

SUITS

Comprehend the immense
Made Suits carried
and see the variety.
a brown, black and
cut double breasted,
and velvet collar; the
und. Price \$11.25.
anted all wool frieze,
quality mercerized
ounce trimmed with
at, price \$14.25.

ade of fine quality
yle, double breast-
age medium collar
id, skirt cut with a
piping, bound with
ack, royal blue and

WDS! ition!

Thousands upon
Jackets and Capes

ontrol can afford to

TS.

ntly especially so at

ay Frieze, new cut

rd Gray, fine Her-

Price \$18.50.

ality Black Beaver

silk, new shape

with fancy cov-

PETS

The advantage
careful work in the

d Linoleums. We

within your reach.

Squares.

QUALITY.

.....\$13.35

.....15.60

.....17.80

QUALITY.

.....12.40

.....14.50

.....16.50

LIMITED.

Street, Montreal.

MURPHY

OO.

WILL LITIES.

owing a full stock

all Novelties im-

of the great manu-

of Europe and Am-

on includes (on a

latest and finest

revel for the seas-

and New York.

ow rooms are now

exceptionally low

Ladies can see

at present, mo-

delicate creations

display of its d-

to say, unrival-

in Canada.

our other depart-

menting with new

special attention

tations of

w Jackets, New

ies, New Skirts,

Silks, New Dress

es, New Laces,

New Hosiery, New

ellas, New Men's

PHY & CO.

Street, corner of

Street.

Telephone, Up 933

a stimulant that

never intoxicates

a blue sky over

heart, maybe, in-

Gardien de la Salle de
Lecture 1901
Assemblée Legislative

Vol LI, No. 12

Catholic Questions of the Day In England.

PRELIMINARY to the annual Catholic Truth Conference a public meeting was held on Monday night in Olympia, Northumberland Road, Newcastle. The local Catholics have taken very deep interest in the Conference.

The address of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan was the principal feature of the meeting. As it deals with several questions which are attracting a great deal of attention, not alone in Great Britain and Ireland, but also in this country, we deem it of importance to give, in full, the report of the admirable and timely deliverance of His Eminence.

ST. EDMUND'S RELICS.—In opening His Eminence said:—You have heard of St. Edmund the Martyr and King of East Anglia, and of the controversy that has arisen as to his relics. I am going to make a very open confession to you. Having built a cathedral, the thought, and desire occurred to me of enriching it with the relics of St. Edmund, the King, which the tradition of Toulouise said were held as a precious treasure in the Church of St. Sornin. I was the more ready to give credence to this tradition, as in a learned life of the saint, published a few years ago in London, careful examination was made into the Foulness tradition, and ended by treating its claim to the possession of the relics as practically proved. No critic or student, so far as I was aware, came forward to question the correctness of Father Mackinlay's conclusion. To me, who am, I regret to say, entirely without experience in studies of historical research, the matter seemed to be certain. I therefore petitioned the Holy Father to obtain this treasure for the Cathedral of Westminster. And His Holiness, desiring to gratify the Catholics of England, and believing that Englishmen in general would be pleased to see the remains of a Saxon King brought back to England, obtained for us from the Archbishop of Toulouise what we all believed to be the bones of St. Edmund, the King. Shortly after their arrival in England two learned men, Mr. James of Cambridge, and Dr. Biggs of Oxford, wrote letters to "The Times" calling in question their authenticity. They did not seem to be absolutely conclusive; but upon the suggestion of the Bishop of Clifton and of Abbot Gasquet and others determined to submit the whole question to experts in England and France, so that we may by means of their researches clear up the difficulties and turn a pious belief into a positive certainty one way or the other. This seemed to me to be all the more necessary, as Abbot Gasquet had written to inform me, that he had himself made a slip some years ago by inadvertently saying that the arm of St. Edmund had been carried in procession in the fifteenth century, whereas he had just found that it should have been the arm of St. Botolph. But last Thursday Sir Ernest Clarke published the report of what appears to be an exhausted and careful examination into the question of the authenticity of the relics, so that the committee of experts I have referred to will have their task, I should think, very much lightened if they do not find that it has been already accomplished. I confess, that Sir Ernest Clarke's evidence seems to me, who am, however very far from being an expert, overwhelming and conclusive; and I, therefore, subject to further examination and verification by other experts, hasten to express to him my hearty and sincere thanks for the service he appears to have rendered. It is through the efforts of a number of men in the course of last century—especially abroad—that historical methods have been perfected to a degree that 100 years ago would have seemed impossible.

In many cases evidence can be obtained on obscure questions, and the degree of doubt attaching to many statements can now be justly estimated. To none are the investigations of historical research more useful than to the Catholic Church, which, while, at the same time, she possesses a known and a forgotten history longer and larger in volume than that of any human institution. Some of our friends may now, perhaps enquire whether the discovery of the relics are not genuine "will be a very awkward matter for the Church?" To this I answer at once, No! at all. The question of the authenticity of relics is like other matters of common history—it is a question of fact to be ascertained by the canons that guide human reason in historical research, and in weighing the elements that produce moral certainty. The Church pretends to no divine evidence for accuracy and certainty in such things as relics. No Catholic is bound by his faith to accept the authenticity of such things. It is a matter of human evidence, if the evidence seen to him, he accepts their authenticity. If it does not, he either suspends his judgment, or rejects it. According to Canon law, relics cannot be enclosed for the veneration of

the faithful unless they have at some time been authenticated or recognized by the bishop of the diocese. But authentication of this kind does not absolutely guarantee that they are genuine. It is a matter of evidence which is always open to experts. Relics known with certainty to be spurious may never be recognized or used as authentic. I remember that a few years ago a dealer in reliquaries in Rome palmed off upon several bishops and others relics that he said had come from suppressed churches in Italy, and he was attached to them forged certificates of authentication. As soon as this was found out a circular was issued by order of the Holy See to all bishops commanding the possessors of all such relics to give them up or to destroy them. But, it will be further asked, is not that too irreverence committed by honoring false relics. To this the answer is yes; if you are absolutely certain that the relics are false. But if you are not certain, if you simply accept the tradition that they are actually or probably genuine, there is no irreverence. The veneration shown to relics, pictures, and crucifixes, as the Catechism teaches, only relative—the honor and veneration are intended for the person represented, and in the case of the saints the honor paid to them is always intended ultimately for God, "mirabile Deum in Sanctis suis." Take a domestic example. If you possessed a locket of what purported to be the hair of your mother you would venerate and wear it with love for your mother, and you would not throw it away unless you became convinced that it was not her hair, but that of some one else. It is thus that we deal with the relics of the saints—our love and veneration are for the person of the saint, and that are to this extent personal—that if we should venerate a spurious relic in the belief that it were genuine, the reverence, being relative and personal, would certainly rest in the inanimate relic or picture, but simply in the person whose memory we have in our mind.

FRENCH EMIGRANT CLERGY.—Just a word on another topic. I do not as a rule notice anonymous attacks. Bad enough to be a target, but far worse to have to reply to every shot. A statement from a London paper has been running through the provincial press to the effect that I have deliberately outraged public feeling by inviting to England certain French religious, some of whose conferes have made themselves particularly obnoxious by their constant attacks upon this country. The fact is that upon the passing of the iniquitous law against every other religion, I gave a general invitation to any religious who might wish to come to my diocese until they could return to France. Among those who applied were three or four fathers, some of whose conferes do not love England. My invitation being general, was not, and am not, going to make distinctions. None will come who do not intend to obey the laws and follow my direction. And if there be any who have not been sufficiently enlightened to appreciate this courtesy while living in France they are the very people who had best come and make our acquaintance. This is the surest way to change their views. But while England boasts of her generous hospitality to every kind of refugee, I shall certainly offer whatever hospitality I can to the refugees for Christ's sake. I am too broad an Englishman to know any other policy.

OUR NAME AND TITLE.—It is necessary—strange as it may be to say so—to vindicate to ourselves the use of the honorable title "Catholic" and "Catholic Church." I have lately had some difficulty in making this clear. I have been told by persons in high public position, "You are Roman Catholics, not Catholics; you belong to the Roman Catholic Church, not to the Catholic Church." It was even broadly hinted that Protestants are the original Catholics, and that the "Reformed Protestant religion as by law established" is the genuine Catholic Church in this country. I need not say I maintained our claim and our right to call ourselves what we like, when it is not a question of statute law and legal convenience—that, as a matter of fact, we are, and we call ourselves, "Catholic" or "Roman Catholic"—that both mean precisely the same thing. I promised, on a fitting opportunity, to make a public statement on the subject. What better occasion than the present? What more intelligent audience than the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society, assembled in its northern capital of England?

The term "Roman Catholic" has two meanings—a meaning that we repudiate and a meaning that we accept. According to the former, Catholic is an original root, or a generic name which has been resolved into species, differentiated by prefixes, such as Roman-Catholic, Greek-Cath-

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1901.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE REAL ISSUE.

Church to insert the word Roman as a note of the Church in her creeds in condemnation of the heresy that has distorted the meaning of the note Catholic. She has already inserted it in the Profession of Faith made by converts. It also appears in the Schism of the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, prepared for the Vatican Council, and is adopted by many of the best modern theologians, as a mark of the Christian Church.

Nor can I doubt but that the Schism of the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, prepared for the Vatican Council, and is adopted by many of the best modern theologians, as a mark of the Christian Church. Nor can I doubt but that the Schism of the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, prepared for the Vatican Council, and is adopted by many of the best modern theologians, as a mark of the Christian Church.

ance to our interests and to those of religion, to excite in us an intense desire to have a Catholic king. Though even the end could never, even remotely, justify the means suggested. But how do matters really stand? We have a constitutional monarch, who is subject to the laws, and whose practice bound to follow the advice of his Ministers. A Catholic king, under present circumstances, would be a cause of weakness, of perpetual difficulty, and of untold anxiety. We are far better off as we are. Our dangers and grievances, our hopes and our happiness, lie in the working of the Constitution—not in the favor or power of the person of any Sovereign.

KING AND DECLARATION.—In dealing with this important matter His Eminence gave expression to some spirited remarks. He said:—Let me say at once that I entirely and gratefully accept the decision of the country that the King must be a Protestant. They believe that this is in some way bound up with the welfare of the empire. Without going to its length, I am convinced that in the present condition of the English people, haunted as they are by fears and suspicions, it is expedient that the King should be of the religion of the overwhelming majority. Besides, the King being, in virtue of royal supremacy, head of the State church, it is impossible that he should be other than a Protestant. Catholics have no difficulty in paying most loyal allegiance to a Protestant Sovereign. In this they seem to be more liberal and confident temper than those who would refuse allegiance to a King unless he professed their creed.

The Catholic has no difficulty because he gives his allegiance and his life, when needed, primarily to the Civil Power ordained of God. The Sovereign represents this power, whatever be his religion. Was it not Catholic, Belgium that placed the throne, and gave to him at least as hearty a devotion as ever has been shown to his Catholic successor? Other Catholic States are ruled by Protestant Sovereigns. And who can say that the sixteen millions of German Catholics are a whit less loyal to their German Protestant Emperor than the millions who are of the Protestant faith? There are people, I believe, pursued by the conviction that we Catholics would do anything in the world to get a Catholic King upon the throne; that the Pope would give us leave to tell lies, commit perjury, plot, scheme, and kill to any extent for such a purpose; that there is no crime we should stick at if the certainty, or even the probability, of accomplishing such an end were in view. Now let me put it to our Protestant friends in this way. If the King of England were an absolute monarch, the dictator of the laws to be enacted, and his own executive, there might be something of vital import-

RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN FRANCE.

In view of the present exodus of religious orders from France we will reproduce some of the statements made by such well known men as Pere Bailly, of the Assumptionists, and others, both of the Benedictines and the Oblates.

"I am aware," said Pere Bailly, "that certain orders are of opinion that they ought to ask for authorization. I do not believe that they will derive the slightest advantage by doing so, being, on the contrary, convinced that they will soon repent of it. The present Government will be sure to seize the first occasion to offer for finding them in default and then, farewell! fine promises. The persecution will be continued with all the greater violence for being less straightforward. As for ourselves, we no longer exist here, but many of us will, nevertheless, remain in France, while others will go to Belgium and England. In Belgium we have united two houses." "You may say," continued Pere Bailly "that we have definitely accepted Cardinal Vaughan's offer to confide a London parish to our charge and that we have decided to create another parish—this one out of London." Pere Bailly predicted that towards the expiration of the legal delay the Government will receive numerous applications from communities whose attitude has hitherto been one of hesitation. "But," he added, "where the Ministry deceives itself is in supposing that submission will be absolute and that the congregations in their obedience to the Government may disobey Rome. You may be sure that they will not apply for authorization if the procedure obliges them to become schismatics."

A Benedictine Father when about to leave Paris for England made the following statement: "All the Benedictines of France are either preparing their preparations for departure or have already left. They are the Benedictines of Liguge, of St. Anne, of Rouen, of Wisques, of St. Magdalen, of Marseilles, of St. Maur-sur-Loire, and of Solesmes. These last will go to the Isle of Wight. At the expiration of the delay there will not be in France a single Benedictine. They will go for the most part to England, whither they have been called by the Prior of Farnborough, very Rev. Fernand Cabrol. The Benedictines need not trouble themselves about the Government's authorization. They have not, like the Trappists and Carthusians, agricultural and industrial interests in France. If the Trappists and Carthusians ask for authorization I believe they will obtain it. Our situation is very different. Our patrimony is entirely intellectual, and science is our field."

The Order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate which is largely engaged in foreign missions, especially in Africa, will apply for authorization, and will without doubt obtain it. One of these religious, in the course of a conversation about the religious interest, made the following interesting remarks upon their mission in South Africa: "The Transvaal has not put a stop to our work. Our Fathers have become military chaplains both on the side of the English and of the Boers. It is only during the last five or six years that we have been able to live on good terms with the Boers, who, being at first, fanatical Protestants, rendered our mission difficult. But when they perceived the good results of our propaganda, when—especially after the declaration of war—they were able to appreciate our services, their attitude towards us was profoundly changed. Thus, when the Boers drove the English missionaries out of Pretoria, our house, whose Superior is an Irishman, was un molested in their capital."

LATE PRESIDENT'S ESTATE.

In view of the exaggerated reports of the amount of the insurance policies on President McKinley's life an authoritative statement was made a few days ago by one of the late President's friends in New York City. He said: "It isn't necessary to mention my name, but all of President McKinley's friends in Washington will understand who is speaking. The exact amount of President McKinley's policies is \$67,000, and not a penny more. Of this amount, \$50,000 was carried by the 'New York Life Insurance Company.' Mrs. McKinley's income from the insurance policies, the pension of \$5,000 a year which Congress will grant, and the money saved by the President will be about \$18,000 a year."

CARD OF THANKS.

The old patriarch, Mr. Denis Murney, wishes, through the "True Witness," to offer his grateful thanks to all subscribers to the drawing for the handsome guitar harp, donated by a kind lady, which was held in St. Mary's Catholic Young Men's hall, on Monday, 23rd inst. It was recently contested, and was a grand financial success. Mr. Alexander Blewett, Jr., of St. Lawrence Sugar Refinery, was the successful competitor. Professor Frank J. Daly, and Mr. Theo. Mitchell, acted as judges.

CONFIDENTIAL ON PAGE FIVE.