

**THE TRUE WITNESS**  
AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT  
No. 761, Craig Street, Montreal, Canada.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION  
Country.....\$1 00  
City.....1 50  
If not paid in advance: \$1.50 (Country) and \$2 (City) will be charged.  
Subscribers, Newfoundland, \$1.50 a year in advance.

WEDNESDAY,.....MAY 18, 1892

**THE TRUE WITNESS.**

His Grace Archbishop Fabre's official organ, *La Semaine Religieuse*, of last Saturday, contains the following:—

"THE TRUE WITNESS, the editorship of which was assumed, some months ago, by Mr. J. K. Foran, is becoming remarkable for its solid and ably written articles on religious and social questions. It pays little heed to politics. The interests which, before all, it defends are those of the Church, and it deems it its duty to give it that encouragement which it merits."

**IRELAND'S CHANCES.**

We have read much and heard more about coercion acts, arms' bills, and a hundred such obstacles cast in the way of Irish Home Rule during the last ten years; but we doubt very much whether ever a more calculated, cold-blooded, determined Anti-Irish policy was ever foreshadowed than the one that seems to be the logical consequence of Lord Salisbury's recent utterances. When Irishmen sought to justify their demands at the Bar of England's parliament they were met with every species of opposition, were crushed by main force and were domineered over by the mere superiority of numbers. When they attempted by other means to enforce their rights they were met with every engine of war that the destructive faculty of man could invent and with persecutions so fearful that the mere narration of the least barbarous would cast into insignificance the most harrowing stories from "Darkest Russia." Then came the day of constitutional agitation; the voice of the people was with the advocates of Home Rule; Scotland and even vast centres in England pronounced in favor of the world—acknowledged justice of the cause; Europe, America and Oceania pleaded with Ireland; times out of mind did her sons knock at the door of the British constitution and appeal to the sense of "fair-play" that Britons claim so loudly to possess. The story is old, and ever new; it requires no repetition here. The nearest to success that Ireland's friends ever came was inside the last decade.

It was only the other day that we called attention to the determined resolutions passed by the Ulster Unionists. They went so far as to promise a rising in arms against any English government that would grant any species of Home Rule to Ireland. A despatch, dated London, 9th May, refers to Lord Salisbury's recent speech in which he not only foretells, but endorses a rebellion of Irish- Protestants in the event of Home Rule being granted to Ireland. His Lordship had many weeks in which to premeditate his speech as grand master of the Primrose league, and Lord Salisbury never says anything that is not carefully premeditated. Both Liberals and Tories acknowledge that the Premier uttered carefully chosen sentences, intended to outline the future as well as to define the past.

Lord Salisbury leaves, no doubt, that if the Liberals could carry the general election, and pass a Home Rule measure in the House of Commons, the House of Lords will throw out the bill, and demand another appeal to the country, on the ground that the electors had not been made aware of the scope and meaning of the measure. He also gives it to be understood that the House of Lords will remain firm in this position, and will look to the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists for support and sympathy. If the House of Lords should be sustained by the crown and the minority of the House of Commons, then there would have to be another general election or a deadlock.

Looking seriously at this new phase of the question, we may ask ourselves, what are Ireland's chances? If, at the next general election, the present ruling party should be returned to power, Home Rule would be relegated to the next century. And even should Mr. Gladstone come in, a bill might be passed; but it would be rejected by the Lords, and another election would have to take place. So, according to Lord Salisbury's programme, "in order to gain Home Rule, its supporters must carry the coming elections, then get a Home Rule Bill through the Commons, then

carry another general election, then pass the Home Rule bill again and finally be prepared to deal with a rebellion in the Province of Ulster."

If this is not opposition, obstruction, unfairness, vindictiveness, systematic tyranny, open disloyal threatenings, and rampant injustice—all combined, then we know not how to qualify such a course and such a ministerial programme. And yet despite Lord Salisbury, and the "Anti-Irish Irishmen" of Ulster, the cause must inevitably triumph. But let no enemy of Home Rule ever again dare to style the Irish "rebels." The only "Irish Rebels," the only disloyal subjects, are in the Black North, in the cradle Orangism!

**THE OXFORD PROFESSORSHIP.**

After the death of the late historian, Professor Freeman, there was considerable speculation as to who would succeed him in the chair of History at Oxford. When it was hinted that Mr. James Anthony Froude was likely to obtain that high honor much comment and much adverse criticisms were heard. The late Professor was, without any doubt, a hard worker, a conscientious man, and a deep historian: Mr. Froude is neither of the three. He is a spasmodic worker, endowed with a knack of parading before the world his superficial views, and passing off—or trying to pass off—for current coin the alloy that he blends into the genuine metal. He is unscrupulous in the extreme, as was clearly demonstrated by the late lamented Dominican orator, the immortal Father Tom Burke. He is not a plodder, but a skipper; he does not study for the sake of erudition, he gallops over the surface and makes all the noise he can for the sake of notoriety. His is not the disposition suitable for a calm, pains-taking, steady Professor. He loves the platform too much. He could never spend his nights in preparing lectures to be delivered daily before a set number of students; there is not fame enough in that kind of life for Mr. Froude. He would prefer to spend his days reading the press reports of his lectures and gleaming subject matter for fanatical harangues to be delivered at night to audiences that shout and clap hands.

We thought, at first, that we might be somewhat misjudging the world-renowned defeated gladiator in the great Froude-Burke controversy; but a recent despatch from London, England, dated the 7th May, proves that our estimate of that peculiar genius has not been very far from the mark. The despatch in question says: "It is doubtful whether Mr. James Anthony Froude will accept the Professorship of History at Oxford University that was recently offered to him. He says that he was not aware of the conditions attaching to the professorship, requiring the incumbent's residence at the University, and neither was he aware of the number of lectures required."

Exactly! How could Mr. Froude reside in Oxford University and at the same time run about the world abusing the Church of Rome? He would have to give up either the one occupation or the other. It is passing strange that such an eminent historian should be ignorant of the amount of work that falls to a Professor's share. He must never have followed a University course; or, if he did, he must have been a very indifferent attendant. His actions, in the world of letters, would indicate that he had never been in even a common school where elementary history is taught. It is very likely that he considered his own importance, and concluded that Oxford, for the mere honor of having James Anthony Froude upon the list of its Professors, would establish a sinecure for his benefit. It is a sad thing that Professors of History in great Universities should be obliged to study, to work, and to earn their honors and salaries like other poor mortals. We are sorry for Mr. Froude: but we hope he will find some more congenial occupation some place else.

**CATHOLIC MISSIONS.**

It is a matter of modern history that the Catholic missionaries have been the pioneers of Christianity in every land. Let the ministers of other denominations go where they liked, they always found the traces of the Catholic priests, their predecessors in the fields of missionary labor. On the burning sands of the torrid zone, and on the eternal snows of the Arctic regions, the impress of Catholic missionaries' feet have been left. And to-day they are carrying out the command of Christ, as faithfully and as heroically as ever did the martyred heralds of Faith in past centuries. There is even a more remarkable heroism about some of the Catholic priests of this day than about the men who led the Crusades. There is always a certain encouragement in the martial music, in the tramp of armed men, in the grandeur and panoply of war to sustain the soldier who advances to death or glory; but where is the display, the pomp, the attractions that support, or cheer the man who leaves his home to bury himself in ob-

livion amongst the Indian tribes, or to go beyond all reach of civilization in the lands where cannibalism still exists? It is brave to rush against an array of bayonets, or up to the muzzles of a battery, under the eye of a commander who holds the coveted decoration, the great and all important reward that a soldier craves. But it is sublimely heroic to leave all the allurements of the world, to walk, at the voice of conscience or at the command of a spiritual superior, into the home of the lepers, and there close the portals, for all time, upon this world, and face a certain death, and a death of a most terrible kind, and all for the sake of souls that God had created and that Christ had died to save. We read of missionaries of other Christian bodies who go into every land, and who suffer fearful privations, in order to carry the Bible to the heathen; but we never read of them, or hear of them taking such a step as a Damien and his successors took. Moreover, these envoys of other denominations have their family ties that bind them in such a manner that it would be impossible, no matter how willing they may be, for them to go so far on the road of sacrifice. A minister dare not bring his family into the land of the lepers; he cannot cut himself off from his family to go there alone, for he would be obliged to remain away forever. The wise, as well as sacred rule of Catholic ecclesiastical celibacy, meets such a case as this one and the application proves the wisdom of the rule.

Yes! all over the wide world the Catholic Church is performing prodigies of valor in the persons of the priests and nuns. The London Tablet of the 23d April, has a beautiful letter by one of her Majesty's Commissioners on the Gold Coast to Mr. G. B. M. Coore, of London, England; it speaks for itself, and we think it well deserving of reproduction, for it substantiates all we could say in praise of Catholic missions.

"You ask me about missions here. The Catholic clergy are doing a noble work. Undismayed by malarial sickness, which, alas, too often carries off their most valued men, the priests are extending their mission throughout the colony with signal success. Elmina, an old Portuguese town is the missionary headquarters, and there as well as at Cape Coast and Quillaba on the Togoland frontier, active work is being carried on with rare energy in this exhausting climate by devoted priests who win the confidence of the faithful, and are respected as excellent managers and untiring zeal. Nor are the Sisters of Charity less worthy of commendation. A native Protestant of position recently mentioned to me that he had sent his daughter to the Convent school as a boarder for he knew that his little girl would be well taught and kindly treated there. He is reported as an excellent manager as well as an officer of great executive ability. It is the wish of the Prefect-Apostolic to open a mission at Accra, the metropolis of the colony, with a pagan population of 23,000. He would, I know beglad of pecuniary aid from home."

Next week we propose saying a few words more on the subject of Catholic missions and missionaries; but from another point of view.

**AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.**

In the good old days, before the electric inventions had almost annihilated space, we looked just as anxiously as we do to-day, for transatlantic news; but when it came we were sure of what we got, because it was full and satisfactory. To-day we receive, by cable, despatch after despatch, and as a rule they are necessarily curtailed, at best giving only a skeleton of the story desired to be conveyed, and leaving to the imagination of the recipient the task of clothing it with the flesh and skin, or to his patience the ordeal of awaiting "further explanations."

There has been, of late, a most important question pending before the courts of Rome, one which has caused considerable discussion in the United States and Canada, and one which touches upon a vital spot in the Catholic system of education. In two words it is the *enquete* upon the merits and demerits of the Faribault system, which has for object the changing of the existing mode of separate schools. Conflicting are the opinions upon the subject and divers the theories that have taken life out of this gigantic controversy. The despatches from Rome indicate that the matter has been decided upon, but exactly in what manner we cannot say; at best it is but conjecture to base an opinion upon the meager information that has been furnished by cable. As yet we do not know, nor can we know until a full official report of the case is made, accompanied with the text of the judgment, in what form the question was laid before the authorities in Rome. Perhaps Archbishop Ireland merely submitted the Faribault plan itself; perhaps the Faribault plan is only a part of a more extensive system; perhaps the reserved case or cases, spoken of in one despatch, refer to such portion of a vast scheme; in fact, until the minutes of the case are transmitted, with the decision, to the proper authorities on this side of the Atlantic, it would be useless to attempt any comments upon the special merits or demerits of the questions submitted to Rome.

However, when the time comes, and when the full and authentic reports of the whole case shall be received, by those who are immediately interested in the investigation, and when such persons

shall deem it expedient to make public the full details of the decision of Rome, we shall feel it time to enter upon the subject and give our readers an impartial review of the important question. Until then let us be patient!

**RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.**

During the past couple of months a religious controversy upon a dozen or more questions has been going on between a score of writers in one of our daily contemporaries. Already, on different occasions, we expressed our disapproval of that kind of guerilla warfare, and strove to point out the utter futility of such polemical fencing. In a number of the Daily Witness of last week a letter appeared signed by a Catholic who has been a reader of that paper for twenty-five years: that letter seems to us to contain a fund of common sense and a great number of truths. Its writer never knew of converts being made through means of newspaper arguments; neither did any one else ever know of such results to flow from a religious discussion of that nature; but we have all known and felt the effects of the bitterness, hard-feelings, uncharitableness, and enmities that spring into existence at the wizard-breath of religious newspaper controversies. If the subject under discussion could be limited, and the number of gladiators on either side agreed upon, there might be some chance of at least following intelligently and profitably the different arguments brought forward; but such is not and never will be the mode of procedure.

There is another point that strikes us as very strange,—it is the fact that neither party can see any good in an opponent or any error in his own case. Surely no greater master in the art of controversy ever existed upon this continent than the late Dr. Brownson; and in an article, written in 1855, upon "Liberalism and Socialism," he says: "We wish now to draw attention to what they have that is true. All systems, however erroneous or false, as we have intimated in the foregoing article have an element of truth, because the human intellect, being created in the image of the Divine and made for the apprehension of truth, can never operate with pure falsehood. To rightly comprehend a system is not simply to detect its errors. We understand not even an erroneous system till we understand its truth; and its real refutation lies not so much in detecting and exposing its fallacies as in detecting, distinguishing, and accepting the truth which it misapprehends, misinterprets, or misapplies." How few of those controversialist letter writers ever dream of taking that view of the matter! Error is in the defect of truth, and evil in the defect of good. We must say this or assert falsehood as a real entity and evil as a positive principle, and thus fall into Manichæism. "If man cannot embrace pure falsehood," continues Brownson, "nor will what under some aspect is not good, it follows that in every erroneous or mischievous system there is and must be an aspect of truth and goodness, and it is only under this aspect that the system is dear to its adherents. If we wish to produce a favorable effect on them, and to refute their system for their sake, we must begin, not by denouncing their error, but by showing them that we recognize and accept their truth." We would respectfully ask our friends, who seemingly read the Bible more for the purpose of getting arrows to fire at the opposite party than for any other object, to try the task of hunting up the truth—no matter how small it may be—that the other side possesses. Upon the several questions of controversy into which the original one developed, the public and the contending parties have had enough of the evils, the wickedness, the corruption, the thousand and one errors and wrongs of each other's theories; now, could they not let us have a few of the virtues, good qualities, perfections, fragments of truth, and rays of light that most certainly should not be completely ignored?

There was a custom amongst the Indians to have horse races, in which the last horse won the day. Each contending party rode his neighbor's horse, so that each one urged the animal with all his might, in order that his own horse would be the last and consequently victorious. This plan of reversing the usual rule of racing created considerable amusement for the "stoic of the woods, the man without a tear." Now, could not our religious controversialists try a similar style for the amusement of their readers? The old regular plan is getting too monotonous; just set to work and let us see which party can say the most good of his opponent, and can find the most hidden truth under his foeman's cloak. The idea is novel; the plan very simple: the interest of the public would go up like a rocket!

Mr. W. F. Maclean, Conservative, was elected member for East York by 227 majority, over Ald. Leslie, the Reform candidate.

King Humbert of Italy has accepted the Rudini cabinet's resignation.

**ROME'S DECISION.**

In another column, under the heading "An important question," we refer to this case, that has of late created so much discussion in Catholic circles. Last week we spoke somewhat strongly of the treatment to which Archbishop Ireland had been subjected by persons who evidently had not thoroughly understood his plans nor grasped his ideas. Our remarks have created considerable comment, especially those in which we predicted his triumphal return to America. The following is the full text of the deliverances of the Vatican in regard to the attitude of the Holy See towards Archbishop Ireland's educational policy, as set forth in what is known as the Faribault-Stillwater (Minnesota) plan.

Before giving this document in full, we wish to explain that if we wrote somewhat indignantly of the opposition made to the Archbishop, and of the severe and unjustifiable criticisms to which he was subjected, it was upon a general principle that we expressed ourselves. We do not believe, we never will believe, nor will we ever countenance premature censurings of the prominent members of the Catholic hierarchy. When Rome decides upon a question submitted by an Archbishop to its tribunal, we bow and accept that decision without a protest; and before that judgment is given, we believe in awaiting in patience its announcement. It is a wrong, a dangerous and an unfair thing to subject an eminent prelate to harsh criticism, even if we do not agree with all his ideas or plans. He may have reasons that we are not acquainted with, he may be governed and surrounded by circumstances that we do not appreciate. Therefore we say that when a dignitary of the Church makes an exceptional move, and appeals to Rome for a decision upon his course, it is the duty of a Catholic, of a Christian, of a fair-minded man, to await that pronouncement; and in no case—unless one of patent, glaring perverseness—should we question the motives or good intentions of the individual. This letter of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda explains itself.

ROME, April 30, 1892.

To Most Rev. JOHN IRELAND, Archbishop of St. Paul, Minn.

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVEREND SIR—It has pleased Your Grace to submit to the judgment of the Holy See the arrangement you deemed well to make for elementary schools at Faribault and Stillwater, Minn., in your diocese, in order to provide in the best manner possible for the spiritual welfare of the children confided to your pastoral care.

This wise resolution of Your Grace seemed all the more prudent because the aforesaid arrangement, even though it regarded only separate and exceptional cases, still appeared to many of the bishops, to the members of the lower clergy and to many worthy of approval, may be because they were not as well acquainted with the circumstances and conditions of the transaction as they ought to have been in order to have been able to pronounce thereon a fair opinion.

For that reason His Holiness confided the examination of this important question to a committee of cardinals chosen from the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. In a meeting held on the 21st inst., after weighing carefully the grave reasons adduced by Your Grace with so much clearness, which induced you to enter into the arrangement mentioned above, and considering the declarations worthy of every praise, which show that in the matter of education Your Grace has always wished to maintain inviolate the principles set forth by the Holy See and commended to the observance of the bishops by the councils of Baltimore, particularly the Third Council. Their Emnities gave their decision on the question submitted to them as it was found in the accompanying document and His Holiness has ratified and approved the same.

I hope Your Grace will be gratified by this decision of the Holy See, because, though unusual provisions made by the different bishops in their respective dioceses according to the requirement of circumstances cannot be approved directly by the Holy See when they imply a departure, to a certain extent, from a general law, nevertheless, when the Holy See declares that such provisions may be tolerated, it thereby puts an end to all indirect attacks upon them.

Furthermore, by order of His Holiness and with great pleasure to myself, I must not fail to inform Your Grace that your expressions of respect, filial obedience and unalloyed adherence to the Holy See and its teachings, of which you have given splendid proofs, have been acceptable to the sovereign Pontiff and myself, and have strengthened the full confidence of the Holy See in your wisdom and piety.

Finally, I pray that God may preserve Your Grace and protect you always.

Your Grace's most devoted servant,

M. CARD. LE DOUOVSKI, Prefect.

IGNATIUS, Archbishop of Damiatina, Secretary.

In special congregation of the Propaganda, held on the 21st of April, 1892; to consider the question what judgment is to be formed of the arrangement entered into by Archbishop Ireland concerning the two schools at Faribault and Stillwater, Minn., in this case, they decided from the decrees of the councils of Baltimore on parochial schools, that the arrangement entered into by Archbishop Ireland, concerning the schools at Faribault and Stillwater, taking into consideration all the circumstances, can be tolerated. In an audience held on the same day His Holiness declared that he approved the resolution of the cardinals given above.

IGNATIUS, Archbishop of Damiatina, Secretary.

**THE PORT SURVEYORSHIP.**

In the pending case of the appointment of a successor to the late Mr. Lewis, Port Surveyor of Montreal, an act of great injustice has nearly been consummated. Mr. O'Hara, the Deputy Collector of Customs, who is not only an applicant for the place, but who is entitled to it, by reason of length of service and right of promotion, has been almost set aside, at the last moment, for Mr. Boyer, the Tide Surveyor of this port. Should

such take place it would be an unheard-of injustice and an unwarranted humiliation to the most efficient officer that the Customs Department has ever had in Montreal.

When Mr. Lewis died every one expected that Mr. O'Hara would succeed him and that not a word of protest would be heard. In fact not one of the higher officers made application, for the reason that they all deemed it would be useless and unfair. Hon. Mr. Bowell, ex-minister of Customs, on the recommendation of our City members, submitted to Council the appointment of Mr. O'Hara. Things had reached that stage, when the Hon. Mr. Chaplani, having recovered from his recent illness, assumed the place of Minister of Customs. He was at once met with a petition, or application from Mr. Boyer for the position in question. That application was signed by several gentlemen who would never have given their names, had it not been that they thought Mr. O'Hara occupied a superior office to the one sought after. At once Mr. O'Hara's appointment was blocked. As soon as the leading importers knew the true state of the case, inside of twenty-four hours they sent a petition to Ottawa to insist on justice being done to Mr. O'Hara. And of these petitioners the leaders were French-Canadians.

For twenty-six years Mr. O'Hara has been in the service; for over twenty-four years he has been actually, if not in name, the Deputy Collector; he has drilled and instructed the two thirds of the officers of the department here during a quarter of a century; he has been instrumental in the promotion and appointment of a score of French Canadian officers superior in rank to Mr. Boyer, and over whose heads that gentleman seeks to climb: he has a positive right to the place and the appointment of any one else, over his head, would not only be unjust to him, but to seven or eight other efficient and deserving men in the same department. Such an act, if consummated, would create no end of trouble and would be fruitful of most deplorable consequences. We hope that it is not too late to check the accomplishment of this great act of unqualified unfairness. Mr. O'Hara is an Irish Catholic, of Canadian birth, who speaks and understands the French language as he does his mother-tongue, who has been the unselfish friend of his French-Canadian fellow officers in the Customs, and in the name of fair play and simple justice we ask, as an Irish Catholic organ, that he be treated according to his strong and legitimate claims.

**A HOME RULE RESOLUTION.**

Notice of the following Home Rule Resolution was given, in the House of Commons, at Ottawa, by Mr. C. R. Devlin, the member for the County of Ottawa, on last Friday.

"That in the opinion of this House of Commons of Canada the time has arrived when a substantial measure of home rule should be granted to Ireland, and this House expresses the hope that at the approaching election in the United Kingdom a majority will be returned to Parliament pledged to enact a measure which, while safeguarding the unity and interest of the British Empire, will satisfy the legitimate and national aspirations of its Irish people by granting to them a parliament with jurisdiction over all matters of a local nature."

Naturally the public will expect, from an Irish Catholic organ like the *True Witness*, an expression of opinion on the subject. We are prepared to give an emphatic opinion; it is to the effect that such resolution is very untimely, inopportune and dangerous to the interests of the cause it purports to assist. Thrice, already, have Home Rule resolutions been carried in the Canadian House of Commons, and thrice have the people of this Dominion expressed themselves, through their parliamentary representatives, in favor of a full measure of self-government for Ireland. This action, on the part of the young member for Ottawa County, tends most certainly to jeopardize the beneficial effects of the former emphatic resolutions. A defeat to-day; or even a resolution carried by a smaller majority than the former ones, would be tantamount to an expression of feeling adverse to the Irish cause.

If the public is rightly informed the mover of this new resolution sprang his notice of motion upon the House without ever having consulted any of his Irish parliamentary colleagues. If it is urged that he did consult with Irish members of his own party, then, it would seem to be for partisan purposes he has taken the step, and for the sake of local political capital, he did not hesitate to risk the interests of a cause too sacred, to every serious Irishman, to be made a play-toy or shuttle-cock. If he did not consult with any of the Irish members in the House of Commons, it is to say the least very imprudent.

It is not necessary that every new member—of Irish extraction—should commence his career with a display of Irish patriotism, and a set speech, whether the occasion requires them or not, whether his action is judicious or injudicious?

In presence of recent deplorable events, which each one, in his own sphere, is striving to consign to oblivion; in the face of the existing divisions at home, and the impending election; under the