

## MISS H. A. McCARTHY, MILLINERY,

673 Main Street, North End.

We have a Big Assortment of Pretty SUMMER HATS to Choose From.

## A Crowley & Co.,

Trunkmakers, etc.,

125 Princess Street,

A few doors from Charlotte St.

## Watch Repairing.

The watch repairing work left for some years past at the store of the late DAVID A. GIBSON, King Street, was attended to by

W. C. GIBSON,

661 Main Street.

Those who had given their time-keepers for repairs at the King street establishment may have the same careful attention to their orders by calling at 661 Main Street.

CENTRAL



STORE

Fresh Fish, not frozen: Gaspereaux, Shad, Haddock, Cod, Smelt, Halibut, Lobsters, Smoked Haddies, Bloaters and Kippers.

No 9 Sydney Street.

Phone 450.

Near Union.

## THE NICKEL.

Mr. Tom E. Clifford

Miss Bertha Dudley

## FINE SPRING MILLINERY

A Brilliant Display of Most  
Becoming Styles

—AT—

Mrs. M. R. JAMES, 282 Main St.

Mail Orders Promptly Attended To...

## Sea Bath Salt.

This salt is obtained directly from sea water by evaporation, and when re-dissolved in natural fresh water, imparts to it that stimulating property which makes it so valuable a substitute for sea water for bathing purposes. A cupful dissolved in the bath will impart decided tone to the skin and exterior nerves. In large packages at 10c.

**Bardsley's Pharmacy,**

Phone. 1687, Main Brussels Street.

F. H. C. Miles,

PORTRAIT PAINTER.

Old Paintings Restored, Bought, and

Sold.

M. B. DIXON, K. C.

Barriester at Law, Notary

Public, etc.,

Office: Hotel Shepody, Riverside,

Albert Co., N.B.

## FRENCH LIQUIDATORS SCRAMBLE FOR LOOT.

M. DUES MADE A SCÀPEGOAT  
FOR DEPREDATORS WHOSE  
NAME IS LEGION.

How One Thousand Million Francs  
Vanished Into Thin Air Under  
Wand of Government Officials—  
Sharing the Spoils.

The following letter from Mr. Stoddard Dewey, the special correspondent in France of the "New York Evening Post," is valuable for the clear view it gives of the liquidation scandal in which the French Government is so utterly involved, and for the proof it affords of the startling injustice that has characterized the government's treatment of the vast number of French citizens who were members of the suppressed and despoiled religious communities.

Thanks to the political rivalries of Combes, Briand, Millerand and the rest, evidence is accumulating to show that the plundering of the defenseless religious orders, whose famous "Milliard" was promised for old-age pensions, was the signal for a grand scramble for loot. For Dues, upon which the whole rumpus presently centres, we may read "Legion," the real name of the depredators. Dues, it has been shown already paid tribute out of his plunder to over 150 persons connected with the press, the Parliament, the magistracy.

Mr. Dewey writes:  
"The French Republic has to face another scandal. Efforts are being made to blow it up to another Panama. What it may come to no one yet knows.

Embezzlement by State Receiver.

"The real meaning of such an affair ought surely to be known before delivering judgment on it. The scandal consists in the embezzlement of public money by a State receiver. The money came from the sales and settlement of the property of religious communities—convents, colleges and schools. Such property reverted to the State by State legislation when Parliament suppressed the religious communities that owned it.

"The case concerns too many interests not to be related exactly. So far, the account given have been anything but exact, from the law which started all this money receiving eight years ago down to this week's arrest of one of the receivers. "The January number of a New York magazine has informed its readers that the religious communities in France were 'exiled' as a first and necessary move toward the separation of Church and State. The communities were not exiled, but dissolved and suppressed, and their suppression formed no part of the separation of Church and State.

"There could be no exile for their members, who were French citizens, like their fathers and mothers and families and friends. They were simply dispersed and forbidden to live together again. And their property, which is now in question was taken from them by the State on the following legal ground. So far it had been the property of the communities as such, and not the individual members of the communities. Therefore, when by an Act of Parliament the communities as such ceased to exist the property found itself without an owner. Therefore, like all ownerless property—bona vacantia—it had to revert by law to the State.

Beyond Pale of the Law.

"All this was done without reference to any law of separation between Church and State. Such a law was not proposed and carried through until several years later, before the next general election.

"This property of religious communities—convents, colleges, and schools had never been held in virtue of any union of Church and State. It did not belong to the Church; neither Bishops nor other members of the Church hierarchy owned it or administered it. In each case it was the private property of the particular religious community by whose members it had been accumulated. It was not properly received from the Church; nor from State subsidies of the Church, nor from direct aid of the State. Its legal holding had nothing to do with any union of Church and State or with the Concordat between France and the Pope.

"Its ownership was exclusively a

matter of the common law governing the holding of property by private associations; and such ownership was perfectly legal until an act of Parliament withdrew from religious associations the protection of the common law, suppressed most of the associations existing and declared their property of every kind—buildings and books, provisions and ornaments, ready money and endowments—to be henceforward State property. As such the property was henceforth to be administered, sold and liquidated by receivers appointed by the State.

For Old Age Pensions!

"At the time the widest possible publicity, inside and outside of Parliament was given to the estimated amount of all this property which thus escheated to the State by State legislation. It was to be one thousand million francs (\$200,000,000), the famous "Milliard des Congregations," which served Waldeck-Rousseau so effectively as a party cry in the years before the elections of 1902. The expulsion of the Sisters and Brothers and priests who accumulated the property and had hitherto been its legal owners, was to turn it into a "patrimony of the poor," enough for the old-age pensions which were already promised, but which Parliament is only now voting.

Once more, this property taken by the French State from private religious associations in 1902 had nothing to do with the latter half-million (\$100,000,000) of Church property property so-called—church possessions and endowments, Bishops' and priests' houses and seminaries—which were taken by the State in virtue of another law, that of separation of Church and State, four years later, before the elections of 1906. This latter—public Church property—has been turned over to the communes in which it exists for purpose of public utility, and it is in no wise involved in the present scandal. This concerns exclusively the former private property of religious communities ("congregations")—men or women living together in convents or schools precisely as they do in the United States.

Catholic Position.

"The Catholic Deputy Denys Cochin, in the course of a debate in Parliament, gave the extreme statement of the case, tinged with natural bitterness. "You have made laws which forbid those who belong to an association to teach. You have thrown them out of doors; you have confiscated their property; and now, while sharing the spoils, some one has been found who put money in his own pocket, and you send him to prison. I ask on what principle you can say to such a thief that he has been taking other people's property?"

"The mother superior of the sixteen Ursuline nuns of Nantes expressed this view more simply when they were expelled from their convent home, which they had built up themselves. She said to the police commissary: 'I can understand your law forbidding us to teach, but I cannot understand a law which takes from us the property which we have earned, cent by cent, by our own labor and economy.'

"The New York Magazine found another motive for the State suppression of these religious communities in France. It says they did the work for the open market at prices impossible to ordinary workmen. In reality, with the single exception of the Grande Chartreuse, the suppressed associations sold no products of their manual labor. They were teaching communities from the primary schools to colleges. Besides losing their property and the right of living together, the dispersed members of such communities are forbidden to teach or keep schools in any way together. This is the negative object of the law—to prevent school teaching by Catholic communities.

Evaporated Millions.

"The noise made over the voting of the law was to persuade thrifty French electors that Catholic religious communities had property enough, if taken by the State, to allow parliament to give old-age pensions. But it has long been an open secret that this "milliard des Congregations" evaporated and left patrimony of the poor behind. In fact, the legislation for old-age pensions now before parliament looks for the necessary funds to other more tangible resources such as the forced contributions of employers and of the employed who are to receive pensions if they live to be old enough.

"Yet every legal precaution is taken by government to secure the utmost return to the State from the liquidation of the property of the suppressed

religious communities. All legal claims against such property have been sifted closely and rejected when possible. Nuns have been obliged to furnish legal documents, which regularly did not exist, before they could get back the dowry which they brought with them to the convent. Legacies and endowments have been turned over to the state with the rest, unless the families could prove that a legal provision existed for the reversion to themselves of a bequest no longer serving its religious purpose. Associations of laymen which, before the law, had been the owners of schools or colleges from their foundation have been held by the courts to be interposed persons concealing the real owners—that is, the members of the suppressed communities—and the properties have been taken and sold over their heads."

THE PARENT.

Where is your son, your daughter, this evening? Do you, Mr. and Mrs. Catholic Parent, as you settle comfortably for your evening "read," really know where that boy or girl of yours is? True, most Catholic parents whose faith is alive enough for them to subscribe and read the Catholic paper, can be depended upon to keep pretty close touch of their sons' and daughters' doings. But a word of reminding is not amiss. We can never be sure of the devil. I hesitate to say which is the most devastating calamity—an epidemic, an earthquake, a fire, or the fact that there are 10,000 children in this city, this evening whose moral conditions or whose whereabouts we know nothing of, said Rev. Joseph P. McQuaide, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, in a recent sermon. "It is your aspiring ambitions homes, your nice-looking homes, many of the fathers and mothers of which are listening to me this evening," he continued, "that are largely responsible for this condition. Do you know where your boy and girl are this evening? . . . The careless home is far worse than the downright bad home. The latter is known. It is watched by the authorities. We can cope with that. But what of the home where the father and mother leave the children on Sunday nights, and go down to a restaurant, or off to the theatre, letting the boys and girls shift for themselves? The careless parents are doing the devil's work."

The careless parent not only does the devil's work in letting young souls go drifting to almost sure destruction, but they are daily putting a load on the shoulders of their fellow citizens by burdening the community with inmates for juvenile courts, reform schools and like institutions kept up either by taxes or philanthropy. It is the careless parents themselves, well dressed, whom one sees in greatest numbers calling regularly and shamelessly to leave their neglected and wayward children on the hands of Charity or the State. This sort of thing grows very easy for them. Such people are the first adherents to that socialism which promises a full stomach for the least effort, and their offspring are recruits for the next step in so-called "progress"—anarchy, says The Monitor, San Francisco.

EXPECTING COMPANY

(Harriet Prescott Spofford, in Christian Endeavor World.)

"My child," the dear old Earth sighed, "now isn't it unfortunate?

Here's our Cousin Comet coming, and I've nothing fine to wear!"

"Dear Mother," the Moon whispered, "I wouldn't be importunate:

With a rainbow and a sunrise I am sure you're always fair!"

"Do you recall the tint in which Ap-  
pleton Brown portrayed me?

Tell the leaves to hurry with it; I must have it by mid-May.

O what a thing of light it was his happy magic made me.

Half emerald and half sunshine, in an apple blossom day!"

"I'll call soft showers," the Moon said then, "and wash clear blue your bonnet

The blue beloved of Raphael, of your son Angelico.

And drop some snowy plumes of fleece, lacy clouds upon it.

And a veil of tender gauzes about your shoulders throw.

"And when the night comes round again in your dark blue velvet, Mother,

With a scarf of pale auroras and the diamonds of your dew—

And I shall be the pearl upon your breast, I, and no other!"

Cousin Comet, on his travels, shall see nothing fair as you!"