



Vol. XLIX. No. 25

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1900.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

## MGR. LANGEVIN'S PASTORAL ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

Much comment has recently been made upon the pastoral letter, which His Grace, Mgr. Langevin, O.M.I., Archbishop of St. Boniface, issued on the 2nd of June instant, to the Catholic people of Winnipeg. We did not do people upon the extracts published by the daily press, as we are always inclined to rely upon official documents, and not upon secular newspaper reports. However, this week we have the full text of that important document, and we furnish our readers with the main features thereof. Comment seems even less necessary now than before, we were aware of the text since the letter itself is an ample exposition of the situation. After referring to the delegation of the Catholic ratepayers that had approached the Winnipeg Public School Board with a view to bettering their position in school matters, and having shown that politics had absolutely nothing to do with the movement, he thus tells what was the significance of that conference with the Winnipeg Public School Board. It is as follows:—

"(a) For ten years you have suffered under the yoke of unjust laws which have not only deprived you of your school rights secured to you by the constitution of the country, the solemn and sacred 'federal pact,' but you have also saddled upon you heavy taxes for the support of public schools, to which your conscience forbids you to send your children. The Reverend Sisters of Jesus and Mary, who teach your children with such great devotedness and a success that brings to them children from outside, have not received any salary for about two years!

## IRELAND AND THE EMPIRE.

The first of a series of articles on "Ireland and the Empire" appeared two weeks ago in the "Pall Mall Gazette." This initial contribution is by "An Irishman." He says:—  
I have studied my "Pall Mall Gazette" so attentively for three or four years that I really thought I knew its opinions—opinions which coincided very closely during that period with those of the average intelligent Englishman as he also revealed himself to my attentive study. Suddenly, however, the "Pall Mall Gazette" developed an entirely new line of thought, and I read the other day, in a leading article entitled "The Lady Paramount," the following passage:—  
"Of all the many and magnificent results which may be hoped for from the present war there would be none more welcome than the healing of the long feud between Ireland and England; and such a result is, in very truth, well within the range of practical politics. Not, we hasten to add, that any Irishman who desires Home Rule will abandon that aspiration, or that any Unionist will have the slightest moral right to claim the welcome to the Lady Paramount, who is above all party politics, as a victory for the particular policy of the preservation of the Legislative Union. On the contrary, we are passing through a crisis in the development of the Empire which, in all probability, will not pass away before it has sown the seed, if not before it has produced the fruit, of a great Federated Assembly, representative of all parts of the Empire. That the existence of such an Assembly would involve great and fundamental changes in our present Parliamentary system is self-evident. Who can tell what future there may not be for Ireland in the scheme of such reconstitution of Parliament as the needs of the Empire us before we have long left behind us this anachronism, the year Nineteen Hundred?"

Since then I have pondered over this utterance, and I am almost persuaded that not only the "Pall Mall Gazette," but also the average Englishman, begins to unlock a door of intelligence which up to this time has remained closed alike to argument or entreaty. In the light of this war he sees somewhat differently the Irish demands. In the first place, he becomes aware that Irishmen have their uses in the Empire; and probably remembers with some penitence his habitual remark that if only Ireland could be submerged for a matter of ten minutes, England would be greatly the gainer. We in Ireland do not share the Englishman's surprise at the action of the Irish regiments, for we did not expect that our countrymen would impair a continuous tradition of valour; we have a certain memory for history, and we

know that not for the first time are Irish soldiers bearing the brunt of England's wars. But to the Englishman these things come apparently as a revelation, and at the same time he is puzzled by the fact that this war of his, his holy, just, glorious, and victorious war, is detested in the very country whence his first fighters are drawn; by the fact that the sisters, wives, and mothers of these Dublin and Inniskilling exult over Boer successes, and check their natural delight in the honor that is paid to their kin. And he probably asks himself, now that we are counting up the resources on which we can reckon for home defence, why it should remain written that there must be no mention of Irish volunteers. Why is it that while every other corner of the Empire is in the hot fit of enthusiasm over a first rally to the Imperial standard—a rally which I believe would have been no less enthusiastic had the enemy been a Great Power and not two petty Republics—Ireland alone is hostile to the Empire? Why is it that a people of brave men, linked to England by every tie of language, inter-marriage, and daily intercourse, cannot be trusted to act as a people for the cause which individuals taken from out of its mass are serving so magnificently, while other communities, alien even in speech, make self-imposed sacrifices for the Imperial idea? Why is it that the Irish peasant, Catholic or Protestant, sides with the Boer, who is the blackest of all "black Protestants"? These are the questions which I hope Englishmen—and the "Pall Mall Gazette"—are beginning to put to themselves; and perhaps an Irishman may suggest the answer.

I put aside the cases of Australia and New Zealand, young communities which have grown up in freedom under the happier days of unchecked colonial expansion; though it should be remembered that foremost among the makers of Australia have been Irish rebels. But take Canada. Suppose Canada were governed as Ireland virtually is, as a Crown Colony, through the agency of a Viceroy and permanent official staff, controlled from England, does any reasonable man believe that French-Canadians, or English-Canadians either, would pay troops for South Africa? Canada has what Ireland desires, and, therefore, Canadians preach the Imperial idea to Boers in the trenches at Paardeberg and elsewhere. But when England granted to Canada the right to manage her own affairs, Canada was in rebellion; Canada was the home of two races, opposed by history, by race, and by religion; the Orangemen of Toronto are as bitter as the Orangemen of Belfast; the Celts of Conamara are not more devoted Catholics than the descendants of the French voyageurs. To-day the precedent of Canada is cited to con-

vince those who believe that if we annex the Dutch Republics we shall enclose in the Empire another perennial focus of hate and rebellion. We shall give, we are told, to the Dutch who took arms against us the same liberty within the limits of the Empire as we gave to the Canadians, and it will breed the same loyalty. Excellent reasoning, I think; but why does it not apply to Ireland? But, Englishmen will answer, the Irish live under precisely the same conditions as we do ourselves. Do they? That brings me to the other question—Why do the Irish sympathize with the Boers? As a matter of fact, no people in the world have a better right to feel for the Outlanders, but their heart naturally goes out, not to the incoming Englishman, but to the occupants of the soil. In great part their attitude is due to ignorance; if they knew the Boers better they would scarcely love them so well; but their dislike of England's action is not based on ignorance. They have been taught to believe and to know that England conquers for her own advantage, invoking the name of justice to sanction any step in her aggrandisement, and they read that in this quarrel England intervened to protect the Outlanders from oppression.

What were the grievances of the Outlanders? They were not allowed to hold public meetings hostile to the Government; meetings of that kind are suppressed every month in Ireland. Their papers were suppressed; so were papers in Ireland. They were not allowed to arm and drill—which, I read in the English papers, is part of the inalienable right of every free citizen. In Ireland no man can own a gun without a licence from a magistrate, and drill is absolutely prohibited. The Outlanders were oppressively taxed; that is to say, taxation was arranged so as to fall heavily upon the articles which they consumed, and lightly on those that the Boers affected. It is the story of England's financial relations with Ireland over again. But, it will be said, the Irish have the franchise and return members to Parliament; this was the privilege that the Outlanders demanded. Undoubtedly the Outlanders did; but if it was to be of more use to them than Parliamentary representation has been to Ireland, the demand was futile. Since I can remember, the fact that two-thirds or three-fourths of the Irish members supported a measure relating to Ireland has been with English members a cogent reason for voting against it. De jure, the English could not abolish the Irish representation; de facto, they did, in so far as they were able; and if the Irish members had played the game according to the spirit of English Parliamentary procedure, the attempt would have been successful. Under the mask of Parliamentary Government, England has persistently attempted to govern Ireland as a Crown Colony. To use a phrase current nowadays, she has treated the Irish as "White Kaffirs"; and every step

in the improvement of their position—the franchise for Catholics, fixity of tenure for farmers, attention to the demands of Irish members in Parliament—has been gained by rebellion, open or covert. In two words, Ireland asks for what Australia, New Zealand, and Canada have already: the right to manage her own affairs in her own way while remaining within the Empire. What are the reasons for refusing it? First, of course, that Ireland has no more claim to separate treatment in the matter of government or taxation than Wiltshire or Yorkshire. That is plainly nonsense. In the first place, Wiltshire and Yorkshire do not ask for separate treatment; in the second, ask a Wiltshire man or a Yorkshire man what he is, and he replies, "An Englishman." Ask a Kerry Papist or an Antrim Orangeman, and he replies, "An Irishman." Ireland is, and has been for centuries, a separate entity, conscious of itself as such. Secondly, that the Irish are charming, intelligent, admirable people, but perfectly unfit to manage their own affairs. That is also nonsense. What congenial inferiority marks off the Irish from the Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, Swiss, French, or any other race? Thirdly, that the English have an exceptional natural talent for managing other people's affairs. That is also nonsense. What works so well that any change must be for the worse and, fourthly, that to establish Home Rule would be a danger to England.

### CATHOLIC PUBLIC SPIRIT.

At a recent meeting of the Catholic Truth Society, held in the Town Hall, Liverpool, and presided over by His Lordship the Bishop of the diocese, the Right Rev. Abbot Snow, O.S.B., delivered the following vigorous address on Catholic Public Spirit.

He said a magnificent meeting like that was most encouraging, for it raised one's spirits and enthusiasm for the common Faith which they all professed. And if there was one part of England more than another which gave greater encouragement and pleasure it was Catholic Lancashire. The feeling of enthusiasm that large gatherings of that kind engendered was very beneficial, but there was something that was more enduring and of greater advantage to individual congregations, and that was what he called "Catholic public spirit." By public spirit they meant that giving up of time, or private convenience and of personal comfort for the public good. Now, in this country of theirs there was nothing more conspicuous to the foreigner than the public spirit that was exhibited throughout the country. It commenced in boyhood in our schools, where the games and the management of the affairs of the school or college (outside the course of studies, outside the discipline of the house) was the management of the boys themselves. In every village, in every town, in every county in the whole kingdom they found numbers of men willing to give up their time, their personal convenience and comfort, for the public good. They saw in the parish councils, in the district councils, the county councils, the House of Commons, the magistracy, in the government of hospitals, infirmaries, and institutions of every kind, a number of men giving up their time for the general good. And they had among these a great number of Catholics who had come to the fore for the public good, not, as he said, for Catholic public good, but for general public good.

"They had an instance in the Mayor who was present with them that evening. Perhaps a more conspicuous instance was in the principal lay-Catholic of the day—he meant the Duke of Norfolk. He (the Abbot) was not asking them to become members of Parliament (laughter) or postmasters-general, nor even to go out to South Africa to take up a position on one of the staffs of the generals. But there was a little world of their own. Each church and mission attached to it consisted of a body—a kind of corporation that each one belonged to. Now, each Catholic belonging to a congregation, to a mission, to a church, should try to be animated by a Catholic public spirit. If he valued his religion, if he were proud of his church, proud of the mission, he would be anxious to do what he could for that mission. That required a certain amount of sacrifice, a sacrifice of time, a sacrifice of a certain amount of comfort and convenience, and when they considered what they hoped the Catholic Church to be in England, what they were striving to make it, each one of them in their circumstances ought to do what they could in the district in which they lived.

"Catholics should offer their services to the clergy, and say, 'What can I do? What am I able to do? I have so much time. And this should apply to all classes, not merely to the laboring man, not merely to those who had much leisure time, but to all who had any time, also the will to do it. They should mix together for Church purposes, for the advancement of the interests of the Church. Even the ladies, the women could do their share. If all were animated with the same spirit, by the 'esprit de corps' in their own parish church, what could they better do? Let them offer their

services to their ecclesiastical superior and cheerfully undertake what he sees is for the best. Their own parish would then succeed and the neighboring parish would also succeed, and they would have throughout the length and breadth of England great progress in the Catholic Church."

### NOTES OF AMERICAN NEWS.

THE IRISH CONVICTS.—Great has been the excitement created by the fact that the famous Irish convicts, Fitzharris and Mullett, are not allowed to land on American soil. A Washington despatch tells the following story:—  
Their champion Mr. O'Brien of New York is here in the interest of Fitzharris and Mullett, the pardoned Irish convicts, who have appealed to the Treasury Department against being deported. O'Brien called on Commissioner-General of Immigration Powderly first and was taken by Mr. Powderly to the office of Solicitor O'Connell of the Treasury, who returned from New York today. O'Brien there made a speech in favor of admitting the Irishmen. He said they were friends of his. He said pardoned convicts have been admitted to this country before, and he hoped that Solicitor O'Connell would not render an opinion against them, and that Commissioner Powderly would decide to admit them.

THE PRESIDENCY.—Admiral Dewey created quite a sensation when he announced that he might accept the candidacy for the high office of President of the Republic. He has given proof of a more level head than was expected, in declining now to have his name used in that connection. Grant's great services as a General won for him the honors of the White House; but it does not follow that every military commander, or admiral in the navy is fitted to be President. It is one thing to win a victory with modern war engines, it is a different thing to win an election with votes. One of our contemporaries said:—  
There will be universal satisfaction at Admiral Dewey's announcement that he is no longer a candidate for President. When, in innocently announcing himself a candidate, he described the Presidency as an easy office, he showed his ignorance of it; but he repeats that error when in withdrawing his name he remarks that Presidents are "not chosen by the people, but by a few political leaders."

HOW MONEY IS GOT.—In New York city there are more methods of getting money, without earning it, than in any other city on this continent, or possibly in the world. Although somewhat lengthy, we give two stories illustrative of two methods. The first runs thus:—  
That it does not always pay to play the Good Samaritan in New York was the lesson the Rev. Frank McCormick, of West Fwanzey, N.Y., learned last night. It cost him \$600 to learn.

The Rev. Mr. McCormick, who is stopping at the Grand Union Hotel, was walking up Fifth avenue shortly after 9 o'clock last night. At Fortieth street he noticed a woman staggering and about to fall. He hastened to her side.

"Are you faint, Madame?" asked the minister, at the same time supporting her.

"Only a wretched ankle," the woman replied. "Hold me for a moment and I'll be alright. So the minister held her for several minutes, he admits—until the pain decreased and then with a gallant bow he bade the sufferer good night.

A few blocks further up the avenue the minister had occasion to feel in the pocket of his long frock coat. He discovered the pocket empty. A wallet containing \$28 in cash and \$571 in certified checks was gone. Also a package of letters.

"I've been robbed," he declared, as he hastened to the West Thirtieth street Station, where he told his story to Capt. Thomas. "My faith in womankind is sadly shaken," he remarked to the police.

After he had telegraphed to his wife at West Fwanzey for some money, the Rev. Mr. McCormick returned to his hotel. What was his surprise on entering the Grand Union to receive from the night clerk a package containing his empty wallet and his papers. Across the face of the wrapper was scribbled in a dashing feminine hand:—  
"For Rev. Frank McCormick, of New Hampshire."

The second story is still more interesting:—  
Several women, wives of Brooklyn millionaires, have accomplished a clever bit of detective work that is highly applauded by the police. Mrs. Louise D. Ruxton, wife of the wealthy ink manufacturer, who lives at No. 10 Garden place, was chief of the band, and after a long effort she has succeeded in capturing a young woman described as one of the cleverest swindlers in Greater New York. Six months ago a young and attractive woman called on Mrs. Ruxton and represented herself as the widow of one of Mr. Ruxton's workmen. She was explicit in her statements, and made a touching appeal for aid, saying that she was about to be turned out of her home.

Mrs. Ruxton was sincerely sympathetic. She gave the young woman a great deal of good advice and the money necessary to pay the rent owed.

"If you will see my husband," she said, when the woman arose to go, "he will aid you, too."

The young woman didn't return, and when an inquiry was made at the address given no such persons were known there. Then Mrs. Ruxton understood that she had been swindled.

A short time after she happened to mention the circumstance at a reception, and a dozen women cried in a breath that they had met the young woman and had given her money. Upon comparing notes Mrs. Ruxton found many of her friends had been victimized, all by some clever tale.

"A woman like that," said Mrs. Ruxton, "is a swindler of the worst type, for she turns charitable people from doing good to those really in need of help. I am going to stop her depredations."

Mrs. Ruxton's friends made a like resolve, and for weeks these women have been awaiting the swindler's return.

Mrs. Ruxton was driving along Fulton street yesterday, when she saw the young woman walking near Hoyt street.

"There," she exclaimed to her coachman. "Do you see that woman? Keep her in sight till you see a policeman."

The coachman drove slowly along until a policeman appeared, when the young woman was arrested. She was at first indignant and then defiant. In the Butler street court she frankly admitted that she was the culprit.

She gave her name as Miss Jennie Roberts, of No. 306 Franklin avenue, and declared that all she had told Mrs. Ruxton was true. In a note found in her pocket were the names of many victims, all persons of wealth and position. After the name of each was the husband's business, address and the wife's day at home, with a memorandum of the family history.

After the name of Mr. Ross Appleton was written "Politician—easy mark." Mrs. Appleton was a victim. John E. Scarsie, the sugar king, was described as "Generous—with advice." He gave something, too.

The police say the woman has taken in more than \$1,000 in a few months.

NEW YORK FIRES.—The "Herald" commenting upon some recent and horror-inspiring fires in the city of New York, especially in the tenement lodgings now so frequently found in the larger cities, says:—  
"The shocking injuries and loss of life in tenement fires chronicled in our news columns this morning lend an appalling significance to the systematic attempts being made to burn down crowded dwellings in this city and enforce the need of drastic revision of the Tenement House law to counteract the infamous defects of our Tammany Building Code."

Last night's fire caused the death of two persons and the injury of many, while in the fire of yesterday morning eleven victims perished and half a dozen others sustained injuries. In the latter catastrophe a combustible and badly constructed staircase—and such are common in tenements—was the seat of the outbreak. In every one of these human lives the stairways, exposed as they are to every corner, should be fire-proof.

"Touching the incendiary fires that of late have so fearfully increased in number, they are apparently the work of some Jack-the-Ripper firebug, or perhaps a gang of such miscreants, in what has come to be known as the incendiary district of Yorkville the firemen in the three hours after midnight on Wednesday answered five alarms. Through fortunate accidents the flames were in each case discovered in time to prevent disaster. It is a disgrace to the police that the authors of these incendiary attempts which have terrified successive sections of the city for more than a year past are not discovered.

"We've got to have more alertness on the part of the police, better building laws and a reform in fire insurance methods. This almost continuous slaughter of helpless victims in a great, wealthy, intelligent and humane community like this must be stopped at all costs."

### POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN EUROPE.

THE ELECTIONS IN ITALY.—The Italian Ministry has gained a majority, but has not improved its position at the elections, says the Liverpool "Catholic Times." It hastened them on for the purpose of weakening the forces of the Socialists, but its expectation in that respect has been greatly disappointed. The Socialists have returned from the fray with increased strength, and their power has been particularly evident in those centres of population where the Government was most anxious that it should appear to be declining. The policy of repression adopted by the authorities during the riots at Milan has been resented in the most decided way at the polling booths. That city has returned Socialist deputies without exception.

Continued on Page Eight.