

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.

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.

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. POTTENGL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1872.

Friday, 9—St. Raymond of Penafort, C.  
Saturday, 10—St. Scholastica, V.  
Sunday, 11—Quinquagesima.  
Monday, 12—St. Andrew Corsini, B. C. (Feb. 4.)  
Tuesday, 13—St. Titus, B. C.  
Wednesday, 14—Ash Wednesday.  
Thursday, 15—St. Martina, V. M. (Jan. 30.)

REGULATIONS FOR LENT.—All the days of Lent, Sundays excepted, from Ash Wednesday to Holy Saturday included, are days of Fasting and Abstinence.

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

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

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

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Grave doubts as to the success of the Washington Treaty, especially with regard to those clauses which propose to deal with the Alabama Claims, are entertained, and expressed in the English journals. The amount at which the U. States' statement fixes the damages to be paid by Great Britain, is so extravagant, that the latter would prefer the hazard of war to accepting the charge of paying them; since the most disastrous war could not inflict greater injury, moral and material, upon the country than would the submission to such exorbitant claims. Even in her hour of triumph and of her enemy's prostration, Germany did not impose harsher and more degrading terms on France.

We are told, therefore, that Chief Justice Cockburn, one of the arbitrators, will shortly withdraw from the Board; and that the British Government will repudiate the Treaty of Washington, in this respect following the precedent of the U. States in repudiating the Treaty of Ghent.

Such are the rumors that reach us by telegram; but it must be remembered that they are not authenticated, and that an amicable adjustment of the rival pretensions of the two great countries will be eagerly sought for by the statesmen of both. It is not by any means probable that the arbitrators to whom the claims of the U. States Government for compensation for damages inflicted by the *Alabama*, will give the amount claimed; for it will not be easy to persuade them, that a few small vessels—even if the British Government be responsible for their acts—could have inflicted such terrible injury on the U. States, a great naval power, as the case presented to the Board by the latter pretends was the fact. All we can suggest is—and the question can easily be settled by the Rule of Three—if a few wooden steamers with but small armaments inflicted damage on the U. States to the amount of several hundreds of millions of pounds, what amount of damage could be inflicted on the same States by the British navy? We trust however that there may be no need for such calculations, and that a solution of the pending difficulties, honorable to both of the great nations interested, may yet be discovered.

The farce of a French Republic seems pretty nigh played out. M. Thiers recognises its failure, and that it is ill adapted for the French stage. But falling the Republic—what? Monarchy, that is one man power; or Anarchy? There's the rub. There are so many pretenders, and there is but one to whose pretensions the predicate "rightful" can be affixed. There are Napoleonists, and Orleansists; but betwixt them there is no difference of principle; both represent the Revolution, and neither has any "right." To the Comte de Chambord, and to him alone, the latter belongs; he alone can

claim the Crown, as does our own Sovereign, by "Grace of God;" and he alone represents the principle of order and of right. France may refuse him, probably will, for her tribulations are not at an end; but in rejecting him, she will reject the last chance that may be ever offered to her, of closing the long era of revolution, and of inaugurating a new era of stability, peace, domestic prosperity, and Christian liberty.

Spain is in a disturbed state; the Barcelona outbreak has been suppressed, but there is no appearance that the new Government is popular or likely to endure. A revolt in the Philippine Islands is reported; so that Spain seems in danger of being soon despoiled of all her colonies. The independence of Cuba, and its annexation to the U. States cannot be much longer postponed. There is nothing new to report from Italy.

The International Society, though it works in the dark, is by no means dead, and the secular governments of Europe seem to be in much dread of its operations. From time to time through its organs of the press it gives evidence of its vitality, and holds up to us the ends it proposes to itself. So in a recent issue of the *Vermersch Journal*, the Communist organ *par excellence*, and the most faithful exponent of Communistic principles, we find the following programme of the party it represents:—

"They think they have said everything when they speak of the blood which we have shed. Well! what then? It was made to flow, and the world of workmen congratulate themselves when it is that of the middle classes which is spilled. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, blood for blood! What you have seen is nothing, good people of Paris, proprietors of the Rue St. Honoré, bourgeois of the Marais. What 1872 reserves for you will make your hair stand on end; and then, indeed, you will have the right to speak of the Commune!"

A communication has been addressed to us in which the writer asks for a short answer to a question it contains:—

"I have been informed that the original definition of the Council of Florence was drawn up in the Greek language in the following words:—*'Kath' on tropou zai en tois praktikois ton oikoumenikon sinodon, zai en tois ierois kanoni dialambanetai'*; which I take to mean 'according to the manner which both in the acts of Ecumenical councils, and the holy canons is determined.'"

"Is the Greek text as above quoted correct?"

We reply:—

The Greek text, as cited by our correspondent, agrees exactly with that given by *Lalbe*, and is therefore in all probability correct. So far then our correspondent has been correctly informed.

He has been incorrectly informed that the "original definition was drawn up in the Greek language;" if he has thereby been given to understand that in that language exclusively the "original definition" was drawn up. Both languages, Latin and Greek, were used for that purpose; one is as much the "original" as the other; so that neither is the Latin a translation of the Greek text, nor the Greek a translation of the Latin. The definition was drawn up, signed by the assembled Fathers, published and promulgated, in both languages simultaneously, 6th July, 1438. Here is what the Protestant historian Gibbon says on the subject:—

"The act of union was subscribed by the Pope, the Emperor and the principal members of both churches. . . . Two copies might have sufficed for the East and West; but Eugenius was not satisfied unless four authentic and similar transcripts were signed and attested as the monuments of his victory. On a memorable day, the sixth of July, the successors of St. Peter and Constantine ascended their thrones; the two nations assembled in the cathedral of Florence. Their representatives, Cardinal Julian, and Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, appeared in the pulpit, and, after reading in their respective tongues, the act of union, they mutually embraced in the name and presence of their applauding brethren."—*Decline and Fall*, c. 66.

To assert therefore that the "original definition" was drawn up in the Greek language, though not false, involves what is called the *suppression veri*; since the fact is, that the "original" was drawn up in the Greek and Latin languages—one being as original and as authoritative as the other.

Passing from the historical to the grammatical phase of the question—we maintain that the original Latin "*quoniam modum etiam*" and the original Greek "*kath' on tropou zai*," are exact equivalents; and are both correctly rendered in English by,—"as in like manner is also contained—*dialambanetai*—in the Acts of Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Canons." This translation harmonises well with the idiomatic genius of both languages; whereas certainly, that given by our correspondent as the translation from the Greek, is not a correct or adequate translation of the Latin "*Quoniam modum etiam*;" and we would remind our friend that, if there be two versions of one and the same document, both original, and both equally authoritative; and should one version appear to be ambiguous, or susceptible of two differing interpretations, whilst the other on the doubtful point is clear, precise, and unambiguous—as it is in the case before us in the Latin version—the real meaning of the apparently ambiguous version, and therefore of the entire document, must be determined from the version whose meaning is clear and precise. In other words, the document must be interpreted so as to agree with both languages.

But so clear is the Latin text, that, to evade its force, Dr. Dollinger has found himself forced to contest its genuineness, and to insinuate a forgery or corruption of the original Latin. But this is effectually disposed of by the fact, that all the existing copies contain the words in dispute; that the very old copy in the British Museum, has been examined by Mr. Poulke, a Protestant, and found to contain the same words; whilst Canon Ceconi maintains in a recent work, that a document in the Florence Library in which the very same words also occur, is one of the original "authentic and similar transcripts" drawn up by order of Pope Eugenius "as the monuments of his victory" according to Gibbon. There would, however, have been but little of a victory for Eugenius to commemorate, had the Act of Union subordinated the authority of the Pope to "acts of Councils, and the holy Canons;" rather would it have been an inglorious defeat, which he would have sought to bury in oblivion.

We may add that, according to Gibbon, ten MSS. copies of the original act of union are preserved; and that Protestant historian, in particular, mentions one as being in London, which probably is the copy that Mr. Poulke has lately carefully examined. All these contain the disputed words; and according to Gibbon in a foot note, of these copies several may be deemed as of almost equal value with the originals, having been drawn up in Florence before the 26th August, 1439, the date of the final separation of the Pope and the Emperor.

THE CITY MORTALITY.—One hundred and thirty-three deaths! reported for the last week of the month of January, the period of the year when the mortality is usually at its lowest. During the summer heats, in the months of June, July and August, when all the stinks of the City, and verily their name is Legion, are let loose to fulfil their mission of destruction—the mortality is generally about double of what it is in the winter months; when the nameless and numberless abominations of our streets, backyards, and sewers are, for the time, frozen up, covered over with snow, and thus rendered temporarily innocuous.

But even should—which is certainly if we may judge from the past, not to be expected—the summer months' mortality not greatly exceed that of the winter months, there is much in the lately published statistics of interments to arrest our serious attention, and to prompt us to immediate and energetic action. For it is as certain as anything can be, that the fearfully excessive mortality of Montreal is not due to its climatic conditions, or to its situation, but to causes over which we have very considerable control. In the country, but a mile or two out of town, where the temperature, and all the climatic conditions are as are ours, the annual mortality does not exceed 20 per thousand; whilst in the City itself, and its suburbs, the mortality, even in the healthiest season of the year, at present averages almost 50 per thousand. Now, as Polonius would say—"this effect defective comes by cause." The questions alone remain, "What are those causes? and how can they be removed?"

This problem we do not propose to solve; only would we lay before our readers a few figures to show how monstrous is the amount of our mortality in Montreal; how immediate and active measures are urgently required for its reduction; and this the more, as it is very possible that Cholera may be brought to the shores of North America within a few weeks after the opening of the St. Lawrence navigation. Let us, however, turn back to our figures.

For the week ending January the 27th the City mortality was set down at 133. Multiplying this by 52, the number of weeks in a year, we have the appalling result of an annual mortality of 6,916 or very nearly 7,000 out of a population of, say in round numbers, 140,000. In other words, in the month of January, when as a general rule the public health is at its best, when the mortality is at its lowest, and when for a time the life destroying influences of bad drains, filthy backyards, and all pervading stench—Montreal's besetting sins—are paralyzed—its death-rate, with but two exceptions, is greater than that of any city in the world of which the vital statistics are reported; and in most cases is nearly double of that of any city in the United Kingdom.

We make this statement, extravagant as it may appear, upon the strength of the Return of the Registrar-General for the United Kingdom published on the 8th of last month, and reproduced in the *London Times*. From this official document it appears that the "aggregate mortality," during the week immediately preceding, for "London, and 20 other large cities and towns of the United Kingdom \* \* \* was at the rate of 23 deaths—(not 50 as in Montreal)—annually to every 1,000 persons estimated to be living." If it be urged that small-pox is very rife in Montreal, it may be replied that the same disease is raging as an

epidemic in England, Scotland and Ireland. Remembering then that even with the present death-rate—which doubtless will be nearly doubled in the summer months—the annual rate of mortality in Montreal is about 50 PER THOUSAND, we copy the following from the Report of the Registrar-General for January, 1872:—

The annual rates of mortality in the 18 English cities and towns were as follows:—London, 26 per 1,000; Portsmouth 22, Norwich 46, Bristol 28, Wolverhampton 59, Birmingham 25, Leicester 33, Nottingham 35, Liverpool 31, Manchester 31, Salford 24, Oldham 34, Bradford 24, Leeds 25, Sheffield 33, Hull 24, Sunderland 36, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne 26.

The same Report deals also with the vital statistics of several of the chief cities of Continental Europe, America, and Asia. From these statistics it appears that the annual death rate in Paris calculated from the mortality of the second week in January was equal to 22 per thousand of the estimated population; in Brussels, 21 per 1,000; in Berlin, 37 per 1,000; in Vienna, 28 per 1,000; in Rome, 51 per 1,000; New York, 26 per 1,000. In Bombay the mortality was at the rate of 20 per 1,000, and in Madras 29 per 1,000 of the population.

The statistics we leave our readers to ponder, and certainly they furnish abundant matter for serious reflection. How comes it to pass that Montreal, admirably situated; with, as our rural statistics show is the case, a healthy climate; with a noble river in front, yielding a copious supply of pure water; with no unhealthy marshes in its vicinity, no death giving Campagna to blight it with its malaria—presents with but two exceptions, the highest annual death-rate of any city in the world?

In consequence of the reproduction in the *Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia of an article attributing to the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi, deceased in 1837 in the odor of sanctity, a prophecy to the effect that the world would about this time be visited by pestilence, and a thick darkness which for three days would obscure the heavens—the Bishop of Philadelphia has felt himself called upon to address a Circular to the Faithful of his diocese, with the intent of allaying any excitement on the subject. We have heard that reports similar to those republished in the *Standard* of Philadelphia have been circulated in Canada; and we think therefore that it may interest our Catholic readers to see how a distinguished Prelate of their Church, in the U. States, deals with the matter. We copy from the *New York Tablet* of the 3rd inst.:—

To our Faithful People in the Diocese of Philadelphia.

BELOVED CHILDREN:—We are grieved to hear that a publication in the *Catholic Standard*, concerning the "Three Dark Days," said to have been foretold by the Venerable Servant of God, Anna Maria Taigi, has caused more or less apprehension and excitement among the Faithful.

This holy woman died in Rome, A. D. 1837, in the odor of sanctity; and the examination of her life and virtues resulted in declaring her according to the usual phraseology of the Church, "Venerable."

Although we do not blame the conductors of the paper for the insertion of this item, since they called it from respectable religious newspapers, nevertheless, had we been consulted, we would not have advised its publication.

We have, to-day, authorized the publishing of the life of this venerable servant of God, translated from the Italian edition, printed in Rome in 1865, by an Augustinian Friar, and collated from the depositions taken in the usual Process and examination, and bearing the *imprimatur* of three distinct ecclesiastical officials at Rome.

In this life there is not even mention made of the "Three Dark Days," nor of other prophecies attributed to this "Venerable Matron."

It is, therefore, evident that either these prophecies were not found among the papers in question; or that they were not considered of sufficient authenticity, weight or value, to justify their publication in the authorized history of her life.

Let all minds, therefore, be calmed; let us wait for the decision of the Church, the legitimate judge of such predictions, resting well assured that, no matter what horrors may be visited on the world in punishment for its crimes and infidelity, the Divine protection will be extended over all those who endeavor to avoid sin and to pass their lives in the holy love and fear of God.

Of one thing we are intimately convinced (and we consider the admonition both necessary and opportune) that should any extraordinary scourge be sent us by the Divine indignation for our sins, it will most severely visit and punish those who dissipate their substance and desolate their homes by debauchery and drunkenness; and especially those who, whilst they pretend temptation in every form and in every locality, reckless of the consequences to themselves and others, and heedless of the limitations and cautions dictated by our holy Mother the Church, pursue their dangerous calling in a manner utterly inconsistent with their duty as men, citizens and Christians.

"Better is a little with justice than great revenues with iniquity." Proverbs, chap. 16, v. 8. "The peace of God, beloved children, which surpasseth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus. Amen!" Philippians, chap. 4, v. 7.

JAMES FURBER, Bishop of Philadelphia.

The School Question in New Brunswick is one in which all the Catholics of the Dominion are interested, since when one member of a body suffers, all the other members suffer along with it. We offer then no apology to our readers for continually directing their attention to the subject, with the object of thereby enlisting their sympathies with their ill-used brethren.

That the agitation in New Brunswick is serious, and that the extreme Protestant party is doubtful about its position, are facts evident from the insolent threats which its journals address to French Catholics, residents of the Province, should they take part therein.

The subjoined from a Provincial paper, the *Moncton Times*, is very significant, and indicative of what French Canadians in Lower Canada will have to expect from the hands of the dominant party, should the relative positions of Catholics and Protestants in this Province ever be reversed:—

"Let it be remembered that religious animosities are easily aroused but allayed with difficulty, and let the French, in particular, bear in mind that they are the weaker party and must finally go to the wall if the feeling once becomes general that Catholic and Protestant sentiments are struggling for the right to shape the politics of this County. They have always been treated fairly by the English electors, and they owe it to themselves to firmly and promptly reject the advances of any candidate who seeks to make political capital out of their religious sentiments.

"They must, of course, take the responsibility of all the acrimony, bitterness and illfeeling that a contest, turning on this point, will give rise to.—Hitherto the French and English, Catholics and Protestants have lived together in harmony, and the worst enemy of both is he who would now seek to put an end to this desirable state of affairs by introducing the religious element into a political contest. We hope that nothing of the kind will be attempted; but it seems desirable at the present moment, before any bad feeling is aroused, that it should be understood that if educational matters are to be considered at all, the question will not be, shall we have free, unsectarian schools? but shall we have Separate Schools?"

On this the *St. John Freeman* comments as follows:—

The impudence of this is almost sublime. Why should there be acrimony, ill feeling or bitterness because any number of the Electors, great or small, sought in the proper constitutional way to give expression to their opinions on the policy of the Government and the Act of the Legislature? Why should French and English Catholics, and Protestants, quarrel because some or all of them differ on this question? We are satisfied that they will not quarrel. We know, too, that many English as well as French, many Protestants as well as Catholics, disapprove of the new School System, and we are satisfied that, despite the efforts of the *Times* and of those for whom it speaks, the people of the County, at this as at previous elections, will condemn those who forced such a measure upon them.

That our Catholic friends are by no means disposed to submit to the degrading yoke of State-Schoolism, but are resolved at all costs, to educate their children as they please, and independently of all State control, may be inferred from the following paragraphs which we also clip from our esteemed contemporary the *Freeman*:—

Two Christian Brothers arrived in St. John on Saturday to reinforce those already in the city. Their services were required as the number of pupils attending the schools is much larger than before. The Catholics of Fredericton have also applied for some of the Brothers to teach their boy's school.

THE STATE OF THE PROVINCE.—Never was this Province more disturbed or distracted than at the present day. The Local Government, urged on by the Lieut. Governor, contrived by means the most corrupt and odious to force upon the country a School Act which they knew the majority of the people of all parties and denominations were unwilling to accept; and as if this were not doing mischief enough, they imported, through the Lieut. Governor, to administer this system so hateful to the people, a Nova Scotian whose conduct the people of his own Province found unendurable.

To-day one half the Province, if not more, is in open revolt against the tyranny with which the people are threatened in the name of liberty and progress, and refuses to aid in carrying out an Act, passed despite the well understood wishes of the people. Indeed, as far as we can learn, more than half the Province has determined to resist the enforcement of this Act by every legal means available.

Throughout the Province indignation meetings have been held. The true spirit of constitutional resistance has been evoked, and we trust that it may not be allowed to subside.

A GOOD SUGGESTION.—The *New York Tablet* discussing the remedies which are necessary for restoring political and social honesty in the U. States, insists strongly on the doing away with the system of an elective Judiciary. As our correspondent most truly says:—

The thing most needed in any government, State or municipal, is an independent Judiciary. One of the grave complaints of the Colonies against Great Britain, and one of the causes that led to their separation from the mother country, was the change introduced by the British ministers, of the tenure of the colonial judges from that of good behaviour to that of the good pleasure of the crown. This change of tenure destroyed the independence of the judges, and was a constant temptation to them to seek in their judicial decisions the pleasure of the crown, rather than law or justice. There is just as much need of the independence of the judiciary in face of the people, as in face of the crown.

We will go so far as to say that it is of even more importance to have an honest, and therefore independent Judiciary, than it is to have honest and independent Legislators. The best laws, if badly or corruptly administered; if administered for instance by such a gang of knaves as those whom the late J. Fisk had under his control—are a greater curse to the community, than would be of itself the most iniquitous Code that the hell-inspired wit of man ever devised; and the most glorious fact in the British Constitution, that which preserved it in the darkest days and the stormiest weather, has been the independence of its Judiciary. To the contrary fact—that, with the exception of the Supreme Court of the U. States, the Judiciary of that country has always been more or less dependent on the very worst of all influences, popular control, because of the most absurd and mischievous system of electing the Judges therein pursued—must be attributed a great part of the rascality, public dishonesty, and private immorality for which that great country is conspicuously prominent amongst all the nations of the earth. In Great Britain, in Canada—we have full confidence in the integrity of our Judges. We know that,