

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. PATTENGLI & 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 5, 1872.

ECOLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JULY—1872.
Friday, 5—Of the Octave.
Saturday, 6—Octave of SS. Peter and Paul.
Sunday, 7—Seventh after Pentecost. Most Precious Blood of Our Lord.
Monday, 8—St. Elizabeth, V.
Tuesday, 9—SS. Zenon and Comp., MM.
Wednesday, 10—The Seven Brothers, MM.
Thursday, 11—St. Bernardine of Sienna, C.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The treaty providing for the evacuation of French territory by the German troops was signed last Saturday night. It requires the ratification of the French and German Government within one week after having been signed. The republicans have resolved to oppose every form of monarchical government in Spain.

A Geneva special says the mode of proceedings on the direct claims has not yet been ascertained, but the court will probably consider *seriatim* the character of the Confederate cruisers, and accordingly as they determine that character, adjudge England responsible or not for the depredations of one or all of these ships. The character of the ship being thus determined, the arbitrators will next consider the award of damages on this point, and will probably confer freely with the counsel of either side; should the views of these not too widely differ, as to the amount of the indemnity, the court may name a gross amount between the two. If there should be no hope of reconciling the conflicting estimates to the assessors, provided for by the treaty, and so conclude their sittings.

We continue our task of sifting the lot of rubbish, shot from the historical dust cart of the *Witness*. It is a tiresome job, and somewhat a dirty one; still it has to be done.

We laid down the proposition, in reply to the *Witness*'s remark that Education was the battle-ground on which the conflict between Romanism and Protestantism had to be fought out—that, wherever the State had remained strictly neutral, refraining from occupying the battle-ground, but leaving the belligerents to fight it out between themselves—there the cause of Romanism had triumphed. So it happened three centuries ago, when, as the *Witness* admits, the Jesuits by means of their schools, turned back the flow of the Reformation, and check-mated it. So will it be again we argued, if the State will but remain neutral and not interfere with that which is not its legitimate business, that is to say Education, leaving it to the *Family* in whose hands God has placed it. We again assert that in no country has Protestantism obtained a footing, or maintained its position without the aid of the State; and that wherever the State has refrained from passing Penal Laws against the Catholic Church, or has repealed its persecuting code, there Catholicity or Romanism has always approved itself more than a match for its opponent.

To refute us, all that the *Witness* had to do was to adduce one single instance of a country, or State, in which Catholics unmolested by penal laws have been left free to practise their religion and to educate their children as they pleased, and in which that religion has not triumphed. Such an instance our opponent does not adduce; but in lieu thereof he seeks to divert attention by raising irrelevant issues; and he rakes together all the dirt and garbage that he has been able to collect from "*Hand Books of Popery*" and similar works to show that Protestants were as lambs in the midst of wolves, gentle, and the victims of Romish persecution. It is this filth that we have to sift.

He cites the "Sanguinary Duke of Alva" and his severities against the rebels in the Netherlands, aided and countenanced as were the said rebels by the government of Elizabeth. Now it is not our business to defend Alva; he

was a brave and able soldier we believe, and a ruthless one; but we must remember that he had to deal with ruthless enemies, whose cruelties against Catholics provoked, if they did not justify, the severe retaliatory measures of the Spaniards. In the words of the Protestant historian Froude, whom we quote, not because he is a correct historian, but because he is a bitter Protestant historian—"the Commons of the Netherlands rose in rebellion, sacked churches, and cathedrals, burnt monasteries, killed monks when they came in their way, set up their own services, and broke into the usual excesses which the Calvinists on their side considered also supremely meritorious."—Vol. 9, c. 16. Perhaps after all, Alva had some good reasons for treating these gentle Protestant lambs with the severities of martial law—even as we dealt with the lamb-like Sepoys in India at the time of the great mutiny.

And yet with all his severity, Alva was a mild and gentle soldier, compared with the captains whom the Protestant government of England sent to Ireland with instructions to impose the Protestant religion upon the Irish; and whose cruel proceedings were duly reported to and approved of by the aforesaid Protestant government. Again let us hear what the Protestant Froude says upon this matter:

"The English nation was shuddering over the atrocities of the Duke of Alva. The children in the nurseries were being inflamed to patriotic rage, and madness, by tales of Spanish tyranny. Yet Alva's bloody sword never touched the young, the defenceless, or those whose sex even dogs can recognise and respect."—Vol. 10, c. 24.

No! Alva—pitiless to the strong and the armed though he may have shown himself—never stained his sword with the blood of the weak, of the defenceless, of children, or of woman. These outrages on human nature were perpetrated indeed, but not by Catholics on the Protestant lambs, but by the gentle chivalrous soldiery of Protestant England on the Catholic Irish. Again we quote Froude:—

"Sir Peter Carew has been seen murdering women and children, and babies that had scarcely left the breast; but Sir Peter Carew was not called on to answer for his conduct, and remained in favor with the Deputy. Gilbert who was left in command at Kilmallock was illustrating yet more signally the same tendency. . . . He regarded himself as dealing rather with savage beasts than with human beings, and when he tracked them to their dens, he strangled the cubs, and rooted out the entire broods."—*Froude's Hist.*, 7b.

And these atrocities on women and children, were, in the Court of the Protestant Queen of England received the highest applause:—

"Not he only"—says Froude—"but Elizabeth's representative, the statesman, the gentleman, the accomplished Sidney, he too, for these things could find but words of praise, nay, could scarce find words sufficient to express his admiration of them."—7b.

And all these horrors proceeded from the attempt of the Protestant government of Ireland to force their blessed religion upon a Catholic people. "But for the question of religion," admits Froude, "the towns would have been loyal * * * while the native chiefs, however turbulent, would never have seriously desired to transfer their allegiance to Spain." But England was determined to curry the blessings of the Reformation to Ireland; and as in England these blessings had, in the reign of Edward the VI., been forced upon a reluctant people by the gospel ministrations of German Lanzknechts, and Italian musketeers—so a few years later it was attempted by similar evangelical processes to confer similar blessings on Catholic Ireland. This it was that provoked the resistance of the Irish to their foreign oppressors:—

"The suppression of the Catholic services, enforced wherever the English had power, and hanging before the people as a calamity sure to follow as the limits of that power were extended, created a weight of animosity which no other measure could have produced, and alone, perhaps, made the problem of Irish administration hopelessly insoluble."

A little modesty and moderation of language on the part of English Protestants when speaking of Alva and the action of the Spanish Government towards its revolted subjects in the Netherlands would, we think, not be out of place.

But even the action of the Crown towards Irish Catholics—of the Sir Peter Carews, and Gilberts recorded above—was mildness itself, as compared with the treatment which the Protestant colonists of Ireland meditated towards them; and would, but for "an accident" have carried into execution. That treatment involved the wholesale massacre of all the Irish race, and their total improvement off the face of the earth. Again we quote the Protestant Froude:—

"The action of the Crown was hesitating; embarrassed by a sense of responsibility, and hampered by considerations of humanity." [We have seen to what these considerations amounted.]

"The adventurers" (or Protestant colonists) "it is plain, understood the problem which they were undertaking, and meant to hesitate at no measure, however severe, which would assist them in dealing with it. . . . Their extinction—that of the Irish Papists—was contemplated with as much indifference as the destruction of the Red Indians of North America by the politicians of Washington, and their titles to their lands as not more deserving of respect. . . . but it is no less certain that to these intending colonists, they were of no more value than their own wolves, and would have been exterminated with equal indifference. Accident only, which betrayed the project prematurely, and gave the chiefs time to combine, prevented the experiment from being tried."—*Froude's Hist.*, Vol. 9, c. 24.

When Protestants feel disposed to expatiate

on the horrors of the French St. Bartholemew—a crime which Catholics are not called on to apologise for—they would do well to remember that, by the confession of one of the ablest of their own historians, but for an accident, but for the premature betrayal of their hideous conspiracy—the Protestant colonists of Ireland would have instituted a St. Bartholemew in that country. A little modesty would certainly become Protestants, when treating of the religious wars of the sixteenth century.

As we are treating of Irish subjects we will take up next, though not in chronological order, another instance from Irish history adduced by the *Witness* in support of his thesis, and of the lamb-like nature of Protestantism of these Carews, Gilberts and others of Elizabeth's Protestant captains whom we have seen "murdering women and children, and babies that had scarcely left the breast." The following is the instance to which the *Witness* refers us:

"1641. Rebellion in Ireland under Phelim O'Neil, and the Massacre of 40,000 Protestants in Ulster, October 23."—*Witness*, 18th ult.

We can not see what the desperate struggle made by the Irish in 1641, for their liberties, and national independence has to do with the question at issue between us and the *Witness*. The Irish, it is true, in 1641, flew to arms to expel the alien oppressors of their native land; just as did the Scotch—and with quite as much of right on their side as had the Scotch—under their national leaders, in the days of the English Edwards. The Scotch of to-day are rather proud of Bannockburn and are apt to talk of it over their whiskey toddies—and small blame to them; but why should they find fault with the Irish for having attempted that which the Scotch nobly effected, the establishment of their national independence and the purgation of their native land from the presence of the foreigner.

Unable longer to bear the cruelties of their alien rulers, and encouraged to appeal to force by the successful rebellion of the Scotch against their lawful king as well as by the stormy aspect of politics in England—the Irish did take up arms in 1641. Their cause was a good and holy cause, if ever a cause were good and holy; and though it is probable that, in the fury of the conflict that ensued, and when men were violently excited, many acts of indiscriminate violence were perpetrated, and in some cases, bloody vengeance exacted for the cruel wrongs of a century—there is no historical evidence worth one straw, to show that there was anything like a general or premeditated massacre of the Protestant Scotch and English who had settled on the lands of the Irish, and who were compelled to disgorge their iniquitously acquired possessions. Clarendon, an English Protestant, does indeed assert that in the war for independence of 1641—it is absurd to call it a rebellion unless we call the Scotch under Bruce rebels—40,000 Protestants were massacred in cold blood; but what authority does Clarendon adduce for his statement? what are the *data* on which it is based? Many perished no doubt; but if we put down the number at 4,000, not 40,000 we believe that we shall have far exceeded the truth.

We have no reliable statistics from which to calculate the numbers of those who perished actually by the sword in 1641 in Ireland; but the question as to the number has been carefully discussed by Dr. Lingard, the celebrated Catholic historian, the worth of whose argument our readers will determine for themselves. We ask them to take nothing on Dr. Lingard's bare assertion, for so to act would be as unreasonable, as it is to accept Clarendon's unsupported statement as truth; but we ask them to weigh his reasons, why there are no valid grounds for accepting the story of the premeditated massacre of 40,000 Protestants.

No contemporary records of such a terrible catastrophe exist; and Dr. Lingard argues that if it ever occurred, there would be some traces of it to be found in the long letters written regularly during the months of October, November, and December, from Dublin, by the Lords Justices, giving, in so far as they knew them, full and ample details of the progress of the rebellion.

These letters exist, and in them there is no allusion to a general massacre of Protestants. Under date Oct. 25th they describe the rising; and several acts of plunder by the insurgents; adding, "this though too much is all that we yet hear is done by them."

Under date Nov. 15th, the Lords Justices report the capture of almost all the strongholds, and castles of the Protestant Englishry in certain Counties of the North of Ireland; they tell us that the insurgents had put many of the garrisons of these places to the sword; that they had surprised and deprived of their arms a troop of horse in the King's army, commanded by Lord Grandison; that they had captured, and still retained as prisoners, Lord Caulfield, Sir Edward Trevor, and a number of gentlemen of quality; that they, the insurgents, had wasted, destroyed, and spoiled wherever they came; that they had slain many, robbed and spoiled thousands, and turned many Eng-

lish off their lands; that they warn the English to be gone—a proceeding not consistent with the theory of a conspiracy to murder; that they demand the restoration of the lands whereof they had been robbed; the right of self-government; and the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. These, and other enormities of like nature are insisted upon at length by the Lords Justices in their despatches during the first fortnight of November; but not a word do they say of a wholesale massacre of 40,000 Protestants. Indeed they recognise the fact that the insurgents detained many as prisoners—a fact incompatible with the theory that they put to death all who fell into their hands.

Later in the same month of November under date 25th, the Lords Justices write again: they deplore the expulsion from their houses and castles of many of the English; and they record that, having, with the loss of 120 men on their side, stormed and captured Mellifont the Lord Moor's house, they had killed ten of the garrison: on the 27th of the same month they lament their incapacity to prevent the spoiling of the English, even in the vicinity of Dublin, so strong had grown the rebels; and on the 6th December, they tell us that the rebels have added to their former cruelty, threatening with death all who gave help to the enemy: that at Longford they had put the garrison to death, and continued to harass and lay waste the country held by the English. Still no allusion even to a wholesale massacre of Protestants. On the 23rd December, the said Lords Justices give to Henry Jones, Dean of Kilmore a commission to take evidence as to the injuries to property inflicted by the rebels—examining such Protestants as have been robbed, and despoiled—which would have been a hard thing to do had the insurgents killed indiscriminately all Protestants who fell into their hands. Now all this affords certain proof that the Lords Justices had up to January 1642 never heard of a massacre of 40,000 Protestants during the month of October, 1641, or assuredly they would have made mention of it in their elaborately prepared bill of indictment against the insurgents; and if they had never heard of it then, the presumption is strong, very strong that no such an event ever occurred.

Evidence taken before Commissioners, and still extant in Dublin, gives us the number of 2,109 persons as having been killed by the insurgents *out of wars*, during the first two years of the rebellion: to this number, on the report of Protestants 1,619 were added; and on further reports 300 more—which would give us a total of about 4,000 actually killed by the insurgents in a war of several years duration. Many more probably perished from hunger, from exposure, sickness, and the invariable concomitants of war; but it would be absurd to set these down as the victims of a massacre.

On the whole we conclude:—That there was no general or premeditated massacre of the Protestants by the Irish in 1641: that in many instances prisoners were put to death, when captured with arms in their hands or in places that were taken by storm: that as a general rule no quarter on either side was given: and that there is not a well authenticated instance of the intentional killing of any women, children, or even any non-combatants by the Irish.

THREE QUESTIONS.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Asent the New Brunswick School difficulty and the discussion thereon in the House of Commons, we desire (with permission of course) to put the following three questions to the *True Witness*:—

First—If Sir John A. Macdonald, in his capacity of Minister of Justice, sincerely believed (as we are willing to suppose) that he was *right* in declaring the School Law of New Brunswick *Constitutional*, cannot the unanimous voice of the House of Commons, recommending the case as a doubtful one to the attention of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, be regarded as an expression of *want of confidence* in the decision arrived at by the Premier?

Second—Should the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council declare the School Act *unconstitutional*, from what tribunal must we then demand the repeal of the said Act—from the Federal Government, from the New Brunswick Local Government, from the Judicial Committee, or from one of the many Canadian Courts? (Here we would remark that the Federal Government is the acknowledged guardian of the Constitution.)

Third—If we should be obliged to return for redress to the Federal Government, is it not highly probable that the said Government and their supporters (Protestant and Catholic), will again throw us overboard, under the plea that they are opposed to Centralization, because "Centralization is dangerous to all the Provinces in general, and to Quebec in particular?"

We tender *Marle* the following answers to his three questions:—

(1.) The appeal from the legal opinion of Sir J. A. Macdonald as to the constitutionality of the New Brunswick School law, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a sign that neither by the Ministry nor the House of Commons is Sir John looked upon as infallible, or as constituting in himself a Supreme Court of Appeal.

(2.) Should the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council declare the New Brunswick School Act unconstitutional the Federal Executive will be obliged by the Act of the Imperial

Parliament which created it—to disallow the said School law. Catholics will be quite safe in refusing to pay any assessments attempted to be levied on them, for the Courts of Law will uphold them in that refusal. No political action of any kind will be required.

(3.) The answer to the second question disposes of the third. No law declared "unconstitutional" by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which is the Queen's adviser on legal matters can be enforced on British subjects. The matter will be altogether beyond the grasp of our Federal government, which has no powers but these which it holds from the Imperial authorities. These decisions that the New Brunswick School Act is unconstitutional, the Federal legislature and Federal executive have no longer any dominion in the premises, unless indeed they proclaim their independence, and renounce their allegiance.

DEATH OF THE REV. SISTER SLOCOMBE.
—In our last issue we briefly announced the death of the Rev. Jane Mary Slocombe, Superior General of the General Hospital of the Grey Nuns. Since then we have been furnished with following details:—

The Sister Jane Mary Slocombe was born at Taunton, County of Somerset, England, on the 29th of Oct., 1819; her father and mother were Protestants, but she lost them at an early age. Two years after, at the age of ten, she had the happiness to learn the Catholic religion, and she embraced it with joy. Educated at one of the best educational establishments in England, she came to Canada at the age of 16. For years after, feeling herself impelled by her piety to consecrate herself to God, and devote her life to alleviate the sufferings of the poor, she obtained admission to the Noviciate of the General Hospital of the Grey Nuns.

From the first day of her entrance, to the day of her death, Rev. Mother Slocombe was the perfect model of all the virtues of a true Religious. The Almighty, Who wished to use her as a means to teach religious life to a great number of young Sisters, and Who had even destined her to be one of the main supports of her Sisterhood, had endowed her with all the qualities of mind and heart the most apt to secure to her the esteem and confidence, not only of the Sisters who formed her family in religion, but also of all those of the outside world who occasionally met her.

To a mind highly educated and polished, she united the greatest kindness of heart, which made her feel in herself all the sorrows and sufferings of others, and taught her to succour them, but with such delicacy and tact that her advice and assistance were ever sought by all, great and small, rich and poor.

In 1853, eleven years after her profession, she was named Mistress of the Novices, a duty which she fulfilled during 10 years, with perfect satisfaction to the whole community, and which she resigned only to fulfil the functions of Superior General, to which place she was assigned by the General Chapter of Sisterhood in the year 1863. Re-elected again five years afterwards, she continued to govern with all the zeal and devotedness of a worthy religious, until death almost suddenly snatched her from the esteem and affection of every member of the Sisterhood, who lament to-day the loss of a Mother worthy of their most sincere regrets.

We are not in the habit of writing against the Corporation, we fully understand that there are many things which cannot be managed in the very best possible manner, and therefore we do not consider it necessary to pitch into the City Councillors when anything in the civic management displeases us; neither are we in the habit of suggesting all sorts of improvements which may suggest themselves to our mind; we fully understand that were our Councillors to accept all suggestions offered, they would have an endless task to perform, but there are some improvements which present themselves so strongly to our mind that we cannot refrain from urging them, among others there is one to which we wish to draw the particular attention of the Road Committee and the whole Council, as being absolutely necessary and of an immediate necessity. It is that there should be a sidewalk placed on the south-west side of the Cote des Neiges Road, leading to the Cemetery; the sidewalk on the other side also is in great need of improvement. It is a road frequented every week by hundreds on the most painful of errands, they are obliged, when in carriages, to leave their seats at the foot of the hill, and with the poorer mourners to trudge their way up the hill under a broiling sun, whilst at the other side of the street, were the rubbish removed and replaced by a foot-path, they would have protection from the heat and their melancholy labor would not at least be made heavier by reason of unnecessary physical suffering. We hope that some of our energetic Councillors will take the matter up, and see that a reform be effected at once; we look to the representative of the Ward to move all in his power with that object, and we are certain that in so doing he will earn the gratitude of many a weary mourner.