

A DAILY PAPER.

The statement is frequently made, by a number of our fellow-countrymen and co-religionists, that we should have a daily paper. While freely admitting, that, amongst the number of those who give expression to that idea, there are quite a few who sincerely and earnestly give voice to their deep-seated conviction in that respect, it cannot be denied that a very large number merely repeat the phrase with the sole object of endeavoring to evade the duty surrounding the preliminary work which would ultimately lead to a daily issue. Have any of those promoters of the scheme of a daily edition of a paper ever given the subject of the expenditure in connection with the enterprise any consideration? Have they ever considered the question of the amount of capital which would be required to launch the undertaking in a manner which would ensure its share of patronage in a field where such powerful mediums exist—where the battle is now raging between morning and evening dailies to such an extent that editions of events are being manufactured and issued within the space of one hour after they have taken place, in order to capture the attention of the masses, especially the rising generation? Have they even spent an hour in figuring out the salaries of an editorial staff, whose combined talents would be of such an order to enable the paper to be placed side by side with all of those existing, and not only compare favorably with them, but inspire the readers with the desire to purchase it on account of its superiority? Have they, even in fancy, ever thought of a sum like \$12,000 per annum for that branch alone? Have they counted the cost of plant that would be required to equip the establishment merely for the purpose of issuing the paper? Or have they dwelt upon the fact that \$20,000 would be sunk in that way? Have they estimated the amount required in the composing room, in the business office, in the press room, in the dispatchers' department, not speaking of the sum which would be necessary to disburse for material, premises, and with the canvassing agents for advertisements and subscriptions? If those promoters of the evening newspaper scheme will merely devote a few moments to a study of the subject of the capital needed to behold the realization of it, they may have a temporary chill after they have made the totals of the long lists of expenditures, to be followed by a series of chills when they calculate the short list of revenues to meet that expenditure during the first years.

We are led to indulge in this expression of our views on account of the beautiful flippancy which characterizes the outbursts of certain evangelists amongst our own nationality and religion in connection with the idea of a daily paper. That we cannot have a daily paper at present, unless \$75,000 can be secured, is no mere visionary statement. But we may have a daily paper in the near future if the weekly is supported, just with the same measure of certainty that a business man with a fairly remunerative establishment will have a fortune or a nice competency if he husbands his income with any degree of economy.

The newspaper history of Canada has many parallels where weeklies have become dailies by the dint of applying that good old principle of "making haste slowly." Several of the most successful journalistic enterprises started out as weeklies, and after a period of encouragement became semi-weeklies; then another term and they became tri-weeklies, and finally appearing in their daily dress. There are other journals which were

merely of a monthly issue that in a moment of an upheaval or some public excitement in which the nationality or class whose interests they were supposed to protect were antagonized that sprang into existence and are now firmly entrenched in the affections of that section as a daily visitor.

THE TRUE WITNESS is the only weekly organ within the broad limits of the Province of Quebec that has for its mission the aim of guarding the rights and privileges of the English-speaking Catholics. To the unthinking mind it may be a feeble medium, and to the indifferent Catholic a kind of an unpalatable luxury, because he yearns for some other kind of mental food which will tickle his fancy in a piquant manner by unsavoury pictures of sensationalism, whilst some of the columns of the medium which he supports are nothing more nor less than silent evangelizing forces wearing their fascinating leaden impression, which unfortunately too often contain those venomous stings which underlie the sentiment treasured against anything associated with Roman Catholicism. To the thoughtful man, to the father of a family who appreciates the treasures of a good sound Christian education for his family in the probationary period of youth, THE TRUE WITNESS will appear what it is and what it will continue to be, a powerful electric motor that will germinate the current which will send its flashes of alarm when necessary into many thousand Catholic homes and warn the inmates of any impending danger to their cherished rights. He also may rely upon it that it will speak out boldly those words of counsel and advice in an emergency which will not be tinctured by a sectionalism that favors any political faction or party, any particular organization or special congregation, parish or individual, but proclaimed in the endeavor to promote the best interests of the English-speaking Catholics.

We will leave our readers for the present to mediate upon the matter, with the hope that they may devote some portion of their leisure to spreading the lessons we desire to inculcate amongst the friends in their circle. That the English-speaking Catholics of this Province are respected on account of their numbers is also a truism, but that they would be more powerful with THE TRUE WITNESS in every Catholic home is a greater truism.

**MANITOBA SCHOOLS.**

In this issue we publish the decision of the Greenway Government of Manitoba concerning the rights of the Catholic population in that Province to have separate schools. It is a plain, unvarnished statement, whereby all external interference is repudiated and set at defiance, and the doctrine laid down that the Catholic minority must submit to the will of the prejudiced Government now in power. This question now rises high above the din and conflict of mere political parties. It has to do with the vital interests of an immense section of this Dominion's population, and it is the flinging down of a gauntlet that only the most ungenerous as well as unpatriotic would for a moment ever dream of handling. Justly has one of our contemporaries said: "The Manitobans have set their ideal of national schools on one side and their respect for their Catholic fellow-countrymen's conscientious opinions on the other, and have decided in favor of their school ideal. They are not doing as they would like to be done by were the position of parties reversed."

A glance at the situation in our Province of Quebec suffices to show how un-

fair and unconstitutional is the act of the Manitoba Government. We have no intention of entering into all the powerful arguments in favor of the Catholic contention; but we purpose stigmatizing the course of the Greenway Government as cowardly, bigoted and un-British. It is cowardly, because it is the act of a "bully," who has a weaker party in his grasp, but who, were he in the position of the latter, would be the loudest in his plea for justice; it is bigoted, because the Government knows full well that it is merely taking advantage of a play upon the wording of an act to perpetrate a criminal—if legalized—injustice upon a section of the people; it is un-British in the two-fold sense that it is notoriously unfair, and that it is a direct menace to the constitutional economy under which we have so far lived.

It was acts like this that raised the ire of the Barons and wrenched the Magna Charta from the despotic power of King John; it was dangers like this that awakened the independent patriotism of the men of '37 and '38, and that brought about the revision of our legislative system in 1840; it was in order to avoid such petty party tyranny that the great organization of our Confederation was brought into existence; and if the law of our Dominion is too weak, or our system of Federal and Local government too faulty, to prevent such an abominable crime being committed against the consciences of a third of our population, then the sooner the confederation is amended and rectified the better for the stability of Canada.

Premier Greenway's Government is evidently animated with the spirit of the men who originated the Laws of the Pale. Could it do so, in the face of this whole Dominion, it would probably send the Catholic population of Manitoba "to Hell or to Connaught." But the day of religious persecution, of political ostracism, has long since set; and whosoever attempts to revive its lurid light will have to be prepared for a scorching in the fire of his own creation. We have been somewhat silent regarding this question, because we were anxious that the Manitoba authorities should have a fair opportunity of hearing all the arguments, of seeing for themselves the great wrong that might be done to the Catholic minority, and of taking the easy but necessary steps to the settlement of such an important question. They have had the time, they have studied the case in all its phases, they have calculated on the weakness of the Catholic vote, they have felt that the Protestant element is sufficient to keep them in power, and they have decided to ignore the rights, the feelings, the conscientious opinions of their Catholic fellow-citizens.

How would Mr. Greenway, or Mr. Anybody else, connected with this despicable and narrow-souled piece of legislation, like to find the same course adopted by the Catholic majority of Quebec? But to men who could issue such a cold-blooded answer, or ultimatum, the interests of Protestants or Catholics, elsewhere, outside of Manitoba, are nothing. We believe, that were the Manitoba government certain that its position could only be held by the sacrifice of every Protestant interest in Canada's other provinces, it would not hesitate a moment to decapitate the whole Protestant population. Such men are prepared to ride into power over the hearts and lives of any section of the community. Devoid of fine feeling, actuated by no sense of justice, they care little what ill they originate, what bitterness they engender, what animosities they create, provided their own miserable ends are attained. The reply to which we refer is a direct insult to every Catholic in

Canada and a mean injury to the numerous high-minded, justice-awayed Protestants of this Dominion. In our recent issues we unfolded pretty clearly the question of the rights of minorities in matters of Education, and do not intend going over those arguments again; but we say, and can logically prove, that the action of the Greenway Government is un-Christian, unnatural and unconstitutional. It is un-Christian, as it is a violation of Divine law; it is unnatural, as it is a violation of the underlying principles of the British Constitution. If our language of indignant censure is deemed too strong, we are prepared, by pen or voice, here or elsewhere, to make good our accusation and to prove beyond the power of contradiction, that the Greenway reply is unworthy of any British subject or Canadian legislator.

**WOULD MEND THE LORDS.**

LORD ROSEBERRY MAKES A PLAIN FORWARD DECLARATION.

LONDON, October 27.—The Prime Minister, Lord Roseberry, made an attack on the House of Lords in a speech in Bradford this evening. The veto power exercised by the irresponsible chamber, he said, would prevent the present Parliament from continuing for anything like the full extent of its natural life. The next election, in his opinion, would be fought on the questions of the continued existence of the House of Lords. That House, as it existed at present, was a mockery and an invitation to revolution. The House of Commons might vote bills till they were black in the face; they must still go up, cap in hand, to the Lords and ask them to pass the bills. He favored the principle of a second chamber, saying that the temptation of absolute power was too great for any single person or body. He believed that the feeling of the country on this point was the same as his. (Shouts of "No" and cheers.) The issue was the greatest that had been presented since the country resisted the tyranny of Charles I. and James II., involving a revision of the entire constitution. The country had not given a mandate to the Government at the last election to deal with the House of Lords; if it had, it had not given the Government a sufficient majority. The Government must, therefore, walk warily; it must first bring the Commons into play. The Government proposed to submit to Parliament a resolution, the exact terms of which he would not state now, but affirming the principle that the Commons, in the partnership with the Lords, was unmistakably the dominant partner. Such a resolution, which in the present temper of the House of Commons would undoubtedly be passed, would represent the joint demand of the Government and the Commons for a revision of the constitution, the question thus entering upon a new phase. Then the verdict would be as favorable as the verdict of the Commons. These steps would be taken immediately, because the Government hoped to pass useful measures before dissolving Parliament. The Government threw down the gauntlet to the Lords and it was for the people to take the gauntlet up.

**MADE DEACONS.**

Archbishop Fabre has conferred the following orders; Deacons—Charles L. Pontbriand, Burlington; S. A. Rocheleau, London; R. A. Bernardin, Manchester; F. Fitzpatrick, Peterborough; P. O'Leary, Peterborough; F. L. French, Pontiac; Jos. Mincham, Toronto.

Sub-deacons—E. P. Guilbault, Montreal; P. J. McKeon, London; J. H. Brennan, Manchester; H. H. Halpin, New York; W. A. Gilfillan, Springfield; D. J. Meloche, Valleyfield.

**ECCLIASTICAL NOMINATIONS.**

The following nominations have been made by His Grace the Archbishop.—Charles Laforce, chaplain to the Sisters of St. Anne's Lachine; Zanon Therien, vicar to St. Bridget's, Montreal; O. Lachapelle, vicar to St. Louis de France, Montreal; Joseph Landry, vicar to St. Bruno.