

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BYThe True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)
233 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.
P. O. Box 1138.

MS. and all other communications intended for publication or notice, should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director, The True Witness P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1138.

The Subscription price of THE TRUE WITNESS for city, Great Britain, Ireland and France, is \$1.50.

Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, \$2.00. Canada, United States and Newfoundland, \$1.00. Terms payable in advance.

New subscriptions can commence at any time during the year.

Money for renewal and new subscriptions should be sent to Managing Director, P. O. Box 1138. You may remit by bank cheque, post office money order, express money order or by registered letter. Silver sent through the mail is liable to wear and loss through the envelope and is lost.

We are not responsible for money lost through the mail.

Discontinue.—Remember that the publishers must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid. Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name or our books unless your post office address is given.

The date opposite your name on the margin of your paper shows you up to what time your subscription is paid.

We recognize the friends of THE TRUE WITNESS by the prompt manner in which they pay their subscriptions.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.

When you wish your address changed, write us in time giving your old address as well as your new one.

If you fail to receive your paper regularly, notify us at once by letter or postal.

All communications for publication must be written on one side of the sheet only, otherwise they are liable to rejection.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1896

AN APPEAL TO HISTORY.

The A. P. A., which, as our readers are aware, is represented in Canada by an organization of somewhat a different name, has received a stunning blow from Mr. Patrick Henry Winsten, who claims to be "a native-born American citizen of English descent, a Protestant in religion and in politics a Republican of the school of Abraham Lincoln." According to Mr. Winsten, the American Protective Association is a secret political society, formed for the purpose of excluding Roman Catholics from holding office in national, State or municipal government and from enjoying the other rights incident to American citizenship. Its platform was adopted by the Supreme Council at Des Moines, Iowa, on the 4th of May, 1894. One of the declarations of principles is to teach its members to be intensely active in the discharge of their political duties. While professing toleration of all creeds, it holds that the subjection to and support of "any ecclesiastical power not created and controlled by American citizens, and which claims equal, if not greater sovereignty than the United States of America, is irreconcilable with American citizenship." It is, therefore, opposed to the holding of offices of any kind by any "subject or supporter of such ecclesiastical power." What is the power indicated in this extraordinary clause? No person can fail to discern that one particular communion is aimed at, and no person is unaware that the communion in question is the Roman Catholic Church. That Church certainly was not created by American citizens. But is there any branch of Christendom that claims to have been created by American citizens? Surely even those sects that, as to their organization, are of recent origin, if they profess Christianity at all, must pretend to some higher sanction than the authority of American citizens. And what religious bodies are controlled, as well as created, by American citizens? It is evident that this negative definition is extremely vague. Even among non-Catholic communions it would be difficult to find such an organization. Is it meant to create the impression that there is a form of Christianity that is essentially American, and that only such persons as belong to it are worthy of holding office in town, state or nation? Does it mean that there is a church established or especially favored by the law of the land, and that those who are outside of it are unworthy to be trusted with any public employment? And their church, it would seem, differs from all others in tracing its creation not to divine authority, but to American citizens and by American citizens, not by those whom God has chosen for its administration, it is to be controlled. If the wording here is absurd, the terminology that follows is quibbling and dishonest, the term sovereignty being so used as to confound in the minds of ignorant readers the notion of civil or political supremacy and that which concerns matters purely spiritual. A conflict is thus suggested where there is no conflict at all. "Why," asks Mr. Winsten, "employ equivocal and ambiguous language, when dealing with matters involving the most sacred rights of millions of American citizens?" He then puts the charge into unmistakable language, namely, that American Catholics, being subject to the Pope, owe His Holiness an allegiance that is in conflict with their allegiance to the Government of the United States.

And the inference (the charge being accepted as proved) is that American Catholics should be excluded from all office under that Government.

Mr. Winsten then gives an able outline of the share that Catholics have had in opening up the new world, in exploring it from every point and in every direction, in settling it, civilizing it and christianizing it. Columbus, the Cabots, Jacques Cartier, Bilboa, De Soto, Marquette, La Salle and many another of the pioneers in exploration, in missions, in colonizing effort, were Catholics. In Catholic Maryland alone in the early colonial days men escaped proscription and persecution on account of their religious faith. It is the Protestant historian Bancroft that bears witness to the equality of religious rights enjoyed in the Catholic province. Washington gave testimony, alike honorable to himself and to them, as to the service that Catholics, like the Carrolls and Fitzsimons, had rendered to the cause of independence, and presumed that their fellow-citizens would not forget their patriotic part in the accomplishment of the Revolution. Mr. Winsten proceeds to enumerate some of the more important soldiers and statesmen who took part in the great struggle and contributed to the legislation, diplomacy and administration that followed it. Stark and Wayne and Lewis, John Barry, "the father and founder of the American navy," Commander O'Brien, who fought the first sea fight of the Revolution, were Irish Catholics. There was not, says Mr. Winsten, a battle from Stony Point to Yorktown in which Irish Catholic blood was not freely shed. Galloway, Speaker of the House of Assembly of Pennsylvania, when examined before a committee of the British House of Commons, and asked as to the origins of those who fought in the service of Congress, answered: "I can reply with precision to that question. They were scarcely one fourth natives of America; above one half were Irish; the remaining fourth were mainly English and Scotch. Again, when Major General Robertson, commissioner for the exchange of prisoners of the British forces, was questioned by Edmund Burke regarding the constituents of Washington's army, he promptly replied: "One-half Irish; one-fourth natives (of the American colonies), and the rest Scotch, Germans and English." The Catholics of other origins who took part in the contest on the side of the triumphant colonies—French, Poles, German—constituted a host large enough to silence, for very shame, the detractors of Catholic loyalty. What would Lafayette, Rochambeau, Pulaski, Kosciuszko, De Kalb and La Grasse have thought if they had foreseen the oblivious or ignorant bigotry of the leaders of the A. P. A.? As we follow Mr. Winsten's historical outline, we pause for a moment as he denounces these pioneers in bigotry, the Know-Nothing party of 1854. Before another decade had past, every American, of whatever Protestant communion, who felt in the great crisis the promptings of devotion to the Union, was glad to recognize the loyalty of the thousands and scores of thousands of Irish Catholics who drew sword or carried rifle in the cause of the nation's integrity. It is a long roll of honor that this fair-minded Protestant has compiled to convict the framers of the Protective Association's platform of ingratitude or else of shameful ignorance. P. H. Sheridan, Buell, Rosecrans, Ord, Rorer, Stone, Tyler, Shields, McCurdy, Halpine, Graham, Beaumont, Harwood, Ramsay, and many another who offered their life for their country in her hour of sharpest order—does the A. P. A. really accuse such men of a hesitating or pretended allegiance to the American flag? As well might those bigoted sowers of dissension charge Lord Howard of Effingham and the other Catholics, gentle and simple, who fought three hundred years ago against the Spaniards, with having forfeited the confidence of their Queen and country. We need not follow Mr. Winsten to the close of his fair-minded and able pamphlet. He devotes one chapter to an explanation, for the benefit of unprejudiced Protestant readers, of the Pope's real authority and functions, and then he points the anomaly of professed Republicans and advocates of liberty assuming an attitude of menace towards their Catholic fellow-citizens, threatening them with proscription and disfranchisement, while every state in Europe has abandoned such a policy, and Catholics and Protestants have forgiven and forgotten their ancient feuds and jealousies. In so far as the A. P. A. has found imitators in Canada, Mr. Winsten's condemnation applies to them no less than to their outrageous prototypes. From all such pretenders either to religion or to civic virtues may Providence deliver us!

A PARALLEL.

The decision that the Home Rule members of Parliament, who are Catholics, had to make on the 13th ult., was not without its perplexities. On the one hand, they were bound by gratitude to the party that Mr. Gladstone had led and which had followed Mr. Gladstone when he declared that self-government was Ireland's due. To abandon those

allies and to support an administration that had intercepted their advance to a goal of triumph that would have made their country autonomous, could not fail to seem a transaction of doubtful honor. Besides, it was a defection over which the Conservatives were sure to glory and thus to provoke the Liberals to an anger not easy to appease. On the other hand, their duty as Home Rulers, when brought into conflict with their duty as Catholics, their devotion to their children's welfare, and the conscientious obligation to avail themselves of an opportunity of righting what they believed to be a great wrong, had clearly to give way, as to a stronger plea. Mr. Clancy was the first to announce his intention to vote for the second reading. In accordance with the professed independence of his wing of the Nationalist party, he made no apology to the Opposition for siding with the Government on such a question. The bill, he said, had his cordial support, because (though to a much less extent than he and his friends desired) it tended to remove the inequalities that existed between the two classes of schools in England—the Board or secular system, and that in which religion was taught, as well as the ordinary branches. He did not think that the upholders of the Board plan were quite honest in denouncing all teaching of religion in schools, for, unless he had been misinformed and the convictions of a large part of the public were mistaken, a religion was taught in the Board schools that was neither that of Catholics nor that of Bible-believing Protestants. Mr. Clancy pointed out the inequalities that would still remain if the bill passed in its actual form. The advantage, in Government support, would still be largely on the side of the secular system. At a later stage in the debate, Mr. Dillon and Mr. T. P. O'Connor said they would vote for the second reading. Mr. Dillon's speech was apologetic throughout. It was with the deepest pain, he said, that he should go with the lobby against those who had been the allies of the Irish party. But, as a Catholic, he had no alternative. He criticized adversely several features of the bill, and thought the voluntary schools, now that they had their opportunity, should claim the full measure of their rights. Mr. O'Connor spoke more kindly of the bill, with the main proposals of which he was in agreement. It had its defects, however,—some of the provisions being merely an alleviation, not a removal, of the grievances that weighed down the voluntary schools. Mr. O'Connor foresaw that the promised decentralization was not likely in all cases to be a boon to the Catholic schools. It must be conceded that neither Mr. Dillon nor Mr. O'Connor spoke with the freedom and candor of Mr. Clancy, their desire to conciliate the Opposition, whom they were offending by casting in their lot with the Unionists, though only for a time, giving their criticism of the measure a strained and unreal look. Mr. O'Connor made, for instance, a point of sympathizing with the Nonconformists, who were being sacrificed for the benefit of other Protestants; yet by a singular coincidence two Nonconformists, who spoke before and after him respectively, expressed themselves in favor of the bill which, in the opinion of one of them, would effect a great educational reform.

But the main point on which we would insist is that the Nationalists, however reluctant they might be to turn their backs on their Liberal friends who had stuck to them for ten years, even courted defeat rather than betray them, recognized that the case was one of conscience and that they could not do otherwise than vote for the principle of religious education. It is impossible not to admit that their situation offers a parallel for that of those Catholics in Canada who, though associated with the Liberal party by political allegiance, are brought face to face with a problem of the utmost delicacy, the solution of which implies on their part an appeal to the tribunal of conscience. On the one hand, they may sacrifice their religious principles for the sake of a partisan name; on the other, they will have discharged a sacred duty enjoined by the Church, the performance of which may influence forever the religious and moral condition and thereby the material prosperity of successive generations of our people.

A CORRESPONDENT, in another portion of this issue, calls attention to the fact that certain persons are endeavoring to prejudice the Catholic voters against Dr. Roddick, on the grounds that he was opposed to the admission of Catholics to the Royal Victoria Hospital. The correspondent gives an instance in his own experience of a special case where the Doctor not only applied for the admission of a Catholic, but gave the case his special attention with a successful result. We agree with the correspondent that Dr. Roddick is quite incapable of such an ungenerous act. Such tactics in elections are common, but they usually fail.

A PIOUS FRAUD.

The only religious Daily, our pious contemporary, the Witness, gives vent to its feelings in the following manner:—The outrage perpetrated by the Roman Catholic clergy in the name of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus upon the municipal integrity of our city in school matters, which the Mercier government adopted and abetted, and which the De Boucherville and the Taillon governments failed to set right, has been, it appears, righted or is in process of being righted as far as the Protestants are concerned, by the Flynn government. The appearance is that this is the result of having got rid of an honest, but religiously narrow premier and of having a Protestant minister in the provincial Cabinet. We must heartily congratulate Mr. Flynn and Mr. Atwater on having thus put an end to a condition of tyrannical oppression which had lasted for years, under which the Protestant proprietors in the district, affected were deliberately, treacherously and unblushingly plundered.

In a former issue the question of the parish of St. Gregory was dealt with. At the same time the exceedingly plain and conclusive answer of the Montreal Gazette was also given. There is no need of returning to the subject. We are more than pleased that the Quebec Government has taken the matter in hand, and removed all cause of complaint in this one little parish injustice, under which our Protestant neighbors were suffering, through their own fault. It is refreshing, all the same, to find the Witness speaking of the fact that money was levied from Protestant ratepayers, in the parish of St. Gregory, as an outrage. Now, our pious and daily religious contemporary ought to be logical. Surely there can be no cause of complaint on the part of our contemporary should we gently hint that in the Good Book there is such a maxim as the golden rule: "Do unto others as you would wish others to do unto you." Possibly in the heat and turmoil of a general election, the Witness may overlook that simple, but very effective, utterance of the Great Master. When the fray shall be all over, and the Witness, in its own peculiarly pious way, will have done all that its energies are capable of, to secure the triumph of its political friends, the time may have arrived to return to first principles, and to preach the doctrine of what is called fair play amongst ordinary sinners, but which no doubt the Witness would be shocked to style by any other name than Christian charity. This is not the propitious time evidently. Our contemporary is looking forward to the long period that shall elapse, after the general elections are over, during which it may indulge in the teaching of sublime virtues. No other solution of the attitude of our *unco guide* presents itself to our mind. We may be obtuse; but if it be an outrage to take Protestant money or Catholic schools in one small parish in the whole Province of Quebec—if no other language will satisfactorily characterize the proceeding, in that solitary instance, than the words of the Witness, that the "Protestant population, in the district affected, were, deliberately, treacherously and unblushingly plundered," how, in the name of all the sense that is common, are we to account for the fact, that the Witness, in column after column of its daily issue, defends the course of the Manitoba legislature, which not merely takes Catholic money for Protestant schools in one parish, but pounces upon the whole school taxation of the Catholic people of the Province, and applies the funds to a system of education against which clergy and laity of the Catholic faith have never ceased to protest. The Witness professes to be not only a religious, but a loyal paper. How then does it reconcile its attitude towards the solemn pronouncement of Her Majesty's Privy Council? There the verdict of that august tribunal, the last resort for all British subjects, was: that the Catholics of Manitoba have a grievance. In that judgment, the Privy Council held that the Catholics had rights which had been sealed by a solemn parliamentary compact—still that goes for nothing in the unprejudiced eye of our pious and daily religious contemporary, which poses, by the way, as independent in politics. Where in the teachings that it so loves to invoke will the Witness find that it is allowable for Christians to use two sets of weights and measures? If it be deliberate, treacherous, unblushingly plunder, to take Protestant money in one parish in Quebec for Catholic schools, will it be kindly explained how it is truly Christian, just and honorable, to plunder the whole Catholic population of Manitoba, for the benefit of its overwhelmingly Protestant majority? Consistency, thou art a jewel! If there were any honesty in the game our contemporary is playing, it might be worth while to say a word or two about other tactics that are being resorted to by the Witness at this juncture; but it would be a waste of time to appeal to a journal which, whilst professing Christianity, ignores the very elementary teachings of the Divine Master. When a paper professedly devoted to religion can descend so low as to caricature Bishops and clergymen; open its columns day after day to the most vulgar exhibitions, to pictures that would not be tolerated in a police gazette—when what nine-

tenths of the people of this province and more than one-third of the population of the Dominion hold in reverence is handed over to some clumsy caricaturist as a "fit subject for his venom, nothing decent can be expected from such a quarter. The thin cloak of religiosity with which our contemporary attempts to conceal its true inwardness is transparent to the most inexperienced, and the political wire-puller the prejudiced partisan and inveterate opponent of fair play to a weak and struggling minority battling for its constitutional rights, stands plainly discernible by all manner of men.

IRELAND'S ANCIENT SPEECH.

A few weeks ago the Bishop of Raphoe (Most Rev. P. O'Donnell), being unable, through other and pressing engagements, to attend a public meeting of the Gaelic Union, wrote a letter to the Secretary, commending the Union's work in significant and gratifying terms. His Lordship wished the Gaelic movement the full measure of success that it deserved. To let the ancient tongue of Ireland die through disuse and neglect would be, he said, "to throw away a national treasure of great value and to neglect an educational medium of the highest importance to our people." We are not aware that the movement of which the Bishop of Raphoe spoke so highly has made much progress in Canada. Doubtless, here, as in the United States, individual students have made the language and literature of ancient Eire a special pursuit. The Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language numbers several diligent and fruitful workers between the Atlantic and the Pacific, Hudson's Bay and the Gulf of Mexico, and for those who wish to learn there is no lack of good teachers. Such masters of Irish lore as Jeremiah Curtin are exceptional even in the old land, but that the subject is receiving an attention that even the most sanguine did not look for some years ago, is beyond question. Some of our readers may, perhaps, be sceptical as to the utility of reviving a form of speech which they are wont to regard, complacently enough, as doomed to extinction. In this view they can claim the approval of a good many and even some of the foremost of Ireland's political leaders. A recent lecturer before the Irish Literary Society blamed even the patriotic O'Connell for neglecting to inculcate the necessity of keeping alive Irish racial customs, language and traditions. It would be ungrateful, however, to dwell too emphatically on such incidental shortcomings in the career of a leader who was called to do a special work and who thought it better to concentrate his energies on his chosen and needful task than to risk total failure by attempting more than he could accomplish. Davis and his colleagues in the Young Ireland movement deemed it possible to awaken the best aspirations of their fellow-countrymen by a literature which, while leavened with Irish sentiments, traditions and hopes, was still English in language, form and culture, and alien to the mass of the Irish peasantry. Until the close of the 18th century, according to Dr. Hyde, the literary activity in those communities in which the old tongue was still spoken was very great. Not in the South only, but also in Ulster, "the number of poets was something astonishing." Translations were also made from the French, Latin, Spanish and English—mostly of prose. In those days "every well-to-do farmer could read and write Irish, and many of them could understand even Archaic Irish," which was "much the same as though Chaucer's poems were handed down amongst English peasants." During the tour that he made while collecting material for his excellent volume of Irish tales, Mr. Curtin was saddened to find so few able to speak their ancestral language, but where ever it was spoken, some share of the traditional lore still survived.

With this decay of their native tongue among its true heirs there has, on the other hand, been a wonderfully successful revival of it in the circles of the learned. What is called the Celtic revival, which of course includes all the divisions of that once wide-spread branch of the Aryan family, was a natural result of the fresh interest in philosophy due to the discovery of the relations of Sanscrit to the languages of Europe. Cornish had been allowed to die unheeded, but Welsh and Breton, Gaelic, Erse and Manx, were still alive; and foreign scholars had shown their importance. Welsh is the descendant of the language that Julius Caesar heard nearly two thousand years ago from the Britons that resisted his landing, and the speech that Tacitus assigns to the northern foeman of his father-in-law, Agricola, was based on an original probably not greatly dissimilar from the Gaelic or the Irish of today. Celtic was thus the original speech of the British Islands as of a great part of Gaul and other regions of western Europe, and for the wealth of tradition that it guards, if for nothing else, it is worth preserving. Wales has been most stubborn and most victorious in clinging to its cherished heritage. Why it should

have made a better fight than Ireland or the Highlands, we cannot now inquire. It is still necessary that in some parts of Scotland the religious services should be conducted in the Gaelic tongue. Even in this Dominion there are settlements that are hardly at home in other speech. Still the tendency is towards decay. As education extends, English becomes more and more the medium of intercourse. In Ireland, many families have deliberately abandoned their native tongue. Even the old Irish names have been frequently changed. Dr. Hyde and other enthusiasts hold that while the educated classes set the example of honoring the old language—until it becomes a disgrace for a Macdermott, an O'Sullivan, a MacCarthy, an O'Neill, to be ignorant of the speech of his fathers, the national revival, which so many profess to desire, is out of the question. Others would be satisfied with imbuing the English language with the spirit of old Irish literature. This is a task on which a good many gifted and zealous writers—poets, story-tellers, scholars—are already engaged. Aubrey De Vere, Catherine Tynan (Mrs. Hurkison), Standish O'Grady, W. Yeats, Dr. Todhunter, Dr. Douglas Hyde, Mr. Graves, Miss Sigerson and her father, and several others, have contributed to this patriotic labor of love. But, while some of the best minds that Ireland has given the present generation are thus devoting their gifts to the transfusion of Celtic blood into English poetry, fiction and drama, those who believe in the vitality of the Irish language are sparing no effort to familiarize the tongues and ears of the people with that ancient speech. "The magic power of our ancient language," wrote Bishop O'Donnell, on the occasion which suggested these remarks, "to open and fill the minds of our people was admirably illustrated during the confirmations, when we had several sermons from priests who are masters of the Gaelic tongue." His Lordship closed by recommending the encouragement of the study of Irish in the national schools. It is pleasant to observe that this movement has the support of Protestants as well as Catholics. At the meeting at which Bishop O'Donnell's letter was read, the mover of some important resolutions was a Protestant incumbent of the neighborhood, the Rev. Mr. Shea. The Irish Literary Societies of London and Dublin are alike composed of Irishmen of both creeds. Their aim, according to Sir Gavan Duffy, is "to make the Celtic people of Ireland all they are fit to become, to increase knowledge among them and lay its foundations deep and sure; to strengthen their convictions and enlarge their horizon; and to tend the flame of national pride, which, with sincerity of purpose and fervor of zeal, constitutes the motive power of great enterprises."

REVEREND DOCTOR CONATY.

On Sunday last the parishioners of St. Patrick's had the advantage and gratification of hearing the Reverend Dr. Conaty, who preached at High Mass. Needless to say that the discourse was worthy of the theme and of the reputation of the distinguished preacher. He chose for his text the Gospel of the day: "Go ye forth, teach all nations, etc." One of the sure marks of a genuine preacher is to find him speaking from text of the day. The Church identifies our sojourn here below with the eternal life to come, by bringing to our minds the passages of scripture bearing upon each day of the year. No departure from this glorious and time-honored path, no attempts to drag into the pulpit semi-scientific or half literary subjects, can ever realize such results as are to be derived from a sound exposition of the doctrine and morals of Catholicity, suggested by the Gospel of the day. Father Conaty's style is simple and impressive, his language is plain but forcible. He speaks from a well trained mind and a truly Catholic heart, and his appeal goes to the minds and hearts of his hearers. His explanation of the mission of the apostles, a mission not confined to one nation or race of men, but to all nations, he dwelt upon as the most glorious ever confided to the officers of any army. The divine mission of the Church was developed in such a manner as to make his hearers feel that to-day, as in days of yore, our Holy Mother the Church has her authorized teachers, truly inspired and duly commissioned. With such men to meet the enemies of truth and fight the good fight, there need be no apprehension as to the future.

THE subject of higher education for women has been engaging a good deal of attention lately in Dublin. A petition has been presented to the Chief Secretary of Ireland asking that, in the proposed further endowment of the Irish University, the claims of women in regard to a higher form of education should be considered.

RECORDEUR DE MONTIGNY rendered a very important judgment on Monday in connection with the legality of the Early Closing By-Law. His Honor maintained that the City Council had no power to pass such a law wherein specific exemptions were made in favor of certain traders.