THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE TRUE WITNESS P. & P. CO., Limited,

2 Busby Street, Montreal, Canada. P. O. Box 1138.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE—City of Montreal (delivered), $1.50; other parts of Canada, $1.00; United States, $1.00; Newfoundland, $1.00; Great Britain, Ireland and France, $1.50; Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, $2.00. Terms, payable in advance.

All Communications should be addressed to the Managing Director, "TRUE WITNESS" P. & P. Co., Limited, P. O. Box 1138.

EPISCOPAL APPROBATION.

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

"†PAUL, Archbishop of Montreal."

SATURDAY ..... JULY 27, 1901.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

AN APPRECIATED TRIBUTE. — We were specialy touched, and for more than one good reason, with the friendly and honest tribute paid the "True Witness" by that staunch old Irish Catholic organ the "Irish-Canadian." Taking occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of this paper's existence, our kindly contemporary from Toronto gave expression to sentiments of admiration regarding our past and good wishes concerning our future, that we appreciate. Long before the writer ever dreamed of having any direct connection with the "True Witness," this organ, and the "Irish-Canadian" came weekly to the home of his parents. We admired the "Irish-Canadian," for its Catholicity, its Irish patriotism, its unchanging attitude, its fairness to opponents, and its friendliness towards all its Irish Catholic contemporaries. And all of these qualities but mirrored the mind and heart of the veteran journalist, Mr. Boyle, so long its editor and manager.

If we felt a deep gloom coming over our spirit when we learned, some years ago, that the "Irish-Canadian" was about to disappear—at least in name, we exulted with a gladness that can only spring from the heart, when we beheld it reappear again, and assume once more its rightful position in the ranks of Catholic and Irish journalism. The sentiments expressed in its last issue regarding this paper are reciprocated in full. We consider that tribute more in the sense of a lesson to Catholic journalists than otherwise. Let them learn from the ever outspoken and honest-spirited organ of our people in Toronto, that real union of heart and sentiment is necessary to our two-fold cause. Mutual respect, assistance, and encouragement are required if we are to make headway against the flood of opposition that we are fated to encounter. And every outspoken word of kindliness that one of our organs expresses in regard to the other, reflects as much credit and honor upon the one writing and publishing that word as it brings pleasure and pride to the one of which it has been written.

LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.— The following facts have been made known to us through the American press :—

"Mayor Morse, of Emporia, Kan., asked the editors of Emporia papers recently to refrain from publishing details of suicides. He said that the publication of such details had caused an epidemic of suicides in that community in the last two years. He had consulted with the Board of Heath, and thought that if the papers would not comply with his request he had a right to stop summarily the publication of suicide details under a law providing for the suppression of epidemics."

It has been contended that Mayor Morse encroached upon the "liberty of the press." We cannot see it in that sense. It is not an encroachment upon the liberty of the press to stop immoral publications; it is not an encroachment upon the liberty of the citizen to arrest and confine in a prison the one guilty of a crime. Liberty of the press does not mean unbridled license to publish anything and everything regardless of consequences. The Mayor's own reply seems to us to be full of common sense.

"If the paper," he said, "on which these local papers are printed had been kept in a place infected with small-pox I could demand that the papers quit using that paper or stop publication. If they spread another contagion, the contagious suggestion of suicide, I believe the liberty of the press is not to be considered before the public welfare, and that the courts would sustain me in using force to prevent the publication of papers containing matter clearly deleterious to the public health."

A PECULIAR DIVORCE CASE.— Justice Maddox, of the Supreme Court in Brooklyn, annulled yesterday the marriage between Josephine Milliang Breuer, of Great Neck, L. I., and Charles Breuer, of Great Neck, L.I., on the ground that the woman's consent to the marriage contract had been secured through fraud. The plaintiff was allowed to resume her maiden name. Both were or had been, Catholics. Breuer had obtained a divorce from his wife in order to marry Miss Millang. The latter would not marry while his first wife was alive. One day he told her that his wife was dead — which was false. They went before a magistrate and had the ceremony performed. Then they started for Long Island ferry. The bride thought they were going to a priest to have the marriage duly performed; but the husband then admitted that his first wife was alive, and that no priest would marry them, as the Church does not recognize divorce in any form. Miss Millang thereupon left him. She brought suit to annul the marriage on the ground that she consented through a fraud perpetrated upon her, and the marriage had never been consummated. The court gave the above decision.

The report of the trial says : —

"Then Father Donnelly, rector of the Catholic Church at Bay Side, was called. He swore that Miss Millang's marriage to Breuer excommunicated her from the Church, and that so long as the marriage contract existed she was debarred from receiving the sacraments of the Church."

The report of Father Donnelly's evidence must be very incomplete, because the foregoing is quite misleading. Miss Millang was a Catholic; as such she acted properly in refusing to marry Breuer, while his first wife was alive. When she was informed of his wife's death the previous divorce did not affect their present position, as she believed the first marriage tie was dissolved by death. She may, however, have acted unwisely in consenting to marriage upon the mere word of her future husband; she should have taken means to verify his statement. But apart from that oversight, or negligence, which may or may not have been sinful, she forfeited her membership of the Church by going before a magistrate to have the marriage performed. Ipso facto she was excommunicated. But what sounds strange to us is the remark of the priest "that so long as the marriage contract existed she was debarred from receiving the sacraments of the Church." There was no marriage in the eyes of the Church existing between her and Breuer. The civil contract was of no consequence; it did not constitute a marriage. Whether the court annulled it or not did not affect her position as far as the Church is concerned. That the so-called marriage was not consummated, and that she left the man of her own accord, and at once, are points in her favor. What we think was intended to be said was this: as long as she did not have the excommunication on account of undergoing a civil marriage ceremony removed she could not receive the sacraments. The lesson, in any case, is a severe one and shows that Catholics cannot play with divorce in any form, nor safely hold any intercourse with those who disregard the Church's severe precepts concerning the Sacrament of Marriage.

THE PASTORAL VISITATION.— On Monday of last week His Grace, Archbishop Bruchesi, completed his programme of pastoral visits for this summer. In the course of his lengthy tour through a section of the diocese, His Grace administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to 10,400 persons — principally children. In the city of Montreal alone he confirmed 5,700; and, in the forty-two outside parishes he confirmed 4,700. This alone was a gigantic work. But when we consider all the other labors and duties performed on the occasion of each visit, it seems almost incredible that one man could do so much and in such a short space of time. The forty-two parishes are situated in the three counties Berthier, Joliette and Montcalm—save five that are in the County of Hochelaga. It is certain that in each of the parishes thus visited the occasion will be long remembered. The results of the work performed during these two months must be most gratifying to His Grace. At every turn, as the years pass along, the wisdom of Rome, in her choice of a successor to the late lamented Mgr. Fabre, is made more and more manifest. Youthful vigor, unconquerable energy and a steadfast purpose, are necessary qualifications in the one called upon to rule over such an important ecclesiastical domain; and those qualities our good Archbishop possesses in an eminent degree.

WARNINGS TO BE HEEDED. — The number of young women who, during the past few weeks in Canada, have met violent deaths in one way or another, should constitute a warning to be heeded by all who have so far escaped the actual consequences of their thoughtlessness. On one point, at least, we can speak with no uncertain sound; as far as Catholic young women are concerned they should follow more closely than many do the instructions of the Church in such matters. If a young woman is faithful to take and follow the advice she receives, either from the pulpit, or in the confessional, she is certain not to fall into the net work of dangers that are constantly set to entrap those who brave the danger. The Church is specially concerned in matters of the soul; but, at the same time, she is the safest guide in affairs of ordinary life.

MUSIC AND GENIUS.—It is generally supposed that music has a power, not only "to soothe the savage breast, but even to sway the sentiments of all men—especially men of learning and of artistic and literary proclivities. The New York "Press," in this regard, makes a peculiarly strange statement to the effect that:

"'Some of the acknowledged geniuses of history, among them true poets, could not hear the sound of the sweetest melody. Byron had no ear for music, and neither vocal nor instrumental afforded him the slightest pleasure. Edmund Burke, whose oratory was music to his audiences, hated music. Charles James Fox, another great orator; Daniel O'Connor, still another; William Pitt, a third; Robert Peel, a fourth—all of these ran away from the sound of music. Hume, the historian, and Dr. Samuel Johnson were strangely affected by playing and singing. Pope could listen to a hand organ, but not to classic compositions. Rogers, the poet, was uneasy at the sound of music, and so also were Sir Walter Scott, Lord Tennyson, and Southey."

BISHOP CONATY NOW. — It is with unfeigned delight that we read the other day that Rome has seen proper to raise the learned rector of the Catholic University of Washington to the episcopal rank. The people of Montreal are thoroughly acquainted with the Right Rev. Doctor—now Bishop—Conaty; his sermons and addresses here will not be easily forgotten, nor will any who have met him fail to recall his splendid qualities of mind and heart as well as his towering intellectual superiority. It was in the Grand Seminary of Montreal that the new Bishop made his theological course, and to that sacred Alma Mater does he from time to time, quietly return to spend a few days of rest and religious meditation. When a simple parish priest in Worcester, Mass., he performed such wonders for the schools under his supervision —even to the extent of publishing a magazine for them—that his grasp of the educational questions of the day and of the requirements of Catholics in America, marked him for some higher and more responsible position. His heart was set upon the Catholic Summer School, and the success of that grand undertaking is due in most part to his zeal and experience, devotedness and many-sided talent. From the presidency of the Summer School he moved to the rectorship of the Catholic University, and from the rector's chair to the Episcopal throne. It was a constant and regular ascending step by step; and he was carried upward by the strength of his own merits and ability. In congratulating Bishop Conaty on his newly-acquired dignity, we can equally congratulate Catholic America and the entire Catholic Church.

MORE ASHES SCATTERED. — Once more do we learn of a man dying with the request that his ashes be scattered over the ocean. The report of the fulfilment of that will reads thus :—

"Edward Nepivoda carried out last Friday the deathbed request made by his brother-in-law, Edward Herzig, of 515 Monastery street, West Hoboken, N.J., on last New Year's, that his body should be cremated and his ashes thrown into the ocean. On Jan. 3 the body was cremated at Fresh Pond, Long Island.

"On Friday afternoon Nepivoda went to the fishing banks with the Palisade Fishing Club of Union Hill, N.J., of which he is a member and to which Herzig also belonged. He took the urn containing Herzig's ashes with him, but said nothing to his fellow club members of his mission. When the banks were reached and the fishing lines cast, Nepivoda asked the band to play a funeral dirge. Then Nepivoda explained the meaning of the solemn music. He broke the neck of the urn and as the fishermen stood with bared heads and the band played 'Nearer, My God, to Thee,' Herzig's ashes were cast to the wind."

We mean no disrespect when we say that we fail to see how the hymn "Nearer, My God, to Thee" applies in this case. In fact, it seems most inappropriate. The "Dead March in Saul" or "Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep" would have suited the occasion much better.

THE AMENDED OATH.

In regard to the much discussed coronation oath we have had our say, and in three or four different editorials we have squarely expressed our views, both as concern the oath and the amendment. Consequently, we need not repeat those articles, nor rehash all that we deemed it necessary to advance on the subject. However, it may interest our readers to know what other sections of the press, both here and elsewhere, have said in connection with this matter. "La Presse," the leading French-Canadian organ, has had two lengthy articles on the question. In one of them it points out "that nowhere are the narrow and exclusive views of the British Parliament, which are really childish, entertained, and it points out the customs of different countries as regards the oath of the sovereign or leader of the nation. In Germany the Emperor simply binds himself to keep the constitution intact. In the United States the President promises to faithfully fulfil the duties of his office. In France, the President is not obliged to take any oath. In Austria-Hungary the oath implies simply a maintenance of the fundamental laws of the kingdom. In Belgium the king swears to maintain the constitution, which constitution stipulates liberty of worship. The oath of the King of Italy includes nothing against the different religious creeds."

The truth of this cannot be challenged; and it constitutes a very sad commentary upon what is generally called "British Freedom;" at all events, as far as it is applied to the Ruler of the realm. In the other article the same organ very pertinently says :—

"If people persist in imposing upon the King an oath which declares Catholicism to be astray and to constitute an aberration, they can no longer denounce Papal infallibility. The King declares himself equally infallible and impeccable in matters of creed. How does he know that transubstantiation and the Immaculate Conception are mere impostures, if not by the mere force of his reason? Protestantism has its own arguments on this subject and its own manner of interpreting the Bible; Catholicism has also its own views. There is no human organization to judge between these two great pretensions. The least that can be done in this century, when light becomes so plentiful, is to remain calm, and respect others, and not force those whose opinions differ to mutually despise one another. If the Catholic subjects are independent men, enjoying their liberty and their intellectual and moral dignity, they can but smile with pity at the sight of an empiricism which they find ridiculous. If they have not the faculty of an intense protest resulting from a deep wound, they are no longer anything else but mere tools in the kingdom. God knows where thinking tools will stop.

"The proposed modification is, after all, a mere modification of words. Liberty of conscience will continue not to exist for the kings and queens of England. One of the conditions to reign over Great Britain will always be not to believe in transubstantiation and to swear it publicly, and also to declare one's self Protestant against all men."

From this Catholic expression of opinion, we now turn to the "Daily Witness" of the 20th July instant. Certainly no person will suspect the "Witness" of any sympathy with any Catholic cause, yet that organ is much more fair than many other anti-Catholic publications. For example, in the course of the lengthy editorial above referred to, the great Protestant organ says :—

"We have, however, no belief in the power of any oath to control the faith, and the prize which is hereby offered to lack of candor is not of a character to elevate royalty in its own estimation or in that of the people even when the said royalty has no misgivings as to the subject matter of the oath other than those which the oath itself is calculated to suggest."

This constitutes one of the forcible arguments in favor of the entire abolition of the oath. After speaking of the efforts made at times to impose a religion other than that of the State to-day upon England, the "Witness" thus concludes :—

"It is to be owned, however, that the last efforts to enforce a given religion on the subjects of the crown did not emanate from Rome, and that the last remnants of a privileged religion have not been eliminated from the constitution, and that therefore absolute religious liberty has not yet been attained, and that the achievement of this would be better than any form of religious monopoly."

This suggests a contention that is equally as strong between different sections of Protestantism, as it is between them and Catholicity. That religious liberty does not exist in the Empire is a most evident fact. However, studies have been made in that direction, and with time it may yet come.

On the 22nd June, the "Gazette" published its editorial opinion concerning the oath and the revision and amendment thereof. In closing that article our contemporary says :

"The amendment proposed to the oath takes from it the clauses that may be called deliberately obnoxious to Roman Catholics. It is a step in a path that advance has already been made in. It even suggests that another will come in time. The objectors are not without ground for satisfaction."

We are quite in accord with these remarks. In fact, we believe that "the ice is now broken," and that the day is not distant when the last relic of a more or less barbarous time will disappear. In reality all the comments of the Protestant press tend, in a mild way, towards that direction. Not one of them feels proud either of this oath, or of the obligation imposed upon the King to take it.

The New York "Freeman's Journal" in a brief comment upon the amendment, says :—

"It would have been more decent to have left out 'Defender of the Faith,' since, as everybody knows, the title was first conferred by a Pope on an English King for defending that very Faith which this oath makes declaration against."

This is true; but we suppose that the King and his advisers retain the title as referring to the Anglican Faith—which by some process of mental jugglery is represented as being the old Faith which Henry VIII. once defended.

But the most pertinent comment of all those we have yet read seems to us to be that of the London "Tablet," which remarks :—

"It is impossible not to be struck by the apparent liberality of the formula forced upon the Sovereign under penalty of the loss of three kingdoms. It allows him to be a Mohammedan or a Buddhist, or a Parsee or a Unitarian, or a member of any other non-Christian body. The King of England may be a fire worshipper or an Atheist, or a Mohammedan, but he must not believe that 'at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is a transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.' The King of this realm may be Pagan or Infidel or Protestant, but he must not believe in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. In the second section the words 'superstitious and idolatrous' are omitted, and the King is solemnly committed to the statement that Catholic doctrines are not Protestant doctrines. He might just as usefully point out that black is not white."

In addition to all this, we have only to say that the whole trouble is due to the fact of a temporal king being created head of a State Church by Act of Parliament. Remember Christ's answer to the enemy who sought to entrap Him with a coin of the Empire bearing Caesar's effigy.

TO PAY THE DEBT. — The Rev. George T. Donlin, the new rector of St. Jerome's Church, in the Bronx, has organized a church debt paying association among the members of his congregation for the purpose of clearing off the heavy debt incurred in erecting the handsome structure completed just before the death of the late Father Tandy.

WILL CONTESTED. — The contest over the will of Mrs. Mary Johnson, of New York, who left an estate valued at nearly $700,000, most of which was left to the Catholic Church of All Saints, to the exclusion of her relatives, has been settled. Mrs. Johnson's will was contested by more than 60 cousins, who alleged undue influence.

THE PROTESTANT PRESS And Catholic Correspondents.

New York, 22nd July.

It is only occasionally that I send you a few items of news from this Empire city; it seems to me that our daily papers have now such a large circulation in Canada, and especially in Montreal, that anything I could send would be only read second-hand and would be of little interest. On taking up one of last Sunday's city papers, I was forcibly struck by the number of articles on Catholic subjects that it contained. One of these is a column and a half analysis of the new Catholic Directory, another consists of two columns of letters upon a recent controversy started by some writer signing "Stanislaus Thomas," the authors of which letters are evidently Catholics—but not all of them Catholics sufficiently grounded in their religion to be accepted as authorities! One would almost imagine that it was the intention of the Sunday paper in question to devote as many columns as possible to religious subjects, and above all to subjects of Catholic controversy. Without desiring to take any part in the discussion of issues raised by the writer "Stanislaus Thomas," I cannot refrain from stating that his ill-advised letter to a leading secular paper has given that organ the right to publish all rejoinders, as well as all manner of letters purporting to support the original correspondent. A reverend priest of Madison, N.J., replied to "Stanislaus Thomas," and in turn has been the object of one of the most abusive pieces of literary Billingsgate that it has ever fallen to my lot to read. A writer signing "Greenville," from Jersey City, is the perpetrator of this tirade. Decidedly I have never read such a series of hard hitting and very undignified letters — and they are between Catholics; even between Catholic clergymen.

What fun it must be for the non-Catholic, and even anti-Catholic editors and publishers of these Sunday papers, to afford an arena for such struggles between Catholics. How they must rejoice to see our co-religionists tearing each other to pieces, and setting at naught every principle of Christian charity. Yet, we do not seem to perceive that we are thus playing into the enemy's hand. No wonder that so much space is given to Catholic subjects, when the manner in which they are treated serves to bring out every human weakness in those who belong to our faith, while keeping in the background every element of strength and unity that characterizes our Church. These letters are the talk of the clubs, they furnish material for sermons that reflect in no measured terms upon Catholicity in America, and they place untold impediments in the way of the steady propagation of the Faith in this land.

That men should be indiscreet enough to make use of a secular and hostile press to air their own petty grievances at the expense and to the detriment of the general cause of Catholicity, is not a matter of surprise. But it is unfortunate that we have not some medium of our own whereby to reach the ears and eyes of those whom they evidently seek to address. It is under circumstances such as these that we realize the need of a good Catholic daily press.

Is it not a wonderful thing that in all these United States, with over ten millions of Catholics, there does not exist a single Catholic daily paper, printed in the English language. From the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, from Maine to California, from Atlantic to Pacific, there is not a Catholic daily in that language to be found. You people in Montreal came the nearest yet to the supplying of that want; you once had a Catholic daily; but you did not keep it up. Over here there never has been one. Still, if ever the vast body of American Catholics needed such an organ, it is at the present moment.

For lack of a daily mouthpiece we are actually at the mercy of those who are most interested in wiping out whatever influence we may have gained and in preventing us from keeping pace with them along the road of progress. It is not for me to say where the blame lies; I am not in a position of sufficient importance to cause my views to prevail, no matter how just they may be; but there is nothing to prevent me from pointing out the unfortunate side of the situation. It seems to me that if some one of the generous and wealthy Catholics who leave by will immense sums to certain deserving institutions, were to found a Catholic daily and endow it with sufficient funds to keep it afloat for five years, the work would be one of paramount service to the Church, the country, all our institutions, and to the Catholic cause in general. It would be a carrying out of one of the great desires of the present immortal Pontiff, as well as the realization of the fond dream of the hierarchy of this country. That the day will come when Catholic America will have its daily organ I have no doubt; but, I fear it will not dawn until we shall have passed through a long and dreary night-time. On the sky of our journalistic night our many Catholic weeklies twinkle brightly; but what we need is a sun—not so many stars.

Let me say that many of your friends over here rejoiced to learn that the "True Witness" had completed its fiftieth year of publication, and they all hope that not only will the future be prosperous for your staunch old Irish Catholic organ, but that the coming years may find, as the past years once found, the "True Witness" associated with a companion in the form of a daily paper.

FAST SERVICE. —Rabbi Prey of Wabash, has sent a letter to the Post Office authorities in Washington asking to explain a method by which mail can be transmitted to [illegible]