

## The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 210, St. James Street, by  
J. GILLIES,  
G. E. CLERK, 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. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. PETERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1872.

## ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH—1872.

Friday, 1.—Of the Holy Shroud.  
Saturday, 2.—Of the Feria.  
Sunday, 3.—Third in Lent.  
Monday, 4.—St. Casimir, C.  
Tuesday, 5.—Of the Feria.  
Wednesday, 6.—Of the Feria.  
Thursday, 7.—St. Thomas Aquinas, C. D.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Alabama question remains as it was, and no steps towards a solution of the difficulties wherewith it is surrounded, have yet been taken. The general opinion seems to be that peace will be preserved. It is a curious and instructive fact that, whilst the U. States Government is insisting upon the most stringent application of neutrality laws as towards Great Britain, it stands convicted before the world of having itself systematically violated those laws during the late war betwixt France and Germany, by supplying the former with arms and munition of war. The utmost that can be urged against the British Government is: that it was guilty of negligence in allowing the Alabama, and one or two other ships, built in England for the use of the Government of the Confederate States, to put to sea, unarmed, and unequipped for hostile purposes; whilst on the other hand, the charge urged by Senators in Congress against the U. States Government, is to the effect that the latter not only allowed the sale of arms and munitions of war to France; but that it was itself actually a party to the transaction—as is clear from the evidence of M. Lecesne, President of the Armament Committee at Tours in France, who testifies that—"we treated directly with the Federal Government of the U. States, which delivered those arms without charge on board vessels." We must suppose therefore, from the action of the U. States Government in this case, and in that of the Alabama, that it recognises two distinct sets of obligations; of which the one is binding on other nations, but from the observance of which, it is itself in virtue of some higher law, dispensed.

The agitation in France in favor of the pretensions of the Comte de Chambord is acquiring great importance. His adherents are however, we must suppose, still in a minority. Unfortunately for his claims, the Comte de Chambord is a high-minded Christian gentleman, in the very best sense of the word; and the being a Christian and a gentleman are, in the eyes of democracy, faults for which nothing can atone. Still the prospects of the King, for legitimate King he is, seem brightening, and are such as to inspire us with hopes for the future of France, and her regeneration.

Rumors reach us from Rome to the effect that the Sovereign Pontiff proposes to re-assemble the General Council of the Vatican; and that as Rome is now in possession of the Piedmontese troops, who have made, for the time, religious liberty impossible in that City, the Pope has made overtures to both the Austrian and the British Governments to ascertain whether it would be possible for the Fathers of the Council to meet in their dominions. Malta and Trent are both spoken of as places suitable for the purpose, but the latter will probably be preferred. We give the rumor for what it is worth. A crazy apothecary is said to have been arrested in Berlin upon the charge of meditating the assassination of Bismarck. The proofs are strong against him. He is strongly suspected; he had a pistol, and is deemed to be a returned Papal Zouave; therefore it is evident that he was a Romish emissary charged with the slaying of Bismarck. None but a sceptic can resist such evidence.

The Tichborne case in England has advanced another stage; the Attorney-General has brought to a close his long address to the Jury for the defence, and witnesses have been already heard on the same side. The first called was Lord Bellevue, and his evidence, if it may be believed, is conclusive. He was a fellow-student at

Stoneyhurst with the real Roger Tichborne, whom the claimant personates; and whilst at College, the two boys mutually tattooed one another. The marks of this operation being indelible except by actual cautery, would of course be visible on the plaintiff's arms to-day—as they are on those of Lord Bellevue—were the former Roger Tichborne; but on his arm there is no trace of such an operation ever having been performed, and on his cross-examination he positively swore that he had never been tattooed in his life. On the other hand, he has a scar on his left fore arm, which the medical men say may be the trace of an abscess, or of the application of a hot iron. The plaintiff can give no account of how he came by this scar; but it is a curious fact in connection therewith, that many Chilians who had known Arthur Orton, son of the Wapping butcher, intimately, have deposed that the person whom they knew under that name had the initials A. O. printed in blue letters on his left arm just where the scar now appears. The inference is strong, therefore, that the plaintiff has had the said initials effaced by the application of the hot iron. This is but one of a thousand circumstances which have impressed the public mind with the conviction that the plaintiff is an arrant impostor. The termination of this extraordinary trial—the most extraordinary that ever British judges and British juries have had to deal with—is looked forward to with much anxiety. The issue however can scarce be doubtful, and is pretty clearly indicated by the fact that the other day, Messrs. Rose of Baxter, Rose and Norton, Attorneys for the plaintiff, announced in Court that they had withdrawn from the case, and had washed their hands of the dirty business. In all probability the *Wuyga Wuyga* butcher will ere long have to take his stand at the bar on a charge of perjury; and should such be the case it will not be the first time of his appearing before the public in the character of a criminal. In Australia he came into collision with the law on a charge of horse stealing, more elegantly termed "the unlawful use of a horse."

The Home Rule movement has assumed such proportions that it can no longer be ignored by the present, or by any future government. Of its expediency we say nothing, for we feel not competent to offer an opinion how far what is demanded under the name of Home Rule would benefit Ireland. But that the demand for Home Rule is a just demand, one that the Irish have the right to make and insist upon, no one who claims the same right for Canada can deny. The Home Rule party will present a formidable array in the House of Commons, formidable both as to numbers and talent, strong too in the force at its back. We have Mr. Butt, Captain Nolan, and Mr. Bleunerhasset lately returned, all pledged to Home Rule. The O'Donoghue, once so popular, who looks coldly on the movement has fallen into disgrace amongst his own people, who call upon him to resign; and Mr. Bright the one English statesman who of late years was in general favor in Ireland, is now denounced in unmeasured terms for his opposition to the measure. It will however, be carried at last, and not for Ireland only, but for the other portions of the British Empire. The Imperial Parliament will find that it has not time to attend to all the local wants of the several component parts of the Empire; and will at last be glad, reserving to itself its Imperial functions, to delegate to local legislatures the task of watching over and providing for the interests of their several districts. With Home Rule for Ireland, there must necessarily come Home Rule for England, for Scotland, and perhaps for Wales.

It is rumored that the United States Government has declared itself willing to accept a round sum of £10,000,000 in full of all demands on the Alabama claims.

FIRST LESSONS IN CHRISTIAN MORALS.—FOR CANADIAN FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS.—By Egerton Ryerson, D.D., L.L.D. Authorized by the Council of Public Instruction of Ontario.

Had the Rev. Mr. Ryerson contented himself with compiling and publishing this Protestant Catechism expressly for the members of his own sect, we should not have felt ourselves called upon to notice it in any manner. But when—availing himself of his official position—he induces the Council of Public Instruction to adopt, and to "recommend it for use" in the Common Schools of the Province—Schools to the support of which Catholic parents are often compelled by law to contribute—then we say the work becomes public property, and is a legitimate subject of criticism, whether friendly or hostile.

The first word we would say about it is of course addressed to Catholics. The work is essentially a Protestant and sectarian catechism, unfit—no matter what the Council of Public Instruction may tell you—quite unfit for you, and your children. Forbid them to use it in any manner; insist that it be not read or expounded to them on any pretence: and protest loudly and incessantly against its introduction in Schools for whose support you are by law

compelled to pay. This duty you owe to yourselves, to your children, to your Church, and to your God.

With regard to the work itself, we will admit that it contains many truths, much to which no Christian should object. If it be but a feeble exposition of Christian morals, it does not directly, or intentionally, at least, encourage immorality. Its arguments are weak, its soundest passages are but dreary platitudes, and washy copies of the old Catholic masters; but we are not so unjust to its author as to tax him with conscious immoral teaching.

Indeed it is occasionally so near the truth in some passages, that we see not how it can fail to excite the ire of the Calvinistic or evangelical section of the Ontario community; except upon the hypothesis that it is illogical, and unable to draw the obvious inference from admitted premises, and to carry out a principle to its legitimate conclusion. How, for instance, can evangelicals, whether Low Church Anglicans, or adherents of the more avowedly Calvinistic sects, approve of the Sacramental system of the High Anglicans, clearly laid down by the Rev. Mr. Ryerson in his catechism? a system incompatible with Calvinism, and which, if adopted, and logically carried out, leads inevitably to Rome. We will give an instance of our meaning.

Having at p. 44, Lesson ix., Q. 36, laid down the principle that every one owes to himself the duty of "self-consecration;" and having defined in the next question, 37, that, by "self-consecration" is meant the being a Christian—he asks Q. 39—"What is required by your self-consecration?" Here is the answer:—

It is required that I should use the means of grace which God has appointed for that purpose—(self-consecration, or being a Christian)—of which are the Sacraments, namely baptism and the Lord's supper; that if I have not been baptized, I should apply to be baptized; that if I have been baptized, I should fulfil the obligations of my baptism."

Here then is clearly implied the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; repudiated, not only by the professedly evangelical or Calvinistic sects, but by the assembled fathers of the Anglican denomination, who the other day laid it down positively as a doctrine of their church! that baptism works no physical or moral change on the recipient. But surely "the means of grace which God has appointed for that purpose"—self-consecration—may with perfect security be neglected, if they do no moral good to, or effect no moral change in, him who avails himself of them; yet the Rev. M. Ryerson insists upon their employment, which certainly implies that they must be of some use, must therefore work some beneficial change. For otherwise the baptized would enjoy no moral advantage over the unbaptized in so far as "self-consecration" is concerned. Again the reverend gentleman defines a sacrament as:—"an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given to us, ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the same."—p. 45, Q. 40.

What will the opponents of the Sacramental system say to this? Can they be so dull of eye as not to see that the entire sacramental system of the Romish Church is involved in this definition of a sacrament—as the divinely appointed means of grace—whereby we receive the same—i.e. grace. "A Sacrament," says St. Augustine, *Cir. Dei, lib. 10, c. 5*—and the Catechism put forth by the Council of Trent adopts the definition—"is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification," or as the Rev. Mr. Ryerson puts it "our self-consecration, or the being a Christian."

The Catechism is therefore essentially "sectarian," since it inculcates opinions on the Sacraments which all logical Calvinists must repudiate; it sins likewise as being "sectarian," in that it holds, or inculcates, that Jesus Christ is God—an opinion repudiated not only by the distinctive Unitarian branch of the Protestant Church, but by the most learned amongst Protestants of all denominations; and it is therefore, we contend, as being essentially "sectarian" on both these heads, a Catechism unfit for use in the Common Schools of Ontario. Calvinists, if consistent, would protest against the use in schools to whose support they pay, of a Catechism which teaches that the Sacraments are the divinely appointed means of grace, whereby we receive the same; Unitarians, and Liberal Christians would, in like manner, if consistent, protest against the use in the Common Schools of a Catechism which taught, that Jesus Christ the Son is God. So much for our criticisms on this book from a Protestant stand point; from the Catholic point of view it is equally objectionable, equally unfit for use in schools for whose support Catholics are, by an iniquitous law, taxed; but our remarks under this head we must postpone to next week.

Since writing the above we have seen extracts from the organ of the Baptist body, the most strictly and logically consistent of all Calvinistic sects, which fully bear out the opinions we have expressed as to the "sectarian" character of Dr. Ryerson's Catechism, and

therefore of its unfitness for a text book in the Common Schools of Ontario. *The Canadian Baptist*, the denominational organ alluded to, "protests"—we give the words of the *Globe*—"in the name of 50,000 Baptists in Ontario against Dr. Ryerson's views of Sacraments, as 'thoroughly unscriptural.'" And in its issue of the 8th ult., the *Canadian Baptist* has a strong article on the subject. Speaking of Dr. Ryerson's lessons on this point the *Baptist* says:—

"They seem to us to be a compound of Church catechism and 'Methodist discipline,' diluted in such a way by the venerable author that he evidently fancied it would prove acceptable to Baptists. Never was there a greater mistake. In the name of the 50,000 Baptists of Ontario we enter a decided protest against the introduction and use in our public schools of any text-book which contains statements like the following.

He then cites from the catechism the questions and answers by us given above, and sums up as follows:—

"According to Baptist belief, each one of these answers contains a grave error. Baptism is not the 'application of water,' does not 'solemnly ratify' the relation of its subjects to Christ; and should not be urged on children as an immediate duty, apart from the question of their Christian character.

"We know that some Baptist parents have already notified school-teachers that they cannot allow their children to study such a text-book; and we have no doubt that many more will follow their example. But private protests and objections are not enough. Our denomination must, in some organized way, make its voice heard in the Council of Public Instruction, in our Provincial Legislature, and by the Executive Council itself, if need be. Indeed we cannot doubt that all lovers of religious liberty and equality will gladly make use of every effort within their power to banish from the schools of our Province a book that at least four different Christian denominations cannot fail to regard, in its present form, as anything else than an outrageous assault on their most cherished religious beliefs."

Thus the justice of our criticism on Dr. Ryerson's Catechism, and our condemnation of it, as "sectarian," even from a Protestant point of view, are fully recognised by the organ of one of the evangelical sects. From a Catholic stand point the work is we say equally objectionable, and as Catholics we protest against its use in the Common Schools.

The Quebec *Morning Chronicle* of the 15th ult., of which a copy has been passed to us, contains a lengthy notice of the proceedings at, and resolutions adopted by, the *Auxiliary Bible Society* of that city. In these proceedings there was nothing new, nothing to distinguish them from those of the Anniversary Meetings of our Montreal evangelical Societies, which we have commented upon, and whose absurdities we have often exposed. One or two remarks we will however make.

The false assumption which underlies all the arguments of these Societies, and which in practice render them obnoxious to Catholics, is this:—That the perusal of a certain book which they distribute under the title of the Bible, must necessarily work a beneficial change in the minds of those who read it: and that it is the divinely appointed means, or means appointed by Christ Himself, for converting the world, and spreading the knowledge of the Gospel. Now not only is this historically false, but it is also important to note that the Gospel or good message is one thing; and that a book which treats of that message, and gives some historical details of the manner in which it was originally brought to earth, is another and a very different thing. A community may thus have the Gospel, or glad message itself, in its perfection, though destitute of the book; or again, it may have the book, and yet be utterly destitute of, or disbelieving in, the message itself. It is thus with a large and daily increasing portion of the Protestant population of Europe and America. They have retained the husk or book, the outer covering of the nut; they have cast away.

There is therefore no connection, however remote, betwixt distributing bibles, and propagating Christianity; though the old women of our evangelical societies constantly confound these two different proceedings. St. Paul distributed no bibles, but he made converts to real Christianity; our modern Protestant Missionaries shed their bibles broadcast, and the world reaps a plentiful crop of infidelity.

That this is so is easy of proof, for it is admitted by Protestants. Let us look at Italy, at Rome; of which as their now, thanks to the Revolution, facile field of labor, the speakers at the Quebec meeting, made so much boasting—and what is the result? Why this, as we showed the other day by extracts from the *Montreal Witness*; that the Protestant reformation in Italy walks hand in hand with infidelity; that a social rationalism, or a rationalistic socialism, is supplanting the old Catholic faith: and that just in proportion as the Bible is spread, so also does disbelief in its contents, and disregard for its precepts, spread also, and abound.

Christ Himself appointed one way, and one way only, for establishing His kingdom upon earth. He appointed a living Church, as the keeper of His Gospel—we are not speaking of the book—or glad message of salvation to all men. Protestants in substance tell the Lord that He has blundered; that the means by Him appointed are inefficient; and they vainly purpose to

supplement His shortcomings by their *Treaties* and Bible Societies. To use a favourite form of expression in the conventicles, they have in this acting, hewed out, for themselves cisterns; broken cisterns that will hold no water, and which serve but as foul dens for the noxious serpents of immorality and infidelity to knot and gender in. Thus too we see verified the truth of our Lord's prophecy, that every tree which is not of His planting shall be barren of fruit, and will be cut down and cast in to the fire, Amen.

The cynical contempt for truth displayed by our liberal Protestant contemporaries when it is their object to create prejudice against the Catholic Church or her authorities, is well exemplified in a short communication from the Very Rev. E. Langevin, V. G. of His Lordship the Bishop of Rimouski, and addressed to the Toronto *Globe*. In its issue of the 14th ult., that paper had inserted an item from its "own Quebec correspondent," to the effect that the Bishop above named had signified his readiness to withdraw the sentence of excommunication, by him pronounced against a resident of the county of Rimouski, for having at the last local election voted for the Protestant candidate. Of course the intention was to insinuate that Mgr. de Rimouski had pronounced such sentence of excommunication, and for the cause indicated.

The Rev. M. Langevin writes under date 19th ult., that no such an event ever occurred; that, in fact, it is a pure invention of the malignant and mendacious writer in the *Globe*. "His Lordship never pronounced a sentence of excommunication against any resident of the said county, with relation to that election, or any other matter whatsoever." Signed Edmond Langevin, Vicar General.

From this simple incident we may learn what reliance may be placed upon the statements of the liberal and anti-Catholic press, when the interests of the Catholic Church are concerned.

The injustice of which our brother Catholics in New Brunswick, in the matter of their schools, are the victims, has excited much interest in Canada, and has elicited strong expressions of sympathy from the press, both French and English. Would that it were in our power to do more; but situated as we are, we do not as yet exactly see in what manner we can best render our New Brunswick friends practical assistance. They will no doubt agitate the question, and perhaps may yet be able to bring it, and their grievances, before the Federal Legislature, in which, we are sure, they will be able to command a respectful hearing. The great thing, evidently, at the present moment for them to do is to bring their case under the notice of the Dominion or Federal Government, so as to enable their numerous friends in Canada to intervene. In the meantime we watch the contest with deep interest, and we pray God that the courage of our brethren may not fail. "No surrender" must be their motto.

The Dollinger movement in Germany is pretty nigh played out, even by the admission of its own partisans. *The Witness* writes:—"A reliable authority says that they consider Dollinger's movements as regards Catholics as virtually at an end—even those who supported him, it is said, have now got beyond him. The policy of staying in the Church has been tried by reformers before now, with what success history tells—and unless he takes a more decided position he will probably lose most of his influence."

This self-evident truth is beginning to dawn upon the Protestant mind—that it is impossible to be a member of the Church whilst denying her teachings; and that he who refuses to accept with heart and soul the definitions of the Vatican Council, is as much a heretic as if he had repudiated the entire Creed. That Dr. Dollinger will be able to found a new Protestant sect, merely rejecting Papal Supremacy, we do not believe; his followers will go beyond him, and will soon reject, one by one, every distinctive article of the Christian faith.

The Ottawa *Times* having sneered at the management of the small-pox hospital under the direction of the Sisters at Ottawa, the *Weekly Citizen* takes up the cudgels in their behalf, for which we thank him:—

Why describe our hospitals in this style? "Attendance." When the ladies of the convent assumed the charge of small-pox patients, nine of their number immediately devoted themselves to the task of attending those sick of the disease. They were, and are still, isolated from the rest of the community; and have each of them performed their self-chosen task with a fidelity that would do honor to even a Miss Nightingale. As for "medical aid," Drs. Beaubien, St. Jean, Grant, Hill and Van Cortlandt, can bear testimony. With regard to the Protestant Hospital, the directors of that institution can speak, as we reported we published a few days ago will show. Altogether we think it but a poor return to those self-devoted Christian ladies to cast this unmerited slur upon them as attendants of the sick. A better report would be theirs, and we are sure the public will agree with us when the facts above given are made known. In conclusion, it may be said, that the power of giving the fullest proof, that every patient brought to the hospitals has been carefully nursed, attended and prescribed for in a way unobtainable elsewhere; and the credit of the medical gentlemen whose names we have mentioned, as well as the character of the hospitals, are involved in the charge made by our contemporary. But, as the whole article is untrue, it bears its own refutation.