

died into echo and the bluster was but a passing breeze. He then cites the work done by Cardinal Lavigerie, in Africa, as representative of the Pope. In the course of the article Dr. Bacon says: "Priests educated at Rome, are generally men of broader and more genuinely Catholic ideas than the graduates of Maynooth, or of American seminaries." Whether there be any truth or not in this remark it is certainly a high tribute to the educational liberality in the centre of Catholic unity. He points out three questions which have been settled, without pomp or ostentation, by the Apostolic Delegate, since his arrival on this continent. He thus enumerates them: 1st, the rights of the clergy; 2d, the school question; and 3d, the Americanization of the Church in America. The whole article stands forth in marked contrast with the frightened bigotry of Bishop Vincent's diatribe. The one is afraid of his shadow, and has visions of Roman ghouls and Papal ghosts haunting the halls of American Liberty, the other sees in Catholicity a time-honored, a venerable and a powerful portion of Christianity from which there is nothing to fear.

After these two it is an easy transition to Rev. Dr. Laughlin's able and amusing contribution. In it he tells us that "the incessant attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church are among the most powerful instruments of her propagation." Again he points out that men of the Bishop Vincent stamp are not fighting facts but suspicions. "It is not what the Catholic Church has done here during the century of our existence as a nation that excites their ire, but what they fancy she will do, or may do, nay, what she must do, unless (a contingency which never enters their brain) they are calumniators and false prophets." As we have given so much space to these articles we come to a rather abrupt close, but not before giving what the learned Doctor most eloquently says of the Apostolic Delegate:

"With a perfect comprehension of the object of his mission, with an absence of pomp and an inward consciousness of power which recall the embassy of a Lepidus in Egypt or a Franklin in Paris, he has wasted no time in setting about the performance of the task laid upon him; and owing chiefly, no doubt, to the opportunities of the juncture at which he appeared and to the faithfulness with which thousands of humble workers had paved the way for him, but in great measure also to the confidence inspired by his manifest singleness of aim and intrepidity in pursuing it, by his honesty, his affability, and his anxiety to deal justly by the mighty and the lowly alike, his presence among us has been heartily welcomed, even by thoughtful men outside the Catholic communion, as a most acceptable addition to the moral forces of the nation. And, unless I am much mistaken, it is precisely these attractive qualities of the Pope's representative which render him most obnoxious to those who are persuaded that no good thing can come from them."

THE HERALD GREW ANGRY.

Evidently the Herald did not relish our remarks of last week, they must have struck home, or it would not have made such an exhibition of its spleen as that which appeared in Saturday's issue. "This is a free country and there is no accounting for tastes," says the Herald. We agree with our angry and sarcastic contemporary upon that point, otherwise there would be no accounting for the Herald's own peculiar style of making political capital out of every little move upon the chess-board of public affairs, and its constantly mistaking mean insinuation and assertions devoid of all proof for literary refinement and solid argument. There is not the slightest danger—no matter what may be

thought of THE TRUE WITNESS—that any unprejudiced man will ever accuse the Herald of being "conducted with sense and ability," at least as far as its anti-Irishism is concerned. In its rebashed accusations against the Solicitor General, or rather against his office, the Herald only makes one square and unqualified statement, it says: that THE TRUE WITNESS is Mr. Curran's "pocket-organ." We have but a very plain answer regarding this assertion—we say that it is false. We do not qualify the term in any way. The Herald seems to know, or desires to know, more about every other person's business than it does about its own.

It would please the Herald very much, we have no doubt, if we were to enter into a regular statement of how very little the honorable gentleman in question has to do with THE TRUE WITNESS: it would be still more gratifying to that seeker after scandals if we were to give it some information upon the duties of the office that it constantly belittles. Why is the Herald so anxious to know all about the internal working of that particular department? Has it a candidate for the Solicitor-Generalship in view, in the event of a change of government? Why is it so determined in its desire to ferret out the private business of the representative of Montreal Centre? Is it for the purpose of creating a precedent that it howled so loudly against a few years ago, when it condemned, in no measured terms, the insolence that was not checked even at the threshold of a man's private affairs? Perhaps it thinks that THE TRUE WITNESS is sufficiently lacking in sense and ability, (if it chooses) to be a party to its espionage and to give it a helping hand in attacking and crying down a man of manifest ability: for were he not such, the Herald would not be constantly attacking him, it surely has "sense and ability" enough to save powder and shot for what it would consider higher game.

If ever the day comes that the party, from which the Herald draws its support, should regain the Treasury benches at Ottawa, it will be amusing to note how suddenly that organ will find out the necessity for the office of Solicitor-General. Perchance some one of its own very dear friends will seek that position; but, why argue with the intentionally and perversely blind?

In its little moment of wrath, the Herald forgot to tell its readers why it constantly seeks to make political capital out of the Irish question? Why it lauds the advocates of Home Rule to the skies when they are of its own stripe in Canadian public affairs, and ridicules, sneers at, and belittles the equally sincere and equally powerful advocates of the same cause, when they happen to be on the other side of the fence in our local Canadian questions? The Herald's motto evidently is: our party first; the Home Rule question next, provided its advocates are of our party; the Home Rule question last or not at all, when its advocates are not of our party. That hide of Liberalism ill becomes you, dear Herald, beneath it you but ill conceal the opposite spirit. You preach Liberalism and you struggle in practice, its very best attributes.

The death of the learned theologian Cardinal Zigliara, recalls to mind the name of that other eminent author and professor of theology, the famous Jesuit Liberator. These two powerful writers, profound students and world-famed teachers have left behind them works that will waft their names down the centuries as masters in the science of all sciences. The students of the Gregorian University, at Rome, have started a subscription for the erection of a bust of Father Liberator.

THE JEWS.

We notice that a couple of weeks ago, the Catholic press of New York expressed itself somewhat indignantly regarding the manner in which a most prominent and respectable member of society in that city was treated by one of the political clubs of the place. He was black-balled for no other reason than that he was a Hebrew in nationality and a Jew in belief. We are well aware that Christians feel a certain repugnance for the creed of the Hebrew, especially on account of the sad and never-to-be-forgotten events that surrounded the dawn of Redemption. But no matter how we may abhor the Jewish tenets we have no right, as Christians, to extend that feeling to individuals. We must remember that Christ, Himself, forgave them from the Cross and that He commanded all His followers to likewise forgive their enemies. Besides the Jews were for long ages the chosen people of God; they gave us the patriarchs and the prophets; they handed us down the decalogue and the old testament; they constituted the race from which the Saviour sprung and to which the Blessed Virgin belonged. It is true they did not accept Christianity, but "they know not what they do" said Jesus Christ. They err, and we know it; but that by no means gives us a mandate to persecute them, to crush them, to curse them. At different epochs and in different countries they have cruelly persecuted the Christians; but have not Christian sects persecuted each other? Has not the Church of Rome been the object of most cruel attacks and most tyrannical treatment from those who, while claiming the title of Christian, sought to destroy her influence and wipe out her faithful? We believe that the Jews bear upon their heads, as a race, the effects of the blood they caused to be shed on Golgotha; yet, are they not carrying out to the letter the condemnation that was their punishment? They have been driven from their paternal land; they wander homeless and countryless up and down the earth; they are chased away by every other nation or else their lot is rendered intolerable for them. In all this we behold the hand of God; but the same God never gave us a commission to execute His sentence; He never told us to treat them other than as human beings; He never commanded us to do otherwise than forgive them, and, if they are our neighbors, to love them. While we hold in horror their denial of His Divinity, the most we have a right to do is to strive and convert them to Christ—not by the sword, or fire, or torture, or ostracism, but by showing the example of all our Christian virtues, by leading them to believe in our sincerity, by forcing them to admire, respect, and thus finally adopt our principles and our Faith.

Recently, in Chicago, Dr. E. G. Hirsch lectured before a large audience in the Sinai temple; his subject was "the Jews and Jesus." In the course of his remarks he said:

"Toward christianity as a religion the Jews have always felt a kindly interest. Christ is recognized by orthodox Jews as one who carried the beacon light to the untutored of Jerusalem. In Jewish literature there is no allusion to the life, labor, work or character of Jesus. This attitude is easily accounted for. They have no reason to hate the founder of christianity. They have no reason to hate his followers. But they have reason to hate their persecutors. For centuries they have suffered tyrannous oppression; mercy was never shown the Jew; the rack and the stake were their lot; old age was never shown mercy, wisdom never respected, but they were slaughtered without pity or compassion in the name of the founder of that religion that goes thundering down the vestibule of

time. Christianity is not hated by the Jews; there is absolute silence in the literature of Judaism regarding the carpenter's son of Bethlehem. It is only within the past sixty years that scholars have felt themselves called upon to trace back the source of religion and how it was sent forth. Never has the Jew felt the necessity of going beyond his own religion—a religion that could make life worth living; a religion that filled the home with the music of peace that the world could never take away. For this in the middle of ages they suffered martyrdom, to-day they suffer ostracism in many fields.

When sentiments such as these are expressed by the great men of that Hebrew race—not by the mob, nor the ignorant degraded Jews—we, as true followers of Christ, should step out and meet them half way. If we cannot hold communion with them in matters of religion, at least we can respect them as men, as human beings, as members of the one great family, in accordance with their individual merits. Therefore we cannot see any excuse for the persecution of the Jews as a people, nor the ill-treatment of them as individuals. Whether it be in the streets of Moscow, or in the streets of New York: whether it be made apparent in the depopulated villages by the Volga or in the social circles by the Hudson, we hold as unjustifiable and anti-Christian every attempt made by men—calling themselves civilized—to crush, to grind, to tyrannize over and to persecute a people whose great mission in the past was nobly fulfilled, whose dread crime of deicide is being hourly expiated under the hand of Providence and according to the decrees of God.

SALISBURY, Balfour, Chamberlain, Saunderson, and their admirers, would have the world believe that the Irish are not capable of governing themselves. They would also be glad to impress upon all strangers to Ireland the idea that no more lawless country exists on the face of the earth. We would like very much if these gentlemen, or any other gentlemen, could name us the country in which the Judges of the Criminal Courts are found, month after month, opening the assizes in different counties and meeting with blank dockets. More white gloves have been presented to judges in Ireland than in any land under the sun. In Reynold's Newspaper, of London, the following paragraph appears: it speaks for itself:

"According to the last return of the Inspector-General of Irish Constabulary for the quarter ended March (of the present year) there has not been a single case of murder, manslaughter, assault on the police, burglary, or robbery, reported throughout the whole of Ireland, except one case of assault on a bailiff, which occurred in Orange Ulster. At this moment Ireland is the most crimeless country in the whole world. Yet we have hypocrites, like Chamberlain, himself the representative of a city (Birmingham, England), which has gained a most unpleasant notoriety for its immorality, staking about the country uttering slanders upon the character of Ireland and Irishmen."

"Observe that the Inspector-General does not say convicted or tried, but reported." There are thirteen thousand police in Ireland and the officers would only be too glad to report any crime, if there were the slightest ground given them. But none were even reported, in the land where Balfour deems coercion necessary to preserve the peace.

Bradstreet reports 27 failures in Canada this week, against 19 last week and 22 in the last week of May last year.

The Macdonald monument at Hamilton is not likely to be unveiled before September.