

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)

At No. 761 Craig St., Montreal, Canada.

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 1758.

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 renewals and new subscriptions should be sent to Managing Director, P. O. Box 1758.

You may remit by bank check, post office money order, express money order or by registered letter. Silver sent through the mail is liable to wear a hole through the envelope and be lost.

We are not responsible for money lost through the mail.

Discontinuance.—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 on 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, FEBRUARY 6, 1895.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. J. P. Tardivel of La Verite, in his chapter entitled "Causerie sur l'Education" in his issue of last week, falls foul of L'Electeur on the question of the dual language. It appears that the latter journal contends that, willing or not, the language of the millions (English) must be spoken by French-Canadians; in fact, that it is more important than the French language in the general affairs of life in this epoch and in Canada. Mr. Tardivel is of opinion that useful as the English language is (and he admits its great utility and almost necessity) the French Canadian should give the preference to his mother tongue. We agree with Mr. Tardivel. As far back as 1886 we publicly advocated the same idea, and since we have had no reason to regret so doing or change our opinion.

On both sides examples are given; there are dozens of prominent Canadians who speak equally both languages; there are also scores of successful men, in the Church, on the Bench, in the Profession and in the State, as well as in Commerce, who know only one language, and who speak English quite imperfectly. L'Electeur may be more utilitarian; La Verite is certainly more patriotic and sensible. By all means let the French-Canadian child be taught English; it will be a most important factor in his education, and will serve to level the road he has to travel down the years of his future; but commence by teaching him his mother tongue, by making him speak and thoroughly understand the French. Let it be so stamped upon his mind and planted in his heart that forever it must hold the first place, and all danger of its ever being effaced or uprooted is obviated. He has time enough, if he have the talent, the opportunity, the inclination,

or if he sees the necessity to study the language which will complete his education and polish off his future; but if his mother tongue is neglected from the cradle, experience has proven that he will have certain difficulty in learning it properly later on, and he will find that his inclinations to preserve and perpetuate the chief safeguard of his nationality have diminished to an alarming degree.

What is man? A being created by God, and consisting of two elements—a body and a soul. Perfect as the body may be, let the soul depart from it and you have only a corpse, a mass of clay that a few hours must reduce to ashes. A nation is the aggregate of individuals; and a nation consists of a material body and spiritual elements. In this country the English language gives expression to the solid body of the nationhood. In every part of the world it is understood; it is the language of commerce, of progress, of invention. But the French represents the spirit of the nationhood; it is the language of arts, sciences, philosophy, literature, religion; it is above all the diplomatic language of the universe. Take away the French language and you destroy the spirit that animates that being called a nation, a people.

Moreover, the French language is the medium whereby thousands of the most useful, the sweetest, the loftiest, the most inspiring ideas that the world has ever known, are embalmed for the use and admiration of untold generations. Let the French-Canadian child forget or learn indifferently his mother tongue and he will grow up without a perfect knowledge of English and without any knowledge of the perfections and beauties of the French. He will soon affect to despise his mother tongue, and, after the example of a number who went to the United States (and who are now glad to get back) he will find himself in turn contemned by his own people and laughed at by the English-speaking race. Some have even gone so far, in their insane desire to pass for Americans or English, as to translate their very names. Not long ago in Chicago one Magloire L'Everque, told a magistrate that he was Mr. Myglory the Bishop.

No matter how high the position to which a French-Canadian may aspire, in the Church, or in the professions, in public life, or in business, let him remember that the more perfectly he knows the language of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Corneille, Racine and Lamartine, the more likely is he to become an adept in that of Bacon, Cuthbert, Macaulay, Shakespeare, Milton and Longfellow. Besides, as a Catholic, he must know that the French laws and French language are the two pillars that protect the religious and national institutions from falling beneath the strength of the Sampson of Anti-Catholicity.

WE HAVE already spoken of our St. Patrick's Day Souvenir Number. We are anxious to add a new feature to this publication. If the colleges and convents would get their best and most clever pupils to write short essays upon the feast, either from a religious or a national standpoint, or from both, and each institution send us the most able production, we will publish the same, with the pupil's name and portrait. But we must also get the photograph of the pupil, and have the material in before the 16th of this month. The composition should not exceed a column and a half. We have several times made similar offers and no attention was paid to them; and yet our institutions wonder why the press is not more liberal with the young. We had to give up the youths' column of letters, simply because there was only one school that took

advantage of it. It is too bad to be obliged to force opportunities upon those who so loudly clamor for them when they do not exist.

A QUESTION OF POMP.

We have had many occasions to criticize Professor Goldwin Smith for his very prejudiced expressions of opinion concerning the Catholic Church, Irish questions and Canada; but we have never hesitated to give credit to that able writer whenever he happened to appear rational in his effusions. A couple of weeks ago we pointed out how exact he was in his criticism of Froude, this week we can heartily approve of some ideas expressed in his recent letter to the London Advertiser. Speaking of the movement so generously set on foot to provide for the family of the late lamented Premier, Professor Smith says: "Sir John Thompson's family have a fair claim, not only on our sympathy, but on our justice. Sir John had been compelled, in conformity with the social requirements and the present scale of living at Ottawa, to expend on ministerial hospitalities more than, with his salary, he could afford. The mimic court at Ottawa inevitably leads to expensive habits. Years after the departure of Lord Dufferin, who was the real creator of this court, it was said that the narrow purses of clerks in Government departments were still feeling the effects of his reign."

Whether Lord Dufferin is to blame for the extravagance to which this system gave rise is a question open to debate, but the cold fact remains that more domestic trouble and financial ruin have been caused by this semi-regal state of social entertainment than could easily be calculated. To such a degree had it come at the Capital, that nobody was "anybody" who had not received an invitation to Rideau Hall. And for very many of the citizens such an invitation was the forerunner of another and more emphatic

"Billet-doux,
With Queen Victoria's compliments,
Requesting one pound two."

We know cases in which men were obliged to launch into a very vortex of debt in order that their wives and daughters should assist at a reception, or ball, and that their names should appear in the morning Citizen as members of what society calls the elite. Imagine a poor fellow, who is trying to eke out an existence on a salary of six or seven, or even nine hundred dollars a year, spending the third of his pittance on the necessary dresses and accompanying requirements, rather than have his name and those of his family members omitted in the reports of the opening and closing of the House, the vice regal receptions and balls. And yet he feels that he must either incur that expense or else find himself outside the social circle. He is "between the devil and the deep sea;" ruinous obligations on the one hand and social ostracism on the other. We have known several who paid as high as ten per cent per month to money-lenders, in Ottawa, in order to secure the sufficient amount to settle millinery and dress-making bills. The money had to be got because credit would not be given; experience taught the tradespeople many severe lessons. On whom does the blame fall for all this? On the victims of the system. On whom should it fall? On the promoters and encouragers of that system.

In concluding his letter Goldwin Smith hits some very hard raps and uses expressions that might be somewhat qualified, but which, in a general application, are very timely. He says: "It is wonderful that self-respecting people can take

part in such a performance, at which they may be sure the pages are tittering all the time and their Excellencies themselves will laugh when all is over." This sentence follows a most sarcastic description of the "Montreal State Drawing-Room," a description that we do not deem it necessary to reproduce. The Professor then adds: "The genuine thing in the old country has at least the grace of antiquity, while the performers do not need a posture-master to teach them how to courtesy. But what can the imitation among us generate except vanity and funkeyism, together with the habits of expenditure, which have left the family of a prime minister in want of public assistance?"

We are not quite as democratic as the multi-phased professor, especially when he goes into raptures over American institutions as contrasted with those of Canada; but we cannot help admitting that he is not far wrong in his estimate of the true value and results of the miniature pomp and court life that our citizens are induced to adopt. Of course Mr. Smith sees everything perfect in Washington; but he must forget that "like causes" over there produce "like effects;" and that even without the excuse that we have the inhabitants of the American capital from the same social extravagance and rivalry. Much as our American cousins may boast their democratic principles, their practice falls short of the mark; moneyed aristocracy drives them into the same groove. In Canada—as a general rule—the words of Burns apply to our people:

"The rank is but the guinea-stamp,
The man's the man for a' that."

"WAGES CONTRASTED."

In the Brooklyn Eagle, of January 24, Mr. Francis Wayland Glen has a very telling letter on the subject of "Wages." Evidently the recent trolley line difficulties in that city gave the writer of that communication occasion to express the views that he ably sets forth. With a considerable portion of the letter we are not immediately concerned as it is altogether local to Brooklyn in the matters treated. But there are a few general facts laid down that may serve as a basis of argument, in any city where the trolley system is in use, in favor of more substantial compensation for men at whose hands the lives of citizens are constantly at stake. The following paragraph, for example, may find its application even in our own city:

"A mechanic in a machine shop receives from \$2.50 to \$3.50 for ten hours for running the lathe. For eight hours of the ten he stands or walks by it and simply looks on. A carpenter receives \$4 for ten hours, and a stone mason from \$4 to \$5 for ten hours. They do not receive too much. A motorman works with his hands and feet, his eyes and his brain, without a moment's intermission, to earn \$3 in twelve hours. It is seldom that he has ten rods of clear track ahead of him. He is responsible every moment for human life. It is bare faced robbery to ask him to render that service for laborers' wages."

Leaving aside the exact figures, for they do not altogether agree with the rates of wages in Montreal, we can heartily commend the writer for his remarks regarding motormen and the salaries that their responsible position should command. It is totally unnecessary to go into details concerning all the difficulties these men have to meet and coolly overcome. Any person who travels on our street cars, especially in winter, has only to take a front seat a few times, and to watch the operation of guiding, checking, starting and controlling the car, to be convinced of the fact that the man, on whose action so many lives may at any moment depend, is