authority over his people for the sake of promoting the interests of a party do what is wrong by whatever name they call themselves. It was a mistake to mix the school question up with party politics, and it was worse than a mistake to identify the Episcopate with a party. That the Episcopal Bench in this province should have pronounced in favor of the course that seemed to promise justice to the aggrieved minority in Manitoba was only in keeping with its previous record. But with the fact that such course was taken by one party rather than the other, the Bishops had nothing to do, and to emphasize that fact as implying partisanship on the part of their Lordships is unjust, uncalled for, and, for a professed Catholic, in extremely bad taste. *Quis se constituit iudicem super nos?*

THE SHAMROCKS' PROTEST.

Those of our readers who are interested in lacrosse have already, no doubt, heard a good many expressions of their opinions as to the action of Mr. Chitty, the referee, in ruling off Mr. M. J. Tansey in the third game, for the rest of the match of the 19th ult., between the Capitals and the Shamrocks. As to the effect of that ruling on the subsequent course of the match there seems to be no doubt in the minds of the impartial public. At that stage in the match each team had won a single game, Tansey having scored for the Shamrocks. The loss of such a player by the Shamrock team, already weakened by the withdrawal of Hinton (to pair with the injured Carson, of the Capitals), so diminished its strength, that, without some unlooked for turn of exceptional good luck, its defeat became a foregone conclusion. It was not surprising, therefore, notwithstanding their plucky play, that no further game was scored for the Shamrocks, and the champions returned to Ottawa with another triumph. Such a match could not be regarded as a fair test of the skill, activity and staying power of the respective teams, and all true lovers of the game of lacrosse could not help regretting that the winning and losing teams had not been more evenly matched.

It was in the nature of things that some dissatisfaction should be felt among the friends of the Shamrocks, and this feeling was not lessened when all the details of what had taken place were given to the world. The first published report of the match, in its account of the untoward incident that cost the Shamrock team the loss of one of its best men, was practically in accordance with the evidence subsequently taken as confirmation of the formal protest against Mr. Chitty's ruling. That Mr. Chitty, a member of the Montreal Club, was conscientiously resolved to do his duty, and had no intention to be anything but impartial, we are willing to believe. We are as much opposed as he is to the rough and violent play that causes a distaste for the game with a large class of persons who would otherwise be drawn to it.

The laws which all lacrosse men are bound to obey were framed with a view to put a stop to the practice of cross checking in its various forms and of every kind of fouling. But there may be fouling in the application, as well as in the physical violation of the laws; and even when such fouling is unconscious, it may, in certain circumstances, be of more serious import than the roughest play. The enthusiastic and stalwart lacrosse player is not deterred from the ground by risks that to men of punier physique and less tried mettle would be absolutely prohibitive. But the evil precedent of an ill-considered or partial judgment has a tendency to create distrust in the minds of the players and to produce disorganization in the most efficient teams. How such a sentiment, once it gains admission, is likely to work, it is not difficult to foresee. The case in question may be taken as a fair illustration of the way in which it would operate.

Here we have two teams playing a match of peculiar interest. A member of one team commits an offence against the laws. The attention of the referee is promptly called to the "foul"—a deliberate foul according to the solemn declaration of the captain of the victim's team. Had proper notice been taken of this violation of the rules, by ordering off the offender for the rest of the game, official justice would have been done. In all probability no further dispute would have occurred. But, whereas the aggressor was let off with impunity, the breach of rule thus provoked was made the pretext for inflicting a penalty out of all proportion to the offence, the burden of which was borne by the entire team, deprived for the rest of the match of the help of one of its best members. Nor is that all. The Captain of the team thus doomed to defeat bears witness that, before the match was begun, it was arranged that whatever disputes might arise during the continuance should be settled by the joint action of the referee and the two Captains. Yet this arrangement was completely ignored—the only satisfaction given by the referee, when reminded of it, being that he had made his decision and it must stand. It is difficult to conceive on what principle Mr. Chitty could have acted in defiance of a distinct agreement, and if Mr. Polan's statement were not so clear as to leave no doubt on the subject, we should be inclined to believe that there was some misunderstanding as to what Mr. Chitty had engaged to do. But on that point Mr. Polan's declaration leaves no room for question.

Last week we published a summary of the proceedings at the special meeting of the Lacrosse League for the consideration of the Shamrocks' protest against the Referee's decision. Every one of the documents that Mr. C. A. McDonnell, on behalf of the Shamrocks, laid before his fellow-delegates, shed fresh light on the controversy. To Captain Polan's evidence we have just referred. That of Dr. Kennedy confirms

the affirmation of Mr. M. J. Tansey, as to Mr. Crown's assault, and is in agreement with Mr. Polan's account of the same incident. The letter of the Hon. Secretary of the Shamrock Club contains an able summary of all the circumstances of the *contretemps* to which the defeat of the Shamrocks may, in all justice, be attributed, and thereon based a demand for the annulment of a match so manifestly unfair. But Mr. Stuart, the delegate of the Capitals, was not to be moved by any arguments, facts or consideration of consequences. Had the other delegates (one of them especially) had the courage of their convictions, the Referee's decision would have been overruled. If, however, Mr. McDonnell alone of the delegates supported the protest of the Shamrocks, he was not alone before the tribunal of public opinion. The Sunday Sun, while acquitting Mr. Chitty of any intentional favoritism, says that "in sending a player such as Tansey off for the entire match he certainly was well aware that the Shamrock's chances of winning were decidedly slim. In his action he broke the backbone of the Shamrock home, discouraged the balance of the team, and gave a hand-down of the championship to the Capitals." The Sun then recounts Crown's aggressive attack, Tansey's vain appeal to the Referee, but loss of self-control under the double provocation, and the deplorable result. The Montreal Herald, like the Sun, admits that Tansey had broken the rules and deserved punishment. "But," it continues, "there are times when justice should be tempered with mercy, . . . and Shamrock sympathizers think that Tansey would have been sufficiently punished by being put off for the game only." The Herald then reminds its lacrosse-loving readers of the kind of game that Mr. Crown plays, and adds that "Tansey received a blow from him that laid open his skull." Under such provocation the Herald does not think it surprising that Tansey lost his temper, especially as Crown was let off with impunity. La Presse is still more severe on Mr. Chitty, and holds that referees should not by their decisions help one team in a match by embarrassing the other. It thinks the ruling entirely without justification. The Star is milder, but condemns the ruling as "an error of judgment," which "meant practically giving the match to the Capitals." The Gazette, without excusing Tansey for retaliating, reminds its readers that Crown had cut his head badly. "Under the circumstances," adds the Gazette, "it seemed to the majority of people present as if ruling off for the game was penalty enough." As to the effect of the ruling on the subsequent play, the Gazette is equally outspoken: "To this episode may practically be attributed the loss of the match, for previously the home team were showing their opponents the way." The Daily Witness says that during the early part of the match comment had been heard on Mr. Chitty's leniency. He seems to have been lenient down to the moment in which Tansey retaliated on Crown's unrebuked assault. Then he made a new departure which ensured the loss of the match by the Shamrocks.

THE RESULT OF A MOVEMENT.

The great Convention of the Irish race is curiously in keeping with one of the most characteristic movements of our age. If the second half of the nineteenth century be commemorated hereafter by some qualification, intended to indicate its most distinctive feature, it will be called the age of association or unification. It would require some reflection and research to discover all the causes that have combined to produce this far-reaching tendency. One of them is, undoubtedly, the greater facility for intercommunication that our time has enjoyed compared with the centuries that preceded it. The World's Fair, inaugurated at the very beginning of the period in question, would have been impossible in any earlier age. Since the year 1851 the progress of railway construction has surpassed the most sanguine hopes of its most ardent advocates. When the project of a transcontinental line was first broached in the United States Congress, the idea was laughed to scorn, and it was only the lesson of the Civil War that convinced the objectors, not only of its feasibility, but of its absolute necessity. It was the same with our own Pacific Railway. To Canada

belongs the honor of sending the first steamship across the Atlantic, but what a mighty change has taken place during the two-thirds of a century that have since elapsed! It is just forty years since the Grand Trunk celebration in this city, which some of our readers can recall. A little later a weekly Atlantic line was established. But in the interval of forty years what a veritable revolution has taken place in transatlantic navigation! It is the same all over the world. The Pacific is now traversed regularly by giant vessels that connect the New World and the Old in constant intercourse. Canada has become a half-way house for the traffic westward, as the Suez Canal is for the traffic eastward. Yet some of us can recall the old days when Cape Horn and the Cape of Good Hope were the turning-points in these routes. Russia is doing for Siberia what Canada has done for Northern America—the great lone land of a few years ago. From Paris to Constantinople is only a pleasure trip; it will soon be possible to continue the route to the eastern seas and then, if desired, across the Pacific and back to Europe by the Canadian Pacific. And yet every day marks some improvement in response to the demand for greater facilities and greater speed by land and sea.

But besides these world-wide opportunities for travel, this annihilation of distance and conquest of time, there are other causes that tend to bring people of like sympathies nearer to each other. We see it exemplified in the yearning for national unity; in the oft-expressed desire for religious union which is itself a condemnation of schism; in the combinations of skilled and unskilled labor; in the organizations of science, art and letters, and in the myriad athletic and sporting clubs and societies of both hemispheres. There is not one of these many-sided interests—racial, religious, industrial, etc.—that does not suggest illustrations without number of successful union for a specific end. But the Dublin Convention seems to stand apart as a gathering *sui generis*, a movement without precedent, indicating the sentiment of a racial unity that is independent of geographical barriers, and the existence of a greater Ireland, the oneness of which overpowers any mere local dissension. The idea having been found efficacious for the special purpose for which it was given shape, it is to be hoped that when complete union is established in the ranks of the parliamentarians, the Convention will be used for still larger objects, serving as a kind of *Fœdis* of the old model in which the whole nation, domestic and foreign, will be worthily represented.

Can we find any precedent in the gatherings of our time for such a perennial Convention, taking the place of a regularly constituted people's parliament? Curiously enough one of the lessons that India has learned from contact with her British rulers is the influence of representative assemblies. But from Ireland India learned, in addition, the value of Home Rule, if representative institutions were to have their full effect. One of the forms that the ambition of the native races—Hindoo and Mohammedan—has assumed in recent years is the desire to learn English. With a fair knowledge of the English tongue generally comes a wish to study English history and institutions and in this way the more advanced representatives of Young India have become acquainted with that struggle for liberty, civil and religious, that is one of the most interesting chapters in the political annals of the United Kingdom. Having thoroughly mastered the principles of liberty and self-government, the Indian admirers of free institutions began to apply these principles to their own condition. They started an agitation for Home Rule. One Viceroy was inclined to support their plea, but his successor held different views.

Then came to pass one of the most remarkable illustrations of that tendency to combine for common ends that recent times has afforded. Before this crisis the people of India had been divided not only by race and creed and caste, but also by vast distances. The latter barrier was to some extent removed by the Indian railway system. Education, common aspirations and the necessity for union helped to overcome the more serious obstacle. The agitators were of different religions and races, but they were bound together by patriotism and love of liberty. They determined to organize a congress. At first the officials of the general and local governments laughed at the idea. But the leaders were not to be put down by ridicule. By and by, seeing them so determined, the authorities began to be alarmed. But the agitators had no intention of breaking the law. They had resolved to follow British precedent and to agitate peacefully and legally.

In due time all the arrangements were completed and the first National Indian Congress met at Bombay in December, 1885, just the time that Mr. Gladstone's mind was in travail with his first Home Government bill. The president of the congress was a Bengal Brahmin, Mr. W. C. Bonnergie. There were not many Mohammedans present, but the discussions were full of interest. Every mat-

ter of common concern was debated with vigor and point, in accordance with British usage, and perfect order prevailed. At the second congress a Hindoo gentleman, who afterwards entered the British House of Commons, occupied the chair. The Mohammedans were in great strength, and at the third congress the leading Mussulman barrister of Bombay was elected speaker. The delegates on this occasion numbered 607. The movement was clearly succeeding, for it was no slight victory to get the better of Mohammedan prejudice. At the fourth congress another barrier was surmounted when an English merchant of Calcutta consented to preside. He was followed the year after by a Scottish baronet, and thousands of visitors were attracted to the debates.

The later congresses have been marked by an important feature. After the political discussions are at an end, a conference is held for considering the question of social reforms in the Hindoo community. These conferences are largely attended and not unfruitful. The congresses have been held in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Allahabad, Poona, Lahore and other important cities. The chairmen have shown much tact in directing and controlling the debates. The utmost freedom has been allowed within certain limits. Reforms in Indian administration have been always in order, but no disloyal utterance is sanctioned. In discussing social reforms, a distinction is made between what is doctrinal or ceremonial and what is of morbid social growth.

Altogether, the Indian congresses have been a remarkable success. They have made themselves felt both in India and England, where they have an office and an organ, and no government can pretend to ignore or despise them. Surely the Irish Convention ought not to be behind the Indian Congress as an *ad interim* parliament.

OUR PHILOSOPHER

THANKS HER UNKNOWN FRIENDS FOR THEIR KIND SENTIMENTS.

K. Dolores returns sincere thanks to her unknown friends, "Babette" and "Walter R.," for their kind comments on her journalistic efforts.

Commendation from "Our Paraphraser" and "Our Observer" is no small encouragement for a humble "philosopher" who reads the bright spicy paragraphs of these writers with pleasure and profit.

K. D.

MR. J. J. LANNING

COMPLETES HIS TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR OF SERVICE IN THE G. T. R.—HE IS STEADILY IMPROVING IN HEALTH.

Mr. J. J. Lanning, of the G.T.R., who has just returned from St. Agathe, where he was spending the summer, was seen by a representative of the TRUE WITNESS yesterday afternoon, at his residence.

Mr. Lanning is looking fairly well, and expressed himself as being much benefited by his sojourn at the popular Canadian Colorado. In the course of the interview, Mr. Lanning informed the TRUE WITNESS that he completed his 28th year of service in the G.T.R. last week. He also spoke very highly of the treatment which he had received during the past year from the present General Manager, Mr. C. M. Hays, and his predecessor, Mr. L. J. Sergeant, through whom he had received a leave of absence for the period of one year, in order to recuperate his health. Mr. Lanning, although a young man yet, has a wide and splendid experience in railroad matters. He is deservedly popular, not alone among the officials of the big railway enterprise, where he has so long and so faithfully labored in the interests of the Company, but also in the circle of citizens of all creeds and nationalities. Mr. Lanning is a splendid type of an ideal young Canadian, who, through the dint of a tireless energy and a true and just appreciation of the demands and duties required of him in the various official positions which he has held in the G.T.R., has risen to a place of distinction in its service. The TRUE WITNESS, in wishing that Mr. Lanning may soon return to his post of duty perfectly restored to health, merely voices a sentiment cherished by a large section of the community.

THE FORMER NUN OF KENMARE

REPENTANT AND SEEKING RECONCILIATION WITH THE CHURCH.

The Catholic Witness says: "Miss Cusack, once well known as the Nun of Kenmare, has grown weary of the life she has been leading of late years, and has sought reconciliation with the Church, avowing her repentance for the scandals she had caused since she went out from its fold. This will be glad news to the many persons who remember how much good in her way this former nun accomplished, and who never abandoned the hope that she would repent of the folly that took her into other than Catholic fields of labor.

Mr. H. J. Codd, Secretary of the Catholic Truth Society, and fourth son of the late Rev. E. T. Codd, M.A., of Leamington, England, was united in marriage on the 29th ultimo, to Miss Katherine Frances McAuley, only daughter of Mr. Francis McAuley, of this city. The ceremony, which took place at the Archbishop's Palace, was performed by the Very Rev. M. McAuley, V.G., of Coaticook, Que., uncle of the bride. The bride wore a becoming travelling dress, and was attended by Miss Alice Lunny as bridesmaid, and Mr. F. W. Cotter was in attendance as groomsman. After Mass the bridal party drove to the residence of the bride's parents, and after partaking of the *dejeuner*, proceeded to the *Palais de la Station*, where the happy couple took the train for West. The bride was the recipient of numerous handsome presents.