

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.

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. FETTING & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. ROWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JULY—1872.

Friday, 12—St. John Gualbert, Ab.  
Saturday, 13—St. Anacletus, P. M.  
Sunday, 14—Eighth after Pentecost.  
Monday, 15—St. Henry, C.  
Tuesday, 16—B. V. M. of Mount Carmel.  
Wednesday, 17—St. Alexius, C.  
Thursday, 18—St. Camillus of Lellis, C.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

A Paris despatch states that England, Italy and Switzerland decline accepting the modifications proposed to the treaty of commerce by France.

A report is in circulation that Victor Hugo, who has been persistent in his efforts to secure the commutation of sentence passed upon Henri Rochefort, has succeeded, and that Rochefort, instead of being transported to the penal colony of New Caledonia, will be simply banished from France.

A Berlin despatch states that M. Bismarck has received assurances from three great Catholic powers consenting to a conclave of Cardinals, in order to have a perfect understanding between the Cardinals and Governments interested in the Pope.

The Spenser Gazette official says Emperor William has appointed three of the law officers of the Crown to prepare a report upon the San Juan Boundary question.

A despatch from Constantinople announces that the fire in the suburb of Scutari was checked after destroying but a few more buildings than before stated.

The revolution is again gathering strength in Mexico.

A severe electric storm, without rain, at York, Me., on Wednesday, melted the telegraph wires for a long distance, and killed a little girl, seven years old, who was sitting beneath them, wounded her little brother, and left unharmed a third child, who was sitting between the others.

The Prince Edward Island Legislature was prorogued on the 29th ult.

Lord Dufferin has officially declared his intention of residing a part of each year in Montreal.

There were seventeen deaths from small-pox last week, a decrease of seven from the previous week. Of these thirteen were Roman Catholics and four Protestants.

In our last we took up the instances adduced by the *Witness* from Irish history to disprove our thesis that Protestantism has never made any permanent conquests, except there where it has been supported by the State; that left to itself, it has always dwindled away before the presence of the Church. We have still to deal with the instances from French history which the *Witness* adduces to prove that it is Catholicity, and not Protestantism, that has thriven upon State aid. For this purpose the *Witness*, May 18th, cites:—1. The Massacre of St. Bartholemew, Aug. 24th, 1572; and 2nd the Revocation by Louis XIV. of the Edict of Nantes, and the severe proceedings instituted by the same monarch against the Huguenots.

With regard to the first, or St. Bartholemew massacre, we remark that it was purely a political crime, and therefore not relevant to the question at issue. It was a crime planned and carried into execution by an unprincipled woman, who cared as little for Catholics as she did for Protestants; and we contend that it was the merest chance in the world, that its victims were not the Catholics, as they would have been, but for the vacillating policy of the English Queen, and the obstacles which she was ever opposing to the long talked of Alencon marriage, ardently desired by the Queen Mother. The consequences of this union would have been, a massacre no doubt, but the massacre of the Catholic by the Hugue-

not party—the espousal by France and England, conjointly, of the Protestant cause throughout Europe, and war with Spain, and the Catholic Powers of the Continent. This was the policy that found favor in the eyes of Catherine de Medici and the French Court, and which commended itself to many of the leading French politicians of the day, who were then as eager to revenge on the Spaniard the battle of St. Quentin, as their descendants to-day are eager to exact from the Prussian, payment for the disaster of Sedan, the capitulation of Paris, and the late Treaty of peace so humiliating to France. But single-handed France did not dare, in 1572, to go to war with Spain. The English alliance, of which the terms were the marriage of Elizabeth with Alencon, had to be consummated before France would undertake to draw the sword on the Protestant side, and therewith to drive Alva, and his Spaniards from the Low Countries. Failing in this alliance, France would have to fall back on the Catholic party for support against the Huguenots; but until Elizabeth could be forced to give a decisive answer, Yes or No, to the Alencon marriage propositions, the Queen Mother, who virtually ruled France, was obliged still to hesitate, as to whether she should throw herself unreservedly into the arms of the Huguenots, massacre the Catholics, and declare war with Spain; or whether she should place herself at the head of a great anti-Huguenot party in France, and throughout Europe. Up to the 10th of August, about a fortnight before the massacre—her mind was still in suspense as to which course of policy she should adopt; all depended on the acceptance, or non-acceptance, by Elizabeth of the proffered hand of the Duc D'Alencon, and as usual Elizabeth could not be wrought upon to decide, even though urged to do so by her able advisers, who for the most part were in favor of the French alliance. That these are the facts we propose to show by Protestant authority; and if the facts were so, it is clear that the St. Bartholemew massacre was purely a political crime, and one for which the Church is in no wise responsible, since, but for the vacillation of Elizabeth and her duplicity, the Catholics, not the Huguenots, would have been the victims of the Queen Mother's cold blooded schemes.

In the 23rd chapter of his History of England, the Protestant Froude having told us that "for the French government to go to war with Spain as the ally of the Prince of Orange, would be equivalent to an open declaration in favor of their own Huguenots;" adds, that all the exertions of the Catholic party to prevent this were apparently useless, and thus goes on to describe the attitude of the Court:—

"The traditions of Francis I. were not dead. The opportunity for revenging St. Quentin, and tearing in pieces the Treaty of Cambray was splendidly alluring. . . . Charles was carried away by the temptation, and perhaps by nobler motives. Coligny said that whoever was against the war was no true Frenchman, and the Court appeared to agree with Coligny. The Princess Margaret's marriage, independent of its political bearing, was in itself a defiance of the Papacy."—*Froude's Hist.* vol. x., p. 395.

Everything in the month of July seemed to indicate that the Court of France was about to become Huguenot itself, and to openly espouse the cause of Protestantism throughout Europe, against Spain and the Pope. There was but one obstacle:—

"The only uncertainty rose from the attitude of England. Catherine de Medici had acquiesced in the war—the war with Spain and against the Catholics"—"with the proviso from the first that France and England should take up the quarrel together."—*Id.*

But of the Anglo-French alliance, the marriage of Elizabeth with Alencon was the pledge and indispensable condition. All depended on her and she would not give a decided answer; nay it was at last discovered that she was acting treacherously, and was actually intriguing with Alva, against France. So Froude continues:—

"As soon therefore as it was discovered that Elizabeth was not only playing with the Alencon marriage, but was treating secretly with Alva to make her own advantage out of the crisis, the Queen Mother's resolution gave way—or rather, for resolution is not a word to be thrown away upon Catherine de Medici—she saw that war was too dangerous to be ventured."—*Id.*

But the projected Protestant alliance, and Spanish war being thus impossible, the Court was compelled to adopt the other alternative; and since it could not crush the Catholics by means of the Huguenots as it originally proposed, it must in self-defence crush the Huguenots, or deprive them of power by cutting off their leaders:—In religion the Queen Mother was herself perfectly indifferent, very Liberal indeed:—

"Religion, in its good sense, and in its bad sense, was equally a word without meaning to her. She hated and she despised Calvinism; it was a new superstition as overbearing as the old, and without the sanction of traditional existence; it had shaken her own power, and her son's throne, and though if it would serve her purpose, she was ready to make use of it, she was no less willing if it stood in her way, to set her foot upon its neck."—*Id.*

Still up to the 10th of August, fourteen days only before the massacre, the Queen Mother had not made up her mind to abandon all hopes of the English and Protestant alliance: "Coligny still had a powerful hold on the mind of the King. The Queen Mother when she attempted to oppose him found her influence shaking; and

even she herself, as late certainly as the 10th of August, was hesitating on the course which she should adopt. On that day she was still clinging to the hope that Elizabeth might still take Alencon; it was only when she found distinctly that it would not be, that she fell back upon her own cunning."—*Froude.*

It appears therefore from the testimony of the Protestant historian, that on the 10th of the same month as that on which the massacre occurred—its chief instigator, the Queen Mother, was still hesitating betwixt an English alliance and a pro-Huguenot policy; and peace with Spain and an anti-Huguenot policy.—This disposes of the charge of treachery and premeditation urged by some Protestant writers against Catholics, and shows that the crime was the result of a sudden inspiration or fury—the consequence of the break down of the negotiations with Elizabeth.

That it was a crime no one will deny; that it was a mere political chance, and the consequence of the vacillation and double dealing of Elizabeth, that the Catholics instead of the Huguenots were not the victims of it, is also pretty certain; for had the Queen Mother sided openly with the Huguenots—and raised them to power, we know from their antecedents how they would have treated the Catholics subjected to them. Again we will quote *Froude*, who as a Protestant himself, says as little as he can against his co-religionists, and deals as tenderly as the notorious facts of history will permit, with their peccadilloes. And yet *Froude* is forced to admit that, if "on land the chief sufferers had been the Protestants":

"On the sea they had the advantage, and had used it. The privateers had for the most part disposed swiftly of the crew and passengers of their prizes. Prisoners were inconvenient and dangerous; the sea told no tales, and the dead did not come back. With the capture of Brill and Flushing, the black flag had been transferred to the shore, Sir Humfrey Gilbert, following the practices he had learnt in Ireland, hung the Spaniards as fast as he caught them. The Hollanders had shown no mercy to the priests. . . . The Prince of Orange crossed the Rhine in July, coming forwards towards Mons. He took Burenne by assault, and the monks in the abbey and priories there were instantly murdered. Mechlin opened its gates to him, and after Mechlin, some other towns followed the example; in all of them the Prince could not prevent his cause from being dishonored by the same atrocities."—*Froude's Hist. of England*, vol. x., p. 394.

Perhaps the memory of these atrocities, of these cold-blooded murders of Catholics, of priests and nuns, by the Huguenots who, regarded neither sex nor age, but slow indiscriminately all Papists who fell into their hands may account for—though it may not excuse—the cruel retaliation of the 24th of August, 1572. At all events, we must remember that the St. Bartholemew massacre stands not alone in the stormy annals of this XVI. century; and that all its worst horrors had, before 1572, become as it were chronic in Ireland, where for years, as we showed in our last, acting under the orders of the English government, the captains of Elizabeth, the most illustrious of England's chivalry, had carried on against the Catholics of Ireland a war of extermination more ruthless than that even waged against the Protestants by Alva in the Low countries; a war of extermination which extended to the women, and to the babes at their mothers' breasts; a war which respected neither age nor sex; whilst England's Virgin Queen, and English chivalry, and English Protestantism looked on the bloody spectacle, and loudly applauded. That this was so, we refer for proof to the pages of the Protestant historian *Froude*, by us quoted in our last.

Two wrongs do not make one right. The crime of the St. Bartholemew Massacre in France is not lessened even by the still more brutal crimes perpetrated in cold blood by English Protestants in Ireland, at the orders of Elizabeth's government; and no student of history being a Christian, will ever attempt to justify either the one or the other. Our object therefore in referring to these sad events is, not to offer an excuse for the crimes of the French Court on the grounds that the English Court was just as bad; but to show that if force were in the quarrels of the XVI. century resorted to by one party, the other party was equally swift to appeal to the same mode of arbitration; and that it is with a very bad grace that Protestants reproach their opponents with their persecuting tendencies. In our next we will try and examine whether at all the Church of Rome is responsible for the severities of Louis XIV. towards the Huguenots? and whether after all these so-called severities were not justly deserved by those who were the victims of them?

\* It must be remembered that at the time alluded to, there was no war with Spain by England; these atrocities were simply the amateur atrocities of English Protestants against Spanish Catholics.

Your "Old Catholics" as the new Protestant sect of which Dr. Dollinger is accounted the head, and of which Gavazzi, Loyson, and we suppose—if he be still in the flesh—Achilli are active members, are styled as the funniest fellows imaginable. They are always putting forth programmes, the one more ridiculous than the other, and in short if there be a sect to which the name of "programmatists" is applicable it is that of the Dollingerites.

One of the last of these programmes that we have seen—but as it is now several days old—

there may have been a dozen new ones since it was issued, is given in the *Montreal Witness* of the 4th July. "This programme"

"proclaims the intention of erecting the work of disciplinary and moral reform in the Church of Rome on the divine foundation of Jesus Christ—whatever that may mean—considering any attempt at religious reform inspired by another spirit as impotent. They accept beside the Holy Scriptures 'all the traditions of divine origin, and all legitimate decrees of the Catholic Church; but they absolutely reject the 'human traditions and abuses of authority.'"

Now the only obstacle to the carrying out of this programme or of any other which any non-Catholic sect may adopt is this—and a fatal obstacle it is. Who is to define which traditions are of divine origin, which of human origin? who is to determine what decrees of the Catholic Church are legitimate, and what are abuses of authority?

If every one be left to answer these questions for himself; and as they involve matters on which men have been disputing for centuries without ever coming to any common understanding, it is evident that the result will be what we see in the older Protestant sects, from which that of the *Old Catholics*, or *Dollingerites*, will differ only in name.

But if not to the private judgment of each individual, the answering of these all-important questions be left, some authority competent must be invoked. But no authority not infallible is competent to answer such questions, besides no man intellectually above an idiot, would ever submit himself to an authority which he did not at least believe to be infallible. A fallible tribunal adjudicating on religious questions, or pretending to adjudicate, is a sight at which all but fools must laugh, at which the angels must gaze with awe, and wonder at man's presumption, and which must fill with delight the devil and his angels.

The Dollingerites, therefore, cannot help themselves. They must accept either the Protestant principle of private judgment, or the Catholic principle of authority. If the former, they will soon be just where all those who apostatized from the Church before them, find themselves to-day; if the latter, or principle of authority, they must come back to the Roman Catholic Church, for no other body on earth so much as pretends to be infallible, or competent to distinguish betwixt what is divine and what human in the traditions, betwixt what is legitimate, and what an abuse of authority in the decrees of the Church.

THE COMING ELECTIONS.—In a few days the writs will be out, and the people of the Dominion will be called upon to elect their representatives and law-makers for the next five years. How, and for whom to vote? is a serious question, which Catholic electors should seriously ponder.

Not to us, a Catholic and non-political paper, does it belong to discuss the merits of this man, or that man; neither have we the presumption to dictate to our readers how they should act—further than this. They should do all things *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*: to the honor of God, and the good of His Holy Church.

Yes; a corrupt vote, or vote given from corrupt motives is a sin, because the citizen is bound, in conscience, to exercise his secular privileges, as one who will have to render an account to God for all his actions; for all evil done, for all opportunities of doing good neglected. He should therefore study so to vote as to secure the election of men who will legislate in a Christian spirit; and if in doubt, we see not that the Catholic elector can greatly err, who seeks counsel from his spiritual director. More than this, it becomes us not to say. Fortunately there are not at present any of those great issues before the Federal Legislature which some years ago engaged the attention of the Canadian Parliament, but such issues may arise, and we should be prepared to meet them. What we chiefly look for in the political, or purely secular order, from the Federal Legislature is that it shall scrupulously respect, State Rights, and seek to maintain the connection now existing betwixt Great Britain and the Dominion.

Many excellent candidates present themselves, and on looking over the several lists we almost regret that we cannot return them all; we therefore pray that the coming elections, may be distinguished from those that have preceded them, by their peace, by the absence of personalities, and hard words which party strife so often engenders. For the rest we may say, that for our representatives we want not so much eloquent speakers, as honest men, and men of substance; men who have a stake in the country, interested in her trade, manufactures, and agriculture; of independent means and unblemished reputation. These are the men we want not flashy political adventurers, often unable to pay their debts, or settle their little accounts with the grocer, the baker, and the washerwoman. Such men may make good stump orators, and from the upper window of a corner grocery may be able to charm the ears of the gaping mob below; but such men make

but bad legislators, and we want none of their breed in Parliament.

But we have said all that it becomes us to say, and we finish as we commenced—let all things be done *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*. These are our politics, the Church is the only party we know, and they whom the Holy Ghost has placed in authority, are our leaders.

MONTREAL, June 28th, 1872.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir,—My attention has been directed to an article which appears in your journal of this day, in which I am censured for using the term "baby-farming" in connection with one of our excellent Religious Institutions. Permit me, Sir, to explain that "baby-farming," as I understand it, and as it is understood by nine-tenths of our profession, is simply "giving children out to nurse," or, in other words obtaining for infants, in the houses of others than their own parents,—generally farmer's wives,—that care and attention which is denied them by their own parents. This is most commendable, and is the meaning I shall be content to adopt until Lexicographers shall determine that the term should bear another and an odious meaning. It is the abuse of this custom, in itself most unobjectionable, which has called down the thunders of the London *Times*, with its not over feeble re-echoings on this side of the Atlantic (as *side True Witness*, 28th).

I should be exceedingly sorry if any words of mine should be construed into an unfriendly stricture upon a most useful and noble institution, which has always been remarkable for its acts of noble charity and daily works of mercy; and I take this earliest opportunity afforded me of disclaiming in toto giving the meaning to the term which you have adopted, and which it certainly never had in my mind.

I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your obt' serv't  
W. E. BESSEY, M.D.

No. 8 Beaver Hall Square.  
When a gentleman disclaims the intention of giving offence, he has made ample atonement, and we accept the apology in the spirit in which it is tendered.

At the same time we insist that the term "baby-farming," though in common use since the discovery of an abominable practice very common in England, and which is resorted to when the services of the professional abortionist have failed to accomplish their desired object—never is, and never has been used in any other sense save that given to it in our columns. It is used *invariably* as a term of reproach, or contumely, and to denote a lately discovered species of crime. It is not by lexicographers that its meaning must be determined, but by the *usus loquendi*, or rather *scribendi*. It is a term, in short, through which the chronic malignity of the *Witness* against the Grey Nuns finds vent. In short, we defy Dr. Bessey to find a single instance in which the term "baby-farming" is used, except in the bad sense by us attributed to it; or a single instance in which it has been used to denote an act of Christian charity. From what we have heard, however, and on the best authority, of Dr. Bessey, we fully believe that he erred through inadvertence, and that he would not designedly say a word to give pain to the Grey Nuns, or any other ladies engaged in good works.

MASSON COLLEGE, TERREBONNE.—Perhaps none of us enjoyed more pleasant feelings, on Dominion Day, than a few friends who visited Terrebonne, on the occasion of the Distribution of Prizes at the Masson College. It was gratifying to see this admirable Commercial Institution acquitting itself with marked success, and exhibiting a result of a year's labor which will compare favorably with any of our Canadian Colleges. On this occasion, the large hall of the new wing was densely crowded with an assemblage of the relatives and friends of the pupils, and a number of Catholic clergymen of the Diocese. The exercises were various and interesting, evidencing as they did that our French Canadian friends are doing much to secure their children the advantages of a thorough commercial education, and also that the children exhibit a very commendable adaption for such attainments.

The programme was not tedious, and was carried out very successfully. The Band executed some selections in a very creditable manner, and the orations were far beyond the stereotyped effusions which are let loose on such exhibitions. The Rev. Canon Fabre, Mr. Masson, M. P., and Mr. Villeneuve addressed the audience on the advantages afforded by the College to secure a branch of learning which has hitherto been deplorably neglected in this section of the Dominion.

The presentation of prizes then commenced, and the successful competitors were greeted with plaudits in a very enthusiastic style. Our lads had to contend against some very clever opponents from the States, and it would appear that the honors were about equally divided. The Irish element worked hard, and was the victor in many contests, yet the bright-eyed Canadians departed with small libraries. The writer was informed that the examination was the severest test of progress that has taken place for some years, and the disappointed acknowledged that the honors were fairly won.

R. M. D.  
We have received the first two numbers of the *Catholic Reflector*, a new paper published at Albany, N.Y., and wish it a long life. It has the approbation of His Lordship the Bishop of Albany.