

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY,
AT
761 CRAIG STREET.
M. W. KIRWAN—EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
Terms—\$2.00 per annum—in Advance

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3.

CALENDAR—APRIL, 1878.

WEDNESDAY, 3—Feria.
First Baptism by St. Patrick in Ireland, 433.
THURSDAY, 4—St. Isidore, Bishop, Confessor, and Doctor of the Church.
Oliver Goldsmith died, 1774.
FRIDAY, 5—Most Precious Blood of Our Lord.
Battle of Cappelouin, 1645.
SATURDAY, 6—St. Vincent Ferrer, Confessor, (April 5).
SUNDAY, 7—PASSION SUNDAY.
Treason-Felony Bill introduced by Sir G. Gray, 1848.
MONDAY, 8—Feria.
TUESDAY, 9—Feria.
Thomas Addis Emmet imprisoned at Fort George, 1798.

THE VOLUNTEERS.

ST. JEAN BAPTISTE VILLAGE
INFANTRY COMPANY.

THE MEMBERS OF THE ABOVE COMPANY
WILL ASSEMBLE AT THE...

QUEBEC GATE BARRACKS,
(DALHOUSIE SQUARE).

To-morrow (THURSDAY) Evening,
At 7.30.

M. W. KIRWAN,
Captain Commanding.

NOW READY.

"LA CAMPAGNE IRLANDAISE."

REMINISCENCES OF THE

FRANCO-GERMAN WAR,

By W. M. KIRWAN.

To be had at DAWSON BROTHERS, Montreal. Price, in Paper, 75 cents; in Cloth, \$1.

Mr. Patrick Costello is authorized to collect monies, solicit subscriptions and advertisements for this office. He will, this week, call upon those of our subscribers who are in arrears.

THE PROPOSED CATHOLIC DAILY.

At the conclusion of a retreat in St. Bridget's Church, Dorchester Street, on Sunday last, the Rev. Parish Priest, Father Lonergan, having invited his parishioners to assist the Daily paper project, they responded with some effect, and subscribed \$226.00, of which \$108.50 in cash were handed to the Rev. Jas. Brown, as Treasurer for the fund. The remainder is over good names. The list is not ready for publication. One gentleman offers \$500.00 bonus if a few others will do the same.

THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS.

We beg to call the attention of our readers to the explanation of the Catholic School Commissioners in reply to some charges made by the Mayor and some Aldermen in the City Council against them. This explanation we publish in another column, and it clearly defines the position of the School Commissioners towards the Mayor and the Corporation of the city. It quotes the Act of Parliament which shows that the Commissioners are in no way under the control, or responsible to the Corporation of Montreal. In fact the Corporation has nothing to do with them, and whatever action it may, as a body take, it does so gratuitously and can in no way effect the Catholic School Commissioners. As rate-payers each member of the Corporation has, like every other rate-payer, a right to discuss the affairs of the School Commissioners, the same as any other public institution, but as a Corporation, the members only spend the time of the public in discussing a question with which they have nothing whatever to do. The School Commissioners publish annually, according to law, a statement of their receipts and expenditure for the information of the rate-payers, beyond that they are answerable only to the superintendent of Education for the Province of Quebec. From him there is an appeal to the Council of Public Instruction, and if the rate payers have any fault to find with the management of the School Board, their only course is to petition the Superintendent of the Province of Quebec for an enquiry into the management of the School Funds. If such an enquiry was instituted some members of the Corporation might be appointed on it and this course is the only one which can be legally pursued. We have been informed that some petitions have been presented to the Corporation to institute an enquiry into the management of the School Fund, but as the Corporation has no power, either to institute, or to cause to be instituted, such an enquiry, we hope the School

Commissioners will pay no attention to anything that comes to them from such a source. The Catholic School Commissioners have nothing to fear from an enquiry. Their schools are an ornament and an honour to Canada; and they have done more within the last ten years to forward education, particularly commercial education, in this Province, than had ever been done before. Instead of embarrassing them by petty jealousies and vexatious petitions, it behoves all good citizens to give them all the support which their successes and their labours justly entitle them to. We hear nothing of the sacrifices made by some of these devoted men for the benefit of this institution, the Gold Medals and cash given in perpetuity by two commissioners, amounting to \$250 a year, while another commissioner who visited the United States and Quebec, year after year in order to acquire knowledge of the various systems and the passing of the various laws, refused to accept even his travelling expenses, amounting to several hundred dollars. On the board their always have been a representative from the *Evêché* and the *Seminary*, and this fact alone, ought to be a sufficient guarantee of the honesty of the Commission.

THE VOLUNTEERS.

HEADQUARTERS:
1ST OR PRINCE OF WALES REGT.
VOL. INFANTRY OF CANADA.
MONTREAL, March 30th, 1878.

To the Editor of the True Witness:

Sir,—The attention of the Lieut.-Col. Commanding having been called to a paragraph in your issue of 27th inst., viz: "In Montreal it is well known that the fife and drum band, of the Prince of Wales Battalion, is the band of the Orange Young Britons in uniform." I am directed by him to express his sincere regret, that such a statement should be made, and to inform you that the paragraph in question is distinctly untrue. Not one individual member of the 1st "Prince of Wales" Regt., band, belongs, or is attached to any other band in the Dominion. It is plain that the effect of such paragraphs is to foster a spirit of disloyalty and distrust, among the Catholic members, who have joined the Regt. during the past year, whereas the aim of the officers has been to break down all differences regarding religion, and cultivate but one feeling, that of loyalty towards the Crown.

With respect to the contemptible allusions to the Sergeants Mess Reading Room, no notice would be taken of it; were it not to inform you, that it also is to be moved into larger rooms, more suitable, and necessary, for the increasing patronage they now receive from members of other corps, and the public generally.

I have &c,

Yours, S. KINNEAR,

Lieut. & Adj. 1st. "Prince of Wales" Regt.

Time after time we refused to believe that the information supplied us was true: at last, however, our informants declared themselves to be so positive, that we accepted their statements. We frankly confess that the letter we publish is to us proof that we have been misinformed, and perhaps it is better that the rumour should be thus publicly made, and publicly denied. We would say more, but if we did we would be misunderstood. We may, however, say that the tone of the letter we publish, is unnecessarily harsh. If the officers of the Prince of Wales had been calumniated and falsified as much as the officers of the St. Jean Baptiste Company have been, they might have stronger reason to be annoyed than they now have. If falsehood after falsehood, had been circulated about them by slanderous and cowardly anonymous writers they might understand how friendliness may be changed into doubt and suspicion. We have had "contemptible" rumours not one but dozens published about us and yet we have combatted them in a different spirit to that which animates the letter of Mr. Kinnear. When we were traduced pronounced disloyal "hadn't taken the oath," passing the Catholic Union through the ranks "hid 200 rifles prepared to attack the orangemen" and all the other "contemptible" rumours that were circulated, there was no sympathy among the volunteers, and the antagonism we experienced only caused us to fight all the more bitterly for the privileges which we believe we are entitled to. Not that we have ever suspected the officers of the Prince of Wales Battalion of encouraging this feeling. On the contrary, we accept the statement contained in the letter we publish, that they have done all in their power to bring about a good feeling between Protestant and Catholics. We all owe a great deal to Colonel Bond and to every officer in his command. Our admiration of them has never changed, and if this explanation is accepted in the spirit in which it is given, the good feeling which existed before will be continued.

THIS MORNINGS NEWS.

The latest advices seem more threatening than ever. One report says Russia has demanded the fortress on the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, together with barracks and hospitals and that this was formally done by the Russian Embassy at Constantinople. It would amount to an ultimatum if true. The warlike moves being made in England, the recall of the Duke of Edinburgh, the increase of the fleet in the East, and the summoning of the reserves for the 19th inst., make this look serious.

SCIENCE OF RELIGION.

Everything in our age tends to become a "science." The word is not much the better for it, for two obvious reasons: because in everything but the study of material things, and not seldom in that, the so-called science is only a catalogue of random guesses and arbitrary assumptions; and because a very small portion of mankind have the smallest knowledge of its pretended discoveries. From the nature of the case they never will have. Human science, true or false, is not for them. The only science which appeals to the masses, and lies within the grasp of their comprehension,—because it is the only one which it really concerns them to know,—is the science of revealed truth. Vigorous intellects have been employed upon it, but it does not require a vigorous intellect to apprehend it. It would be only a snare and a mockery if it did. He who made us knows what we are, and knows how to teach us. The unlettered peasant can appropriate His teaching as well as the philosopher, and sometimes a good deal better. Even Locke confessed that a revelation was necessary, because the truths which it discloses are "beyond the reach of unaided reason"—a rational conclusion in which he was anticipated by Plato. Theology is strictly and essentially a science, with its own definite objects, and its own mode of attaining them. It is the calamity of our time that that is precisely what its sham science denies. It refuses to take note of anything which cannot be weighed in human balances, and of which the dimensions cannot be determined by human measures. And therefore in all questions of the soul and its destiny, compared with which all others are trivial and without substance, it has substituted for knowledge a voluntary and contented ignorance. It even calls this degrading nescience scientific! That is its consolation. There are men in our day who put out their own eyes, and boast that their darkness is light. This is about the highest achievement of "modern science," which is not modern, since in every point it is only the reverberation of pagan echoes of two thousand years ago. "We cannot find out God," said the ancients. "We are equally impotent," say the moderns. It is not a discovery which had or has much interest for either. And therefore they never make it. They will not employ the means. Yet a man might as well attempt to race with an eagle in mid-air, as hope to find out God by any other scientific process than that which He has put within the reach of all. And for this reason the only practical discovery of the dreary and impious philosophy of our day, affects to apply religion the lame methods of its own bastard "science," is this extremely useful and exhilarating proposition, that it was not God who made man, but man who made God!

These remarks are suggested to us by an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. In all which does not relate to religion it is perhaps the most acute, and certainly the most sagacious of English journals. When it talks about religion a subject which it would do well to avoid, it reminds us of the saying of that most facetious of human apes, Voltaire, that "if God made man to His own image, man has reversed the process." Rationalists and sectaries agree in this, that they make God, as Voltaire suggested, exactly like themselves. The first represent Him as unable to make Himself known to His own creatures, and the second as equally unable to keep His own adorable revelation from odious corruption, and His own all holy Church from shameful error and decay. It is hard to say which is the most unpleasant blasphemy of the two. The latter is incontestably the more ridiculous. Rationalists only deary that God has made a revelation, but sectaries insist that though He made one, He allowed it to be subverted almost from the beginning, and abandoned His most devoted servants, in all ages, to shameful errors and corruptions. That was His way of rewarding their tender love and holy zeal. In other words, the first contend that He is unknowable, and the second that He is not worth knowing. On this occasion we have to deal only with the first. They summon what they call "science" to their aid, and a very droll science it is. "The science of religion," says the *Pall Mall*, "though of comparatively recent origin, has firmly established its claim to recognition." The best proof of it is, that it has triumphantly banished religion to the nebulous sphere of sentiment, and demonstrated, to its own serene and jubilant satisfaction, that there never was and never can be any definite religious truth. And this it establishes by putting out of court all the witnesses who alone have a right to be heard,—because for eighteen centuries they alone have never varied in their testimony,—and judging religion by the incoherent talk of men, who differ more about God's revelations to man than they do about anything else. It would be just as easy to banish astronomy or chemistry from the circle of sciences, by quoting only those who

were totally ignorant of both. "The modern school," we are told, "founds the study of religion on a scientific basis, for it builds its theory on a comprehensive generalization, arrived at by a careful observation, analysis, and comparison of the largest possible number of religious phenomena,"—without the smallest doubt of its own capacity to interpret them. Yet there is one phenomenon, of vast dimensions, and absolutely unique in the history of human thought, of which this shallow and flip-pant "science" takes no account whatever, though it is the most prodigious psychological fact in human history. From the hour in which the Christian revelation was made, though it was falsely and variously interpreted outside the Church, within her fold, which is now conterminous with the habitable world, and embraces men of every race and tongue, countless millions of men have ever been, and are at this hour, in all which relates of revealed dogma, "of one heart and one mind." This is a scientific phenomenon of considerable gravity. Only fools or knaves would affect to ignore it. Only a baseless and superficial philosophy would pass it by. It solicits explanation. It gives the lie to "the modern schools," by a more cogent than any mathematical demonstration, for it proves, with more than scientific rigor, that there is a deposit of constant, certain, and immutable religious truths, and that in every age, and under all condition of mental character; men are able to receive it. It proves, also, as Leibnitz, Kepler, Newton, and Pascal, saw and proclaimed, that the gift by which these truths are embraced is not human reason, but divine faith. "There is no such thing," replies the rationalist, perfectly indifferent to the fact that he is contradicting not only the general testimony, but the actual experience of thousands of millions of human beings, including the most vigorous and cultivated minds of every land and every age. When Woodworth spoke of "the ape philosophy," he must have been thinking of the mingled folly and impudence of a braggart "school," which insists that everybody must be as ignorant as itself, denies the spiritual powers which it does not understand, and mocks the supernatural gifts which it does not so much as wish to possess. Even Mr. Huxley tells this pretentious school, of which he is one of the oracles, that "everything in its ultimate analysis is mystery." If this is true even of the material, how can it be otherwise than true of the spiritual world? And what can be more grossly unphilosophical than to deny or dispute "phenomena" which belong to the spiritual order, under the pretence that they have no existence—which the collective testimony of the human race disproves,—and could not be classified if they had? "There is no conflict," says the writer in the *Pall Mall* "between science and religion," and why? because "when a proposition becomes capable of demonstration it ceases to be an article of faith and passes from the domain of religion." Therefore, he adds, it is idle to quarrel with theology, which is only "the unsuccessful attempt to reduce to a scientific formula that which by its very nature is incapable of the transformation." To which we need only reply that impiety is always doomed to be irrational always assumes what it cannot prove, denies what it does not value, and can only maintain its indictment against the conclusions of enlightened reason, and the testimony of instructed conscience, by a system of intemperate negations which the authentic history of the human soul convicts of falsehood, and which has no more claim to the name of "science" than it has to that of religion or morality.

THE SYLLABUS.

The *Witness* is constantly harping on the Syllabus. It has become like the 'Confessional' 'Idolatry' &c., to the pages of our contemporary. If the *Witness* read Mr. Newman on the Syllabus it might induce it to be somewhat milder in its tone. In his letter to the Duke of Norfolk in the Gladstone Controversy, Dr. Newman says: The virtue of the Syllabus, then, lies in its references; but of these Dr. Gladstone has certainly availed himself very little. Yet, in order to see the nature and extent of the condemnation passed on any proposition of the Syllabus, it is absolutely necessary to turn over the passage of the Allocation, Encyclical, or other document, in which the condemnation is found; for the wording of the errors which the Syllabus contains is to be interpreted by its references. Instead of this Mr. Gladstone uses forms of speech about the Syllabus which only excite in me fresh wonder. Indeed, he speaks upon these ecclesiastical subjects generally in a style in which priests and par-accused by their enemies of one are speaking of geology. For instance, the Syllabus, as we have seen it, is a list or index; but he calls it "extraordinary declarations" p. 21. How can a list of Errors be a series of Pontifical "Declarations?" However, perhaps he would say that, in

speaking of "Declarations," he was referring to the authoritative statements which I have accused him of neglecting. With all my heart; but then let us see how those statements fulfil the character he gives of them. He calls them "Extraordinary declarations on personal and private duty," p. 21, and "stringent condemnation," p. 19. Now, I certainly must grant, that some are stringent; but only some. One of the most severe that I have found among them is that in the Apostolic Letter of June 10th, 1851, against some heretic priest out at Lima, whose elaborate work in six volumes against the Curia Romana, is pronounced to be in its various statements, scandalous, false schismatical, injurious to the Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils, impious and heretical." It well deserved to be called by these names, which are not terms of abuse, but each with its definite meaning; and, if Mr. Gladstone, in speaking of the condemnations, had confined his epithet "stringent" to it, no one would have complained of him. And another severe condemnation is that of the works of Professor Nuytz. But let us turn to some other of the so-called condemnations, in order to ascertain whether they answer to his general description of them.

1. For instance, take his own 16 (the 77th of the "erroneous Propositions.") "It is no longer expedient that the Catholic Religion should be established to the exclusion of all others." When we return to the Allocation, which is the ground of its being put in the Syllabus, what do we find there? First, that the Pope was speaking, not of States universally, but of one particular State, Spain, definitely Spain; secondly, he was not speaking of the proposition in question directly, or dogmatically, or separately, but was protesting against the breach in many ways of the Concordat on the part of the Spanish government; further, that he was not referring to any theological work containing in, nor contemplating any proposition; nor, on the other hand, using any word of condemnation at all, nor using any harsher terms of the Government in question than those of "his wonder and bitterness." And again, taking the Pope's remonstrances as it stands, is it any great cause of complaint to Englishmen, who so lately were so severe in their legislation upon Unitarians, Catholics, unbelievers and others, that the Pope does merely not think it expedient for every state from this time forth to tolerate every sort of religion on his territory, and to disestablish the Church at once? for this is all that he denies. As in the instance of the foregoing section, he does but deny a universal, which the "erroneous proposition" asserts without any explanation.

2. Another of Mr. Gladstone's "stringent Condemnations" his 18th, is that of the Pope's denial of the proposition that the Roman Pontiff can and ought come to terms with Progress, Liberalism, and the New Civilization." We turn to the Allocation of March 18, 1861, and find there no formal condemnation of this Proposition. The Allocation is a long argument to the effect that the moving parties in that Progress, Liberalism, and new civilization, make use of it so seriously to the injury of the Faith and the Church, that it is both out of the power, and contrary to the duty of the Pope to come to terms with them. Nor would these prime movers themselves differ from him here; certainly in this country it is the common cry that Liberalism is and will be the Pope's destruction, and they wish and mean it so to be. This Allocation on the subject is at once dignified, and touching; and we cannot conceive how Mr. Gladstone should make stringency his one characteristic of these condemnations, especially when after all there is here no condemnation at all.

3. Take, again, Mr. Gladstone's 15th—"That the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Pontifex would be highly advantageous to the Church." Neither can we find in the Pope's Allocation any formal condemnation whatever of this proposition, much less a "stringent" one. Even the Syllabus does no more in the case of any of the eighty, than to call it an "error" and what the Pope himself says of this particular is to warn and reprove [monere et rearguere] those who applaud the decree by which the Roman Pontiff has been despoiled of all the honor and dignity of his civil rule, and assert that the said decree, more than anything else, conduces to the liberty and prosperity of the Church itself.—Alloc., April 20, 1846.

At page 122 he says, "Now considering that the Syllabus was intended for the Bishops who were to be the interpreters of it as the need arose to their people, and it got bodily into English newspapers even before it was received at many an episcopal residence, we shall not be surprised at the commotion which accompanied its publication."

Bishop Fessler, Secretary General of the Vatican Council, in his work on "True and False Infallibility," a work approved by the late Pope in a Brief prefixed to it, says p. 107, Dr. Shulte assumes that the Syllabus with its 80 propositions is one of those papal definitions of doctrine of which the Vatican Council speaks in its 4th Session. The assumption he has failed to prove. Dr. Shulte assumes it to be so as a fact, whilst the truth of the matter is the fact is called in question by the gravest theologians.

But it is all the same to our contemporary, it is the Syllabus—magic name, and so it is denounced.