

Co. LIMI... Sewear... under way for... BLES TO MAKE... Covers, 39c... WHITE CAMBRIC... 36c

The True



Witness

Vol. LIV., No. 48

MONTREAL, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1905.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS ENEMIES

Impressive Address by the Archbishop of Dublin.

The text of an address delivered by the Archbishop of Dublin upon the completion of the Church of the Holy Family in that city is at hand, and it should be widely read by the Catholic laity. His Grace said:

"Bodily needs seem never to tire of interfering in our religious affairs, while they are notoriously, at least some of them, leaving undone, or all but undone, their own proper business, business that they are well paid for doing, but that, to judge by results, they seem practically incapable of doing, or even of making any serious practical attempt to do (applause). As I have said, I prefer to leave our laymen, who are, in a sense, more directly concerned in the matter, the task, which seems to them to be the very welcome one, of chastising the impertinence of such people. I have never myself referred to the matter, directly or indirectly, before, and if I do so to-day, to speak candidly, it is mainly because in the circumstances in which I have been placed for the last day or two, no other topic has suggested itself to me to speak about, and also, to some extent, because a reference to this particular topic was suggested to me this morning by a passage I chanced to meet with in a book to which I had reason to refer for quite a different purpose. The book, which I happen to have with me here, is a volume of lectures by Dr. Newman, CARDINAL NEWMAN,

his famous lectures—on what he described when delivering them, as "The Present Position of Catholics in England." The lectures were delivered in Birmingham in the year 1851, at a time of fierce excitement. All England was then seething with passion, anti-Catholic, anti-Papal, passion, over the action of the Pope of the day, Pope Pius IX., in appointing an Archbishop and a number of Bishops in England, the country having previously been governed, ecclesiastically, by Bishops no doubt, but by Bishops who, instead of being Bishops in dioceses of their own, were simply Vicars of the Pope, delegates of the Pope, acting exclusively in his name in the ecclesiastical government of the different districts into which England had long previously been divided by Papal authority.

The absurdity of the communion that was raised on the occasion has often been commented upon. If there was any very substantial difference between the two methods of exercising the authority of the Catholic Church in England, it is sufficiently obvious that it was downright folly to denounce as a Papal aggression upon the liberties of England, an exercise of Papal authority such as I have described, an act by which the Holy See abandoned the system of an ecclesiastical administration of the country by Papal authority exercised through Bishops who were merely vicars or delegates of the Holy See, substituting for it the system which has since then been in operation, and, for years past, in perfectly tranquil operation, in England, as it has for centuries past been in operation in Ireland, the ecclesiastical administration of the country by Bishops, canonically appointed, each of them, as Bishops of a canonically erected diocese. At all events, all England, all

PROTESTANT ENGLAND, WENT SIMPLY MAD with rage over what the Pope had done. Mr. Gladstone and a few, very few, other public men, kept their heads. Others so far forgot themselves and what was due to the responsibility and the dignity of their position in the State, that it excited comparatively little wonder when, at a Lord Mayor's banquet, the highest of the officers of State, the Lord Chancellor of England, excited tumults of applause by speaking of trampling Cardinal Wiseman's hat under his feet. Now, this may seem a mere digression. But in order to make intelligible what I have to say

opinion, or what seems to them to be a public opinion, against us, and against the carrying on of the works in which we are engaged. But what we have to look to for the success of each such work is not the opinion of the general public, at least of any such public as would be influenced by those foolish declamations. What we look to, here to-day, for instance, is the local opinion of Aughrim street (hear, hear).

THE LOCAL OPINION OF THE PEOPLE OF THIS PARISH,

and of those friends of theirs outside who are ready to help them in this work and to contribute to the expenditure upon it, because, whatever anyone else may think about that work, they at all events know what that work is. They know that it is not only a useful work, but a much-needed one. They know that the expenditure upon it, heavy as that expenditure is, and must be, is in no way, in no sense, extravagant (applause). And knowing all this, their support of the work, and of those engaged in it, may be relied upon with the most absolute confidence. Here is another passage from the same lecture. It is quite in the same sense as those that I have already quoted for you. It keeps to the same typical case of Birmingham and London. "It," he says, "troubled times come on, and the enemy pages, and his many voices go forth from one centre all through England, threatening and reviling us. . . why in that case the Birmingham people will say, 'Catholics are, doubtless, an infamous set.' . . for the Times says so, and the Bishops of the Establishment; and such good authorities cannot be wrong; but somehow an exception must certainly be made for the Catholics of Birmingham. They are not like the rest: they are indeed a shocking set at Manchester and elsewhere; but, however you account for it, they are respectable men here. . ."

BISHOPS, CATHOLIC BISHOPS, ARE TYRANTS.

but always excepting the Bishop of Birmingham, who affects no state or pomp, is simple and unassuming, and always in his work. And, he continues, in like manner, the Manchester people will say, 'Oh, certainly, Popery is horrible, and must be kept down. Still, let us give the devil his due. They are a remarkably excellent body of men here. . . It is very different at Birmingham; there they have a Bishop, and that makes all the difference; he is a Wolsey and all that. . ."

WE DO NOT RECOLLECT WHO ASCERTAINED THIS.

but it was a most respectable man, who was far too conscientious and too charitable to slander anyone. And thus, he concluded, "the charges against Catholics will become

A SORT OF HUNT THE SLIPPER.

everywhere and nowhere, and will end in "sound and fury, signifying nothing." Now, what could be more appropriate in its bearing upon this foolish outcry that has been got up about the building of churches in Ireland. For my part, they may say what they like (applause). Here in Aughrim street, or, to put it more generally, here in Dublin, in so far as it concerns this or any other particular parish, no one whose opinion is worth taking count of will believe them. All their ranting will not lessen the contribution of the people of the place by a single pound, or by a single penny (hear, hear). Possibly from want of knowledge of the facts, some one in Dublin may be led to attach some weight to the

VAGUE, WILD STATEMENTS

about extravagance in church building elsewhere, in some other diocese, in the north, south, east or west of Ireland. Possibly from a similar want of knowledge of the facts, some persons in those other parts of the country may be led to think that the charges so freely made—charges which they know have no truth whatever if applied to themselves or to their own part of the country,—may have something in them as applied to us in Dublin. But out of all this, NO HARM WHATEVER CAN COME. The people elsewhere know their own business. We here know ours. Let that suffice. Our business here, our business to-day, is to stand by

those who have courageously taken upon their shoulders the responsibility of providing this parish with a suitable church, in other words, with a church large enough for the population of the parish, large enough for the requirements of the parish, costly, no doubt, but not costly beyond what a church, a temple raised to the honor and glory of God, and standing in so prominent a place in our city, ought to be. I have no doubt that, as upon all former occasions when you were called upon to do your duty in any such work, the result of to-day's meeting will be one that will give a practical and a fitting answer to your would-be defamers, the would-be, contemptible defamers of the Catholic people of Ireland (prolonged applause.)

Holy Father's Blessing to Little Children.

The following announcement appears in the June number of The Sentinel of the Blessed Sacrament: The Rev. Father Durand, of the Congregation of the Most Blessed Sacrament, having asked His Holiness Pius X. for a special benediction for the young children who would pray each day for the success of the Eucharistic Congress at Rome, received this charming answer, which the Holy Father deigned to write with his own hand below the petition:

"To our dear son, Henry Durand, priest, and to all the little children who, during the days of the Eucharistic Congress at Rome, shall pray at least five minutes before the Most Blessed Sacrament, we grant with the Apostolic Benediction one hundred days (100) indulgence.

"PIUS X., Pope.
The Vatican, April 8, 1905."
The Eucharistic Congress opened in Rome on Thursday, June 1, and closed Tuesday, June 6.

Death of Father Moloney.

The Gaelic movement has suffered a heavy blow through the death of Father Moloney, of London. For a great many years past Father Moloney was a member of the Ard Ceisde of the Gaelic League of London, and it is largely owing to his exertions that the League now enjoys such power and widespread influence in the English capital. Of a refined, gentle disposition, he was not one to force himself into prominence or to seek notoriety for himself for the good works he performed. He was a quiet, silent worker, but he had a wonderful capacity for organization—for enforcing his own earnest enthusiasm into others, and there is no department of Gaelic League work in London which has not profited by his connection with it. It is for his efforts to make the Irish language once more the handmaid of religion that Father Moloney will best be remembered by Gaelic Leaguers.

Writing in the Freeman's Journal on the 17th March about the great Irish celebration in Westminster Cathedral this year, Mr. John O'Keane, who was, as Hon. Sec. of the Gaelic League of London, a co-worker with Father Moloney, and in a position to speak with first hand knowledge, says:—"The man who has, as far as I am aware, done most by the best form of precept, example, to restore the Irish language into the services of the Church, is Father Moloney, the guiding spirit of this celebration. He has been for years a worker in the London Gaelic League, and is well known at the Oireachtas and other Gaelic gatherings. Since Folee Padruig, 1901, the Irish religious celebration has, owing to his efforts, yearly been held in the Dockhead (London) Catholic Church. Though of considerable inconvenience to him in many ways, these events were always a source of gratification to London Gaels, were worthy of the promoter, and, what he valued more, of the occasion itself." It was Father Moloney, too, who organized the series of lectures on Gregorian music delivered in the Belvidere College, Dublin, last year, and who organized the summer school for the study of the Solemn Chant at the Isle of Wight.

THE YEAR IN FRANCE.

[ALVAN S. SANBORN in The Atlantic Monthly.]

A vigorous reassertion of the traditional French abhorrence of delation, in a period which had appeared inclined to tolerate it, has been the most interesting, the most significant and the most reassuring event of the past year in France, whether the point of view be that of national politics or that of national psychology. The French people have got back—thanks to a complete exposure of the French Freemasonry as an agency of political corruption and intrigue—the robust sense of honor which long was theirs, but which, to put it as mildly as possible, had latterly been badly compromised. This change is an unmistakable symptom of complete restoration to health.

The Latin races have always taken exceedingly high ground regarding espionage of every sort except that which is strictly professional. Neither the Latin temperament nor the Latin ethical code based on the Latin temperament admits the right of any man who is not a detective by trade to turn even the worst criminal over to justice. The Latin peoples hold that the role of informer is absolutely incompatible with the character of a gentleman.

A score of years ago a French criminal, Charles Redon, escaped from a French prison and succeeded in crossing the frontier into Spain with his father, by favor of the latter's devotion. Arrived at Valencia, they consulted the leading lawyer of the place. The lawyer betrayed their confidence. He had them imprisoned, and steps were being taken toward their extradition, when the 1350 inhabitants of Valencia rose as one man, with the bishop and prefect at their head, demanded their release, obtained it, and then drove the treacherous lawyer out of the town with imprecations and yells.

More recently, when the notorious Humberts (who were hiding at Madrid) were turned over to the police by a member of the Spanish Royal Academy, Senor Cotarelo, the entire Spanish press denounced his act in no measured terms. Nunez de Arce brought the matter to the attention of the Academy, and several members of the Academy threatened to resign, on the ground that they did not wish to make a part of the same body with M. Cotarelo, who, "being neither a policeman nor a magistrate," had been "guilty of contemptible conduct." The poor, to whom M. Cotarelo offered the twenty-five thousand francs he was given for his revelation by the French authorities, flatly refused to accept it. France (where the offering of a reward for the apprehension of the Humberts had been strenuously objected to) and the rest of Latin Europe, were inexpressibly shocked and disgusted by Senor Cotarelo's action. "On this subject," wrote Charles Laurent at the time, "public opinion will listen to neither raillery nor reason. It is useless to try to gild for it the pill, to attempt to mislead it regarding its own sentiments. Though it may hesitate for a second, it quickly gets its bearings again, and resumes the right path. With us, whoever has played the role of informer is thereafter condemned to resort to a pseudonym if he wishes to enjoy the fruits of his villainy in peace. And in Italy, in Spain, among all the peoples, even the most remote, who are of Latin origin, it is the same—imperiously."

officers and civil functionaries, compared with great pains and infinite attention to detail by a bureau of the Grand Orient specially established and equipped for the purpose, with the help of Freemasons in all sections of France and in all walks of life. These notes concerned themselves with the personal habits and morals, and even with the thoughts of their subjects. They invaded the sanctity of family life. Starting from the false premises that free-thinker and republican are interchangeable terms, and that a person who takes the Sacrament, or even goes to Mass, is necessarily disloyal to the Republic, they blacklisted those officers who profess or practice religion, and called down condign punishment upon them. They pass belief in their pettiness. M. Combes is said to have been deprived of his job a certain river-keeper for the offense of having transported in his boat a member of a religious fraternity from one bank of the river to the other. The surprising thing is, not that M. Combes should have punished the offense, but that he should have learned of the offense. Such an incident indicates better than pages of explanation could the perfection of the Masonic spying system, and shows at the same time that the loyalty demanded in reality by M. Combes was not loyalty to the Republic, which is perfectly consistent with religion, but loyalty to M. Combes, which, it is very true, is not.

A veritable tidal wave of blended indignation and disgust swept over France at M. Guyot de Villeneuve's unsavory revelations, catching up and hurrying along with it hosts of staunch anti-clericals who had hitherto been the warmest supporters of the ministry.

M. Joseph Renach, for instance, said: "That a government has the right to inform itself, by its own agents (its direct agents responsible to it), regarding the loyalty of army officers, no one under any regime has ever contested. But the loyalty of an officer to the government is quite a different thing from his political, philosophical, and religious conscience, which should be an impenetrable domain. Loyalty to the government consists in a respectful attitude toward the constitution and its institutions, and this may very properly be made a matter of discipline. But the right stops there. To go farther is the inquisition."

The country at large had paid relatively little attention to such puerile displays of bigotry and petty spite, to such gratuitous and profitless persecutions, as the removal of religious emblems from the court rooms and of crosses from the cemeteries; the suppression of the Messe Rouge or the Mass of the Holy Ghost for the magistracy; the putting of an embargo, locally, on the wearing of the cassock; the placing of the statue of the skeptic Renan before the Cathedral at Troguier; the exclusion of the Sisters of Charity as nurses from the Invalides and from the marine hospitals; the interdiction of religious processions; the forbidding of soldiers to frequent Catholic clubs and recreation rooms; the abolition of the traditional Good Friday rites in the navy; and the substitution of cold and colorless civil festivals for the picturesque pardons of Brittany.

It had shown very few signs of being excited when the right to take vows and live in common was denied to a large class of French citizens; when an Alsatian abbe was expelled from French territory, before he had uttered a word, because it was assumed that he was going to criticize the ministry; when priests and ecclesiastics were disciplined for allowing monks of the preaching orders to deliver Lenten sermons in their churches; when schoolmasters were encouraged to make their influence not only non-religious, but anti-religious; and when its own monks and nuns, expelled at the point of the bayonet, were welcomed with open arms by non-Catholic countries, as accessions to their material, moral, and intellectual wealth.

(Continued on Page 8.)

ERSKIRTS... cotton, dery, above. hand, throughout.