

The True Witness and Catholic Chronicle

Printed and Published by the True Witness P. & P. Co., Limited,
178 St. James 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

All communications should be addressed to the Managing Director,
"True Witness" P. & P. Co., Limited, P. O. Box 1138.

TERMS, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

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.....FEBRUARY 17, 1900.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

When we look back over our files, for a few years, we are surprised at the amount of space occupied with articles upon the dignity of womanhood, and the terrible crime of divorce. Yet we should not be surprised, since the subject is constantly before us, in one form or another, and the gradual increase in the divorce business has become a daily augmenting menace to the well-being of society. One predominating note runs through all the articles: the Catholic Church by raising marriage to the dignity of a sacrament, has alone saved woman from the misery, the humiliation, and the degradation to which man (and even sister woman) would fain expose her. It is with no small degree of satisfaction, therefore, that we read the admirable and widely-circulated sermon, preached two weeks ago, by His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore. In it this true prince of the church, has dealt terrific blows to polygamy, woman's rights, and divorce. Great has been the social effect of that sermon, and wonderful the noise it has made in some of the most exclusive circles of American society. A few extracts may give our readers an idea of the magnificent manner in which the scholarly prelate has treated this important subject.

Cardinal Gibbons said:—
"I regard woman's rights women and society leaders in the higher walks of life as the worst enemies of the female sex. They rob woman of all that is amiable and gentle, tender and attractive; they rob her of her innate grace of character, and give her nothing in return but masculine boldness and brazen effrontery. They are habitually preaching about woman's rights and prerogatives, and have not a word to say about her duties and responsibilities. They withdraw her from those sacred obligations which properly belong to her sex and fill her with ambition to usurp positions for which neither God nor nature ever intended her. Under the influence of such teachers we find woman, especially in higher circles, neglecting her household duties, gadding about, never at peace unless she is in perpetual motion, never at ease unless she is in a state of morbid excitement. She never feels at home except when she is abroad."

"When she is at home the home is irksome to her. She chafes and frets under the restraint and responsibility of domestic life. Her heart is abroad. It is exulting in imagination, in some social triumph or reveling in some scene of gaiety and dissipation. Her afflicted husband comes home, to find it empty or occupied by a woman whose heart is void of affection for him. She is ill at ease; thence arise disputes, quarrels, recriminations, estrangements, and the last act in the drama is often divorce. I speak the sober truth when I affirm that for the wrecks of families in our country woman has a large share of the responsibility. The remedy for this is found in the teachings of Christ."

Having shown that the Catholic Church, following the teachings of the Gospel, and of the Epistles of St. Paul, proclaims woman the peer

of man, he proceeds thus to deal with the inviolability of marriage, and to set it up as the palladium of woman's honor. He says:—

"The Church has always maintained the unity and indissolubility of marriage. She has invariably declared that a man can have but one wife, and a woman but one husband, and that the death of one can alone permit the other to enter into second nuptials. She has upheld this law against the encroachment of temporal sovereigns and the violence of human passions. Innocent III., in the thirteenth century, compelled Philip Augustus of France to take back his lawful wife, Ingeborga, whom he had repudiated, and to dismiss Agnes, whom he had married. The Pope refused to grant Henry VIII. of England a divorce when he wished to marry Anne Boleyn, but the King easily obtained it from Cranmer, the reformed Archbishop of Canterbury. In the beginning of the present century the most powerful monarch of Europe—Napoleon—tried to force the Pope to grant a divorce to his brother Jerome, who had been married to Miss Patterson, of this city, by Archbishop Carroll."

Having pointed out woman's ingratitude for all the protection and rights accorded and secured to her by the Gospel, His Eminence closed with this touching and beautiful peroration:—

"Mothers and daughters, you have a sacred mission. You cannot be apostles in the strict sense of the word; you cannot preach the Word of God, for women are commanded by the Apostle to be silent in the Church; you cannot be priests, but you are chosen to offer up in the sanctuary of your homes and in the altar of your hearts the sacrifice of praise, thanksgiving and supplication to God. Christian women, let the husband and son on returning home after buffeting with the waves of the world, find there a haven of rest. Let the angel with the flaming sword protect and preside over your homes, repelling from them all unhallowed thoughts. For, what is a home from which chastity has fled but a deserted temple, from which the spirit of God has departed."

REUNITED.

The lengthy reports and the accompanying editorials in the various Irish weeklies, on the subject of the reunion of the Irish Parliamentary Party, indicate a spirit of hopefulness that has, in consequence, sprung into existence in the Old Country. The only little cloud that now appears upon the horizon of the future is one that we trust will soon vanish: it consists in a slight doubt, or rather a very extreme degree, of cautiousness on the part of those most intimately connected with the "United Irish League." It would appear, if we can judge properly from the public expressions of opinion that we have read, that the leading promoters of the League would wish to have the now united party in some way associated with it and its aims. While the "United Irish League" is actually the only organization of its class in Ireland to-day, and must consequently occupy a large share of the public attention, it is, nonetheless, entirely distinct

from the Parliamentary Party; and we glean that Mr. Redmond—who has been elected chairman of the reconstructed party—does not wish that there should be either any clashing, or any alliance between the two. While all are working with praiseworthy endeavor, for the greater good of the Irish people and the success of the Irish cause, still their spheres of action differ almost radically, and the leaders of the new party—for such it is—do not wish to compromise or confuse matters by having the United Party dependent on any other contingency than that of a united people at its back.

The only direct expression of this spirit of hesitancy, or misgiving as to the continuance of this union, of sections, we find in an editorial comment of "The Irish People." Mr. William O'Brien's organ. That very determined publication says:—

"If Messrs. Dillon, Redmond, and Healy have really settled their quarrels the country will unfeignedly rejoice. But there is need of exercising a wise caution as well as a large charity. The country will require some guarantee of the sincerity and the continuance of the new Treaty of Peace. The only real guarantee available is the presence of an organization of the people impartial enough to be independent of all the sections, and strong enough to impress them all."

This tone, in a new but very important Irish organ, coupled with Mr. Healy's absolute refusal to speak, or give expression to any personal opinion, despite his vote in favor of Mr. Redmond's resolution, is the only apparent opposition—if the declining to immediately co-operate can be so construed as such—that has been made known to the public. By reading some items in the press, it would appear as if the unity thus admired and praised was not of a nature to inspire universal confidence amongst Irishmen. However, if our readers will kindly peruse some of the extracts from the speeches delivered by leaders of different sections, as they are given in another column, they will find that there is every reason to be grateful for even the degree of harmony, which principally through the efforts of Mr. Harrington, has been obtained.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE.—"La Semaine Religieuse" has just published some interesting statistics, for the year 1899, concerning the famous shrine of Ste. Anne-de-Beaupre. Without entering into the elaborate details given, we think that the main figures are sufficient eloquent to show that the great devotion, that reigns throughout the Church, to the mother of the Blessed Virgin, has by no means decreased as time has passed on.

During the past year there were 122 pilgrimages to the shrine; ten less than the previous year, yet consisting of five thousand more pilgrims than in 1898. The number of pilgrims amount to about 120,000; that is to say 78,500 by rail, 45,000 by boat, and from 8 to 10,000 on foot or in vehicles. The most remarkable days of the year were the 18th June, 26th July, and 29th Aug. Amongst the distinguished personages who, during the year, visited the shrine, may be noted, His Excellency, Mgr. Falcois, Apostolic Delegate; Their Graces Archbishops Bégin of Quebec, Langevin of St. Boniface, Gauthier of Kingston, and Bishops McDonald, of Charlottetown, Gravel, of Nicolet, Blais, of Rimouski, Lorrain, of Pembroke, Lalonde, of Sherbrooke, Cloutier, of Three Rivers; Rev. Abbott, of the Oka Trappists, and over 1,000 priests and religious.

Some very remarkable favors had been obtained, a list of which appears in the "Annals of St. Ann." The sanctuary's walls glitter with the "ex-voto" offerings of pilgrims grateful for blessings obtained. In gold, silver and marble are they to be seen; and precious stones, jewelled ornaments, and similar offerings, tell the story of faith's gratitude.

MISSION TO CATHOLICS.—The following announcement made in the daily press of this city, during the course of this week, explains itself:—"A meeting was held yesterday morning in the Y.M.C.A. building of the Presbyterian Committee of the Protestant Ministerial Association, to consider the question of a reply on behalf of Protestantism to the mission recently undertaken by the Rev. Father Youman, in St. Patrick's Church."

It was finally decided that a mission should be held, the same to commence in Knox Church on the evening of Feb. 25. The mission will be opened by the Rev. Father O'Connor, of New York, an ex-priest, and a convert to Protestantism, who will, for a fortnight, conduct a series of conferences in the afternoons

and evenings, and will answer questions put to him. The rev. gentleman's lectures will embrace the essential truths of the Christian religion, repentance, regeneration, confession and other subjects. It is the hope of the committee that a spirit of candor and kindness will characterize the meetings, and nothing will be said or done to wound unnecessarily the feelings of those who may conscientiously differ from the speakers."

We have not the slightest doubt as to the goodwill of the members of the Presbyterian Committee, nor do we, for a moment, imagine that they are actuated by any sentiment other than one of good will towards their Catholic fellow-citizens. It is to be regretted, however, that, in their zeal for the salvation of Catholics, they should have chosen exactly the means best calculated to estrange and to offend those whom they seek to attract and please. The selection of an unfrocked priest, and one who has abused the Catholic Church, the teachings, the practices, the discipline, the sacraments, and all that is or ever has been held sacred by the adherents of our faith, is, to put it mildly, a sad evidence of lack of forethought and diplomacy.

ANONYMOUS LETTERS.—In connection with the recent decisions regarding the removal of the Point St. Charles monument, we have received a lengthy letter from a person signing "Irish Catholic." Without entering into the merits or demerits of the writer's statements, we must decline to publish a communication without having any knowledge of the author's identity. It is not fair to a public organ to insist that it should accept a responsibility for opinions or views which the writer, himself, does not appear inclined to assume. We have never shirked any question connected with Irish or Catholic affairs of importance, but we claim that others should not seek to impose upon us a responsibility, which they are not prepared to share. We do not pretend that the author of the letter before us is mistaken, nor that his opinions conflict with our own; we simply wish to have it understood that every one who sends us a letter for publication should, at least, furnish us with some clue to his (or her) identity.

While on this subject we cannot refrain from repeating an advice which we have already many times given, to the effect that the non-de-plume "Irish Catholic" should be sparingly used. It is a very easy matter to sign these two words at the foot of a letter, but they are no guarantee that the writer is really what he represents himself to be. When a correspondent wishes to conceal his name from the public, which frequently and reasonably is the case, he has a million names and signatures from which to choose—it is only on rare and special occasions, that "Irish Catholic" is timely or definite enough. Too many poisoned arrows have been fired from behind that shield to cause us to accept the name without doubts and hesitation. In all this we do not wish that the writer of the letter, which we thus decline to publish, should feel at all offended. It is a very simple thing for a writer to enclose his card—not for publication, but simply as a guarantee to us of the genuineness of the correspondence. Any one declining to trust us to this reasonable extent cannot expect that we should trust him.

REUNION OF THE IRISH PARTY.

Continued from Page One

into a reconstructed party was somewhat different. The position was more difficult for the small minority coming into the re-united Party, and he felt that if a re-union in Ireland was to be a reality the minority must be able to satisfy their supporters in Ireland that the basis of the re-union was such that they would not be simply absorbed and disappear, but that during the interval—when the reconstructed Party would be on its trial, so to speak, before the world—they would have their legitimate position, and interest safeguarded and protected.

Then referring to the resolutions to be submitted, Mr. Redmond said:—"Of course, it was not pretended that these resolutions were exhaustive, and that they provided a complete scheme of reconstruction. They were put forward only as a basis of settlement, and interpreting their spirit and meaning as he had done, he said, on behalf of himself and his friends, that they accepted them publicly and in a most unequivocal manner. There were other matters to be considered, one of which, when the proper time came, he would urge very strongly upon the consideration of hon. members, viz: the holding at some suitable time of a National Convention in Ireland to place the National movement once more upon a sound foundation. He asked them to adopt this resolution:—"That, in the name of Ireland, we declare at an end the divisions which hitherto separated the Irish Nationalist representatives, and hereby form ourselves into one united Party, in accordance with the principles, and under the Constitu-

DR. ST. GEORGE MIVART'S CASE.

In our second last issue, we dwelt to a considerable length upon the peculiarly painful case of the now famous Dr. St. George Mivart. We related how this eminent scientist, erudite thinker, and deep student, gave expression to views concerning certain doctrines of the Church, which views met with the disapproval of Rome. We saw how Dr. Mivart, with a marked degree of Catholic humility, submitted to the adverse decision of the Church, and repudiated and withdrew his own works. So far all had gone on admirably; the principles of Catholic teaching were asserted, vindicated, and accepted by the one who had erred in his interpretation of them; and, on his part, Dr. Mivart had displayed a magnificent example of faith conquering human respect or literary pride. But, for some reasons that no sane person could entertain, Dr. Mivart, without rhyme or reason, without provocation or occasion, rushed into print again, and announced through the "Nineteenth Century" and "Fortnightly Review" that he repudiated his own repudiation, and reiterated the views which had incurred the censure of the Church. Thereon a "Profession of Faith" was submitted to him, for acceptance and signature, by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. This profession is so lengthy, that we cannot reproduce it full; but it contains all that a Catholic should accept, nor is there a paragraph therein that any Catholic could or would decline to accept in full.

So far, however, Dr. Mivart has declined to sign this Profession of Faith, while still claiming to be a Catholic in the fullest acceptance of the term. The result has been that he has been inhibited from the sacraments. While the Church, which is the "Pillar and Ground of Truth," is ever ready to accord every reasonable latitude to the faithful in matters of discipline, still the moment there is question of a dogma, that same Church never has and never will give way the most infinitesimal fraction of a section. It matters not whether the offender be the most powerful individual in the nation, or the most learned; infallibly he has to submit or else incur the open censure of the Church. The circular addressed to all the priests of his arch-diocese reads thus:—
Archbishop's House, Westminster,
Feast of St. Peter's Chair, 1900.

Rev. Dear Father,—Dr. St. George Mivart, in his articles entitled "The Continuity of Catholicism," and "Some Recent Apologists," in the

"Nineteenth Century" and the "Fortnightly Review" for January, 1900, has declared, or at least seemed to declare, that it is permissible for Catholics to hold certain heresies—regarding the Virginal Birth of Our Lord and the Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin; the Gospel account of the Resurrection and the immortality of the sacred Body from corruption; the reality and transmission of original sin; the Redemption as a real satisfaction for the sins of men; the everlasting punishment of the wicked; the inspiration and integrity of Holy Scripture; the right of the Catholic Church to interpret the sense of Scripture with authority; her perpetual retention of her doctrines in the same sense; not to speak of other false propositions. As he has thereby rendered his orthodoxy suspect, and has, moreover, confirmed the suspicion by failing, after three notifications, to sign the annexed profession of faith when tendered to him by me, it now becomes my duty to take further action; and I hereby inhibit him from approaching the Sacraments, and forbid my priests to administer them to him, until he shall have proved his orthodoxy to the satisfaction of his ordinary.

Believe me to be, Rev. dear Father, your faithful and devoted servant,

HERBERT CARDINAL VAUGHAN,
Archbishop of Westminster.

P.S.—If it were true, as Dr. Mivart asserts, that there were persons calling themselves Catholics who hold any of the above heresies, it would be necessary to remind them that they have ceased in reality to be Catholics, and that if they were to approach the Sacraments they would do so sacrilegiously, at the peril of their souls, and in defiance of the law of the Church.

HERBERT CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

Under the circumstances, we have but slight comment to make on the situation. We can only express deep regret that a man of Dr. Mivart's great and acknowledged gifts should have exposed himself to such a condemnation, and we hope that, like on a former occasion, he will yet see the wisdom of signing the Profession of Faith. If he be a Catholic he cannot decline to accept every item therein set forth; and if he has actually lost the faith he should be manly enough to acknowledge the same, take the consequences, and cease proclaiming himself a Catholic.

tion of the Irish Parliamentary Party from 1885 to 1890" (applause).

Dr. Connors seconded the resolution. He did not think it was necessary to enter into any argument to convince those present that the union of the Irish members into one Party was the first object to be achieved.

The principal other speech was that of Mr. Dillon, and as leader of the Nationalist Parliamentary Party, his words carried more weight than they would otherwise have borne. Leaving aside certain criticisms of present, or proposed efforts, Mr. Dillon said he desired to recognize to the fullest possible extent the conciliatory spirit which had animated the speech delivered by the hon. member for Waterford. He reciprocated in the strongest possible terms the principle Mr. Redmond had laid down in that speech, that if there was to be a useful re-union it must be based upon a frank and open spirit of conciliation, and a determination on the part of all present to, he would not say forgive, but to forget anything that had been said amongst them in the course of party controversies in the past. He also felt himself strongly in accord with Mr. Redmond in another sentiment to which he had given expression, viz: that the union of members of Parliament effected in London would be of very little avail if it was not based upon a united and organized country behind it in Ireland. He came there that day on the understanding that this was a Conference, and not a Party meeting convened in order to endeavour to arrive at terms of general union.

C. M. B. A., BRANCH 232.

The Progressive Euchre Party and Social, of branch No. 232, held in Beaman's Conservatory Hall, St. Catherine street, last Friday evening, was a grand success, and it will pass down as one of the greatest successes ever held in the history of this highly esteemed and popular branch.

The members and their friends turned out "en masse," as there were upwards of some 215 persons present, all of whom enjoyed themselves to their hearts' content. A start was made at 8.45 p.m., and the euchre tables were quickly filled, fifty-two tables being occupied. And after Grand Deputy Bro. G. A. Carpenter, had on behalf of the officers of the branch extended a most cordial welcome to the large assemblage present, and also returned the thanks of the branch, he read the rules of play for the Progressive Euchre, and at 9 p.m. everything was in full swing, and lasted without interruption un-

til 11.45 p.m., when the last game to be played was announced. As on the former occasion, the prizes were displayed on the platform, in view of all those playing, and they called forth many comments, for they were without a doubt the handsomest collection of prizes ever given for a similar entertainment by any society.

The contests for the prizes were very keen, and the following was the result announced:—Mrs. J. H. Neilson, 1st ladies' prize, handsome five-o'clock china tea set; Mrs. P. Grace, 2nd prize, 1 doz. silver spoons; Miss Alice Shea, consolation prize, jewel case; Mr. J. Hamilton, 1st gent's prize, brass mounted china collar and cuff box; Mr. B. Tansey, sr., 2nd gent's prize, brass mounted three compartment china cigar and match holder; Mr. W. A. Hodgson, consolation prize, Doulton tobacco jar.

When the presentation of the prizes took place, the following gentlemen were called upon to make the presentations:—Chan. P. F. McFarlane, 1st vice-president Grand Council of Quebec; Grand Deputy, A. B. Polivian, Grand Council of Canada; Grand Deputy, C. Fortier, Grand Council of Canada; Grand Deputy, J. J. Costigan, Grand Council of Canada; Grand Deputy, J. H. Feeley, Grand Council of Canada; President T. R. Cowan, of Branch 232.

After the prizes were presented and the hall cleared of the euchre tables, refreshments were served, and a word of praise is due Bro. W. J. Shea, for the manner in which he attended to such a large number of people. After full justice had been done to the good things, provided the hall was again cleared, and dancing was indulged in. Everyone went away delighted at the entertainment and loud in their praise of Branch No. 232, and of the kindness and courtesy of its officers to do all they could to please and entertain them. If public opinion counts for anything, Branch 232 has a great lead as a popular branch, and one that knows how to entertain its friends.

To the following gentlemen who composed the committee, nothing but the greatest praise is due for the manner in which they attended to their many duties.
President T. R. Cowan, Chancellors T. A. Lynch and T. M. Ireland and Bros. R. J. Cherry, W. J. Elliott, J. H. Neilson, W. E. Durack, Jas. McDonald, B. M. Rowan, T. McGillivray, J. Thompson, A. C. Coleman, W. J. Shea and G. A. Carpenter.
Grand Deputy G. A. Carpenter announced that Branch 232 would hold another Progressive Euchre and Social on Easter Monday night in Beaman's Hall.