

August 17, 1901
July and August
LIMITED
St. James Street,
August 17, 1901.
Reduced.
every day, all go
ditions, it's not sell-
a few hours will
Mousseline Ori-
10c. Special 5c.
Roman Stripes,
20c. Special 10c.
in Check, Lawn,
e, Point de Paris,
Silks.
Washing Silk in
erie, etc., etc.,
25c.
ss Goods.
Price,
of clorings, light
r, regular 27c to
de, English Fa-
5c. Special sale
ored stripes and
to 65c. Special
ide, French Fa-
rth from 67c to
ns.
rt Waists.
Percales and
Shirt Waists in
arve, pink, etc.,
value \$1.50. Spe-
c.
LIMITED.
reet, Montreal
WA, Canada.
Calendar sent
ar, has been this
ed and the de-
e attention of
whose thoughts
distribution of
back no fur-
grocery. It is
suffering next
to the conflict
r weeks all the
e price of pota-
s and bounds.
e a heart. To-
ota, October
clusion. String
as the quality
is evidently
ow wrong a
this year and the
st year will
e army it was
which suffered
port would have
d things are
However, pota-
\$4 and \$5 a
responding time
ould be bought
n \$1.75, an
at 800 per
oor ones
h \$1.50 and
orth \$1.50 and
quantity last
e. The price of
100 per cent.
e. For cant-
what's just
as last year,
one of all
e about the
ity.
ure is, how-
g than might
e country and
e crops
e, but New
England have
ffer, and the
e. The re-
ns have been

Opinion and Criticism

Vol. LI, No. 7 MONTREAL, SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1901. PRICE FIVE CENTS

TOPICS OF THE DAY.

FINANCIAL AIDS.

There is no doubt that a regular competition exists in every sphere of human activity to-day. In religious and educational matters the strongest and most continuous competitors are the Catholic Church, on the one side, and all the Christian denominations combined, on the other. While we know the strength and infallible invincibility of the Church, and are certain that she must eventually come out ahead in every grand competition of the class mentioned, still we cannot close our eyes to the fact that she has to hold her own against powers that, as far as this world goes, are supported by the most essential means—that is to say, the enormous wealth, and corresponding generosity of non-Catholic supporters of educational and religious establishments. Every day the press is full of reports informing the public of large sums left by will or donated, during life-time, by wealthy Protestants to various institutions. A few examples from last week's papers alone will suffice to accentuate what we advance. Take the following, for instance:

Frederick N. Dubois, of Catskill, N.Y., has presented to Jeremiah Day, president of the Catskill branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, \$25,000, for the purpose of erecting an association building in the village. J. Edward Mears, of Philadelphia, has presented to George W. Mears Memorial Medical Library of Indianapolis, with 4,000 volumes of medical works, some of them of rare value. The library was established as a memorial to his father, who was one of the pioneer doctors of the city. The millionaire Gavril Ssolodovnikoff, who recently died at Moscow, left all his possessions, valued at 25,000,000 rubles, for the founding of high schools for girls, training schools for workmen, and cheap lodging-houses for the poor. During his life he had already spent large sums for a music school and a hospital, yet he was not esteemed because in private life he was known as a miser and an inexorable creditor. The will of the late Elizabeth F. Harvey, of Boston, widow of Peter Harvey, who was a friend of Daniel Webster, contains public bequests amounting to more than \$40,000. The New Hampshire Historical Society gets the portraits of Daniel Webster and Ames, together with all the letters of Mr. Webster to her husband, and all the letters and papers given to the latter by Mr. Webster or by his son Fletcher. Lord Mount Stephen has made a munificent gift of £40,000, the annual revenue of which is to be applied towards the augmentation of the stipends of over 20 ministers of the Church of Scotland in Aberdeenshire and Banffshire whose parishes are situated in the vicinity of Lord Mount Stephen's native district. Each minister will benefit to the extent of £100 annually. In the deed constituting the trust Lord Mount Stephen states that, in view of the reduction which has taken place in parish ministers' stipends during the last 50 years, he desires to restore the clergy to a position of greater independence.

We have cited a sufficient number of cases to confirm our statement. What we desire to impress upon our readers is the fact that this generosity on the part of friends and patrons of non-Catholic institutions is one of the powers with which the Church is obliged to compete. We do not pretend that these large gifts are in any way intended to be hostile to Catholicity, nor detrimental to its cause. But it is obvious that when our institutions are obliged to compete in the world's battle, with others that are so significantly favored the struggle, from a material standpoint, becomes very one-sided. It needs all the superiority that the Church has ever held in matters pertaining to moral education and to intellectual advancement to enable her to compete successfully with such a weight of financial influence. It consequently behooves us the more to lend every assistance in our power to our religious and educational establishments; otherwise we shall have to long wrestle for success with the most powerful earthly auxiliary that a cause can possess.

"DISHONORING BARTER."

One of our American contemporaries characterizes as "dishonoring barter" the exchange, on the part of the wealthy American girl, of her maidenhood for a title, or a place in the privileged society of the old world. All this is due to a London despatch, dated August 1st, in which it is suggested:

"That this practice is to be carried on to an extent that will be

FRANCE'S NAVAL POWER.

The old rhyme so familiar to the Irish race, "The French are on the Seas," will, no doubt, be recalled to mind in reading the following somewhat startling prediction of a correspondent of the Chicago "Record Herald," who, in a recent communication to that journal, writes:

When the right moment arrives France will astound and shock the world. Already the French have theoretically revolutionized naval warfare, and it needs only a struggle upon the seas to demonstrate their wonderful achievement. They have solved the problem of attack and defence under the water.

To-day they have submarine craft which are thoroughly successful, eminently practical, and which await only opportunity to show their terrible destructiveness.

Already the French have develop-

ed their under-water fleet to an extent which is believed by experts to give them the mastery of the Mediterranean. In five years they will be ready to sweep the British Channel, the North Sea, the whole stretch of water lying along the mainland of France and the Iberian peninsula. Unless mistaken in their calculations, they are now strong enough to close the Suez route to the east, and thus to throw out of service a quarter of the sea power of their rivals. In five years they expect to have the coasts and ports of England and Germany at their mercy. They hope to be able to paralyze the commerce and the fleets of the Kaiser and the King.

A JESUIT'S PLEA FOR JESUITS.

A REVIEW BY "CRUX"

In the "Gazette" of Wednesday, August 14th, appears an editorial under the above heading, which I am inclined to suppose is a well-intentioned statement of the merits, and, incidentally, the supposed demerits of the much-abused Jesuit Order. From passages in the article I am convinced that the writer has no great ill-will against the Jesuits; but, like thousands of others who pretend to know something about the Order, he is evidently "bating the air with both hands." I must admit that the whole is a most unmitigated jumble. There seems to be in the writer's mind some ill-defined distinction between the Jesuit in Canada and his co-religionist in Europe. To come more directly at the meaning of the article, I will have to turn it upside-down and deal with the second part of it first.

The writer, after comments not very complimentary to the Jesuit organization, says:

"This was not the experience of the author of 'A Jesuit Plea for Jesuits.' This clergyman, the Rev. John Gerard, S.J., sometime provincial of the Society of Jesus in England, has had his eyes opened at an early age, and he knew well when he sought admission into the society that its fame with most of his countrymen was not desirable."

This may or may not be a compliment to Father Gerard, just according as it is read and through what colored glasses. Then, after telling us that Father Gerard has been five years a member of the Order, that with his knowledge of "its members, its principles of conduct, its rules of life, its work in various fields of endeavor—letters, science, missions, teaching—and being aware how entirely alien from the popular judgment are the characters, aims and actions of his colleagues, he is affected with wonder rather than annoyance that persons of intelligence, generation after generation, should have their own part, he solemnly asserts that neither he nor any Jesuit whom he ever met would remain in the society for half an hour if the order were really found to be what it is represented as being. Why men of ordinary discretion should renounce all that is most attractive upon earth with no prospect but that of becoming sons of perdition, he does not attempt to explain."

Having quoted some remarks of Father Gerard concerning the fact that the rules of the Order are accessible to the whole world, the article closes thus:

"Fifty years ago, a gentleman told a near relative of Father Gerard's that he had been reading Loyola's Constitution, and that one would suppose the man had no object but to serve and honor God, and 'you know,' he concluded, 'I can't quite believe that.'"

Now all this would look like an appreciation of Father Gerard's work, a somewhat vague one, if you will, but still an appreciation.

But prior to making these references to this particular work, the

"Janissaries of the Vatican." I will quote that passage from Father Prout's semi-humorous, but fundamentally serious essay upon an order with which he was intimately familiar. Let the "Gazette" take the hint.

He wrote thus: "What could have possessed the professor? Did he ever go through the course of 'spiritual exercises'? Did he ever eat a peck of salt with Loyola's intellect? Had he ever manifested his con- science? Did his venturesome foot ever cross the threshold of a Jesuit sanctuary? Was he deeply versed in the 'ratio studiorum'? Had his ear ever drunk the mystic warnings of the 'monita secretorum'? No. Then, why the deuce did he sit down to write about the Jesuits? Had he not the Brahmins of India at his service? Could he not take up the dervishes of Persia, or the bonzes of Japan? or the brotherhood of Bohemian Gypsies, or the ancient Order of Druids, or all of them together? But, in the name of Cornelius a Lapide, why did he undertake to write about the Jesuits?"

To talk about matters of which he must be necessarily ignorant never occurs (except in this case) to his comprehensive habit of thought; and it was reserved for modern days to produce that school of writers who industriously employ their pens on topics the most exalted above their range of mind, and the least adapted to their powers of illustration. The more ignorance, the more audacity."

If my advice be taken, and the rest of the essay be read, the writer of the editorial in question will learn that nothing offensive is intended by the selection of the foregoing passage.

TREATMENT OF DRUNKARDS

In the United States.

The legal treatment of the drunkard is a perplexing problem in administration in every populous centre. The fact that in the last fiscal year for which statistics are available, no fewer than 312,000 arrests for intoxication were recorded in the 129 largest cities of the United States indicates the economic and social magnitude of the question. The attitude of legislatures and police departments toward inebriety is a study in diversity.

The policy of the police toward drunken individuals varies so widely in different cities that no common ratio exists between the number of arrests for intoxication and the volume of drinking. In the prohibition city of Portland, Me., the year's arrests for drunkenness aggregated 423, or 8 to every 1,000 population. In Toledo, Ohio, where there were 647 licensed saloons and where, under Mayor Jones, the practice of official leniency toward drunkards obtains, there were only 367 arrests for drunkenness, or 3 to every 1,000 inhabitants.

Although Cleveland has less than three times the population of Toledo, the census of its arrested drunkards was nearly twenty-one times as great as that in Mayor Jones's municipality. In Hartford, Conn., with 214 saloons and with a somewhat rigorous police policy, the arrests of victims of inebriety numbered 2,585, or 32 to each 1,000 population, while in Bridgeport, in the same State, with 312 saloons, the arrests footed up only 784, or 11 to every 1,000 residents.

In wide open New York the arrests for intoxication were 13 to each 1,000 people; in decorous Philadelphia, 22 to each 1,000; in intellectual Boston, 34 to each 1,000, and in beer-drinking Milwaukee, with 1,747 licensed saloons, 6 to each 1,000. These figures, selective in character and capable of abundant expansion, display downright discrepancy, and their explanation lies largely in the varying local policies of police authorities in dealing with the votaries of grog.

American laws prescribing penalties for drunkenness range through wide extremes. The maximum that fines for intoxication run from 50 cents in one State to \$100 in several other States, and that imprisonment for the offence varies from five days to five years, shows with striking boldness the different angles of vision from which law-making assemblies view the subject. In the general statutes of eighteen States, all in the West and Southwest, no specific legislation bearing on drunkenness may be found, but punishment is provided for in local ordinances.

In the prohibition States of Maine and New Hampshire the misdemeanor is punished exclusively by imprisonment. In Maine common drunkards may be confined in the House of Correction until discharged by the overseers of the poor or by two Justices of the Peace. In New Hampshire the maximum period for which drunkards may be incarcerated is six months.

In Ohio, South Dakota and Virginia the statute books prescribe fines for intoxication, but make no reference to imprisonment. The penalty is inelastic, and in Ohio it is

fixed at \$5; in South Dakota at \$10, and in Virginia, except where a different punishment is established by local ordinance, at \$1.

In sixteen Commonwealths the alternative penalties of either fine or imprisonment are authorized. The lightest monetary punishment for intoxication is found in Delaware, where a uniform fine of 50 cents is exacted. On the other hand the fines in Illinois range from \$20 to \$100.

Alabama likewise authorizes a maximum fine of \$100 for a person who "manifests a drunken condition by boisterous or indecent conduct or loud and profane discourse," but penalizes variations in imprisonment penalties for intoxication. For instance, the maximum term for which a drunkard may be imprisoned in Wisconsin is five days, while in Rhode Island a habitual drunkard may be committed for three years, and in New York a habitual female drunkard may be kept in the House of Refuge at Hudson for five years.

In several Commonwealths the penalties are graded and cumulative. For example, in Connecticut the first offence a common drunkard may be sentenced to hard labor for a maximum term of sixty days; for the second offence, to a maximum term of 240 days, and for the third offence, to a maximum term of 360 days. In Minnesota, which is also typical of the States in which the scheme of graded sentences prevails, for the first offence a drunkard may be fined from \$10 to \$40, or imprisoned from 10 to 40 days; for the second offence he may be fined from \$20 to \$40, or be imprisoned 30 to 60 days, and for the third offence he may be imprisoned from 60 to 90 days.

In Arkansas, West Virginia and Indian Territory security for the good behavior of a convicted drunkard may be exacted in lieu of a fine or imprisonment. In Arkansas the presiding Magistrate may require the intoxicated person surety "for good behavior and for keeping the peace not exceeding one year," but in case the bond cannot be procured imprisonment for a maximum term of thirty days is authorized. In Virginia the life of the security is limited to six months.

In eight States and Territories statutory provision is made for the institutional treatment of inebriates. North Dakota authorizes the commitment, at county expense, of habitual drunkards to "any reputable institution for the treatment of drunkenness" designated by a committee appointed by the Governor. The victim must express a desire to undergo treatment and must be inebriated a second time at the public expense. In the Territory of Oklahoma, where the law is substantially similar, not more than four persons can be sent to the institution from one county in a year. In North Carolina the period of treatment cannot be less than three months nor more than a year, and a drunkard may commit himself, upon application indorsed by a respectable friend.

Legislation providing for the suspension of the execution of sentence and the conditional release of a convicted drunkard upon parole, under the supervision of a probation officer, has been enacted in Massachusetts, New Jersey and Rhode Island. The probation system was introduced into Massachusetts more than a dozen years ago, and it has become an important feature of the penal policy of that Commonwealth. Probation laws establishing probation machinery based upon the Massachusetts practice have been under advisement in the Legislatures of various States this year.

The conventional treatment of convicted drunkards in the United States is retributive rather than reformative, and it is not justified by the logic of results, some students of the subject say. Experience, they declare, has proved with painful pe- nalties that the imposition of a fine or a jail sentence does not operate on the inebriate as a regenerative agency and does not tend to divert him from his anti-social tendencies. The most hopeful experiments, they think, he along the line of the application of the probation system to first offenders, and the commitment of habitual drunkards to a special institution under an indeterminate sentence, where they may be confined at hard labor and under scientific treatment until their appetites for alcohol is deadened and motives for sustained good conduct are created.—New York Sun.

REV. FATHER SPELLMAN, who has been associated with St. Patrick's Church during the past two years, we are informed will return to the diocese of Springfield early in September. In a hour, of need he came to St. Patrick's. Many of our readers are familiar with the zealous and wholesome manner in which he has entered into every work which was calculated to promote the spiritual and temporal welfare of the parishioners of the parent Irish parish. We have reason to know that Father Spellman dislikes having his name appear in print; but we consider it a duty to place on record, in this brief manner, our appreciation of the enthusiasm and zeal evinced by him during his all-too-brief residence in our midst. The genial and warm-hearted priest will, we have no hesitation in saying, carry with him the best wishes of the Irish Catholics of Montreal, and of the parishioners of St. Patrick's in particular, for his future success.