

"PROTESTANT" ANSWERED.

A correspondent, signing "Protestant," has a letter in the Daily Witness, of the 29th December, on the subject of "Religious Persecution." After quoting a number of authors, and citing several facts, he comes to the conclusion that "the Montreal Roman Catholic organ should be called the False Witness." He may call this organ just what he pleases; but he certainly will require to be more exact if he wishes to show that the article to which he refers was not logical and well founded. Either "Protestant" read or he did not read all our editorials on that subject; if he read them, he is certainly in bad faith, for he perverts the expressions and arguments of some, while he ignores entirely the very answers that have been given, in others, to his oft-repeated calumnies; if he did not read them, we will be happy to furnish him with copies of the numbers, in order that he may not fall into the sin of "bearing false witness against his neighbor."

It has taken this correspondent several weeks to concoct his half column series of accusations and to twist and turn authorities to suit his preconceived prejudice against the Catholic Church. He starts out with the following quotation from our editorial: "Persecution by the Church never took place, and is contrary to one of the fundamental principles of Catholicity." That is exact; and that we are prepared to maintain against all comers—provided they are impartial, logical, and open to conviction. He says: "'Deny everything, admit nothing,' is one of Rome's maxims which her advocates use in controversy." We beg his pardon; the maxim was Voltaire's and Luther's. These two worthies put it into practice, each in his own way; the former to destroy all religion, the latter to destroy the true religion.

This learned gentleman cites "the accredited expounders of Roman Catholic law and doctrine, Ligouri and Dens, at the end of their 'Moral Theologies.'" He then gives a passage that is meaningless without its context. It is like picking out some one text of Scripture and building up a creed thereon. It is evident that he has read as little of the authors from whom he pretends to quote, as he has of the articles in THE TRUE WITNESS. He found the quotation in that unmentionable volume lately imported into Canada by a city book dealer, and which is as rotten as the mind of the man who compiled it. Has "Protestant" ever read St. Thomas, St. Augustine, or any Catholic theologian? Certainly not; or he would have found our conclusions entirely supported. In the space of one article we cannot go into all the more or less false assertions of this would-be historian; but, if he will kindly follow THE TRUE WITNESS he will find them met one by one. The main object, however, of "Protestant" is to prove that we were wrong in asserting that *The Church* never persecuted, and that persecution is contrary to a fundamental principle of Catholicity. We repeat that in so stating we were right.

If individual Catholics in the fourteenth or sixteenth century performed acts of cruelty, or persecuted others, it was not because they were Catholics, but because they were men living in an iron age. They did not persecute for the Church, but in direct opposition to the Church's mandates. "In one case," says a great Catholic authority, "it is true, the Church is, and always must be, intolerant. Truth is intolerant of falsehood. The mission of the Church is to condemn error, to eradicate it. But the weapons of her warfare are not carnal, but spiritual; and her judgments receive

their sanction, not from them that kill the body, but from Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Read "Protestant's" so-called oath of bishops, in the light of this statement, correct it by substituting the word "follow or pursue" for "persecute," and you have an explanation that any rational mind must accept. They bind themselves to pray for and to teach heretics, to seek out heresy and to destroy it—not with sword, or fire, or carnal instrument, but with those spiritual arms which Christ left to His duly appointed representatives. If "Protestant" would only take the trouble to read thoroughly the works from which he pretends to quote, and then to give what goes before and what follows his quotations, he would not be exposing himself to the ridicule of all thoroughly read men.

We will now cite the words of a Protestant author, one who was, when he wrote, President of Kenyon and Hobart Colleges—James Kent Stone: "As a Protestant, I do not see how any man who is at the same time decently educated and fairly disposed, can lay to the account of the Catholic Church such items as the Spanish atrocities in the Netherlands, the Dragonnades of the Cevennes, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew. It would be as fair to hold the Orthodox Church of Russia responsible for all the woes of Poland, or to assert that the wrongs of Ireland are the necessary consequence of the theology of the Thirty-nine Articles. The *Te Deum* of Gregory XIII. is certainly a morsel for Protestant controversialists; but it is mere churlishness to refuse to believe that the Pope had been deceived as to the facts." On this point take the North American Review, for June, 1863: "The See of Rome was imperatively called upon for immediate action before the true facts of the case could by any possibility have been really known, if indeed, they were not designedly concealed."

Does "Protestant" require Infidel and non-Catholic authorities? Let him read Voltaire, Ranke, Guizot, Schlegel and others, and he will find that the Spanish Inquisition was not a Catholic, but a national and local tribunal. It was political in its origin, was maintained by royal power, and was considered necessary to protect the unity of the Spanish kingdom, and founded upon the principle that heresy was a crime against the peace of society, and as such, punishable by the civil power. Even Mr. Lecky and the famous, or infamous, Llorente, admit that the Roman Pontiff more than once endeavored to mitigate its severities, and protested against the horrible excesses of Torquemada. When Charles V. and Philip II. attempted to impose the tribunal on Italian cities, the Popes encouraged the Italians in resisting the imposition.

Perhaps our friend "Protestant" will claim that Llorente was a secretary to the Inquisition. But he must know that Llorente was dismissed in disgrace from that post. He was a traitor to his country, and a bitter enemy of the Pope and the Church. When Joseph Bonaparte put the records of the Inquisition at his disposal, he took good care to burn such as might be inconvenient to preserve.

As to the St. Bartholomew, the Galileo and Inquisition arguments, so often have they been disproved, so clearly have the falseness of such basis of attack upon the Church been demonstrated, that the man who is so far behind the age, and so steeped in prejudice as to harp upon those long since unmusical strings, is indeed to be pitied, he must live in a very narrow circle, and breathe an unhealthy atmosphere. Remember that recrim-

ination is not an argument; we are not going to quote Hallam's Constitutional History, nor Macaulay's History, nor his Review of Hallam, nor Lecky's chapter on Persecution, nor Milner's Letters to a Prebendary, nor Challoner's Memoires of Missionary Priests, nor Palmer on the Church, and the Writ "De Hæretico Comburendo," nor the laws for "hanging and disembowelling Papists;" we will merely indicate these few that "Protestant" may take the trouble to read them and, perhaps, change his views somewhat. He might also take up Lecky's "Rationalism in Europe," v. ii. pp. 57, 59, 61.

We would recall to "Protestant's" mind the epigrammatic remark of the famous D'Alembert; "Les Reformes qui reprochent tant l'intolérance a l'Eglise Romaine, ne haissent la persecution, que quand elle les regarde,—et nullement quand ils l'exercent." "The Reformers, who so reproach the Roman Church with intolerance, hate persecution only when it concerns themselves,—and never when they exercise it."

Says the great Protestant author of "Rationalism in Europe,"—"Persecution among the early Protestants was a distinct and definite doctrine, digested into elaborate treatises, indissolubly connected with a large portion of the received theology, developed by the most enlightened and far-seeing theologians, and enforced against the most inoffensive as against the most formidable sects. It was the doctrine of the palmiest days of Protestantism. It was taught by those who are justly esteemed the greatest of its leaders. It was manifested most clearly in those classes which were most deeply imbued with its dogmatic teaching."

But all this—even in a creed of yesterday—would in no way justify the Catholic Church—a creed of nineteen centuries—in adopting or teaching persecution as a principle; but we are prepared to disprove "Protestant's" insinuation as to the Catholic spirit—and we are ready to change our title from "True" to "False" if we should fail.

THE PROFESSION OF POLITICS.

There are two letters in the current number of the "Arena," one from a young student about to leave college, asking advice as to the choice of politics as a profession, the other a sage reply from a man of the world. Both we expect are the composition of N. D. McCrackan, M.A. A portion of the reply given strikes us as very applicable to our own country and our own young men. It contains truths that are seldom brought before the public mind, but which every disinterested reader will admit the moment they are stated.

"No honest man can enter political life to day without doing so as a reformer—not in the partizan sense—and there is no money in reform work. You will find yourself left out in the cold. While the professionals are dividing the spoils, you will have to stand aside. No office will be offered to such as you. The party conventions will dread your appearance as an omen of disloyalty. You will be scorned as a theorist and a dude. In debate they will shake their finger at you as a traitor and a hypocrite. At every turn your honesty will prove a stumbling block to your advancement. For you must first realize to what depths our party system has sunk."

No person can deny the exactness of the remarks, but still more so do we deem the following:

"The truth is, competing parties are first of all playing with each other for certain stakes, which are offices, fat

places, salaries, etc. If there is any time or money left over, then vital questions are treated a little, as an afterthought. Every political campaign resolves itself into a wordy manoeuvre for points of strategic importance. The idea is not to enlighten the voters in regard to the real issues at stake, but rather to distract their attention and fix it upon catching non-essentials. The great aim of every well constituted party is, of course, to counteract the good moves of its opponent, no matter at what cost to the public welfare; if possible to fasten upon it the blame of any national calamity; above all to drive it into a hole." * * * "The man without ideas in politics naturally becomes a spoilman because there is nothing honorable left for him to do. Having no interest in the public good, he straightway attends to his private interests."

We may add to these striking remarks that "to become an honest politician, and a real intelligent legislator, a man must learn to resist the lobby which corrupts, and the party organization which deceives. He must place his professional honor securely upon principle, not upon expediency. He must be prepared to be called all manner of names, and in the end, perhaps, to be rated a worldly failure."

We leave these few observations to the consideration of our young and ambitious fellow-countrymen, especially those who are preparing to enter the whirlpool of politics.

CATHOLIC ORDER OF FORESTERS

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

Council No. 113, Side Rank Degree of Foresters, attached to St. Anthony Court No. 126, had their annual elections at their meeting of 11th inst. The following are the officers elected for the ensuing term:—Wm. J. Cochrane, grand high ruler; John Flanagan, grand vice-high ruler; Michael Toner, grand past high ruler; Ed. Hubert, grand high prophet; Jas. Daly, grand high guide; J. P. Doran, grand high secretary; M. J. Walsh, grand high treasurer; John Kelly, grand high inside sentinel.

J. P. DORAN, Sec.

LINCOLN'S TENDER HEART.

A PATHETIC ANECDOTE OF THE MARTYR PRESIDENT.

The Martyr President's tender heart is clearly visible in the following pathetic narrative. One day in May, 1863, while the great war was raging in America between the North and South, President Lincoln paid a visit to one of the military hospitals. He had spoken many cheering words of sympathy to the wounded as he proceeded through the various wards, and now he was at the bedside of a Vermont boy of about 16 years of age, who lay there mortally wounded.

Taking the boy's thin white hand in his own, the President said in a tender tone: "Well, my good boy, what can I do for you?" The little fellow looked up into the President's face and asked: "Won't you write to my mother for me?" "That I will," answered Mr. Lincoln; and calling for pen, ink and paper, he seated himself by the side of the bed and wrote from the boy's dictation. It was a long letter, but the President betrayed no signs of weariness. When it was finished he rose. "I will post this as soon as I get back to my office. Now, is there anything else I can do for you?" The boy looked appealingly to the President. "Won't you stay with me?" he asked. "I do so want to hold your hand." The kind-hearted President at once perceived the boy's meaning. The appeal was too strong for him to resist, so he sat down by his side and took hold of his hand. For two hours the President sat there patiently, as though he had been the boy's father. When the end came he bent over and folded the thin hands over his breast. As he did so he burst into tears, and when soon afterward he left the hospital they were still streaming down his cheeks.