

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.,
(LIMITED)

At No. 761 Craig St., Montreal, Canada.

J. K. FORAN, LIT. D., LL.B., [EDITOR.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

City \$1.50
Country 1.00
If not paid in advance, \$1.50 (Country)
and \$2 (City) will be charged.
Subscribers, Newfoundland, \$1.50 a
year in advance.

All business communications to be
addressed to

C. A. McDONNELL,
Managing Director,
THE TRUE WITNESS P. & P. Co.



MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, AUG. 15, 1894.

UNJUSTIFIABLE CONDUCT.

We regret exceedingly that our forms for the last issue were on the press before we became aware of the very disgraceful exhibition that took place in Quebec when the members of certain religious bodies were attacked by a mob and driven from their meeting houses. To judge from the different reports we can only come to the conclusion that this uncalled for and insane course on the part of the perpetrators of that outrage was due to certain articles that appeared in one of the local papers of that city. At a moment when the feeling of religious animosity seems to run more strongly than is desirable this action comes with very bad grace from a section of the community that is pleading for tolerance and freedom of conscience.

Of course we do not for a moment think that the whole Catholic population of Quebec will be held responsible for the conduct of a number of excited individuals, who apparently knew not what they were doing; but, at the same time, we feel humiliated to think that any number of our co-religionists should adopt such unjustifiable means of showing their antagonism to the practices and methods that others see fit to adopt in their religious services. The persons attacked were inside their own buildings and in no way did they interfere with the public or with those of other persuasions. It seems to us that there has always been a latent spirit of semi-communism in that section of Quebec. It is not an over-wrought zeal for Catholic principles that actuates the leaders and inspirers of such mobs; rather is it an inextinguishable desire to create discord and to bring about a reign of disorder. To set such a mass of combustible material on fire, it needs only a small match—and some do not hesitate to apply that match to the fuse.

We remember well the famous riots of 1877 and again those of 1878 in the city of Quebec. It was from St. Roch's and St. Sauveur that the disturbing element came. In fact the leader of a gang who was shot down by the militia, on the corner of St. Paul and Sault-au-Matlot streets, in the summer of 1877, was none other than a man who had played the part of rioter and communist in Paris, during that second "Reign of Terror" that succeeded the Franco-Prussian war. Men of his class, and with principles like

unto his, have long since been playing havoc amongst the honest people of Quebec East, and as a consequence, they seem ready on any pretext—and often without a pretext—to stir up strife and discord. This recent and deplorable event is another illustration of the existence of such a spirit.

In Canada, to-day, we have no room for such men and no welcome for such a spirit. We cannot afford to have chaos brought into our country and religious strife—originating in blind fanaticism—hold sway. The Catholic Church does not need such defenders, nor does she require mobs armed with sticks and stones to assert her rights, to defend her privileges, nor to propagate her doctrines. If we desire that our fellow-citizens of other creeds respect our views we must begin by respecting their honest convictions. The day has long since gone past when the country would tolerate any such exhibitions. It is true we are the first to oppose any religious, semi-religious or other demonstrations that are calculated to create ill-feeling or bring about a conflict between the different elements of a peaceful community; on the same ground do we wish to enter an emphatic protest against the equally unjust and wicked proceedings to which we refer.

We would be long sorry to think that our Faith was so shaky and our Church so feeble, that it was necessary to have recourse to violence in order to protect the one or the other from the effects of evangelical, salvationist, or other assemblies. If the members of these different bodies or organizations deem it well to hold public services—even if they were to go so far as to preach against what we believe and know to be the Truth—we are not, in any way, justified in attacking them personally, in destroying property, in risking the lives of people who have done us no injury, and in turning a quiet and peaceful community into a host of antagonistic savages. Once more, we desire to protest against the conduct of the men who perpetrated that un-Christian act, and we desire that our Protestant fellow-countrymen may attribute the deed to its rightful cause and not hold the Roman Catholic element responsible for the frantic conduct of a number of over-excited, ill-guided, and unprincipled people. We want peace and harmony in this Province, and we are prepared to raise a strong voice against any element that shall seek to disturb the same.

FREEMASONRY.

A writer in the New York Tribune, styling himself an "ex-attache," has dived down into the great, broad lake of his shallow erudition, and while seeking to bring up some pure water wherewith to wash the Masonic body of all heretofore supposed stains, has only succeeded in stirring up such an amount of mud that the members of the craft as well as himself become so besmeared that it would require old Aquarius, with his mighty watering-can, to wash them clean. This wise gentleman wishes to show that Leo XIII. in his recent encyclical referred to the Freemasons of Continental Europe and not to those of Great Britain and America. He claims that as long as the Freemasons of France and Italy remained benevolent bodies and refrained from mixing up in politics that the Church in no way opposed the organization, rather did the Popes encourage it: he holds that "when in 1848 Continental Masonry began to devote its resources and its activity to politics instead of to works of charity and benevolence, the attitude of the Church of Rome underwent a change for the worse, and since the schism has taken place between the

lodges of France, Italy and Austria and those of America and Great Britain, the Vatican has considered it necessary to condemn Masonry and to fight it with all the means at its command." He gives us to understand that "three decades" ago—about 1860 to 1863—this schism took place, and that since then Rome has seen fit to condemn and make war upon Masonry.

Taking this wise "ex-attache" at his word—leaving aside the historical inexactness of his remarks for the moment—does it not appear evident that it was Masonry that commenced to make war upon the Church? By entering the political arena and directing its big guns against the Vatican, did not Continental Masonry place the Church in a position of self-defence, and obliged Rome to turn its thunders against its power? But our sage expounder of Papal encyclicals is wrong, by many a decade and many a lustrum, when he speaks of Rome condemning Freemasonry in 1860. As far back as 1717 the order was introduced into France. In 1788, Pope Clement XII. issued a Papal Bull condemning in most emphatic terms the whole system of Masonry. In 1751, Pope Benedict XIV. confirmed or reiterated that same wholesale condemnation. In 1821, Pope Pius VII. found it necessary to issue a Bull confirmatory of what his predecessors had promulgated against Freemasonry. Again in 1825, Pope Leo XII. was forced by the dangers created to Christianity, through the instrumentality of the Masonic body, to issue a condemnation, as full as any of the previous anathemas. Then, in 1829, Pope Pius VIII. was obliged, for the safety of religion, to condemn this irrepressible and ever dangerous organization. In 1832, Pope Gregory XVI. in most emphatic terms, condemned Freemasonry. Now all these condemnations took place long before Pius IX. became the victim of Masonic persecution; long before the so-called schism between the Continental Masons and those of America and Great Britain; long before the Masonic body entered the political field of 1848. So that Mr. "ex-attache" must find some other reasons for the Papal condemnation of Freemasonry than that of the division in the masonic ranks, or that of the entry of Masonry into the domain of active Continental politics. We have not time nor space, this issue, to follow this diver into all the mud-holes of error that he has fallen upon; but we must point out another striking piece of false reasoning on his part.

If, according to his wisdom, the great line of demarcation between Continental and American or British Freemasonry is in the fact of the former dabbling in politics and the two latter remaining merely charitable and benevolent in their aims; if Rome condemned, for the reasons just given, the Masonry of the continent and did not include (as he pretends) in the condemnation the masonry of the New World, we would like to know what guarantee the Vatican has that the Masons of Great Britain and America may not yet follow in the footsteps of their Continental brethren, and some fine morning make a dash out in the political amphitheatre, and run against the horns of a Papal Bull? Our ex-attache tells us that:

"The activity of the Brotherhood in these last two countries [France and Italy] is neither benevolent nor social, but purely political, and its openly avowed object is the overthrow of the Church and the annihilation of every form of religious belief. Among its publicly declared aims—I quote from French and Italian Masonic writings and speeches—are 'the exclusion of every Catholic or religious element from all public administrations, from hospitals, schools; from the councils that govern the destinies of the country, from academical and other corporate institutions; from committees and families—and exclusion from everything, everywhere and forever,' and 'the abolition in schools of every kind of religious instruction because the State, which ought to be absolutely Atheistic, has the inalienable

right and duty to form the heart and spirit of its citizens' and, again, 'to lay religion waste in its foundations and in its very sources of life—namely, in the school and in the family.' The Italian lodges, moreover, proclaim their determination to secure 'the suppression of all religious corporations, the confiscation of all ecclesiastical property and the abolition of the Papacy,' which the Grand Orient of Rome declares to be 'the implacable and deadly enemy of Italy.'"

Please tell us: who is to secure the Roman Catholic Church against the future possibility or probability of a similar cause to that of the Italian and French Brotherhoods, on the part of the Freemasons of Great Britain and America?

Rome never condemns without good and sufficient reasons, and when from 1738 to 1838 Pope after Pope issued their mandates against Continental Freemasonry, even taking the "ex-attache's" version, they were justified in the latent enmity of that body to the Church, and in its open war upon the same Church in subsequent years. Why does not American or British Freemasonry dash in upon the same track? Simply because the time is not opportune and circumstances are not favorable to such a course. No: the grand object of all Freemasonry is the same—yet different methods for attaining it may be used in different countries—and that object is the destruction of the Church. The aim of Freemasonry is to BUILD; to ERECT an edifice; to construct the grand, universal temple of Masonry. In order to do so they must have the ground whereon to lay the foundations. For over eighteen centuries that ground has been occupied by the Church of Rome; therefore, that they may build up their own temple, they must commence by tearing down the edifice that is at present on the ground. So far they built nothing, because they have not yet succeeded in their work of destruction. Will they ever succeed—by open violence or peaceful means—in accomplishing that aim? No; Christ said: "The gates of Hell shall never prevail against you."

ENGLISH ANARCHISM.

There are two monthly organs of Anarchism in England. One of them is especially frenzied in its style; but its style is not English, nor Scotch, nor Irish—it is simply continental, more particularly speaking, it is French, in fact it is Parisian. Here is a sample from its pages: a sample that might as well have been translated from *La Lanterne*, or *La Revolution*—

"A bomb has burst in a theatre at Barcelona, and the English people are trembling even now . . . Well, I am one of those who welcome the affair as a great and good act,—not on the part of the person or persons concerned, but because of the death of thirty rich people and the injury to eighty others. Yes, I really am pleased; and in spite of the fact that comrades and friends have been talking at me over it, I cannot feel sorry,—there! . . . But you are innocent, you say, my brother! Well, what you call your innocence we feel quite as much to be your guilt, and we would warn you, most learned and reverend seigneurs, that there will be no discrimination."

If this is not more blood-thirsty, cruel and cowardly than even the vaporings of the anarchist press of the continent, then we fail to understand this apostle of a Luciferian evangel. The writer of this has drank at Mazzini's fountain; he cares not for life or limb; he will not discriminate between the truly innocent and those whom he supposes to be guilty; he has no praise for a Vaillant or a Henri; these men are fools in his mind, but they are the instruments of a cruelty that he is not man enough to perpetrate himself. He rejoices in the maiming of unoffending people and the killing of