

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
BY THE PROPRIETOR,
JOHN GILLIES,
AT No. 195 FORTIFICATION LANE.

Editor—M. W. KIRWAN.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars.
To all City subscribers whose papers are delivered
by carriers, Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, Feb. 9, 1877.

CALENDAR—FEBRUARY 1877.

- 9th.—St. Andrew Corsini, Bishop and Confessor. St. Apollonia, Virgin and Martyr. William Carleton, the Irish Novelist, born 1796. Amedeus King of Spain abdicated 1874.
- 10th.—St. Scholastica, Virgin. Boston taken by the British, 1776. Queen Victoria married, 1840.
- 11th.—Quinquagesima Sunday. De Witt Clinton, who projected the Erie Canal, and was four times chosen Governor of the State of New York, died, aged fifty-nine, 1823.
- 12th.—St. Raymond of Pennafort, Confessor. Michelet, French Historian, died 1874. Lady Jane Grey Beheaded, 1554. Wolfe Tone arrived in Paris from America, 1796.
- 13th.—Feria. Shrove Tuesday.
- 14th.—Ash Wednesday; beginning of Lent. Valentine Day.
- 15th.—SS. Faustina and Jovita, Martyrs. The Irish Volunteers at Dunganon resolved unanimously "That the claims of any body of men other than the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland, to make laws to bind this Kingdom is unconstitutional and a grievance," 1782. Galilee born.

REGULATIONS FOR LENT.

All the days in Lent, Sundays excepted, from Ash Wednesday to Holy Saturday inclusive, are Fast days.

On the first four days in Lent, as well as every day in Holy Week, the use of flesh meat is prohibited.

The use of flesh meat at every meal is permitted on all the Sundays in Lent, Palm Sunday excepted.

The use of flesh meat is also by special indulgence allowed at the one repast on Monday's Tuesdays, and Thursdays in every week from the first Sunday in Lent, to Palm Sunday.

On all days in the year without any exception, on which the use of flesh meat is prohibited, it is perfectly allowable to use animal fat, such as lard, or drippings, in the preparation of meagre food; for frying fish, for instance, eggs, and other Lenten diet; but it is not permitted to eat the meat, or animal fat in its natural condition.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. B. QUEBEC.—You mistake our mission. We have announced before that "bigotry in any and in every form will find in us a foe." We are desirous of treating all denominations with courtesy. Above all things we do not wish to promote a belief that it is a Christian duty to hate each other for the love of God. You will find us ready enough to defend Catholic interests, but you will not find us ready to insult our Protestant friends.

NEW BRUNSWICK.—The interesting event to which your letter referred is now too late to notice.

THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

We have received an important communication from the Government in reply to our articles on the Immigration Question. In our next issue we shall publish the communication, and review the question again.

"CATHOLIC INTOLERANCE"

To the bigoted mind we "Papists" are the most intolerant of men. We rejoice in the days of "wooden shoes and brass money"—glory to the Inquisition, and the St. Bartholomew slaughter—delight to hear of our Papal Juggernaut grinding the unbelievers of the earth into raw heads and bloody bones, and in general, kick up such fiendish pranks before high Heaven as make the angels weep. We are the Nazareth out of which no good can come. We can be improved only by being swept off the face of the earth. We are good for little in this world, and are only fit for fuel in the next. We are, in fact, miserable sinners all. Death is the wages of our crimes. There are no bowels of compassion for our misfortunes—we must go down, down below, and say the bigots of this earth sent us there. It is a pity that this should be so, but it is yet true. Hatred of Catholicism is the only religion that some men profess. It is, in the opinion of bigots, quite enough to shout "Down with the Pope," to secure salvation. But are we as bad as we are painted? Are we all "lewed fellows of the baser sort?" Is there no place for us in our "Father's Mansion?" Are we intolerant and idolatrous? Let us see! And first let us take the case of Great Britain and Ireland. Well, what do we find? We find England and Scotland sending 500 M.P.s. to the British House of Commons. These 500 M.P.s. re-

present a population of about 28 millions. Of these 28 millions—two millions at least are Catholic, and yet Great Britain does not send one Catholic M.P. to the House of Commons. The two millions of Catholics in Great Britain are as Catholics, practically disfranchised. Lord Robert Montague at one time indeed represented an English Constituency, but it was before he became a convert. At the present moment there is not a constituency in England with which he would have the shadow of a chance of being elected as its representative. His religion is a sufficient barrier against the support of English politicians, of every shade. Neither Conservative nor Liberal England would tolerate a "Papist," and so our people are debarred from that Parliamentary representation which is supposed to be the guardian of English liberties. If the Catholics of Great Britain were represented according to their numbers, they would have 30 or 40 M.P.'s from Great Britain alone, but the "tolerant" policy of "liberal" England, shrinks from allowing "papal propagandists" to range upon either side of the Speaker's Chair. But how different it becomes in "bigoted," "priest-ridden," "intolerant" Ireland. The land of superstitions "priest craft," and "mimic ceremonials." How different it is all there. Many, if not most of the leaders of the popular party are Protestants. All the Protestant Home Rule M.P.'s represent constituencies where, from four-fifths to seven-eighths, of the electors and non-electors, are Catholic. Butt, Henry, Bigger, Parnell, Bryan, and many other Protestant M.P.'s represent Catholic constituencies. Even the last elections—Waterford and Sligo—illustrate this. The new M.P. for Sligo—a man who will yet, in chivalrous devotion to his native land, prove the Smith O'Brien of Ireland—King-Harman—is a Protestant. Sligo is a Catholic County, but it trusted its honour into the keeping of a Protestant Home Ruler, and one for whom we predict a brilliant and a patriotic career. But it is so all through the Country. Bigotry is unknown. The Dublin Corporation which is always three-fourths Catholic, alternately elect a Catholic and a Protestant for the office of Lord Mayor. Last year it was a Protestant—Owens—this year it is a Catholic—Tarpey. And so from one end of the land, and from one end of the year to the other. And this is "Catholic Intolerance." But let us look a little nearer home. Let us look here in Canada, and what do we find? We find in this Catholic Province of Quebec the Protestants have 15 members in a House of 65 and of these, 15 two are Cabinet ministers. This number is apparently small, but it is more than they are entitled to by five or six members. On the Bench, in the Senate, Legislative Council, and in all other Government positions, the Protestant minority, in Catholic Quebec, have at least a fair representation. Even Montreal—which is more than three fourths Catholic yet "intolerant" "priest-ridden" Montreal—sent a Protestant to each House of Parliament; returns 11 Protestant Aldermen out of 27 and elects a Protestant Mayor alternately with an Irish and French Catholic—has a Protestant Chief of Police, as well as many other officers in the various civic departments. Now turn to the Protestant Province of Ontario where the Catholics number about one-fifth of the population. In a house of Assembly comprising 68 members there are now but eight Catholics, and until recently they had but two or three, including one member of the Cabinet. In the Dominion Parliament there are but two Catholics returned, against 19 or 20 Protestants sent by Quebec to the Parliament of the Dominion. Where is the "Intolerance" here? Of the two Catholics returned from Ontario for the Dominion Parliament, one is returned from Ottawa, which is now more than half Catholic in population. Last year in Toronto, they had not one representative in the City Council, out of 27 Aldermen, while this year the Protestants have so far relaxed that they have allowed one Catholic to squeeze himself into the Chamber. In Toronto there is not a single Catholic employed in any office of note, under the Corporation. The "Protestant Defence Society" takes good care of that! The Senate of the Dominion is the only representative Assembly where the Catholics can claim anything like fair representation. But after all, we repeat now what we have said before—that we are not represented according to our numbers. We form nearly one half the population of the Dominion. Our representative in the Senate is satisfactory. But this is not the doing of the people. It behoves us then, to look to our interests. It is time we awake from our lethargy, and manfully confront the difficulties of the hour, and ascertain for ourselves if we cannot do something to improve the difficulties of our situation. We are neither "bigoted" nor "intolerant," neither at home nor abroad can our enemies make "good their boasts, nor prove them true." Bigotry, in any and in every form, will in us find no friend, but we shall meanwhile do what we can to fight our own cause without malice or ill-will.

"OLIVER CROMWELL"

The Rev. Charles Clark is a brave man. He speaks like one who has the courage of his convictions, and he acts like one who is prepared to stand against all odds in vindication of the principles he holds. This virtue is to be admired in its way, and when allied to Truth, it is a boon well calculated to make a man respected by his fellows. Mark you, we do not think that the people of Montreal entertained "an angel unawares" when they went to hear the Rev. Mr. Clark's lecture on "Oliver Cromwell" last week, or that a half filled house indicated much appreciation of the eloquent gentleman who stood before the audience to defend, nay to applaud, England's great "Protector." There is so much trimming of the social and political top-sails in these days, that it is refreshing to hear a man boldly and honestly—in language full of impassioned eloquence and choice diction—stand up for what nearly the whole world condemns, that we are forced to respect his pluck and his convictions, while we may reject and differ from the conclusion he forms. It is thus with ourselves and the Rev. Charles Clark. In the first place it is difficult to understand why the Rev. Charles Clark never mentioned Cromwell's career in Ireland! The record of the "Protector's" life is not only incomplete, but it is imperfect and unreliable, without containing some of his deeds when he combated for the Commonwealth, against "the Irish enemy." To a man of the Rev. Mr. Clark's attainments the "Ormond Papers" must be well-known documents, and as they are the most reliable source of information about Cromwell's career in Ireland, we must express our astonishment that the subject was never referred to. We will not charge the Rev. Mr. Clark with being overtaken with that coward conscience which is supposed to make poltroons of us all, but still it was passing strange that this page in Cromwell's life which should disclose the "heroism" and "piety" of his nature, was not opened to the view. If he was afraid of the hostility of Lingard, of Curry, of Macaulay, of Carey, of McGee, of Appleton, and others; had he not the support of Goldwin Smith, Froude, and Carlyle. The Rev. Charles Clark grew pathetic over the "martyrdom" of "Sir John Elliott" and justified the execution of King Charles because of Elliott's death; but he was silent over the butchery at Drogheda where thousands perished by the sword for the glory of the Puritan God, the interests of England and by the orders of "Oliver Cromwell, Esq." We shall not excuse the "murder" of Elliott as the Rev. Charles Clark boldly excuses the murder of King Charles. We are not as brave as Mr. Clark, nor do we wish to show our pluck by bigoted and vindictive retaliation. We shall not wish that Cromwell was assassinated as the Rev. Mr. Clark rejoiced at the assassination of Buckingham. Life to us is far more sacred than it appears to be to the Rev. Mr. Clark; Drogheda more cherished in our annals than "Nasby fight," or the "Hypocritical Puritans," as a famous Englishman called the "Reformers" of the day. The Puritans, with Cromwell at their head, were and are accursed in Ireland. On the 1st of May 1654, Cromwell made a law quietly sending our people to "Connaught or to hell." At a stroke of his pen he confiscated five millions of acres of the best land in Ireland, he vowed to butcher the Catholics unless they followed the long visaged Puritans in the mock solemnity of their ways. Ireland was to "Obadiah" or Ireland was to be destroyed. He transported 80,000 of our people to Barbadoes, where they were sold as slaves. In the language of the Scriptures, he lay the county void as a wilderness:—

"Women and Children," says Prendergast, "were found daily perishing in ditches starved. The bodies of wandering orphan children were preyed upon by wolves, man, beast, and bird were all dead, or had quit the desolated localities. The priesthood were hunted down like wild beasts."

And yet Mr. Clark tells us that one of the grand results of "Oliver Cromwell's" acts was to secure "civil and religious liberty." Why Pym, Cromwell's bosom friend and subordinate, boasted that the Puritans would not "leave a priest in Ireland." Even in Cromwell's time the priests were counted as one of the three "burdensome beasts"—the wolves and the Tories being the others. Cromwell was in Ireland in 1654, and we read that in 1655, the "Jails were full of priests, and they were transported to Barbadoes in hundreds, where they lived in cabins. In 1658 a Lieutenant Wood received a reward of twenty-five pounds for apprehending five priests, and soldiers of Colonel Leigh's Company ten pounds for arresting two priests," and so on at the marketable rate of "five pounds" for the head of a "Papist" priest. And this is "Civil and Religious Liberty" under "Oliver Cromwell!" The "fanatical hypocrite" did not know the meaning of the phrase. Why there was no semblance of civil and religious liberty in Ireland until 1829—and even at the present hour, there are offices in Ireland which a Catholic cannot hold. It is no wonder we are surprised at the bravery of the Rev. Mr. Clark to declare in the presence of an intelli-

gent audience—that Cromwell secured the boon of civil and religious freedom. But we shall leave Ireland out of the question. Cromwell's record in that country is stained with murder. Fanatical, and cruel, he has left behind him a name, which is likened to that given to Ivan of Russia, called the Terrible—"a tiger at large." The Rev. Mr. Clark was in some respects as prudent as he was brave, and by omitting the mention of Ireland in his lecture, he adopted that course which is supposed to be the better part of valour.

But let us look at the lecture from an English point of view, let us review it as if we were destitute of Irish sympathies, and take it as we find it. We have alluded before to Pym, to Elliot, to the Rev. Mr. Clark's justification of the murder of King Charles, and to the apology he made for the murderer of Buckingham. We pass all these by, and shall confine ourselves to the question of Cromwell's policy and its results. Did he secure civil and religious freedom for the people of England? What do we find? In the first place we see that from the time of Henry VIII. to that of Charles I. not a single voice was lifted up in England to protest against the violent suppression of the Christian priesthood.—More and Fisher perished for denying the Pontifical authority of the King. The Church was, in the chaste language of Fulke, "spat upon" as a "greasy, stinking, anti-Christian" order. But the Church flourished in spite all Ridley and Hooker and Fulke could do. It flourished until even as late as the reign of Charles II. But even long after this to admit a convert into the Catholic Church was a capital crime. Alluding to this time Dr. Johnston said that "there is no instance even in the ten persecutions, of such severity, as that which was exercised against the Catholics." This continued until long after Cromwell's time. In 1691 an act was passed by the English House of Commons providing that "No person should sit in the Irish Parliament, should hold any Irish office, civic, military, or ecclesiastical, or should practice law or medicine in Ireland, till he had taken the oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, and subscribed to the Declaration against Transubstantiation." Yes, and that act was not repealed until 1829. Was that civil and religious liberty? To say that Cromwell brought about civil and religious liberty in England, is to express what history will not sustain. The Puritans, says Macaulay, were

"as intolerant and as meddling as Laud had been. It was a crime for a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians. Severe punishment was inflicted on those who should presume to blame the Calvinists mode of worship. Churches and sepulchers, fine works of art and curious remains of antiquity, now totally defaced. The Parliament resolved that all pictures in the royal collections which contained representations of Jesus or of the Virgin Mother should be burned. Sculpture fared as ill as painting, nylons and graces, the work of Ionian chisels were delivered over to Puritan stone-masons to be made decent."

These were some of the lovers of civil and religious liberty!

The "Reformation" promised the same. There is no reliable testimony to sustain Mr. Clark. It was after the time of Cromwell that Lecky wrote about the "Scotland covering in helpless subjection before the reformed clergy." Even Emerson admits that the Catholic Church "had been for centuries the democratic principle of Europe, and Christianity lived by the love of the people." Cromwell assisted in substituting the State for the Church—it was only as Itham said "a change of Masters," but the change was not to give Civil and Religious liberty. The people became weaker instead of stronger. "The whole of the Northern people of Protestant countries," said Lord Molesworth, himself a Protestant, "have lost their liberties ever since they changed their religion for a better."—Was that "civil and religious liberty?" Why "civil and religious liberty" did not exist in England until recently—some men say it does not exist there now. But of one thing we feel assured that there is not that freedom from religious intolerance which every true friend of liberty would wish to be universal, and to which the Rev. Mr. Clark is not likely to contribute. It is a pity that a gifted man should be eaten up with the rancour of religious fanaticism, and that hatred of Popery should be his incentive to public emulation.

THE "WITNESS" WRONG AGAIN!

The Witness in reporting the lecture of the Rev. Mr. Clark says:—

"As the audience emerged from the door of the hall, persons who were stationed there distributed hand bills emanating from a Roman Catholic source, and announcing a reply to Rev. Mr. Clark's lecture through the True Witness. It is thus apparent how the exposition of the truth is feared."

We found it necessary to correct some mistakes which the Witness made last week. We now find ourselves compelled to put the Witness right again. It is surely a strange way to fear the exposition of the truth by giving it publicity, and by courting investigation. The Witness is wrong again, and so far from "fearing the exposition of the truth" we are

quite ready to continue the discussion if our contemporary is so disposed.

Again referring to our remarks in reply to "ethnology in politics" last week, the Witness says that:—

"Irish Protestants are not always so well received by Irish Roman Catholics as even Scotch Protestants. A proof of this is the preference which we believe is general throughout Ontario amongst the Irish Roman Catholics for Mr. Mackenzie, a Scotchman, over Mr. Blake, the son of an Irishman."

The Witness is again astray. We deny that it is "because Mr. Mackenzie is a Scotchman" that he is preferred to Mr. Blake by the Catholics of Ontario. Our history refutes the charge. We suppose the Witness has heard of Emmet, of Tone, of Fitzgerald, of Orr, of Mitchel, of Martin, of Butt, of Galbraith, and other Irish Protestants who are politically revered by our people. It is not to Protestants, but it is to fanatics and bigots we object. But there is still another item of news to note in the Witness. It says that:—

"Arthur a Beckett, who has lately joined the staff of Punch, is a Roman Catholic, and was editor of The Tomahawk when Matt Morgan drew the libellous cartoons of the Queen, which gained it notoriety, but destroyed it. F. G. Burnand, author of 'Happy Thoughts' in Punch, is also a Roman Catholic."

We hope the news has not alarmed our contemporary, for if it has we must add fuel to the fire. Fully one half the men on the staff of the London press are Catholics and Irishmen. They have made their way against the current, and they will no doubt hold it as well.

THE OKA INDIANS.

A deputation of Evangelists has been interviewing the Government on the Oka Indian Question. The deputation which was composed of the Rev. Alexander Sunderland, Secretary-Treasurer of the Methodist Missions Society, accompanied by Ald. Clendinneng, of Montreal, and Mr. W. H. Walker, had an interview with the Minister of the Interior.

To Ald. Clendinneng fell the task of "setting forth the condition of the Indians, and asking that some action might be taken." The duty was a pious one to the worthy Alderman, and we can readily picture the apostate zeal with which he bent to his labour. No warrior among the Oka braves ever flourished tomahawk, or whirled in the mad fever of the war dance, more resolutely than Alderman Clendinneng of pious repute, laid the grievances of the Oka Indians at the feet of the Government of Mr. MacKenzie. But "impediments" were in the way, and the Alderman and his friends were informed that "the Government had no jurisdiction in the matter, and the question in dispute would have to be settled before the Courts." The deputation, was discomfited, the Government acted discreetly and well, and the deputation returned from whence they came, vowing no doubt that the trail of the serpent is over Mr. MacKenzie and his Government and all.

"THE CHURCHES OF CHRISTENDOM."

The Rev. Alfred Bray is announced to give a course of six lectures in Zion Church. The six lectures are—"The Greek Church, the Romish Church, the Waldensian Church, the Church of England, the Puritan Church, and the Unitarian Church." We may as well complete the advertisement published in a contemporary, and announce that the price of tickets is \$1 for the course of six lectures, or 25cts for a single admission. Now we do not find fault with the Rev. Alfred Bray for giving six lectures on "Historical and Critical" subjects as announced. But is it not somewhat odd that among all the churches he has selected to lecture about, the "Romish" Church is the only one he ventures to name irreverently.—We are the "Romish" Church. Well, if men ever stand before God with the brand of "bigot" on their countenances, our loving neighbors in Montreal will assuredly be in danger. But let us pray for their conversion, for they know not what they do—for all is "dark, dark, dark, even amidst the blaze of noon."

MR. O'CONNOR POWER, M.P.

We notice that Mr. Power is announced to lecture in the Mechanics' Hall on Thursday next. The subject of his lecture is to be "The Martyrs of Irish Liberty," and it is one well calculated to call forth all the genius and pathos of Irish oratory. We have made arrangements to give a special report of the lecture, but the report will convey but a poor impression of the manner with which Mr. Power delivers it, or of the fervid eloquence by which he kindles enthusiasm in his audiences.

THE MISSION.

The Mission at St. Patrick's and St. Ann's Churches will open on the first Sunday in Lent. The Missioners will be the Redemptorist Fathers.

CANVASSERS for this paper, in Cities and Towns, make more money than at anything else. Send for terms, and go to work. Terms sent free.