

couple of days, so as to get to really understand one another before entering on any formal attempt at settlement.' Partly by his personal magnetism and partly by lowering the British ideal as to the treatment of native labor, Mr. Rhodes had done a very great deal towards reconciling the English and the Dutch interests in South Africa, and, as we have said, he was universally trusted. His connection with the Jamieson Raid, however, and the part he played in the Outlander agitation changed all that, and latterly his name was hated by the Dutch element from one end of South Africa to the other. Olive Schreiner, the well-known author, who has lived for many years as teacher and as friend among the Dutch farmers, gave the following vivid account, in a public interview, of the Boer feeling towards Mr. Rhodes.

'Whom, then,' she was asked, 'do they hold responsible for the trouble?'

'It is not Mr. Chamberlain, nor Sir A. Milner, though they say, "He has blackened us." Their anger is reserved for one man, whom they regard as the root of the evil. The whole face will harden at the name Rhodes—"the traitor," as they always term him. Before the matter had fully ripened into war I was talking with an old Boer farmer, a man of substance and of great influence in his district. He put it in this way: "When I think over the matter, it seems to me Rhodes and those men won't be able to make war; for 'our old Lady' has always been good to us and loved justice, and she won't let it be,"'

'Was it altogether Rhodes they blamed?'

'Well, chiefly Rhodes; sometimes the capitalists. They would sum up the discussion thus: "And the root of the matter is Naboth's vineyard—the gold and the capitalists that want it." There can be no doubt that the Boers felt that Mr. Rhodes, who first won their favor by identifying himself with the Afrikaner party, had betrayed them, and the news that "Rhodes is dead," while it evoked unparalleled manifestations of grief in British circles, would bring to the Boers nothing but a feeling of thankfulness and of relief.

Leo XIII. and the Language Movement.

Every people at all worthy of the name has an unquenchable love for its own language and has as much a natural right to the use of it as to the ownership of its own soil. The attempt, by the mere brute force of coercive legislation, to root out in any country the native language of the people can never, in the case of any high-spirited race meet with any permanent success and the only effect of such repression is to leave a legacy of hatred and bitter memories that will never die. Yet this form of repression is a method very commonly adopted by the conqueror to the conquered, by the very strong to the very weak among the nations. It has been adopted in Schleswig-Holstein where Germany, to whom the territory now belongs, has placed the Danish language under a ban though the inhabitants are almost entirely Danes. It has been adopted in Alsace-Lorraine by the same Power where, since its annexation after 1870, the use of French has been prohibited although the inhabitants are largely French and although owing to the position of the province on the border between the two countries the use of French is almost absolutely necessary for trade purposes. Its adoption is also proposed in the Philippines, in regard to which a United States Commission have recently recommended a scheme of government which provides for the absolute extermination of the language of the Tajals and Disayas. But perhaps the most pathetic example of this most hateful form of coercion is to be found in gallant little Poland, a country which is in so many respects the exact counterpart of unhappy Ireland. In Austrian Poland the inhabitants are fairly treated and are allowed the free use of their native tongue. But in Russian Poland and German Poland the Polish language is placed under an absolute ban in the schools, churches, and Courts of Justice. In German Poland the children in the schools are compelled to learn German and strictly forbidden to learn or speak Polish, and as the children thus know no language but German and in many cases the parents can speak nothing but Polish, it often happens that it is actually impossible for parent and child to talk to each other, so that they can know as little of each other's wants and feelings and joys and sorrows as if they had been born dumb. Little wonder that the people resent such a cruel law and that there are such frequent references in our cables to serious outbreaks and riots in German Poland. Of course it is a matter in which the Church cannot very well directly interfere, and the Pope has intimated that he considers it his duty to abstain from giving a formal decision on the controversies that have arisen over the matter. At the same time the Holy Father has shown very unmistakably on which side his sympathies lie, and has done what he can to help the cause of patriotism and freedom. In a letter published in the *Vaterland* of Vienna and addressed to the Bishops of Bohemia and Moravia, his Holiness writes thus:— 'One cause of disunion, especially in Bohemia, may be traced to the languages which the inhabitants speak according to their different descent; for the inclination to love and protect the tongue inherited from his forbears is implanted by nature in

every human being. We adhere to our determination to abstain from a decision of the controversies that have arisen over the matter. Surely the protection of the mother-tongue, so long as it does not exceed certain bounds, deserves no censure; provided always that the common interests of the state do not suffer. It is the duty of the rulers to preserve intact individual rights, in so far as it can be done without trenching on the welfare of the commonwealth. As for us, it is our duty to provide that religion be not jeopardised through such language controversies, for the faith is the chief good of the spirit and the source of all other goods.'

A Word About Chiniquy.

A correspondent writing from Fairfax, Southland, asks us to please state 'What was the cause of Chiniquy's dismissal from the priesthood.' The dishonesty of Chiniquy's character and the unspeakable infamy of his books have been so often and so completely exposed that decent-minded people are rather tired of hearing about him and it is with reluctance that we make even a brief reference to the career of one whose sole mission in life during the last forty years of his existence was to fan and keep alive the flames of bigotry. Our correspondent intimates, however, that an alleged 'dying confession' of Chiniquy's is being widely circulated in his district and is being used as a means of appealing to sectarian passion and working up anti-Catholic feeling in the community and it is perhaps as well therefore that we should say just a word by way of answer to his query. Briefly stated, the cause of Chiniquy's downfall and suspension was intemperance. Although at first remarkable (at least publicly) for his zeal as a teetotaler he afterwards became careless and was suspended for intemperance on September 20, 1851, and again (by the Bishop of Chicago) on August 19, 1856, and November 20, 1856. He was also subsequently expelled by the Chicago Protestant Synod in 1862, 'for fraud and gross swindling.' An American priest, the Rev. Father Brune, of Haverhill, Iowa, writing from personal knowledge, in the *Irish World* of March 2, 1895, gives the following account of Chiniquy:—

'I spent several years in Canada. I saw the place where Chiniquy was born, visited various places where he officiated as a Catholic and afterward as a Protestant minister. I am in possession of unmistakable proofs as to Chiniquy's life and character.

'Chiniquy was born in the town of Kamarouska, Canada, studied at the seminary of Quebec, and was ordained a priest in 1833. He distinguished himself by his talents, as also by his great zeal as a teetotaler. His successes and the consequent honors elated him and caused his fall. He became careless in his duties and soon fell into many irregularities. His trial followed, and on September 28, 1851, he was suspended and deposed. He then left Canada, and for several years loomed up at various places in Illinois, until the Bishop of Chicago, having learned who Chiniquy was, suspended and deposed him again, November 20, 1856. Subsequently Chiniquy travelled to Europe to collect money for a pretended seminary in Chicago and his thirty promising pupils. In 1862 his fraud was discovered, that he had neither seminary nor pupils; he was accused of fraud and gross swindling and rejected or expelled by the Protestant Synod of Chicago. . . . For a few years the Presbyterians managed to get along with him, but soon he was accused of having squandered great sums of money intrusted to his care. He was consequently rejected by the Presbyterians, and wandered about, giving vent to his anger against the Catholic Church that had expelled him.'

★

So much for the occasion of Chiniquy's expulsion from the Church and for the simple facts of his career. As to the infamous and loathsome character of the man, we have at hand abundance of even Protestant testimony, but we have space for only a single specimen. It is from an article written by a Protestant, Mr. F. H. Baker, and published in his paper, the *Halifax Mayflower*, in 1876. The article was written on the occasion of the publication of one of Chiniquy's abominable books, and we make the following extracts:—

'The man's mind seems to be one mass of corruption and grovelling lust. He would impute sinister and impure motives to the very mother of his Saviour—nothing is too holy or sacred for his slime to cover, or his impious hand to clutch. His personal appearance, as we saw him at the Halifax Hotel, was not particularly prepossessing, and now that we have read his book we can quite understand the very deformity of soul that is stamped upon those repulsive features. We ask any man who has the slightest deference or respect for women, who loves his wife and little ones, who almost worships the name of mother, to read Chiniquy's book, and then ask himself if it can be possible if such a viper as this can be received with open arms into the bosom of any church—not only received, but actually ordained as a minister of Christ, and allowed to preach salvation to anything that is made in the image of God—We would not have it on our soul—it would stain it like blood—to publish even in this worldly paper an extract of this vile