

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 1188.

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, True Witness P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1188.

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, \$1.00. 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 1188.

You may remit by bank cheque, post office money order, express 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.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this money order or by registered letter. 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. All communications for publication must be written on one side of the sheet only, otherwise they are liable to rejection.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1895.

A DANGEROUS SPIRIT.

Some person, actuated, we are ready to believe, by sincere motives, has perpetrated a great wrong in a number of articles recently published in Le Canada, of Ottawa. The spirit evidenced in the contributions is a most dangerous as well as an unpatriotic one. We notice that Le Canada declines to be held responsible for the opinions of its correspondent, and the correspondent, for reasons best known to himself, declines to sign his name. Perhaps he fears that his identity would add nothing to the weight of his opinions and consequently has wisely kept in the dark. It may be that he is ashamed of some of his assertions—and well he may be—and would not like the people he meets and converses with every day to know that he was possessed of the narrow mind and ungenerous sentiments that his writings exhibit. Be that as it may, we have only to plainly state that he has—perhaps not knowingly—given the readers of Le Canada a couple of very false assertions to ponder over. He is no better than the man who would deliberately light a brand on the prairie and start a conflagration of death that he could not subdue. He has sought to strike the match of race enmity and to set one section of the people against another. It is a cool and wicked attempt to bring on a strife that were it not for the honest tolerance and fair-mindedness of our Canadian public might end most unfortunately for all concerned. The man who uses his pen to set one section of the community against another is a traitor to Canada's best interests. We do not know who he is; we don't want to know; we do not covet his acquaintance; but he is Liberal or Conservative, Protestant or Catholic, French, Belgian, English, or Canadian, he is a person whose expressions are dangerous to the well-being of the country and whose sentiments are deserving of the universal condemnation of the honest citizens of our Dominion.

In the issue of Le Canada of September 5, this unknown and nameless writer makes an attempt to defend the Christian Brothers by casting the whole blame of the troubles upon the Irish element. His zeal has got the better of his discretion, and his enthusiasm has run away with his veracity. After following up the history of the difficulties concerning the schools in Ottawa, and relating the story of the division of the Board into English-speaking and French-speaking sections, he proceeds to argue in favor of the attitude taken by the Brothers and to blame the Irish people for all the subsequent unpleasantness. We would not think it worth our while referring to these articles had the author confined himself to a fair and just defence of the Christian Brothers. His arguments concerning the La Salle series, and the right of the Brothers to use their own books are fair enough, but contain nothing new or striking; decidedly nothing to justify the baseless attack, made in the issue of September 7, to which all this reasoning seems to purposely lead up. If all these columns were merely penned for the purpose of giving vent to the wickedness contained in what we are about to quote, we pity the man and we grieve for whatever good cause he might espouse. Imagine a Canadian, a person who professes love of our country, a man claiming to be patriotic, writing the following:—

"I have already stated our position, as a race vis-a-vis our English and Irish Protestant fellow-countrymen. They are by instinct our enemies, and our Irish-Catholic fellow-countrymen are equally so against our common religious faith."

trustees for having done all in their power to injure the Brothers. In that he is right; but upon what authority upon what facts, upon what reasoning, does he base the false assertion that the Irish-Catholics, despite our religion, are the instinctive enemies of the French-Canadians? That there exists a number of uneducated people in both races whose ignorance leads them to antagonize each other we readily admit. But that the Irish-Catholic element, as evidenced in its clergy, its professional men, its officials, its commercial leaders, its political lights, its journalists and its thinkers, is instinctively inimical to the French-Canadian Catholics, we deny most emphatically, and we appeal to the history of this country and to the records of our own day in refutation of the vile calumny. Because a few narrow-minded persons, whom Providence has endowed with the gift of expressing their views, like the writer of the articles in question, are fanatical enough to conceive and to make public such ideas, only proves that they are judging others by their own standard and imagine that because they are filled with rancor and hate the same must be true of others. Does this man know what he is doing? Is he aware that his utterances, if expressed through some more conspicuous channel, might lead to recriminations and unfortunate results for all lovers of peace and good-will in Canada?

We cannot believe that he is a French-Canadian; if he is one, he has borrowed his sentiments from another source, they savor of another spirit that has worked more than one misfortune for Catholics of different origins in Canada. No honest French-Canadian, acquainted with the history of this Province, and aware of the links that bind the Irish and French Catholics together, would ever dream of making such an assertion.

It is not often that we recall to the public mind anything that we have done through the columns of our paper; but there are times when, as an illustration, it is necessary to cast aside the cloak of humility. This organ being the only one the Catholics possess, in English, in this French Province, we feel that we express the views and the sentiments of our people. So far, at all events, we have never been informed to the contrary.

Take up, then, the files of our paper—the mouth-piece of the Irish-Catholic element—and what do you find? You find that, year after year, we have celebrated—heart and soul—the great French-Canadian festival with as much enthusiasm as our fellow-citizens of French origin. Why? Because we felt all we wrote; because we knew it expressed the feelings of those for whom we spoke; because our gratitude, our admiration and affection prompted us; gratitude for unnumbered favors to our race, admiration for the institutions, language and spirit of our friends of other origin, and affection for those who participate in the same glorious faith with us. When their most sacred institutions were attacked by the semi-infidel, anti-clerical element of imported scoffers, and when their press was silent, from end to end, we stood in the breach and fought their battle. When the arrows of wickedness were aimed at the venerable head of our common religion, while not a shield was raised by the press that should have been ready to guard the representative of Christ from the assaults of his enemies, we hesitated not to fight the battle to the bitter end. When our religious communities were in danger from the weapons of Jewish-Masonic liberalism, we alone unmasked the assailant and drew the mantle aside that covered the bloody symbol of its purpose. When the present petty war was raised against the Christian Brothers, not one voice of the press, that should be most interested, was heard; we were the first and the only one to take up the cause in this Province. And are we to be told, now, by some individual who has access to the columns of a paper, but who does not let his individuality become known, that we are the instinctive enemies of the French-Canadians? In the name of the Irish-Catholics of this city, and of this Province, for whom we have a right to speak, in the name of our fellow-countrymen all over this Dominion, we repudiate the calumny and we fling the accusation back in the teeth of the calumniator. Small the heart and narrow the soul, lame the spirit and unpatriotic the man who could harbor such sentiments in a country like this.

It is a poor service the writer of the above has attempted to do the Brothers. And they may well cry out, "save us from our friends." To have a defender animated with such un-Christian ideas is not calculated to advance the cause of an Order that is pre-eminently Christian in name and in principle. The Brothers do not want any such champion to carry their cause before the great jury of public opinion. It is that very spirit which is the greatest menace to our best and most worthy institutions. Let the spirit of race hatred take wing and hover over our land for a few months, and all the efforts of the past to build up a grand nationhood will be lost in the debris and ruins that must necessarily encumber the future. Would that we

had a daily press that we might be enabled to check such inspirers of evil on the very first move!

There is a serious lesson to be drawn from the articles in "Le Canada." Firstly, we should learn that no cause, however just in itself, can be advanced at the expense of truth and of tolerance. Secondly, the person who strives, even in the slightest way, to stir up race or creed animosities, is a menace to the whole community and one to be guarded against by all right-thinking men. Thirdly, that it is time our French-Canadian as well as Irish-Catholic fellow-countrymen should learn the truth concerning their respective positions. As Catholics they are not independent of each other. It is only by mutual support and open and honest confidence in each other that they can possibly succeed in preventing the deluge of opposition from sweeping over their most cherished institutions. The French-Canadian Catholics—clergy and laymen—have yet to experience what the Irish-Catholics have for centuries undergone. It was the cold and cruel persecution to which the Irish-Catholic race had been subjected that has made them so firm in their faith and so tolerant of all others who kneel at the same shrine. The day may come—God prevent it—when the French-Canadian Catholic will find the rod of religious persecution weighing upon his people. Will he be as faithful in the hour of trial as was the Irish-Catholic? Even to-day the cloud—no bigger than a man's hand, if you will—is upon the horizon; it may be blown away by the patriotic breath of Canadian tolerance; but should it develop into a storm, what safe-guard would Catholicity find, unless in the union of the French and Irish Catholics? Is the element that is daily creeping into our political, social and journalistic spheres, very encouraging? Will the cold indifference of some, the Catholic Liberalism of others, the anti-clericalism of a number, the infidel spirit from the Continent, and the marked irreligion and parade-day display of piety, will all these save the French-Canadian institutions; or will the hour ring when the genius of French Catholicity will, like another Marius, weep amongst the Carthaginian ruins of a once glorious nationality? Be warned in time, and learn that there is a bond of union between French and Irish Canadians so sacred that the hand which would cut it would be red with sacrilege and treason.

We feel the more upon this subject because we have calmly and carefully studied the past, the present and the future of the two races. The Gordian Knot that unites them was tied by the hands of sympathy and gratitude as far back as the days of the great scourges and death-dealing cholera and fever; it has been tightened ever since by the memories of the past, the necessities of the present and the hopes of the future. Away with the man who could think, much less insinuate, or state, that either race was the instinctive enemy of the other! It will not be such a man who will be the foremost benefactor of his country in the hour of her need. We want a union of races in Canada, and the sooner this truth is known and appreciated the better. The sooner the spirit of racial union is inculcated by our educators and taught, in practice as well as precept, the sooner will the great Canadian Confederation become a nation worthy of universal recognition.

A KINDLY CRITIC.

Mr. Thomas O'Hagan, M.A., Ph.D., of Arthur, Ont., one of Canada's most distinguished literateurs, has recently contributed a number of most interesting papers to the "Catholic World" Magazine, of New York, on Canadian writers. In his last article Mr. O'Hagan does justice to the Canadian poets, and his work will go a long way to show how fertile Canada is in men of letters. In the limited space at his disposal the author manages to present quite a number of his co-workers to the American public. After paying tribute to such prominent poets as Alexander MacLachlan, Chas. Sangster, Chas. G. D. Roberts, Wm. Wilfrid Campbell, Archibald Lampman, Duncan Campbell Scott, Frederick George Scott, and Bliss Carman, he indicates the works of Evan McColl, "The Bard of Lochfyne," of Phillips Stewart, George F. Cameron, Chas. Pelham Mulvaney, Hon. Joseph Howe, and the late Reverend Dr. Encos McDonald Dawson. We are glad he did not omit the name of John Talon-Lesperance, the versatile and erudite "Laclede" of the Gazette. He mentions Geo. T. Lanigan, Alex. R. Garvie, and Archbishop O'Brien, of Halifax, all—and each in his own style—masters of verse. Then we have a regular galaxy of rising poets; W. D. Lighthall, A. W. Eaton, Arthur Weir, W. W. Smith, A. J. Lockhart, Dr. Drummond, Geo. Martin, J. E. Logan, Matthew Richey Knight, N. F. Davin, and Maurice W. Casey. We have had occasion already to refer to the productions of Mr. Casey's spirited muse; we shall have opportunities in the future of drawing attention to his fine literary efforts. But in all this we note that Mr. O'Hagan's own name merely appears as the critic. It is only just to say that

Mr. O'Hagan occupies a very unique position in Canadian literature; we can only compare it to that of Dr. Maurice F. Egan in the field of American letters. Like Dr. Egan, he is a professor of literature, and one whose work, in that sphere, has been most highly appreciated in several of the leading academies of our country and in some of the highest schools in the neighboring republic. Like Egan, O'Hagan is an elocutionist of very pronounced merit; as a teacher of elocution he is unsurpassed in Canada. Like Egan, he is an essayist of distinction, and we need only refer to the articles, from his pen, that have recently appeared in American periodicals, as illustrations of his gifts in that line. Above all, like Egan, our Canadian O'Hagan is a poet and one of rare and enviable characteristics. His published poems are all—without exception—carefully written, full of true inspiration, originality of ideas and striking illustrations. If any other literary critic, knowing the story of Canadian poetry and poets, were to have written the article to which we refer, he would have ranked Thomas O'Hagan amongst the first of those whom he felt it his duty to praise and encourage. But the fact that such a bright and varied writer should pay tribute to all his conferees in the same field of labor is the best evidence of his fine mind, unselfish character and truly poetic soul.

THE PORTA PIA.

On Friday next, 20th September, the friends and adherents of Italy's infidel government will celebrate, on an extensive scale, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the surrender of the Papal army at the Porta Pia. In other words, there will be rejoicings and glorification over one of the most disgraceful events in the history of modern Europe. On that day the faithful protectors of the Papal States, the devoted Catholics who took up arms in defence of the venerable Pius IX. and the temporal possessions of the Catholic Church, were ordered, by the great Pope, to lay down arms and put an end to the bloodshed and carnage that the "sons of Italy," the brigand followers of Garibaldi, were determined to prolong. The signal for peace from the Vatican was at the same time the consummation of the Illuminati triumph and the closing of a contest that had its origin in the vile cupidity of the Church's enemies and its termination in the plunder of the Church's property. And Europe looked on with cold and emotionless eye at this unjustifiable assault upon the consecrated rights of the Church of Christ. To-day Rome—not Catholic, but modern pagan Rome, godless Rome—fires off rockets, illuminates palaces, makes the air burst with music, and perpetuates the memory of that event under the very shadow of the Vatican and within earshot of the grandest Pontiff, legislator, statesman and heroic sufferer that our age has ever beheld.

Meanwhile, Leo XIII., seated upon the throne of Peter, surrounded by the dignity of ages, with the eyes of an admiring world fixed upon him, looks out from his prison-palace and feels that Christendom is around him in sympathy, veneration and respect. From this Canada of ours the faithful remnant of the brave Zouaves, the men who, in the hour of the Church's need, buckled on their armor, crossed the seas, and from Castelfidardo to the Porta Pia, left all over the Papal States, the real evidence of their devotedness to the most sacred cause on earth, have forwarded an address couched in such terms of filial affection and religious fervor as to indicate that the Church Militant is not merely an idle phantom or a mere name. Through the medium of the brave and venerable General Charette those words, so consoling to the Holy Father in this hour, have been transmitted. All over Italy counter-celebrations are taking place, in the various forms of different religious exercises. Here it is a requiem for the souls of the departed defenders of the cause; there it is a convention of Catholics united to invoke the protection of heaven for the Pontiff and the restoration of Italy. All over the Catholic world, in city and hamlet, in Basilica and chapel, are the prayers of over two hundred million Catholics being offered up for the intentions of the Holy Father. What a contrast between these pious and soul-stirring commemorations and the songs of triumph with which the infidel sons of degenerate Italy will greet the anniversary of their gigantic robbery.

On the 20th September, 1870, a great heart was sad—that of the immortal Pius IX. From the day that his life's star arose over the little town of Sinigaglia, till that hour when it set amidst the splendors of the Vatican, during his long career and wonderful pontificate, the great Father of the Christian world had suffered, even as the early envoys of Christ. He was persecuted to a degree that seems almost incredible when we consider that he lived and reigned in the nineteenth century. When he raised his consecrated hand, on that ever memorable day, and signalled the cessation of hostilities, he must have taken a hurried glance back over a quarter of a cen-

tury and beheld afresh the scenes that had then become historical and in which he was the principal figure. He must have again heard the cries of the revolutionists, the imprecations of the blasphemers, the clatter of the arms that were raised to imprison him; he must have beheld the picture of that memorable night as the covered carriage drove along the Ostian way, and the Pope of Rome turned back to gaze upon the Eternal City from which he was flying; he must have recalled the exile of Gaeta, a pensioner under the roof of a friendly prince, but away from the home that was his—as sovereign of the Papal States, and above all, as Vicar of Christ.

How deeply must the aged Pontiff not have sorrowed when he compared the events taking place around him with those of the mid-century, in which he figured as a conspicuous martyr! In truth to Pius IX. may be applied the words of that Irish Protestant orator: "I have seen the holy head of your religion (he was addressing the Catholics of Cork) with his crown crumbled, his sceptre a reed, his throne a shadow, his home a dungeon; but, if I have, it was only to prove to the world that the simplicity of the patriarchs, the piety of the saints and patience of the martyrs had not wholly vanished from the earth; it was to show to those whose faith was failing, or whose fears were strengthening, that the power from heaven may be crushed and persecuted, but eventually it must triumph over the pigmy efforts of man to destroy it. I have again seen that head of your Church go forth gorgeous, with every knee bending, and every eye blessing the prince of one world and the prophet of another. I have seen him, like the last mountain of deluge, towering sublimely above the desolation around him, immutable amidst change, magnificent amidst ruin, the last remnant of earth's beauty, the last resting-place of heaven's light." Such was a picture of the great, and good, and persecuted Pope on the 20th September, 1870.

Quarter of a century has rolled away and in its stream towards the eternal ocean it has swept the enemies of the Church. One by one they have gone down to the grave and to oblivion. Their names may remain on the page of history to be execrated by the future; but the work they would have destroyed has gone on under the promise of Christ, the Church they would have uprooted flourishes as she never did before, the throne of Peter that they would have reduced to dust is as firm as when the fisherman from Galilee first erected it upon the downfallen palaces of the Caesars. And another quarter of a century will roll past, and Humbert, and Crispi, and Lemmi, and all the deadly enemies of the great Pontiff of our day, will go down to moulder with Victor Emmanuel, Garibaldi, Mamiani, Mazzini, Giobertini, and their mountebank Lolla Montes, while the cross will still glitter from the dome of St. Peter's, a Vicar of Christ will reign in the palace of the Popes, and the Church of the Saviour will continue in her triumphant career unto the end of time.

INGRATITUDE.

Of all the cruel wrongs that man can perpetrate, ingratitude towards a special benefactor is surely one of the worst. To return evil for good is the direct disobedience of one of the most Christian precepts. To return evil for evil is un-Christian enough, but when ingratitude comes in, all the finer and nobler sentiments disappear. Lafontaine, in his Fables, illustrates this in the example of the snake that was taken up by the compassionate farmer; the reptile stung the hand that had protected it. Samples of this spirit are unhappily not too rare in the world. It would seem that some people the very moment they feel themselves under an obligation to a benefactor immediately become that good person's enemy. Fearing, perhaps, that some day they might be called upon to repay the goodness done them, or at least to acknowledge it, they strive to kill conscience and to wipe out the memory of the kindness, by conjuring up every imaginable excuse for an enmity. It is very often the case that men, who have been educated—yes, housed, clothed and fed—by others, show their ingratitude in after life by injuring to the full extent of their power the very friends who secured them in life.

If we were not actuated by more charity than some of the ungrateful celebrities of whom the country bears a good deal at present, we could relate certain stories that would shock these people's admirers. We need not go by guesswork; we have only to talk from what we saw and know. However, no good is to be attained by holding any person up to contempt, no matter how deserving of such treatment his conduct may be. Perhaps amongst the thousands who read our paper there may be one or two who will find that the cap fits them—if so, we trust they will appreciate their own deeds and words at their right value, perchance they may even feel ashamed of the manner in which they antagonize their former friends and life-long benefactors. It is one thing to seek the public interest at the expense of one's own

feelings, and another to crave for popularity at the expense of the feelings of others. Above all it is unworthy to aspire to a certain recognition by injuring those who did us good. These are only general maxims that all honest men must accept. The application of them in individual cases we leave to the individuals themselves. One thing, however, is certain, that ingratitude may prosper for a time, but it eventually brings with it a punishment that is ever proportionate to its magnitude.

"PROGRESSIVE."

Under the heading "Progressive," the Daily Witness of last Thursday has an editorial referring to the announcement that the Catholic University at Washington will admit women students. From this our contemporary concludes that it is a "new thing that the Roman Catholic Church should favor the higher education of women." It also finds it "strange that the Roman Catholic Church should permit the co-education of the sexes." It sees "in this act of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States not so much the emancipation of women as the emancipation of the Church from the thralldom of the early centuries." We are not surprised that the Witness takes these views of the question; yet its having expressed such opinions by no means makes its assertions historically correct. If the action of the authorities of the Catholic University demonstrate anything, it is the fact that our non-catholic friends have been simply ignorant of the Church's attitude and practice in such matters, and blinded to such a degree that this movement flashes upon them like an unexpected revelation.

In the first place it is not "a new thing" for the Catholic Church to favor the higher education of women; of this there is no better evidence than the fact that Protestants who seek the higher education of their daughters make sure to send them to the Catholic convents. In no Church is there such a great and unbroken encouragement in the educational line for the members of the weaker sex. The proof of this exists in the high standard of our female educational institutions the world over. If our non-Catholic friends were acquainted—which they apparently are not—with the works performed in the higher educational field by the numerous talented and successful Catholic ladies—lay persons—on this very continent, they would not, for a moment, entertain such an absurd idea. The Witness wonders that, while exalting the Mother of Our Lord, the Catholic Church makes woman bend under a certain subordination. It is quite the contrary; the Catholic Church, and she alone, upholds the dignity of the Blessed Virgin, and places her as a model of true womanhood before the eyes of all women. In no church on earth are the rights of woman so powerfully protected, are her interests so carefully watched over, are her legitimate aspirations so faithfully seconded.

It is true the Catholic Church does not lean to female suffrage; she does not seek to take woman out of her proper sphere and place her in man's shoes; she does not countenance divorce; she does not sanction the civil bursting of the marriage tie, and the consequent degradation of women, the quenching of the family hearth-fire, the abandoning of offspring to the mercy of a wicked world, the leaving a legacy of illegitimacy to unoffending children; she does not permit woman to barter her noblest prospects, that duty and virtue secure, for a license that legalizes prostitution and renders socially acceptable lives that in the eyes of God and of Christian morality, are disgraceful. The Catholic Church does not applaud the "new woman," the spouting, electioneering, lecture-platform female; she does not go into ecstasies of delight over the bronzefaced, mannish female; she does not encourage the bicycle, bloomer, stand-up collar, cut-away coat species of women. If these are the "interests of woman" that the Church has ever set face against and that the Witness has in view when talking of "subordination"—then we admit that the Catholic Church is not prepared to recognize them—no more would Our Lord Himself.

The "emancipation of the Church from the thralldom of the early centuries" is all nonsense. When the Church emancipated, through the courage and zeal of her missionaries, a whole race of slaves in Africa, was it an emancipation of herself? This is merely one of the worn-out phrases that have become as obsolete as the thousands of stale accusations that ultra-Protestants are constantly bringing up, despite their oft-repeated refutations. But where the Witness does seem to have some reason for its assertions is when it states that it is strange the Catholic Church "should permit the co-education of the sexes." The reply to this must depend upon what the Witness means by co-education. If it means the granting of instruction and education to persons of both sexes in accord with their requirements, and the needs of their special spheres in life, we say that the Church has ever and always taught the co-education of men and women. If it means that members