

The True Witness
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY,
AT
662½ CRAIG STREET.
M. W. KIRWAN—EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
Terms—\$2.00 per annum—in Advance

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, NOV. 7.

CALENDAR—NOVEMBER, 1877.

WEDNESDAY, 7—Of the Octave.
Battle of Tippecanoe, 1811. The British retreat from Pensacola, Fla., 1814. O'Connell chosen Lord Mayor of Dublin, 1841.
THURSDAY, 8—Octave of All Saints. The Four Coronati, Martyrs.
Seizure of Mason and Slidell on the steamer Trent, 1861.
FRIDAY, 9—Dedication of St. John Lateran. St. Theodore, Martyr.
Prince of Wales born, 1841.
SATURDAY, 10—St. Andrew Avellino, Confessor. SS. Typhon, Respicus, and Nympha, Martyrs. Oliver Goldsmith born, 1728.
SUNDAY, 11—TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST. Patronage of the Blessed Virgin Mary. St. Mennas, Martyr.
Killebeg Chapel, Wexford, burned by the military, 1798. Massacre of Cherry Vally, N.Y., 1777.
MONDAY, 12—St. Martin, Pope and Martyr.
TUESDAY, 13—St. Didacus, Confessor.
Rossini, the composer, died, 1868.

ST. JEAN BAPTISTE VILLAGE INFANTRY COMPANY.

The members of the above Company will assemble at the QUEBEC GATE BARRACKS, Dalhousie Square, at 7.30, on FRIDAY EVENING, 9TH NOVEMBER, to receive their arms.—The BAND of the Company will attend.

There are a few vacancies for recruits—standard, 5ft 9in.

M. W. KIRWAN,
Capt. Commanding.

"A CRITIC CRITICISED."

The Witness professes to have something better to do than discuss the "unmitigated rubbish," with which the TRUE WITNESS "crams its readers" every week. It thinks that the city has no cause to regret that the "unmitigated rubbish" does not appear "daily." Well, perhaps so. At least the Witness may rejoice at our inability to measure weapons with it once a day. If we were so able the Witness would soon learn to be civil. It might in fact even become polite. It takes spurts in that direction occasionally, and it sometimes succeeds. But the task is too much for it. Civility and tolerance are merely the varnish with which the Witness occasionally coats its scales of bigotry and falsehood. It advocates "Canadian Nationality," and commences by insulting nearly one-half of the population of the Dominion. It has done more to estrange the people of Canada from each other, than all the other papers in the country put together. We hoped, at one time, that it had seen the errors of its way, but we were mistaken. It was merely a coat of varnish put on after the occasion—the scales appeared soon afterwards, and we are once more undecieved. To-day it is as coarse as ever it was. If we wished to be personal we could account for the change. There were strangers in town. But withal it might make an effort to be original. It spoke about our "dancing round in crazy delight like a boy who had succeeded in pinning a dishelout to an old woman's skirt on the first of April." We have seen this joke fifty times. But it becomes the Witness. There is an affinity between them. Like becomes like. But to business. The Witness assails the Syllabus. It quotes the oft quoted passage:—

"Etate hac nostra non amplius expedit, religionem Catholicam haberi tamquam unicam status religionem, ceteris quibuscumque cultibus excisus."

The English of this is:—

"In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic Religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship."

The Syllabus says that it is an error to entertain such opinions as these. Now the Witness says that when this sentence is

"Bid of confusing inversions, the Pope's teaching is that the Roman Catholic religion should always be the religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship."

Nothing of the kind. The Witness is out of its reckoning. We recommend it to read logically and to "rid" its mind of the "confusing inversions" which the Syllabus appears to have brought upon the brain of our contemporary. Let us set the Witness right, and with some of our "unmitigated rubbish" heap coals of fire upon the bald pate of our—not over polite associate. Now, in the first place, the Syllabus can no more be understood without logic, than the bible can be understood without theology. Does the Witness remember that when a proposition is pronounced false its contradictory is declared to be true; its contrary may be, or may not be true. For instance—"All the Protestant

clergymen in Montreal are men of Christian principles"—the contrary of: this might read thus, "Not all the Protestant clergymen of Montreal are men of Christian principles." But it is otherwise with the contradictory proposition which would read thus—"None of the Protestant clergymen of Montreal are men of Christian principles." Now we ask our contemporary to bear this simple rule of logic in mind, and then we can very easily prove that the Pope never "uttered" the words that the "Protestants are not to be allowed to exercise their natural rights wherever the Catholics can prevent it." The Syllabus says that it is an error to suppose that

"In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship."

Just so. The Pope in that sentence denies that religious unity is less desirable now than ever. Now the contradictory of this sentence would mean that:—

"In the present day it is expedient that the Catholic religion should be the only religion in the State to the exclusion of all others."

This is the contradictory, and it is thus that the Witness reads it. But it is neither thus that it was intended, nor is it thus that it is practised. It is the contrary and not the contradictory of the phrase which is implied. In that contrary there is a medium, and a little knowledge of the elements of logic on the part of our contemporary would have enabled it to see its way. The contrary of the passage would read thus:—

"It may be expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion in the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship."

The passage quoted by the Witness cannot be otherwise interpreted by any man who has ever applied himself to the study even of the elements of logic, and it is mere childishness upon the part of the Witness to deny it. It is just the same with the seventy-eight censure which declares it unwise, where the unity of faith has never been shattered, to excite dissensions "by authorizing the introduction and public practice of other worship." Well this simply refers to countries which are essentially Catholic, such as Spain, Austria, &c., &c. The Syllabus says:—

"It is unwise to introduce strange religions into Catholic countries, and who can look at the torments, the trials, the persecution and the terrors to which the Irish people were subjected because of their faith can doubt the prudence of such advice. But the Syllabus does not say that strange religions may not be introduced. It merely says that it is unwise of Catholic authorities to introduce them into Catholic countries. Canada is not a Catholic country therefore the phrase does not apply. But upon these issues we can leave our contemporary conscious of our own peace, and slightly puzzled to account for the muddle it has made.

Again the Witness replies to our statement as to whether its ideas of the Syllabus are put into force in Catholic countries and admits that they are not, so far as Austria and France are concerned, but implies that they are in Spain. It says that France is "very largely irreligious" and that it is "tolerant in spite of Rome." Your frenzy against "Romanism" is driving you crazy—daily contemporary of ours. France was tolerant before Protestantism was ever heard of and it is only since it was heard of that France has become "very largely irreligious." We repeat that all governments that have a state religion have been more or less intolerant in their time, and France at some short periods of her history was no exception to the rule.

The Witness does not defend the Falk laws, for which small favour we are thankful. But it thinks that the Catholic clergy deserved to be punished for all that. It would be pleased to hear of them all becoming "State" priests and it is vexed because they will not. Again in reply to our remarks:—

"Look at the intolerance of the English people in not sending a single Catholic M.P. to represent the 2,000,000 of Catholics in Great Britain."

It says:—
The reason of this is, we presume, that the leading men in England are not, as a rule, Roman Catholics.

Indeed! The leading men in England are not Roman Catholics! Perhaps the Roman Catholics are not even educated! Perhaps of the 2,000,000 there are none of them fit to take a seat in Parliament. Perhaps the Duke of Norfolk is not a "leading man" and perhaps not one member of his family is as well qualified to take his place in the "first assembly of gentlemen in Europe" as Mr. Burt or Mr. McDonald, two working men, and the working men's M.P.s for Stafford and Morpeth. Perhaps the Howard's of Glassop, are not "leading men" and perhaps Stoneyhurst turns out no one accomplished enough to enter public life. Perhaps Lord Robert Montagu was a "leading man" before he became a Catholic and when he represented an English constituency, and perhaps he suddenly lost all he ever learned, when he was converted, and when his constituents turned him out of his seat because he became a Catholic. No the

reason is plain. The Catholics are not numerically superior to the Protestants in any one constituency in Great Britain, and the Protestants will not have a Catholic on any account. It is for that reason, that 2,000,000 of our co-religionists are without a representative in the House of Commons. Catholic Ireland, the same as Catholic Quebec, give Protestants more than their full share of representation, while Protestant England, and Protestant Ontario, give Catholics no representation at all.

But it would occupy too much space to follow the Witness in all its vagaries. It denies that St Peter was ever at Rome; well so do others as well as the Witness. Perhaps the testimony of St Clement, St. Ignatius, and Papius, Bishop of Hieropolis—all of them immediate disciples of the Apostles in the first century, by St Irenæus, Dionysius of Corinth, Tertullian and Cujus in the second century; of SS. Cyprian and Origen in the third; by Eusebius, the father of Church history, St. Epiphonius, St. Jerome, St. Optatus of Mileve, St. Ponsian, St. Augustine, St. John Chrysostom, and a host of other "historical evidences" are not as good proof as the opinion of the Witness and its friends. Nay, more. Many learned Protestant writers have expressed the same opinion as that which we hold. Blondel, Cate, Grotius, and even John Calvin—none of them have denied the fact. Care said:—

"We intrepidly affirm with all antiquity, that Peter was in Rome, and for some time resided there."

All, both ancient and modern, will, I think, agree with me, that Peter may be called bishop of Rome in a less strict sense (?) inasmuch as he laid the foundation of this Church, and rendered it illustrious by his martyrdom."

If this is not enough, see all the testimony given in Archbishop Kenrick's work on the Primacy. "No title of evidence," says the Witness. This is "unmitigated rubbish," say we. We have given historical evidence that St. Peter was in Rome, and if required we could quote volumes of other testimony to prove the same thing.

Again speaking of Mohammedanism, the Witness says:—

"In the seventh century, when the Church had practically relapsed into heathenism, and public and private worship was addressed to relics and images, and a host of angels, saints and martyrs became the objects of popular adoration, and the Virgin Mary received the name and honors of goddess, reason and conscience revolted; all sorts of sects sprung up, especially in the better educated East, and the half of Christendom gave way to Mahomet, whose doctrine of one God laid stronger hold on the conscience than the practical polytheism then taught as Christianity. Which of the facts quoted above is it that the True Witness wishes to stigmatise as mere assertion?"

We answer that it is all assertion. Immediately after this the Witness admits that it was Charles Martel that stayed the progress of Mohammedanism. Of him the Witness speaks some truth. And who was Charles Martel? An Evangelizer and a reader of the Witness perhaps? He lived in the eighth century, and with the chivalry of Catholic France, in 732 he gave the Crescent an overwhelming defeat and drove its followers back into Spain again. Sobieski, too, and his gallant Catholic Poles had something to do in the work, when they drove the Turks from the gates of Vienna. These were Catholics, all Catholics to a man. And then we have more about Tetzal and Leo X. "selling pardons," &c., and so we come to the close. Then the Witness becomes heroic, talks of "manly and patriotic utterances," and "insolence and nonsense." How dare we raise our heads in presence of our censor! How dare we speak when the Witness bears such testimony for all. It is "insolence and nonsense" on the part of a "Papist" to open his lips in Montreal. But we tell our contemporary that the work is only beginning, and that we shall not hesitate to treat our antagonists just as our antagonists treat us.

THE VOLUNTEERS.

The past week has been a busy one for the Volunteers of Montreal. The arrival of the Lieut-General, Sir E. Selby Smith, in town put the various corps in commotion. The Montreal Field Battery, the Prince of Wales Regiment and the "Victorias" were each inspected in turn. The Lieut-General expressed his satisfaction with all. He is reported to have spoken favourably of the course pursued by Colonel Bond in encouraging Catholics to join the volunteers. For our part we regret that there were not more Catholics in the ranks. The Lieut-General knows well that Catholic soldiers have never wavered in their allegiance, and that Catholic soldiers would, to-morrow be found amongst the foremost to defend the Constitution of this their adopted land. Whatever may be the unhappy cause of internal dissensions, there can be no doubt as to the allegiance of the Catholics to the laws of the Dominion. If we differ with our fellow citizens upon some of the vital questions of the day, we agree with them all in our willingness to defend Canadian soil. We have no sympathy with any man, who lives in Canada, and who hesitates to give

to Canada that allegiance, which is Canada's due. Our duty is to protect the laws that protect us. There is not in the world a better Constitution than the one we live under; and we owe it as a duty to the State, and as some recompense for the security and protection we enjoy, to join the Volunteers and place ourselves at the service of the country.

In writing of the Volunteers last week we made two mistakes. We wrote of Colonel Bond of the "Victorias," while it should have been Colonel Bond of the "Prince of Wales Regiment." Again we fell into the error of saying that "it was the first time in the history of the corps" that a "Catholic contingent paraded for mass." This, too, we are informed is a mistake. In a letter to the Herald, Colonel John Dyde reminds us that we "know very little of the past history of the Volunteer Militia Force of Canada." To this we say that we know very little indeed, and we are obliged to Colonel Dyde for the information he supplies us with. He says:—

During the Oregon dispute in 1845, I raised a regiment, the Montreal Light Infantry, 600 strong, in five weeks, ready for service, and fully one-half were Roman Catholics. Then sometime intervened the Montreal Rifles, now the Prince of Wales, consisted of ten companies, four mixed, two Irish Roman Catholic companies, two French Canadian Roman Catholic companies and two Protestant companies; the Major who was afterwards Lt. Colonel Devlin, and half the officers were Roman Catholics, also the Sergeant-Major and some of the staff Sergeants were Roman Catholics; at all drills, parades and field days there was never a case of insubordination or of bad feeling. On one occasion the whole Montreal force were invited out to the grounds of Lt.-Col. Coffin, behind the mountain, after a field day, arms were stacked and games of all kinds introduced and not one unpleasantness occurred. When the Trent embroglio occurred and war appeared imminent the Montreal force was raised from 1,250 to nearly 4,000 in three months, one-half Roman Catholics. Afterwards when the Fenian threatenings and raids year after year became the fashion, the Volunteer Militia were kept up, and sometimes as many as 1,500 or 2,000 from my brigade were on duty at the front, and when engaged gave a very good account of themselves. During this time Church Parades were frequent, Roman Catholic and Protestant, and on one occasion the whole force was ordered out, and Gen. Lindsay and I with our respective staffs marched at the head of the Roman Catholics to St. Patrick's Church in the morning, when Father Dowd gave an excellent sermon, full of good advice, and in the afternoon we went at the head of the Protestants to the English Cathedral, where we had an equally appropriate discourse from the late lamented Bishop Fulford. If the Roman Catholics have gradually succeeded and kept aloof from the force, whose fault is it, and what is the reason? There must be some latent cause that can only be surmised—perhaps the True Witness can enlighten us.

Yours, &c., &c.
JOHN DYDE, Colonel,
Volunteer Militia.

Montreal, 3rd Nov. 1877.

Let us hope that history will repeat itself, and that Montreal will again witness the Catholics and Protestants marching side by side, pledging a common allegiance, and defending a common flag. He is no loyal citizen of Canada who will endeavour to keep men of different beliefs apart, no matter whether it may be in social, political, or military affairs, and most sincerely do we wish that we may never be compelled, in the defence of our own religion, to advocate it in the two last instances. We pledge ourselves to join in any movement that we believe calculated to remove antagonism and to bring about a better understanding between all classes and all creeds in Montreal, but above all others we think it necessary that the Volunteers, Catholic and Protestant, should entertain a kindly feeling towards each other. But does it not occur to some of those who differ from us that there has been only one side of this question hitherto? Do they not think that the absence of Catholics from the ranks has had something to do with the bitterness of expression upon both sides? Whatever were the causes of that absence we shall not now enquire into. Such an enquiry can do no good. We, however, must admit that the fault rests with Catholics themselves. They were not turned out, they must have left. Colonel Dyde knows far more about it than we do. As for our part "knowing very little of the past history of the Volunteer Militia of Canada," we regret that we are unable to answer Colonel Dyde's question.

THE GRAND JURY SYSTEM.

At a meeting of the Civil Rights Alliance, held on Monday in Perry's Hall, it was resolved to petition the law officers of the crown to "at once take such steps as shall be necessary to raise the status of the Grand Jury." One of the speakers reiterated the charge of "ignorance" while the Rev. Mr. Stevenson in advocating the change spoke as a broad church man and said that "he would oppose any infringement on the rights of his Catholic fellow subject to worshipping God according to his special form of belief, as he would the infringement of any of his rights to freedom in religious matters." Then the Rev. Mr. Bray made a temperate, and, from his point of view, a fair speech, after which it was resolved to obtain signatures to the petition. Before however, the Civil Rights Alliance undertook this mission would it not be well to ascertain whether or not the charge of "ignorance" brought against the members of the Grand Jury is true or not. We have been favoured with some special information upon this point,

and we think the gentlemen who composed the Grand Jury in the Sheehan case were an intelligent body of men. We have reason to know that every one of them could both read and write, and that the charge of "ignorance" cannot be sustained. It was in the petty Jury and not the Grand Jury, where there were supposed to be men who could not write their names. If the Civil Rights Alliance takes the trouble to sift this matter it will find that this is the fact. Again, it was said there were two respectable witnesses against Sheehan. This is another mistake. There were two witnesses indeed, but the less said about the "respectability" of one of them the better. We, for our part, hope that the Civil Rights Alliance will succeed in obtaining an investigation into the matter, for we are certain that it will clear up the mysterious and groundless accusation which is now being made against a body of gentlemen who did their duty without partiality or malice.

THE REV. MR. LYMAN AND THE CANADIAN PATOIS.

The Rev. Mr. Lyman, editor of the Christian Union, of New York, seems to have in his Canadian peregrinations kicked up, with uncautious foot, a hornets nest. The Witness, which sometimes astonishes us with magnificent bursts of frankness, has thought itself in duty bound to give him a lesson. The Herald in a rather dignified manner, but with malice propense stirred up the strife; the other papers throughout the country, and many correspondents joined in the row, but the Montreal Gazette seems to have collected all the hornets in a bunch and flung them in the face of the Rev. calumniator in the following slashing style:—

"His statement about the attendance at the primary schools is untrue. The sneer about the catechism has grown obsolete. The story about the 'business colleges' being built with the Church's superfluous funds is quite pointless. Mr. Abbott's statistics are wholly incorrect. They betray not only ignorance and prejudice, but indifference to truth. He has avowed as much in saying that it was not worth his while to have the tangle unravelled. Altogether his conduct is disgraceful to one holding the position of a clergyman and a journalist. Men who wittingly disseminate falsehoods, whatever be their pretensions, ought to be held up to public scorn, and Mr. Abbott has brought this punishment upon himself."

If there be anything more amusing than another in the world, it is to see the ludicrous mistakes of the self sufficient traveller, who in a flying visit considers himself fully justified to pass a verdict upon a country, which he sees only en passant. Such men often acquire the greater part of their information from carters and hotel-porters.

Had they common sense, which they generally lack, they would remember that persons who earn their money from the travelling public, are as a general rule clever, and apt to play upon the foibles and vanity of their hearers; prudent travellers, therefore, should accept *como grano salis* all statements coming to them in the least way tinged with malice, bigotry or exaggeration. This wholesome rule seems to have been forgotten by the Rev. Mr. Lyman Abbott. This gentleman appears to be one of those editors of religious newspapers, who are a scourge to religion, because they make of it a stepping-stone for their own advancement, and by their hypocrisy and malice disgust honest men from taking up its defence, whilst they give new life to bigotry and ignorance by pandering to the vilest instincts. In the exercise of this despicable programme, the Rev. Mr. Abbott thought fit in a late number of the Christian Union to sneer at the number of churches to be seen throughout the Province of Quebec, and to call the French language as spoken here a miserable Patois. That a political economist, imbued with the idea that everything not producing a direct reverence is useless, should find fault with the number and magnificence of our churches, is nothing astonishing; but that a clergyman should do so seems to us a very extraordinary circumstance. He must have seen described magnificent Churches and Basilicas all over Europe, and beautifying its fall, erected by those "ignorant and tasteless" bears, the monks of the Dark Ages; and tho' true it is, that civilization, with all its boasting, has as yet done nothing to compare with these magnificent structures, and though Protestantism has thought the easiest way to enjoy the full benefits of these wonderful edifices was to rob them from their rightful owners, yet it seems to us in our darkness that Mr. Abbott, with all his modern enlightenment and Yankee cuteness, should have seen in our Canadian Churches a reminiscence of that spirit which beautified every city and almost every hamlet in the old country. And a right noble spirit was that enthusiasm, long may it enrich the smiling valleys of Canada and the banks of the St. Lawrence. Reason and faith tell us that an earth man cannot find full satisfaction for all his desires, the soul will not be cramped within the narrow limits of the body, and in its struggling and longing, it ever and always points heavenwards. But how often does it happen after long struggles with outward foes