

The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
INCL. AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 663, Craig Street, by  
J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERE, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:  
To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.  
The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.  
To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.  
The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription from THAT DATE.  
S. M. PATTENGL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1871.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

APRIL—1871.  
Friday, 28—St. Paul of the Cross, C.  
Saturday, 29—St. Peter, M.  
Sunday, 30—Third after Easter.  
MAY—1871.  
Monday, 1—SS. Philip and James, Apost.  
Tuesday, 2—St. Athanasius, B. C. D.  
Wednesday, 3—Finding of the Holy Cross.  
Thursday, 4—St. Monica, W.

CHANGE OF OFFICE.—The office of the TRUE WITNESS has been removed to No. 210, St. James Street.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The political situation in France has not greatly changed since our last. There have been, there are constantly going on, a great number of "decisive" battles which have not resulted in much beyond a great shedding of blood; though on the whole the insurgents, or Reds, seem to have lost ground. Paris is again suffering from lack of provisions; the shells thrown into her have done more damage than did the Prussian fire, if the report be true that the famous *Arch of Triumph* has been destroyed; and on the whole, the appearances at present are that in this war of Paris against France, Paris will have to succumb, and that M. Thiers, the Assembly, and the troops under their command, will put down the insurrection.

This they may do, probably will do; but what will they put up in place of the Federated Communal regime which the insurgents have adopted as their political platform? Putting down is one thing, and putting up another; and though *mitrailleuses*, and shells may be useful in the first named process, they will do but little towards the accomplishment of the other. When he shall have put down the insurrection, the real difficulty of M. Thiers's position will only have commenced. France wants above all things a government, a good strong government, such as shall inspire confidence abroad, by maintaining order at home; and this, we do not think, that M. Thiers is able to give her. In a word, France needs a ruler who, or which can style himself or itself such, "By the Grace of God," and to whom or which obedience will be felt to be a moral duty, and a sacred obligation. Who shall give to France such a government?

Failing this, failing the old legitimate formula, "By the Grace of God," France must resign herself to a government *By the grace of the bayonet*, to a government of brute force; to which the ruled will yield obedience, not from a sense of duty, but as a matter of expediency, and so long only as they are not strong enough to cast it off. The Empire might give them this; but if they want a legitimate government, a government which shall be able to appeal to its rights, as well as its might, and to remind the ruled of their duties, it must seek it, not in a Republic, nor yet in the Orleans family; but in the person of *Henri Cinq*, where alone it is to be found. In short, it seems as if there were but two alternatives open to France. The Empire, *i.e.* the rule of the sword; or *Henri Cinq* By the Grace of God, King of France.

On the 4th of April, a deputation from the Catholics of England, headed by the Duke of Norfolk, had the honor of laying at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, an address of which we will present our readers with a copy in our next. To it were attached the names of the representatives of all the great historic Catholic families of England: and we need not say that it was most graciously received by the illustrious Sovereign, and holy Pontiff, whom it must have abundantly consoled for the daily insults offered to his sacred person by the revolutionary *canaille* of Italy. The affairs of that country are in a most precarious condition. Discontent is rife throughout the several Provinces which by force and fraud have of late years been an-

nexed to Piedmont; and national bankruptcy, which the cruel taxation to which the Italian peoples are subjected is unable to avert, will soon we trust inflict well-merited shame and punishment upon all who have abetted the recent iniquitous revolutions. Day by day the financial condition of the bogus Italian Kingdom is growing worse, and to all appearances the catastrophe cannot much longer be delayed.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONS.—The first Revolution, that of 1789, may be called the revolt of the *tiers etat* or *bourgeoisie*, against the Throne, the Church, and the Aristocracy; the second Revolution, that of '92 and '93, was the revolt of the *proletariat* against the *bourgeoisie*—and this is the revolution, or revolt, of which the continuation is passing before our eyes.

To understand it, we must understand that, just as the *tiers etat* or *bourgeoisie* prior to 1789, formed an order apart from, and hostile to the aristocracy; so within the bosom of the *tiers etat* there are to-day, two distinct, and hostile orders—the *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat*.

"By *bourgeoisie*," says Louis Blanc the most able and the most moderate of French socialistic writers—"I understand the sum of the citizens who, possessed of instruments of labor, and of capital, carry on work with their own resources, and depend upon others only to a limited extent—*dans une certaine mesure*. These are more or less free.

"The people—or *proletaires*—are the sum of the citizens, who, destitute of capital, depend altogether upon others in that which concerns the primary necessities of life. These are free only in name."

Thus we see that, according to the classification of the Socialists—the *bourgeoisie*, or those who have any property of some kind of their own, whether in the form of instruments of labor, or of capital—form no more a portion of the *people*, than did the members of the royal family, or of the *noblesse* under the *ancien regime*; and that the people, the sovereign people, to whom alone belongs the right to govern, and whose will is law, consists exclusively of those who have nothing—neither capital, nor even instruments of labor. This sharp distinction betwixt people and non-people, betwixt the *proletariat* and the *bourgeoisie*—the *have-nothings*—and the *have-somethings* must always be borne in mind, or the language, the acts, and the aspirations of the *Reds* will be altogether unintelligible. If in England, under its *bourgeoisie* regime, the political rights of the pauper, of him who has nothing, are inchoate, or in abeyance, so in France, according to the socialistic theory of which M. Louis Blanc is one of the ablest exponents—the citizen, by the acquisition of property forfeits his political rights, and ceases to belong to the body of the *sovereign people*; to which belongs exclusively the right of governing, and of making laws; whose will, it is sin of the deepest dye to resist. "Death to the rich—death to proprietors" is the *mot d'ordre* of the revolution of 1871, as it was of the revolution of 1793.

It has also another object in view, and it is this which so complicates the position in France at the present moment. In a certain sense, the *Reds* or Jacobins of to-day have adopted the Federative principles of their ancient antagonists, the Girondists. They aim at setting up, in the form of *Communes*, a lot of federated semi-sovereign and independent States, which shall govern France, and keep the rural population—whose members as proprietors of land, are not worthy of being included, amongst the "*people*"—in subjection to the urban *proletariat*, or non-property holding populations of some nine or ten of the chief cities. The insurrection is thus not only an uprising of the poor against the rich, of what is called labor against capital, but it is also a protest of the urban against the rural, classes, an assertion of the inherent right of the Cities of France to sway the destinies of the entire country.

The rural population of France is still to a considerable extent Catholic, and amenable to moral and religious influences. It may not care much for either branch of the Bourbons, and to the pretensions of the Napoleonic dynasty it may be profoundly indifferent; but it loves order, and would no doubt accept any form of government, Imperial, Orleanist, or Legitimist, which would ensure to it domestic tranquility. But in this very love of order lies its weakness, or inability to cope with its less numerous, but more energetic enemy, the urban *proletariat*. It may be hoped, though it is by no means certain, that the army which is mainly recruited from amongst the rural population, will remain faithful to the class of society from which it springs; but if in the hour of need, the soldiers should turn against the Versailles authorities, it is to be feared that the rural population will have to succumb to that of the Cities.

AN INGENIOUS DODGE.—The Ritualists of England though discomfited by the decision given against them in the Privy Council, are not disheartened or altogether cast down; but are setting their wits to work to discover some means of evading the law as laid down, or rather enacted, by Lord Chelmsford.

At first sight this would seem no easy task. The law is now dead against them; and it is

open to every member of the community to invoke it against the offender. So desperate seemed their position, that at first one would have thought that no alternative was left to them, if they would not submit, but secession from the church as by law established.

Nevertheless the sore pressed Ritualists appear to have found a way of escape, which, if they can but raise the necessary funds, will enable them to indulge their ritualistic tastes, whilst still clinging to the loaves and fishes of the establishment. They do not propose to defy the law, but simply to evade it, or turn it, by a flank movement. The plan of campaign is this:—

Some years ago an Act, known as the "Shaftesbury Act," was carried in the interest of the low church party. By this Act the members of this section of the establishment were released from the obligations of the Law which had till then enjoined upon the minister of the Church of England, the use of the Book of Common Prayer on all occasions; so that he could not even hold a prayer meeting, or preach anywhere, either in barn or in school room, without officiating in the dress prescribed by the rubric, and using the form of prayer enjoined by Act of Parliament. This was felt by many of the low churchmen to be a hardship. Their tastes ran, not in the direction of vestments, and liturgies, but were strongly inclined towards the forms of non-conforming worship,—consisting mainly of long dreary addresses to the Deity, in which that party is instructed how to comport himself, and during the delivery of which the worshippers stand for the most part; and of other long dreary addresses to the congregation, during which they are allowed by custom to sit down. Now the Shaftesbury Act in question gave to these Anglican ministers of non-conforming proclivities, relief by allowing them, outside of the parish church, in any private chapel, school house or other place of meeting, to indulge in such modes of worship as best suited their particular tastes and the tastes of their several audiences.

This law the Ritualists propose to invoke in behalf of their peculiar usages. They propose to erect, by means of private subscriptions, free, or Shaftesbury churches, in which they shall be legally at liberty to conduct worship as they please. They will of course officiate in the old churches, and in the style enjoined by law: that is to say, they will on Sundays and Festivals, therein hurry through the prescribed form of prayer, which will not take long; and three times a year they will, as by law required, celebrate therein their communion service after the pattern delivered by the Privy Council. But these official acts of worship legally discharged, the Rector will be entitled to his salary; and he will be free also to carry on the worship on which his heart is set, and with as close an imitation of Catholic ceremonies as he pleases, within the Shaftesbury church, or meeting house, which it is proposed to erect. There his real, or serious worship will be conducted, and there neither Courts of Arches, nor Privy Council will be able, as the law now stands, to interfere with him. Thus do the Ritualists propose to satisfy the requirements both of their pockets, and of their conscience, to keep on good terms with both God and Mammon. The dodge is an ingenious one, and we shall be curious to see how it succeeds.

The *N. Y. Tribune*, quoted by the *Montreal Witness* of the 20th April, has some remarks upon newspapers, and the causes of their success, and decline. The great secret of the success of most papers on this Continent, says our informant, is to be found in their impurity, and their irreligion; in their pandering to the lusts and the anti-Christian—or anti-Catholic—prejudices of the public:—

"The newspapers of this country, just in proportion as they purify themselves, decrease their circulation, and when a paper becomes positively religious it is almost—*not quite*—certain to become bankrupt."—*N. Y. Tribune*.

There is we fear only too much truth in what the *Tribune* here asserts. A paper that is neither immoral nor anti-Catholic has but a small chance of success; and an increasing subscription list is *prima facie* evidence of, either general smuttness, or rabid No-Popery-ism. Obscenity is always sure to command popularity; but even obscenity may be dispensed with, and its absence condoned for, by a lavish abuse of Catholics, their priests and their religions.—An anti-Catholic paper, if conducted with an utter disregard of truth, and charity, is almost as good a paying concern as an obscene paper.

It is only the "positively religious" paper that fails in commanding success; and to be "positively" religious, a paper must needs be Catholic. Protestantism is simply the negation of Catholicity: it is not a positive, but a negative religion: and consists essentially not in what it affirms, but in what it denies. Its organs are therefore not "positively" but "negatively" religious papers; and the secret of their success, when they do succeed, lies, not in their affirmation, or defence of those Christian verities which they have retained, and which they hold in common with Catholics—for in any-

thing wherein they agree with, or do not protest against the latter, they are *non-Protestant*; but, in their negation of, and assaults upon truths peculiar to Catholics. It is not the Christianity of these journals which makes them popular, but their anti-Catholicity; not their morality, but their assaults upon that Church which all instinctively feel to be the only sure bulwark of Christian morality. For instance: a Protestant writer will never command popularity on this Continent by denouncing divorce as immoral, and anti-Christian, or by upholding the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage tie; but in spite of so doing, he may still find favor in the eyes of the public, if he be but constant and bitter in his condemnation of Popish clerical celibacy, and unsparing of his denunciations of Catholic vows of chastity. And the reason is obvious. The Protestant religious paper is felt by all to be impotent towards restraining the ever onward rolling tide of licentiousness, or of restoring the old Catholic idea of the sacramental and indissoluble union of one man with one woman; whilst on the other hand, it is equally obvious to the most superficial observer, that could the Catholic Church and her teaching be entirely discredited in any community, there the only existing obstacle, not only to divorce, but to "Free-Lovism," would have been removed. The evil then to the Protestant cause that a Protestant journal does by its mild objections to divorce, are pardoned to the editor for the great service that he renders to the cause of immorality, licentiousness, and the abominations of "Free-Lovism," by his constant efforts to discredit Catholicity, and the Church which alone is able consistently and effectually to maintain the sanctity of the marriage tie:—Consistently, because she teaches that marriage is more than a civil contract, that it is a sacrament; effectually, because in spite of the assaults of her enemies she still asserts and exercises dominion over the conscience of millions of the world's inhabitants.

There is nothing therefore inconsistent with the fact that many Protestant papers have a large circulation, in the assertion of the *N. Y. Tribune* that "when a paper becomes positively religious it is almost certain to become bankrupt;" whilst on the other hand, it is quite certain that as a general rule\* just in proportion as journals purify themselves, purge their columns of their licentious stuff, of their highly spiced tales, their innuendoes, their indecent police reports, and similar matter, they "decrease their circulation."

\* There are many honorable exceptions; as in our Montreal secular press,—which is for the most part, pure, high-toned, ably conducted, and deservedly popular.

DISEASED MEAT.—The danger to which the public are constantly exposed from the selling by ignorant or unprincipled dealers of meat, the flesh of diseased animals, was strikingly manifested the other day at Boston; where, as a Coroner's Inquest shows, a butcher named Temple, came by his death from disease by him contracted, by wiping his hands with a towel which had been previously used for washing the inside of a cow that had been dressed for the Boston market. It seems that the cow in question had been one of a drove brought by rail, but had been trampled to death in the train. In spite of this however, and from want of any efficient sanitary supervision, the flesh of this animal, unfit even for dogs, was dressed for human food.

We are, we fear, very unclean feeders; we eat garbage, and thereby we invite many of those foul and terrible diseases, to which, when they visit us, we give the name of "judgments of God." And so they are; they are His judgments upon physical uncleanness, and disregard of the physical laws that He has established, and which cannot be violated with impunity. As Christians we are right in asserting our moral liberty, or emancipation from the laws of meats, and the dietary observances of the Jews; but why run into extremes? We should do well we think, if, from regard to health and cleanliness, we were to take a hint from the Jews, and were to copy, from purely hygienic motives of course, most of their dietary regulations. They have officers to superintend the markets, and to determine—guided by fixed and wise rules, and not by caprice—on the suitability for human food of the meat therein exposed for sale. Why should we not imitate them in this matter? and so prevent the chance, even, of the recurrence of such a horrid disaster as that which is reported from Boston; and of those disgusting cases of *trichinosis*, the reports of which so often meet us in the columns of the public journals.

THE FIRE-INSPECTOR ON CHIGNONS.—Many of our readers, being bachelors, may perhaps be ignorant of the fact that it is the fashion nowadays—and a very ugly and dirty fashion it is—for members of the female persuasion to wear on the back of their heads, false skulls—or things made in form like the posterior lobe of the human skull—covered

over with hair, or else a substance closely resembling hair. These false skulls are called "chignons" by the initiated in such matters; and the stuff with which they are covered outside is very often jute, or Indian hemp, a very inflammable material. It seems also that the manufacture of these false skulls is largely carried on in Montreal, necessitating a large employment of this Indian hemp; and to this very dangerous industry the Fire Inspector calls the attention of the civic authorities; he says:—

"The residue of this (jute) when combed is so inflammable, that, by the least accident, the flames might spread with such rapidity that it would be next to impossible to save the building."

The official therefore recommends that the manufacturing of these hideous and dangerous chignons, or false skulls, be prohibited within the City limits. Those that are covered in, or thatched, with real hair instead of jute, may be less dangerous to the public; but as they are—so we read—often infested with vermin and all kinds of parasites, they are perhaps more dangerous to the wearer, and certainly more disgusting to every one of cleanly habits.

It will not, however, be easy to induce the fair sex to abandon their absurd, ungraceful, dirty, and unhealthy modes of dress, so long as these are what is styled "the fashion."—Whether in this respect they are worse than were their grandmothers before them it is hard to say; and probably in all ages, and in all places, women have been in this respect very much the slaves of custom, and wholly given over to monstrosities of dress. But never can they have sinned more in this respect than they do at the present day. Indeed what with chignons, grecian bands, and other india-rubber or gutta-percha devices for correcting the defects of nature, it would not surprise us to learn that the "*girl of the period*" had been put down in the Tariff as "manufactured goods," and was liable to custom house charges when crossing the frontier. Her present position should certainly arouse the sympathies of some of our political economists for the "unprotected" female, and might suggest to our Chancellor of the Exchequer the means of increasing the revenue, by a tax upon what the French call *postiche*.

On Sunday last, at High Mass, a Circular Letter from His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal was read from all the pulpits of the Catholic churches of this City, announcing the approaching visit to Montreal of our Metropolitan, His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec.—His Grace is expected on Tuesday next, the 2nd of May, about 6 o'clock in the morning; and his arrival will be proclaimed by the pealing of all the bells in the City and in the suburbs. Our citizens will we are sure vie with one another in doing honor to our illustrious visitor.

The *Kingston British Whig* announces the death, on Tuesday the 18th inst., "of one of the most devoted Sisters of Charity in the House of Providence"—Sister Mary Francis Xavier.

The deceased was the fifth daughter of the late Mr. J. Byrne, of Quebec.

The *Journal des Trois Rivières* announces the death, at the age of 33, of Sister Rochette, in religion Sister Meekilde du St. Sacrament, one of the founders of the establishment of the Sisters of Charity at Three Rivers. The deceased was a native of the parish of Nicolet.

THE ELECTIONS.—Already preparations are being made for the approaching elections for the Local Quebec Legislature. For the West Ward Messrs. Doherty, Cassidy, and Rodden are in the field. The *Daily News* says that Mr. Cartier is to be opposed in the Centre Division, but the name of his rival is not given. Sir G. E. Cartier declines to come forward again for the Eastern Division.

His Honor, Recorder Sexton, has dismissed the action against Mr. Garven, the contractor in the Cemetery nuisance case. Of course the Court had to go by the evidence laid before it; and if there be medical men who really believe, or depose that soil largely impregnated with the decomposed and decomposing remains of human beings, offers a healthy site for the erection of the homes of the living; and that the odor thence issuing when disturbed, in damp weather especially, be rather pleasant and wholesome than otherwise—there is no more to be said about the matter. There is no disputing about tastes. Some men may be so constituted as to like the smell of a typhus fever corpse in a very advanced state of decomposition; others may think that the peculiar aroma of small-pox floating about the kitchen imparts a rather piquant flavor to the soup: and others may delight in a somewhat gamy cholera-morbus odor in their sleeping apartments. We cannot reason such people out of their tastes, and they must therefore, we suppose, be indulged in them; but it is carrying the joke a *little* too far to tell us, that these ancient and corpse-like