

very stricken woman protested that she was a good Protestant and could recite the Bible. "Can you recite the Hail Mary?" asked the Rev. dispenser of relief. No she could not. However, a generous lady, Mrs. Armstrong, said that whether the miserable woman were Catholic or not, she would give her what she asked. The woman quoted a passage for the Rev. gentleman, that should have struck home: "ask and you shall receive."

We are thoroughly aware that the Irish Protestant Benevolent society cannot be expected to give relief to the indigent who belong to other nationalities or to the Catholic Church. But there is Charity and Charity; "Charity is Love;" the One who is the Fountain of all Charity gave, of His abundant love, to Jew and Gentile, to Christian and Pagan. It seems to us that Charity should know no limits, that it should not be circumscribed by any possible lines. In the case in question, even if the woman were an "R. C.," her abject poverty must have been unbearable, when it drove her to seek relief at the hands of those who professed to distribute charity to the needy, and who were not of her creed. But perhaps we don't see these things with other people's glasses and each one has a right to his own opinion.

Still this is a very striking instance of how very suspicious certain Irishmen are of all who preserve the accent of their native country. Evidently the *brogue* is an index of Catholicity in the estimation of many. Terrence Bellew McManus, who stood in the Clonmel dock, in 1848, side by side with Smith O'Brien and Thomas Francis Meagher, used to express his pleasure that he had a more Irish accent than the patriotic orator of the "Sword Speech." But as Scott says: "Old times are changed, old manners gone." The charity of those in Ireland had the "ring of the metal" about it.

ULSTER KING-AT-ARMS.

A pious, true-hearted, patriotic Catholic gentleman has passed away, in the person of Sir Bernard Burke, of Dublin, the Ulster King-at-Arms. The *Irish Catholic*, speaking of his death, says: "Holding, as he did, an important position in connection with the Vice-regal Court and the Order of St. Patrick, Sir Bernard's was a prominent and well known figure at every state or castle function. Although he took no public part in political matters, it had somehow come to be known that 'Ulster' was a sincere and earnest Irishman and a warm believer in the right of his country to self-government." He has written a great many works, of which the most important are, "History of the Landed Gentry," "Dormant and Extinct Peerage," "General Armory," "Visitation of Seats and Arms," "Heraldic Illustrations," "The Roll of Battle Abbey," "Report on the French Record System," "The Patrician," "The History of the Royal Families," "Royal Descents and Pedigrees of Founder's Kin," "Romance of the Aristocracy," "Family Romance," "Romantic Records," "History of the Different Orders of Knighthood," "The Historic Lords of England," together with six volumes of "The Patrician."

In 1854 he received the honor of knighthood; in 1856 he married Miss McEvoy, sister of the present M.P. for Meath; 1862 he was made Doctor of Laws by the University of Dublin; and in 1868 he was raised to the dignity of a Companion of the Bath. It is rumored that Sir Bernard will be succeeded by his son, who is Deputy Ulster King-at-Arms. The Irish press seems to indicate that the appointment would best accord with public desire.

LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.

Owing to the number of pressing subjects on hand it is somewhat difficult to continue a series upon such an important question as the "Liberty of the Press," without necessarily having many interruptions. The last article under this heading closed at a point where we were considering the effects of the two extreme types of continental journalism. On the one hand, the extravagance, the madness, of the anti-religious organs of European *free thought* require but little if any comment to prove to any reasoning mind how evil must have been the results of such unreasonable and unprincipled methods. On the other hand, we quoted from a most eminent Catholic author, Mr. William Samuel Lilly, author of "On Right and Wrong," to show how dangerous were the weapons used by the ultra-religious journalists, of whom the gifted and now immortal Louis Veuillot was the leader. In so doing we merely chose the renowned editor of *l'Univers* as being the embodiment of the most uncompromising of Ultramontane ideas, and as the most able, most powerful, most implacable, and most fervent advocate of that party. That Veuillot has rendered more lasting services to the cause of our religion than any other layman, in his or any other day, no one will deny; that in every style he excelled and every subject he touched became grander and truer beneath the magic of his genius, no person will gainsay; that he fought the battles of the Church with an energy, a daring—and a chivalry worthy of the knights of crusading armies, is beyond dispute. On the other hand, we must admit that he was nurtured in Voltairian principles, and while his great soul felt the need of some more solid faith, he carried through life no small amount of the impetuosity, the sarcasm and the hot-headedness of his early master. Therefore, while giving him—and his disciples in after life—full credit for the lofty motives that guided his fiery pen, we cannot but admit that, at a period when a terrible danger menaced the Church in France, his methods were ill-calculated to carry conviction to the hearts of the irreligious and were more apt to lash the enemies of the Faith into the frenzy which actually took possession of them—even in his day.

Let us take a simple illustration. Remember we don't speak of Veuillot alone, but of the school of journalists which he led. You have a neighbor whose property is higher up than yours; he is a dangerous character, has the reputation of being an uncompromising disturber in the community; you are obliged, by circumstances, to live under him; he has the power, whenever he chooses to exercise it, of making life unbearable for you; by having nothing to do with him, or at least by quiet resistance, you can secure at least peace for your household. Would it be a wise policy on your part to tantalize that man, to abuse him, to so act that for simple revenge he would use his power and render your life miserable, your home a scene of confusion and your family existence unbearable? Yet in the vaster household of the Church in France, that was exactly the methods of Louis Veuillot and the imitators of the *Univers*.

Upon this point we will take the liberty of reproducing from the *Philadelphia Catholic Times* a few words, by the now justly famous Catholic controversialist, the slayer of Ingersoll, Reverend Father Lambert. "Some of our ultra-conservative journals seem to imagine that the sole mission and office of the Church of Christ in the world and in society is to play the

brakeman; and that she is the chronic incarnation of—'Don't.' The Puritanic Catholic ought to know that as the mission of the Church is to teach and direct society, her place is at the engine or in the pilot house, to direct the movements of the social train or ship, and prevent it from being derailed or running on the breakers, not by obstruction but by direction. * * * "We have an excellent illustration of this in the difference in policy of the Irish clergy in relation to the aspirations of the people of Ireland, and the conduct of the French clergy immediately prior to the revolution that began with the execution of Louis XVI." * * * "Thus the detestable modern methods of Nihilism, Socialism and dynamite, never obtained a permanent foothold in Ireland. This remarkable fact must be attributed to the influence of the Irish clergy, an influence that was acquired by being in constant touch with the people and in sympathy with their patriotic aspirations."

"The French clergy drew their salaries from the State and were therefore a part of the State machinery; they were quasi State officials. It requires extraordinary grace not to be in sympathy with the source of supplies. * * * Receiving their pay from the Government, the motives of their ultra-conservatism were unsuspected. Their advice was unheeded by a Government which looked upon them as its paid employees. For the poor suffering people they had no counsel but patience, resignation, submission, submission! When the Government and dynasty were swept away in the cyclone of popular wrath, they fell with it. Had they, like the Irish clergy, stood with the people and sympathized with them in their desire for a betterment of their condition, they could have directed the storm and led it on other lines, and history would not have had the Reign of Terror. So much for ultra-Conservatism. The revolution was directly against the old political regime, and indirectly against religion as a part of its machinery. Had the clergy been with the people the revolution would have run its course on political lines, and France would have come out of it Christian. We must make a clear distinction between the Catholic Church and the French clergy. The Church is indifferent to forms of government, whether royal, imperial or republic. * * * It is unwise to represent the Church as the embodiment of fanatical ultra-conservatism. She is not that. She is rather the balance wheel of social progress, now retarding at a down grade, now urging forward as the train strives slowly on the upward slope; now curbing rash enthusiasm, now arousing servile listlessness."

We close for this week with these powerful words of one of the Church's most able advocates alive. Had Veuillot curbed his rash enthusiasm the revolution would have run on political lines and France might be Christian and even Catholic to-day.

SCHOOL PUNISHMENTS.

The Owl, the Ottawa University magazine—one of the brightest and most interesting publications of its kind—has favored us with a three column criticism on our editorial, "Our School Boys." The writer in *The Owl* is evidently a professor and perhaps some of our remarks may have, all unwittingly on our part, struck home. However, his article savors more of the teacher than the journalist. He tells us that we do not know what we are talking about, that we do not strike at the root of the evil, that we have not sufficient experience in the

matter of educational training, that the "abuse and not the use" of corporal punishments is to be condemned, and that we wish to go back to the old times and re-establish the "whipping master."

Quite a lengthy indictment, and on nearly every count we agree with *The Owl*. It is wise to agree with the bird of wisdom. Let us take these different points and state how it comes that we are in perfect harmony with our grey-winged friend of the old *Abba Mater*. We do not know what we are talking about, because we cry *fire* when there is none. Perhaps the punishments described by us are not in vogue in Ottawa College, but there are no less than a dozen institutions, within a few hours ride from our office, to which most of our remarks applied. We do not strike at the root of the evil, because we should strike at the teacher who misuses his authority and not his right to punish. That is exactly what we did do. If *The Owl* would carefully read our editorials it would find that we have done as it recommends—therefore we agree with the sage bird on that score. We have not sufficient experience as a teacher; on this point our friend is right again, for we have no experience at all as a teacher; but we had ten years experience as a pupil, and three years experience in the study of our school system in Quebec. *The Owl* next says that the abuse and not the use of a right to punish should be condemned. We agree again; it is the "abuse" of that right that we have been striking at so strongly. By no possible effort of ingenuity can any professor twist our articles into anything other than so many attacks upon the "abuse." As to the "whipping master," it is *The Owl* that suggests the idea; it never once flashed upon our mind. There is a vast difference between the "whipping master" of the olden times and the director or superior of a college, in our day. To send a boy to the superior does not necessarily imply that he is sent to receive a whipping. It is to save the child against the very "abuse of the right to punish" on the part of a special class of teachers.

We may as well say that we agree *in toto* with *The Owl*, because it is exactly at the vestiges of those old fashioned cruelties that we are directing our every line. We are thankful to *The Owl* for its kindly notice and we can assure the editor that our ideas are identical, but couched in different terms. In the newspaper world we have not the same leisure as the editor of a College Monthly to choose our words and measure our phrases, therefore our language may not be as exact and our style as scholastic, but our views agree.

In wishing *The Owl*, a Happy New Year, we would draw the attention of the editor to the fact that this is THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, and that for forty years *The Witness* has been the ultra-Protestant organ of Canada, and the term "the *Witness* man" has been applied for a whole generation to the late Mr. Dougal, and has been inherited as an heirloom by his son. We pass these remarks because *The Owl* has repeatedly in this last number and in others, called us *The Witness*, and our editor, "the *Witness* man." Evidently *The Owl* broods more in the teacher's sphere than in the journalistic world.

As soon as the new military laws shall have come into full effect the German army will comprise 5,000,000 men; the French 4,350,000; the Russian, 4,000,000; the Italian, 2,236,000; the Austrian, 1,900,000; the Swiss, 489,000, and the Belgian 258,000. Altogether Europe will be able to dispose of not less than 22,000,000 soldiers, or fifteen million more than she had in 1869.