

# 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. PATTENSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. ROWELL & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1871.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

SEPTEMBER—1871.

Friday, 22—Ember Day. St. Thomas of Villanova, C.  
Saturday, 23—Ember Day. St. Linus, P. M.  
Sunday, 24—Seventeenth after Pentecost.  
Monday, 25—Stigmata of St. Francis.  
Tuesday, 26—St. Cyprilian and Justina, MM.  
Wednesday, 27—SS. Cosma and Damian, MM.  
Thursday, 28—St. Wenceslaus, M.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

No political events of any great importance have occurred in Europe since our last. In France a proclamation for the disarmament of the National Guards has been issued, and requiring the surrender within two days, of all arms belonging to that body. The process of disarming is going on without any resistance. The Mont Cenis tunnel has been opened, and has been traversed in 38 minutes; the London Times correspondent speaks of this great engineering work as completely successful. A demonstration was to take place in Rome on the 20th inst. to commemorate the capture of that City by the Piedmontese a year ago; some violent scenes may be looked for. The health of the Sovereign Pontiff is reported good in spite of the wrongs which he has endured, and the outrages to which in his person, the Church is daily exposed from the usurpers.

The signs of the approaching, inevitable struggle between "labor" and "capital" in England are becoming day by day more menacing. The importation of foreign labor is denounced, and the London Times seems inclined to take sides with the so-called labor interest. That the communistic spirit is rife in England, and that ere long extreme measures will be taken to give practical effect to the theories of the International Society can scarce be doubted. A correspondent of the Times describes the British wheat crop as sadly deficient, and if so, dear bread will add to the general discontent, and hurry on the catastrophe. From Ireland we learn that a monster meeting having for its object the taking of steps preliminary to the prosecution of the police for dispersing the late gathering in the Phoenix Park, was to have been held on Sunday last in the suburbs of Harold's Cross.

The truth of the very grave charges lately brought against the members of the New York ruling civic body are to be made the subject of judicial enquiry. The whole truth in this matter will we hope thus be brought to light—and due punishment inflicted on the guilty parties, if guilt be brought home to them. Of course it would be premature at this stage of the proceedings to pronounce any opinion on the merits of the case. We have as yet heard only one side; and as the proverb says "one story is good only till the other be told."

To the Grammar School Trustees of Trenton.—To Lawyer Francis and the 25 signatories of his petition—until to the world at large these letters are respectfully dedicated.

## LETTER III.

GENTLEMEN,—A similar act of cruelty on the part of Mary's Privy Council during her absence from London will be found in the treatment of poor inoffensive Mr. Underhill "the hot gossip" as he was styled. In his zeal for the Calvinistic religion this noble fellow had penned a satirical bull against Papists, and for this was committed to Newgate. Here again Mary's part in this iniquitous transaction was only the pardoning it. A few days after her arrival in London, Underhill was released, and finally found himself restored by this Queen of the sour temper (popular idea) to his place of Gentleman pensioner, with his salary paid in full even for the time of his arrest. (Was Mr. Bond as fortunate?)

A similar act of mercy—in this case almost bordering on the pusillanimous—is recorded of Mary in her conduct towards the Duke of Suffolk. Brought to the Tower with his daughter, Lady Jane Grey, they were lodged in pri-

son rooms. Hearing of her husband's arrest, Francis, duchess of Suffolk hastened to Mary, to beg his release. "Her husband was ill and would die if shut up in the Tower," Mary granted her request and the Duke—co-conspirator with Northumberland—was set at liberty—"a wonderful instance of mercy" says Bishop Godwin. Truly wonderful for a queen "37 years of age, of a temper soured by her mother's and her own disgrace (which never existed) "and warmly attached to the Catholic worship."—(Trenton Trustees Class Book).

"Thus unharmed in body or estate," says a Protestant historian, "Suffolk paid the penalty of but three days' imprisonment for his conspiracy with Northumberland." Well done, Bloody Mary!

So far from Mary having been of a sour temper it appears to have been a speciality of her reign that all who could get personal access to her were sure to obtain mercy. Let us hear the Authoress of the Queens of England on this subject.

"Several instances are to be found of the queen's interference to save persons from the cruelty of her privy council. Those who were of a rank or consequence sufficient to find access to her, were tolerably sure of protection. This peculiarity gave a tone to her reign, which renders its character singular in English history; for examples of political vengeance were made chiefly on persons whose station seemed too lowly for objects of State punishment, because being lowly and obscure they were not able to carry their complaints to the foot of the throne." (Vol. III., P. 445). A rather strong panegyric, Gentlemen, on a Bloody Queen.

If Mary was lenient towards the Duke of Suffolk, she was equally humane to the body of the greater traitor Northumberland. After the Duke's execution John Cock the Lancaster herald, and an old retainer of the Duke, sought an audience from the Queen to beg the head of his master for decent sepulture. "In God's name," said the Queen, take the body too and give it proper burial." With such evidence before us, Gentlemen, there appears to be abundant proof, that at her accession at least, and when left to the dictates of her own good heart, Mary was not "of a temper soured by her mother's and her own disgrace," as "the popular idea"—the great Protestant tradition—as taught by your Class book would have your pupils believe. It would have been well, Gentlemen, perhaps had you, in your treatment of Mr. Bond, not allowed your horror for Catholicism to run away with your cooler judgment. Those who are influenced by facts rather than by fictions, and popular ideas, will be apt to condemn your conduct.

That Mary was not answerable for the Star Chamber decisions of her Privy Council is abundantly evident. This junta sat in the Star Chamber of Westminster Hall, (hence its name), "to apportion the inflictions which seemed good in its eyes, as vengeance on personal affronts to the reigning monarch." Its existence dates back to a very early period. Owen Tudor was evidently summoned before some such tribunal under Henry VI. The unfortunate victim, who under Edward IV. lost his life through an incorrigible habit of joking—"he would make his son heir to the crown" (publichouse)—may probably attribute his sentence and its execution to the strictly loyal sentiments of the same tribunal. Whether John Gough the tapster's boy, who under Lady Jane Grey was nailed by the ears to the pillory, for groaning dissent to Northumberland's proclamation, was punished by the same court, we are not certain. But its decisions were at all times iniquitous, being guided by nothing but the private pique or prejudices of its members. Most of the extortions of the reign of Henry VII., and the bloodshed of that of the Bluff King Hal, may be attributed to the operations of this illegal, inquisitorial, and iniquitous tribunal. One thing is certain, that Mary's influence as long as she had health to exert it was largely used towards the softening its rigors. "In the latter part of Mary's reign," says Agnes Strickland, "when she was utterly incapacitated by mortal sufferings from interference with their proceedings, her cruel ministers inflicted more tragic punishments on old women who 'ruled against the Queen's majesty.'"—(P. 446, V. III.)

We know, Gentlemen, that it is "a difficult and dangerous task" to endeavor to stem the tide of "popular ideas," especially when they have set in on the side of "the great Protestant tradition." Even the rich mass of documents edited by such men as Madden and Tytler can hope to avail little against that ineradicable bigotry (Dr. Darwin believes in the law of inheritance) which three centuries of popular ideas have handed down to our age.

As we are not writing a history of Mary, but merely pointing out to your honorable body the inaccuracies of your Class Book, (for doing which to your sons and daughters Mr. Bond was dismissed), we must pass over many interesting facts of Marian history in order to confine ourselves strictly to our subject. Having dissipated the popular idea of Mary's sourness of

temper, we pass on to the next sentence of your Class Book. In it we find the suppressio verbi used in a very disingenuous manner. "One of her earliest acts therefore," says your Class Book, "released from prison Catholic nobles and prelates." We have already shewn in our first letter from Protestant authority that this first act extended release to both Protestants and Catholics. This your Class Book did not wish to record, lest, like Mr. Bond's annotations, it should give the sons and daughters of Canadian Grammar School Trustees too fair an insight into Marian history when tested by facts.

The next sentence of your Class Book accuses Mary of a breach of promise. "And in direct violation of her promise to the men of Suffolk, the religious laws of Edward VI. were repealed. Is this correct? Did Mary make this promise? Without pretending to discuss the question, as to Mary's right to change the national religion—(to restore the old religion, would be a correcter phrase)—we would still remind your honorable body, that Mary was by law "Head of the Church"—she inherited that office from her father. It was in virtue of this power that Edward VI. had made Protestantism the national religion, for England under Henry had been merely schismatical. Mary therefore—if it was she and not the people who effected the change—only exercised the power, which Edward had wielded before her, when she changed the national religion.

But did Mary break her promise? This will depend upon another question—Did she ever make one? for she could not break it, if she had never made it. Did she then ever make a promise to the Protestants of Suffolk? Intelligent criticism will say that it is extremely doubtful, if not absolutely false. The assertion that she did, is founded upon the indifferent authority of Foxe (III. p. 12) and even he furnishes the strongest proof that she did not. During the persecutions—long after Mary's accession—the Protestants of Suffolk presented to Mary a petition in favor of their religion. The document is long, a presumptive proof that it was meant to be exhaustive. This petition was certainly just the place to remind her of her promise, had it ever been given. But the petition as preserved by Foxe does not mention it. Verily Foxe testifieth against Foxe.

We feel, Gentlemen, that it is an ungracious task thus to dispel one, by one long cherished popular idea. The up-rooting from one's soul of time honored prejudices is a work of anguish—(like drawing one's eye tooth suggests Uncle Toby); but the most powerful forceps is ever the most merciful instrument; and if the decaying stump has to be eradicated, lest it contaminate its neighbors, the firmer the hand that draws, the more merciful withal.

SACERDOS.

We publish below a communication over the signature of T. O. R. Keatinge, D.D., L.L.D. With the writer personally, we have no quarrel, and no desire to engage in controversy. Our quarrel with the editor of the *Hearthstone* is, or rather was, about the publication in that paper of a tale of very immoral tendencies, and one which should not be admitted inside the doors of any Christian family. Without further comment, and hoping that we may never be compelled to revert to the unpleasant subject again, we, as a matter of fair play, give insertion to Mr. Keatinge's rejoinder:—

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

SIR,—As I never intrude personal matter into the *Hearthstone*, I am compelled to request of your courtesy permission to reply in the *True Witness* to that part of your Editorial on "Current Literature," that personally concerns myself. The inference of your remarks is plain enough. "If the Rev. T. O. R. Keatinge, Editor of the *Hearthstone*, be the Rev. T. O. R. Keatinge, who figured in Boston as 'a brand snatched from the burning,' then we are not surprised that such a production as 'A Terrible Temptation' should find its way into the columns of the *Hearthstone*. A little lower down in the article, it is said, 'love your neighbor as yourself for the love of God is the great Catholic law.' Surely, Sir, this 'great Catholic law' should have prompted you to examine into facts before you made rash statements. To begin with, I never figured as 'a brand snatched from the burning,' that statement is your own. Then your inference, that the *Hearthstone* publishes an immoral story because I am the Editor, thereby insinuating that I am personally immoral, is malicious and slanderous. If you take the trouble to examine the file of the *Hearthstone* since I have been Editor, you will see that its tone has improved exceedingly. My controversy with Father Hecker is too well known to need recapitulation. I did say that since it was impossible to impugn that gentleman's erudition, his misstatement of known facts could only be wilful. The tract 'Is it honest?' was then under review, and I repeat again what I said in Boston, and what even Catholics have said, that it is a gross perversion of truth. As to the statement about Dr. Newman, your quotation is most garbled. The judgment of Lord Chief Justice Campbell contained these words: 'I am sorry to see a gentleman of your position descending to become a slanderer and defamer.' As Dr. Newman's statements about Dr. Achilli were proven slanderous and defamatory, it only shows that in the heat of polemical controversy the holiest men may degenerate to the level of the worst. This was cited apropos of the slanders respecting myself. Although this is a painful subject I am compelled to disprove your insinuations by alluding to it. Certain charges were at one time made against me of such a character that no one who knows me would believe them for a moment. These charges were made by personal enemies of mine, all of them guilty of the very offences with which they charged me, to rebut grave charges by myself. One of these parties happened to be assistant Editor of the *Christian Union* at the time, and this gave prominence to the charges which else would have been ridiculous.

• Every one of them was clearly proved.

Not a vestige of proof was ever alleged in support of these charges. Indeed though the Boston *Watchman and Reflector*, and other prominent journals, repeatedly call for proofs and facts, years have nearly elapsed and none have been forthcoming.

One of the persons making these charges was the infamous woman O'Gorman, a wretch so utterly depraved that even her own partisans are ashamed of her.

Though I have repeatedly sought for opportunity to reply *seriatim* to these charges, my letters have invariably been refused publication. The Protestant Religious Press has been quick to condemn, but has uniformly refused me a hearing. The *Christian Union* is a specimen.

I am, however, only awaiting a suitable opportunity to vindicate myself, and shall shortly publish the whole history of my life. If any journal in Montreal will court an action for libel by publishing these charges, I shall be only too ready to try the issue in a Court of justice. The reason why Mr. Beecher was not indicted for slander in New York is that no dependence can be placed in the securing of a verdict according to evidence where the defendant is rich and the plaintiff poor.

I regret that you should have gone out of your way to indulge in personalities. You might have selected papers professing to be religious in the extreme who are daily publishing stories to which 'A Terrible Temptation' is highly moral. I did not expect that so large hearted a gentleman openly proclaiming to 'love your neighbor as yourself for the love of God is the great Catholic law,' would join those whom he must despise, or those who utterly set at naught this 'great Catholic law,' and in whose Christianity Christ has no place.

I am, Sir, yours very faithfully,  
T. O. R. KEATINGE, D.D., L.L.D.  
Priest of the United Church of England and Ireland, Editor of the "*Hearthstone*," and author of "*Ten Years in Rome*."  
Sept. 12th, 1871.

The annexed letter was received by us too late for translation, and insertion in our last issue. It purports to be a reply—how far it is so the reader will judge for himself—to two questions addressed by us to those who accused the Priests and Professors of Joliette College of having excited their pupils to acts of violence against the persons and property of Protestants.

We need only remark that an investigation conducted by "indignant" Protestants, could not have been either calm, or impartial; and that the refusal of the accusers to give when called on to do so, the names of the priests to whom they attribute improper conduct, convicts them, the accusers, of cowardice and slandering. Truth loves the light: is outspoken and fearless, and courts the most rigid scrutiny. With these remarks we insert, as translated by the *Witness*, the letter sent to us from Mr. Vernon:—

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

One of our friends has sent us an article from your paper of the 18th of August, in which you affirm that a portion of our complaints against the Anti-Protestants of Joliette are not well founded. In the transport of your zeal you have made accusations against us in bitter terms. We wish to make no rejoinder to words so hasty, but for the edification of your honest readers, we wish to give you a little more light upon that most lamentable affair.

We have complained that on the 9th and 10th of July last, a number of fanatics and bad citizens rudely disturbed our religious assemblies, interrupted the speaker, beat and wounded those who wished to hear him, and created a terrible uproar in several of the streets of Joliette, and even under the windows of the Crown Council. In reflecting upon these acts, so dishonoring to Popery, we remember another outrage quite as criminal and revolting, committed several years ago in the same little town of Joliette. A depository of sacred books in a house there, rented by Mr. J. Vessot, was then publicly broken open and pillaged, the books were torn and scattered about the town, and in the college and primary school kept by the forces. Some of the guilty scholars confessed in the presence of their parents and of a lawyer (whom we could name if necessary), that their masters had encouraged them to the commission of the offence. Do you ask by whom the investigation was made? We made the investigation ourselves, assisted by the whole indignant community. Yes, Mr. Editor, this revolting scene excited a profound indignation in the minds of all impartial Catholics of the town and vicinity.

We ask you in turn, whose business is it to make an inquiry in order to bring the guilty to punishment? Would not such an outrage, committed in time of peace in any other free and civilized country, have awakened the earnest attention of the men of law and the guardians of the peace? But these gentlemen were afraid of displeasing an occult government, and that you know as well we. Suppose, for instance, that we have a bank at Joliette, and that, during the day or night, the bank is broken into, its safes forced and their contents abstracted, and that traces of the pillage are found in all quarters of the town, in profane houses and in religious establishments: In such a case would not the municipality of Joliette, or its police, be very reprehensible if they did nothing to seek, arrest and punish the perpetrators?

Now, Mr. Editor, you know well that to profess openly our religious faith and publicly to propagate the Gospel in our beloved country, is our right and our duty. This right is more sacred in our eyes than gold or bills are precious to bankers. You ought to know that. Why, then, should we have made the investigation in the two or three instances in which our most precious and inalienable rights were obviously violated? If our representatives of the law have failed in their duty, it is because they feared that the light would displease those whom the Hon. Mr. Curchion, recently characterized as 'detestable extinguishers' (*detestables éteigneurs*). Do Mr. Vessot's books, found torn at the college and school, prove nothing against their directors and their professors, whatever may be their names?

This is all we have to say upon the subject in hand. If you wish for more light, come you yourself and recommence with us the investigations. Many of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens will aid us, for they are still indignant. You ask that the priests be named to you. We shall give you no names, but we hold them all responsible, in different degrees, for the abasement of the moral, intellectual and religious standard of Lower Canada, and of all countries owning submission to the Pope. We hold them responsible, in different degrees, for the barbarous acts so often committed in many parts of the country, and especially at Joliette at various times.

If some good priests have publicly denounced these savage acts, we know that there remains to all of them the dark and secret confessional. Secret societies are generally injurious in all countries where they exercise an influence, but none are more dangerous than those whose members receive their watchword, on their knees and in the darkness, at

• Name him.

† Nothing; till we know who put them there.

the feet of a mortal who pretends to open and shut the gates of Heaven at his!

Yours, &c.,

J. A. VERNON, President,  
NOEL RONDEAU, Secretary.

Joliette, Sept. 9, 1871.

It affords us great pleasure to insert the following tribute to the labors and successes of Father Stafford. His noble efforts in the cause of religion and morality are bearing their legitimate fruits. By following his precepts, and by acting in spirit and deed with his intents and wishes, the Catholics of Lindsay will strengthen themselves morally and physically. In crushing the demon of intemperance Father Stafford has done a good work; and in laying the foundation of sound practical Catholic education he is conferring a boon upon the present, and securing the well being of the future, of his people. May God bless the good work and reward the workers:—

The Rev. M. Stafford is the Catholic Pastor in Lindsay, and deeply is Lindsay indebted to the zealous Priest; and largely too are religion, education and the good cause of temperance his debtors. But a little over three years have elapsed since Father Stafford took charge of this Mission, and yet how notable and striking the change. St. Mary's Church, is now renovated, neatly appointed and elaborately painted building, with a gallery stretching full across the main entrance, paneled and corniced classically on the face and capable of seating with ease about 250 or 300 persons. In these improvements, and reducing the debt on the church, no less a sum than \$3,400 has been expended; and in addition to this, the new church at Fenelon Falls is yet another monument to the incessant toil and energy which Father Stafford has brought to bear upon his mission.

And the Rev. gentleman's religious zeal is paralleled only by his concern for the advancement of education. The dingy log-cabin which formerly served as the alma mater of the Catholic youth of Lindsay has disappeared and upon its ruins has sprung up a school house in brick, two storeys high, handsome in design and structure, at a cost of \$6,000. This building is the most complete of its class in the Dominion, and has been pronounced by Dr. Ryerson himself as surpassing, in many improvements, even the Normal and Model schools of Toronto. A spacious playground surrounds the school, which is protected by a substantial fence of wood, the posts being sheathed with galvanized iron and a well-lined drain running beneath, which carries away the surplus water of the grounds and prevents the portion of the fence below the surface from decay. There are two departments in the school—male and female—in which attend 200 children. Mr. Flynn is the efficient and educated director of the male branch, Miss McDonnell having charge of the other, with Miss Dunn as assistant. There is also a select school in Keenan's Block, in which the more advanced are educated, and this is superintended by Miss Robertson. Yet there is not room enough for the increasing demands of the Catholic community, and Father Stafford finds it absolutely necessary to erect another building, which is intended as a seminary for young ladies. It will be located near the Church, and already is on the ground material for the foundation. The building will be commenced next spring, and will cost \$10,000—\$1,500 of which is now in bank. Add to this two new school houses in the Township of Opps, erected at a cost of \$1,000 each, and you may form a faint idea of a labour undertaken and carried to a successful issue by the Parish Priest of Lindsay.

If religion and education owe much to the single purpose and indefatigable will of Father Stafford, so also does the not less holy and noble cause of temperance. Before the zealous Pastor's advent to Lindsay, the curse of intemperance was wide-spread and defiant. Many farmers who had once been independent and wealthy had lost all through indolence and neglect brought on by dissipation—by a too free indulgence in whiskey. And this state of things still prevailed. It was a critical moment; but Father Stafford was equal to the emergency. He at once crumpled with the "curse" by establishing a temperance society. God blessed the work, and it was fruitful and multiplied. The grain of mustard seed fructified not more amazingly than did this society, till now it numbers 2,050 happy and prosperous souls. Travel where you will through the Townships of Emily and Opps, and you seldom meet a Catholic who is not a member of Father Stafford's Temperance Society. "We want not office or emolument," said the devoted Pastor, "Give us first temperance, and all the other virtues are certain to follow." Irish Catholics would do well to ponder seriously this maxim, and as many of them as are affected by its truth, should shake off the full destroyer and resolve to mend their ways.

P. B.  
—Irish Canadian.

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

SIR,—Can you explain how it is that the members of the body calling itself the Anglican Synod, now assembled in this City are, at every moment, and at every stage of their proceedings, obliged to invoke the interference of the Dominion Parliament for permission to do this, or leave to do that? So that, as one delegate is reported in the *Gazette* as having remarked, a publication of the Consolidated Statutes of the Episcopal Church in Canada will soon be required.

Why is this? We have no established Church in Canada; and I see not why gentlemen, members of the Protestant Episcopal Church here, should not meet together and arrange their own Ecclesiastical affairs without interference from Parliament, just as the other Protestant sects do; just as do the Bishops of the Catholic Church who meet when, where, and as they please, and enact such laws as to them seem good, without troubling Parliament in the matter. I cannot understand the cause of this difference; nor whether certainly do I carry the peculiar and not very dignified position of our Anglican fellow-citizens.

MINOR MAJORS.

Montreal, Sept. 16th, 1871.

Our correspondent *Minor Majors* will see an explanation in the *Montreal Herald* of Saturday. The Anglican Synod is simply the "creature of law," and has no authority but what the law gives it.

Mr. James Murphy, Crier, Superior Court, Quebec, has kindly consented to act as our Agent in room of the late lamented Mr. Neville.