



**EDITORIAL NOTES.**

WE were not surprised, but really sorry to find a section of our Canadian press defending the "Black Crook." Last week, while that abomination was upon the boards, we refrained from referring to it, but now that the troupe has taken its departure and that the rain and fresh placards will soon efface the immoral decorations of the city walls, we desire to ask the police authorities what they intended doing regarding these posters? It may be true that many of the offensive features of the original "Black Crook" have been eliminated from the play, but that in no way changes the fact that it is essentially immoral, for it is more than suggestive. In any case the ordinary passer-by could not be blind to the posters upon the fences and walls. It would be absolutely impossible to present more immoral, or rather, more immorally suggestive pictures than those posted up by the advertisers of the "Black Crook." We hope that the day will come when our city authorities will have a little shame and will awaken to a sense of what they owe to the citizens who have elected them. If they had even the slightest care for the morals of the people, the innocence of youth, and the respect due to womanhood, they would not allow one of these placards to remain five minutes upon a city wall. But let us hope for better things in the future.

AT LAST the authorities have awakened to the fact that gambling dens exist in this city, and that they are carried on with bare-faced impunity. The recent raid made upon a place in St. Lawrence street created considerable talk and great praise is given to the energetic officials who carried out the operation of closing it up. Without wishing to subtract one iota of the credit due the executors of the law, we cannot well join in a chorus of unqualified glorification. It seems to us that the existence of such a place, under the eyes, and certainly to the knowledge, of the guardians of the city, in no way redounds to the credit of those who are supposed to see to the carrying out of the law. It is a good thing that Saturday's move was made; it would have been better were it made a week sooner; it would be praiseworthy had it been made twenty-four hours after the gambling establishment was first started. It was well known that it existed, and there was no excuse for such a delay of weeks. If the officers did not positively know of it, they had ground for suspicion; and in cases of public morality suspicion is a ground for action and detection. While praising the movement made on Saturday we must condemn the general apathy apparent in all such cases.

IT IS STRANGE how every now and again some sensational case appears in our midst to create a species of consternation among the public and to center attention upon some particular character

whose claims to notoriety are limited to the unfortunate circumstances of a suspected crime. The Burchell, the Borden, the Mann, the Edey and a number of other such like cases have kept alive, for a short period, public curiosity, and today the Hooper case is furnishing food for sensational reports and fuel for the fire of a morbid public anxiety. We believe that the ends of justice would be more readily attained by leaving the case to the paid officials whose duty it is to work it out, and that all those sensational reports only tend to create preconceived opinions in the minds of the men who shall be called upon, eventually, to decide upon the merits of the case. If there is guilt, let it be punished to the utmost rigor of the law; but we have no right to either pre-suppose guilt, nor to say or do aught which might tend to jeopardize the cause of one who may be innocent. It may suit the purpose of sensational papers to fill columns with lengthy accounts of supposed horrors; but it decidedly militates against the action of justice.

ELABORATE accounts are cabled of the very elaborate welcome extended to the officers and men of the Russian fleet, by the officials and citizens of Toulon. It is wonderful how enamoured of the Russians the people of France have become; it is astounding how devoted the happiness of France the Russian potentate is to-day. There is something underneath all this: when we consider the rapidity with which national adoration and national detestation succeed each other in the mind of France, and the grasping, self-seeking bearishness—if such a term exists—of the Russians, we cannot but look upon this sudden outburst of more than international friendship with great suspicion. To-day France is wild with jubilation and Russian flags float from the spires of her cities, her people are in ecstasies over the envoys of the great north-land, they would even prefer Siberian persecution under a Russian guard than liberty and peace under the wing of any other nation's protection; in fine, the Russian is to-day a demi-god in France. To-morrow—and more rapid changes have often taken place when France's political weather-cock was turned by every passing breeze—the memories of Moscow may arise, and every child in France may be taught the words of Napoleon, "Scratch a Russian and you'll find a Tartar." We have no faith in these exaggerated international courtesies. If in this case they are serious, so much the better.

HON. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, M.P., has crossed the Atlantic and has been giving the press reporters some of his views on the burning questions of British politics. It might be expected that this rabid anti-Home Ruler and turn-coat Liberal would say all in his power against Hon. Mr. Gladstone and the prospects of his party. Chamberlain unbosomed himself to a certain extent; he admitted that the

date of the next general election was Mr. Gladstone's secret; but he strove to assure his interviewer that the doom of the Liberal party and of Gladstone's government was irrevocably sealed. Upon what he founds his assertion, or rather prophecy, is more than he can tell and more than any other person can imagine. Mr. Chamberlain is an exceedingly modest man; he says that there is no likelihood of his ever becoming Prime Minister of England. He even goes so far as to give very good reasons why such is impossible. He says, what everyone knows, that to become leader of the Government a man must command a following that is the majority in the House; and he has not even a majority of his own party as a following. This is all very true; it is regrettable for Mr. Chamberlain's sake, but highly encouraging for the interests of Great Britain and Ireland. Mr. Chamberlain was "no prophet in his own country," and it looks very like as if he were devoid of any prophetic inspiration in another land. Despite his off-hand assertions regarding the Home Rule Bill and its future chances, the fact remains that he has been a huge failure as a political prophet in the past, and there is no reason why we should accept his *ipse dixit* against the almost unanimous opinions of wiser, older, less bigotted and less prejudiced men. We fear that Mr. Chamberlain looks at the situation through only one eye, and that is a glass-eye; wherefore his distorted vision and false conclusions. But all these wild statements please Mr. Chamberlain and hurt nobody else, so we trust he will enjoy whatever little consolation there is in reading one's own views in the columns of the great American press.

IN AN ISSUE of the Star, during the last week, an article headed "An Ablegate for Canada," appeared. In the course of the remarks an interview on the subject "with a prominent parish priest" was given. The priest in question is reported to have said: "Another recent occurrence, the enforced resignation of one of the most eminent of our clerical college professors, illustrates the nature of the conflict now going on in the Canadian Church." And further on he said: "The college professor, to whom I have referred, was compelled to resign for no other reasons than that he held opinions which the majority of the corporation considered revolutionary. For example he contended that ecclesiasticism was given too important a place in the curriculum of this college." And again: "Against this the deposed professor persistently protested, and for this, as well as for his radical opinions on matters outside of religion, he was compelled to hand in his resignation." With all due respect to the "prominent parish priest" in question we must differ from him upon this subject. We happen to have been amongst the first pupils of the professor in question. Nineteen years ago he taught the writer in classes of history, literature and French. We were the last of his old students to visit him, the

week before last, in the institution to which he was attached. Then he told us, and in Montreal last week he repeated the same to us, why he had resigned his position as Vice Rector of the University and asked repeatedly that his resignation be accepted. Without breaking a personal confidence we could not make public the causes which led up to his retirement from the high post he held, and to his departure from Canada. But we can say this much that he was not deposed, nor was he compelled to resign, nor were his so-called radical opinions the cause of his withdrawal. Moreover, there is no "conflict going on" in the Canadian Church—if the Catholic Church in Canada is the one referred to. We may, however, state this much, that the said professor withdrew of his own free will, and against the desire and will of the authorities in that institution. Moreover, he had just been re-elected Vice Rector when he sent his resignation to Paris. We refer to this article merely as a matter of justice to the professor in question, because the readers who are unacquainted with the gentleman spoken of and with the circumstances of the case, might be led to believe that he was in some way antagonistic to the Church, and the false impression might be created that he was not in perfect harmony with that sacred institution. The contrary is the truth.

REV. FATHER ELLIOT has commenced his work amongst non-Catholics. On September 18 he opened his missions in Detroit. A correspondent of the Michigan Catholic says:

"The spacious opera house was densely crowded every evening, many being unable to gain admission. Three-fourths of those present were non-Catholics, and the eagerness and attention with which the speaker was favored are living proofs that non-Catholics are anxious to hear the word of God expounded, and ever ready to hear the Catholic doctrine and teachings intelligently explained to them. The following subjects were discussed: "Time and Eternity; or, Does Man Live Forever?" "The Still, Small Voice of Conscience—Whose Voice Is It?" "Intemperance; or, Why I am a Total Abstainer," "Purgatory," "The Man, the Citizen, the Church Member; or, Church and State in America." "Confession, and Why I am a Catholic."

WE received another communication from "Desire," in which the question answered last week is enlarged upon and the one about secret societies is repeated. We received the letter too late to find space for a reply in this issue, but will do our best to satisfy "Desire" in next week's TRUE WITNESS.

THE MYSTERY OF THE NORTH TOWER; OR, THE HIDDEN CRIME.—In next week's issue will appear a notice of a new translation from the French of the Abbe Faure of his celebrated play, entitled "The Hidden Crime." Mr. John Patterson, who has delivered several lectures of note before select audiences in Montreal, has spared no pains in his excellent translation of the play. A synopsis of his production will occupy a space in our next issue. Read it carefully to judge well of its merits.