



EDITORIAL NOTES.

We desire again to thank the number of our friends who are sending in their renewals of subscription and procuring new subscribers for **THE TRUE WITNESS**. We certainly must admit that prospects brighten daily and that we yet may realize that which we have ever cherished as a hope, namely the firm, permanent and immutable establishment of a splendid Catholic journal. Each individual in this world has some special object in view, some particular aim in life; our ambition has long been to see our co-religionists and fellow-countrymen in possession of a fearless, honest, uncompromising organ; one ever prepared to defend their rights and assert their privileges. We have accepted it as a life-mission, and to-day we are grateful to Providence and to our supporters for the assurance in the future of **THE TRUE WITNESS**, as the realization of that dream.

It is gratifying to notice that some of the leading "dailies" of Canada have expressed their appreciation of our remarks, in last week's issue, on the subject of certain attacks made by a Chicago paper upon Lord and Lady Aberdeen. We desire, as far as our humble ability will permit, to voice the sentiments of true Canadians, and we cannot but feel pleased when we find our tone harmonizing with the exponents of Canadian feeling. We of the Irish race owe a debt of gratitude to the present Governor-General and his Lady, a debt to be considered entirely apart from their official rank in this country at present; adding these to our respect for the high position of trust which His Excellency holds in our Dominion, we feel that it is our duty to give expression to these sentiments when occasion demands. However, our Chicago friends, revelling in their "liberty," their glorious "democratic freedom," and their detestation of even the shadow of a real lord, have about as much knowledge and appreciation of our position in Canada as they have of the customs, rights, privileges and manners of the Tete-de-Boules. They see us through American spectacles, which are not at all suited to convey an exact impression. They have a reversing telescope that turns upon a wheel set some place in the complicated machinery of their political observatory; when they wish to look at a "lord," they put an eye to the small end of the instrument and behold him magnified into a giant, an autocrat, a tyrant, an ogre; when the desire to take observations of a Canadian, or Canada, they look through the larger lense and they perceive immense distances, with miniature towns, a pigmy race of men and insignificance in every object that falls under the range of their instrument. In both cases they are equally deceived. With all their boasted abomination for aristocrats, they are the first to go into an ecstacy of delight, a delirium of joy, on coming in contact with, or being recog-

nized by, a lord, or a titled personage; and with all their freedom, we are less slaves, in every sense, in Canada—because our "liberty" is unlimited, and never degenerates into license.

SIR GEORGE CHESNEY, in opening the discussion of Imperial defence, at the Junior Constitutional Club, in London, said that all the colonies, except Canada, could be made invulnerable by the use of expeditionary forces; but Canada could not be defended against the United States, in case of war between the latter country and Great Britain. Five million Canadians disagree with Sir George; and we are under the impression that Canadians have a more practical knowledge of their country than has the theorizing politician of London. Sir George Chesney knows about as much concerning Canada as a good many other "Sirs," who can spout rank nonsense to audiences that are as little conversant as themselves with the subjects under discussion. On the other side of the Atlantic—in England and in France—Canada is often made the subject of debate, and the men who express the most positive opinions about this country are generally the very men who know least in the world concerning it.

WE HAVE often been amused at the efforts made by non-Catholics to have the world believe that the Jesuits taught and practised the dangerous principle of "the end justifying the means." Here is a sample of that machiavellian principle; not only is it practised but approved of by those saintly critics of the Reformed faith. The Rev. E. H. Beardsley, a Methodist minister and evangelist, committed a theft at Birmingham, Alabama, in order to be sent to the mines, where he wants to preach the gospel to the convicts. His action has been praised by the synod of his church and he is looked upon as an honor to the sect. They practise exactly what they falsely accuse the Jesuits of teaching; but probably these poor people, like thousands of others who undertake to judge our church without knowing anything about it, are not even aware of the meaning of the phrase "the end justifies the means."

"EX-PRIEST," now "Bishop," J. V. McNamara, and his wife (?) have been making things lively out in Kansas City, where they addressed nearly two thousand people on the "Errors of Romanism." A loaded rifle in one hand and a revolver in the other were his substitutes for Bible and Cross; his female partner also carried firearms. Before the evening closed the A. P. Aist and the A. P. Aistess fired on the people and had to take refuge in flight. Who are these people? The woman—well, never mind her! The man was educated by the Lazarists and subsequently joined the order. For some years he was connected with St. John's College, Brooklyn. Some serious indiscretions of his induced the superior to transfer him to another

station. He refused to obey the order of transfer, and of necessity he was expelled from the Lazarist communion. Obedience is one of the essentials of this religious society. For a while he was without means of support. A southern Bishop took him in and gave him missionary work to do. But he did not stay long in his new field. His misconduct was so glaring and so scandalous that he was again expelled, and later he was excommunicated. Then he became "converted." His first step on being "converted" was to provide himself with a woman, and his next was to set out on a crusade against the church; in all human probability his next move will be in the direction of an elevated framework of wood, with a rope suspended therefrom.

The N. Y. Catholic Review recently published the following editorial note; it is too true to allow it pass unreproduced:—

"Some of the cleverest editorial paragraphs written for the Catholic press in the United States appear under the head of 'Notes and Remarks' in the Ave Maria. That sterling magazine always has the true ring of good metal. Sound in the faith, edifying, opportune, its comments on current events and opinions are notable also for their finished literary quality. In statement and style they are at all times admirable."

SEVERAL times we referred to correspondents who have propounded numerous questions and which we promised to answer to the best of our ability; so far we have not been able to find time or space to enter into these subjects. Last week we received a communication from a person signing "Baptist," in which the writer asks us if the use of Latin in the services of the Catholic Church is not contrary to 1 Cor. xiv. We simply reply: "by no means." Take the whole chapter and merely is a distinction between the one "that prophesieth" and the one "that speaketh in a tongue." Thus runs ver. 16: "Else if thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned, say, Amen, to thy blessing? because he knoweth not what thou sayest." This does not regard the public liturgy of the Church. Strange tongues are never used in the services of the Catholic Church. The Apostle refers to certain conferences of the faithful (ver. 26, &c.), in which they made known to one another their various miraculous gifts of the spirit, common in those ancient days; of these gifts St. Paul prefers that of prophesying to that of speaking strange tongues, because it was more to the edification of the public. The Latin used in the Catholic services was the language of the whole Roman Empire, the official language of the first centuries, and instead of being a strange tongue it was the most universal one. To-day it is the best known language in the world; because no other language—not even English, widespread as it is—is spoken or understood by peoples of different races and nationalities as is the Latin. Therefore, the fourteenth chap-

ter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians is rather an evidence in favor of the Latin than against it; because St. Paul prefers the best known language to "strange tongues."

RECENTLY Bishop Courtey of Nova Scotia, one of the most learned Anglican bishops in Canada, passed through Montreal. In conversation with a Witness reporter, referring to the unifying of the Church (Protestant) in Canada as the result of the establishing of the General Synod at Toronto. He said:

"It makes all the difference between the church speaking with many voices, and the church speaking with one strong, clear voice. A synod of the church might speak, and the reply might be—'Well, it is only a synod.' A province might speak and there might be the same reply. But when the general synod speaks it is for the synod and the province. There is Mr. Smith on the street. If Mr. Smith speaks as an individual, his opinion doesn't catch the general regard. But Mr. Smith, speaking as the head of a great banking institution, and instantly his remarks will be received with respect by the whole business community. Why? Because he represents not himself, but great business interests."

The Bishop is perfectly correct; but how is it that His Lordship cannot grasp the same argument when applied to the Head of the Catholic Church and the Councils of that Institution? Let us change the Bishop's expression to suit the case: "There is Cardinal Pecci in Rome. If the Reverend Pecci speaks as an individual, his opinion doesn't catch the general regard, except in so far as his individual merits command respect. But Pecci speaking as Head of the great Catholic Church, as Vicar of Christ, as Pope of Rome, as Infallible successor of St. Peter, as Leo XIII., and instantly his remarks will be received with respect and submission by the whole religious world." We are never surprised when ignorant people attack the Church; but it does often puzzle us to reconcile the logic of learned and serious men, when applied to any ordinary subject, with their absence of reasoning when there is a question of Catholicity or any of the teaching of our Church.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH, the ultra-British-Tory, anti-American Englishman, Canadian-American Annexationist, and Yankee-Cosmopolitan, has been ever and always attempting to straddle some political fence. In each attempt he has injured his own personal feelings and made life miserable for himself. It is thus he prefaces the fourth edition of his Political History of the United States—another attempt at fence straddling:

"The writer cannot send this fourth edition of his work to press without specially acknowledging the kindness of his American readers and reviewers, whose reception of a book which in so many things contravenes cherished traditions, as a proof of American candor and liberality. Perhaps they have discerned, beneath the British critic of American history, the Anglo-Saxon who, to the republic which he regards as the grandest achievement of his race, desires to offer no homage less pure or noble than the truth."