

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 219, 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. FETTERGILL & 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, JUNE 21, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE—1872.

Friday, 21—St. Aloysius Gonzaga, C.
Saturday, 22—Vigil. St. Ubaldo, B. C. (May 16).
Sunday, 23—Fifth after Pentecost.
Monday, 24—St. John Baptist.
Tuesday, 25—St. William, Ab.
Wednesday, 26—St. John and Paul, MM.
Thursday, 27—Of the Octave.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The shiftings and changings in the Alabama Claims question are more sudden, more intricate, and more unintelligible than those of a pantomime. Everybody mixed up therewith seems to be engaged in a game of cross-purposes: and it is really difficult to believe that on either side of the Atlantic there can exist any very strong desire to carry out the Treaty; for were it so, diplomacy would long ere this have found out a solution for the difficulty. There are some occult influences at work, evidently, to oppose its accomplishment. Russian gold has been hinted at.

Cholera has declared itself in the South of Russia. Thence by quick and easy stages, it will find its way to other parts of Europe, and we should not be surprised to hear in a few weeks that it made its appearance in America. Every man at all events should see to it, and set his house in order. Cleanliness and Temperance are the best material arms wherewith to fight Cholera, which thrives on dirt, and delights in an atmosphere impregnated with the perfumes of the sewer and the whiskey bottle.

The report that it was the intention of the Imperial Government to set free the prisoners still undergoing sentence on account of connection with Fenianism, has been formally contradicted in the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone.

The annexed telegram would seem to indicate that to a certain extent at least, the rights of conscience have been vindicated even in the Common Schools of the United States:—

New York, June 12.—Yesterday the decision of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in the case of the late Bible difficulty in Hunter's Point, was received, and created the utmost excitement and the greatest enthusiasm among the Catholics of Long Island City and Brooklyn when the result was learned.

This decision sustains the appeals of Thomas M. Mahon, and others, Trustees of the First Ward of Long Island City, against John Fahnestock, and others; Owen McElenney, and others, against same; Edward M. Bennett, and others, against same.

The effect of the decision will be to cause the removal of the Bible from every school-house in the State, and the discontinuance of all religious services, unless carried on before or after regular school hours.

All last night bonfires were seen blazing through the streets of Long Island City, and crowds congregated around the dwellings of the Trustees, mainly through whose instrumentality the question was brought to an issue, and the decision thereby obtained.

There is no appeal from this decision except to the Legislature, who must enact a law if the Bible is to be retained as a text-book in our schools.

It is reported that action will immediately be taken to compel an observance of the decision through the entire State.

By Cable on Saturday we learnt that the British Government had withdrawn from the Treaty.

The Jesuits have been deprived of the rights of citizenship in Germany.

Lord Dufferin, the new Governor General, sailed from Londonderry on the 17th inst.

The Anniversary of the ascension of His Holiness Pius IX. to the Pontifical Chair was celebrated at Rome on Sunday, in a becoming manner by the faithful. Four thousand persons, representing all nations of the earth, proceeded to the Vatican, and presented a congratulatory address to the Pope.

The Boston Jubilee opened on Monday with the greatest enthusiasm.

Count Schepis, President of the Tribunal of Arbitration, did not propose the adjournment of the Court on Saturday, as it was reported he would do. The summary of the British argument was accompanied by a protest reserving the right of England to withdraw from the arbitration, if the negotiations with the

American Government relative to the indirect claims fail to result satisfactorily to the Government of the former country. The proceedings of the Tribunal are carried on partly in English and partly in French.

Hopeful expectations of the result of the arbitration are raised.

THE TWO METHODS.

It is much to be regretted that on the New Brunswick School question there should, amongst Catholics, be so much apparent difference of opinion, and so bitter controversy. This we believe arises, not from any difference *au fond* as to the merits of the School question as from a mutual misunderstanding, or misconception of motives.

Au fond, that is to say as to the merits of the School question, there can be no two opinions amongst Catholics. All are alike agreed that the action of the New Brunswick Legislature in the matter of Education is most oppressive and unjust as towards the Catholic minority of that Province. All are agreed that it is our moral duty to use every constitutional means to obtain for that minority relief from the injustice under which they labor. It is only as to the method of so doing, or *modus operandi*, on which any divergence of opinion obtains amongst Catholics. Surely this question of method should be discussed calmly, without acrimony, and with mutual respect.

On one side it is contended that the Federal Government has, without regard to the constitutionality of the school legislation of New Brunswick; irrespective of the consideration, whether it be in harmony with the restrictive clauses of the 93rd sect. of the British North America Act—the legal right to disallow it and any Act that a local legislature may pass; and that right should at once be exercised in this case, on the grounds that the legislation complained of, is, if not in violation of the constitution, unjust towards a large section of Her Majesty's subjects in New Brunswick. This is one view of the case; and certainly we are not disposed to treat it lightly, or to attribute any unworthy motives to those who hold and advocate it. It is so held and advocated by many for whom we entertain the most sincere respect, and from whom it is with pain that we presume to differ.

The other view of the case, that which we have ventured to advocate is this: That the first step that should be taken is to determine the constitutionality of the legislation complained of; and then by appeal, from a tribunal incompetent to determine a question of law, because a political tribunal, or tribunal subject to disturbing political influences, to a purely legal tribunal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Of course, should the decision of the latter be against the constitutionality of the New Brunswick Legislation, the Federal Government would not only have the right to disallow it, but would be bound to do so by the Act of Parliament to which it owes its being. This is the *modus operandi* which we have ventured to advocate; and which we find has been endorsed by Mr. Blake in the House of Commons.

In favor of the first line of policy it may be urged that, if adopted, it would give immediate relief to the Catholic minority of New Brunswick. This is the chief argument, indeed the only argument, in its favor that we have as yet heard urged; and it has its force, no doubt.

On the other hand, and with equal truth, it may be urged, that relief so given would be merely palliative, not curative, of the disease we have to deal with; that it would afford only a temporary, not a permanent relief—that it would be an opiate administered to the sufferer, but not a remedy. The Constitutional competency of the New Brunswick Legislature to enact another school law, equally or more oppressive, in so far as Catholics are concerned, would not be thereby affected; the school liberties of the said minority would still have no better safeguard than the temper of the Parliament for the time sitting in Ottawa, in which Protestants are now almost as three to one of Catholics, and in which the relative strength of the first-named is always increasing.

On the other hand, should the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council affirm the unconstitutionality of the New Brunswick school law, as a transgression of the restrictive clauses of the 93rd Sect. of the Act of Confederation, the school liberties of the Catholic minority would be secured against all fresh attacks, for all time to come. A vast accession of hostile political influence in the Federal Legislature would not endanger them; and the victory thus won would be permanent. It seems to us that for such an advantage we may well submit to a little delay.

And again, without hazarding an opinion of our own as to the strict constitutional right of the Federal Government to disallow any constitutional act that a Provincial Legislature may please to pass, without thereby exceeding its legal functions; admitting for the sake of argument, that it has such unlimited, absolute

power, still we think that, in the interests of Quebec, it is a power whose exercise it would be most impolitic for us to evoke; a power which we should rather seek to repress, than to call into being, since its exercise would be incompatible with State Rights, Provincial autonomy, or Home Rule, faces in which its exercise may be called over, may, perhaps, occur, but only as a last resource, and when all other constitutional means have been tried, and have failed.

And by constituting, in one instance, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council a Court to determine the constitutionality of a certain questionable act of a Provincial Legislature, we establish a most important precedent, and extort from the Federal Government a most invaluable concession. We establish the precedent that when a question of legal right brings the Federal Government into collision with the Provincial Government, the former is not competent to sit as judge in its own cause; we extort from the former, the concession that its powers of *veto* over Provincial legislation are not, as our opponents contend, unlimited, and absolute, but may be limited and determined by another tribunal sitting, hearing and deciding as a Supreme Court.

For these reasons we still think that the course actually adopted in dealing with the New Brunswick School Law is the best that could have been adopted, in the interests both of the Catholics of New Brunswick in particular, and in the interests of the several Provinces of which the Dominion is composed, in general. Should the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council determine that the School Act of New Brunswick is unconstitutional, the victory is won for ever. Should it admit its constitutionality, we shall still be where we were before, and our course of action will then be that so ably indicated by M. Chauveau—we must appeal to the authority which made Confederation, *i.e.*, to the Imperial Government—to make such amendments in its own Act, as shall put it out of the power of a majority in any one Province to oppress the minority in matter of education. That such was the design, even if imperfectly expressed, of the framers of the Act, we believe, from the restrictions with which they hedged round the powers of the local legislatures in that matter; and we, therefore,—should we fail in the Court of Law to which we have appealed our case,—are prepared to bring it back again into the political order, and to labor for an amendment to a law which shall have been interpreted in a sense unfavorable to us.

This then is the method which we propose, and this the sole difference betwixt us, and some of our contemporaries for whom we have the highest respect. Whilst they insist that at once, and without considering the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the New Brunswick school legislation—a question which in truth the Federal Government is incompetent to discuss—the said Federal Government should disallow the obnoxious school law; we contend that first should be determined, by referring it to competent authority, *i.e.*, to a legal and non-political tribunal,—the question of the constitutionality of the legislation complained of; and that, should it be by that authority ruled constitutional, we should then seek to obtain from the Imperial Government such amendments in our Constitutional Act, as both to afford our friends in New Brunswick the relief sought for, and to secure Catholics in all time to come from the danger of being subjected to a system of anti-Catholic education. This a vote of our Federal Parliament could not do: since a legislative assembly cannot by its acts bind its successors, or limit their freedom of action.

There is more trouble a-head besides, and not a very long way off either for which we should be getting ready. How shall we deal with the Manitoba School question when it comes up, as come up it must. To any school legislation that Manitoba may adopt, the restrictive conditions of the 93rd sect. of the British North America Act will not apply, since at the time of the passing of that law, Manitoba did not exist as a separate Province, and had no school law of its own. There are in this the elements of a very pretty quarrel.

NEW AND OLD CATHOLICITY.—“New Catholicity” as defined by the Protestant Dean of Westminster, the accomplished Dr. Stanley, and “Old Catholicity” as expounded by Dolinger seem to be very like one another, and both bear a marvellous resemblance to what people, not accustomed to the niceties of language, are in the habit of calling infidelity. As defined by Dean Stanley Catholicity is identical with “latitudinarianism,” and consists essentially in believing nothing in particular.

Such was the substance of a sermon delivered before the University of Oxford on Trinity Sunday last by the above named great leader of the “Broad’s” in the Anglican Church, and reported in the London Times. “He insisted on Catholicity as inclusive, and not exclusive; advocated latitudinarianism as the truest Catho-

licism; and recommended the spirit animating it as the most likely solvent of the difficulties of the present day, such as those concerning churchyards, primary education, and the doctrine celebrated on that day—the dogma of the Trinity.”

What the man who thus monstrously jumbles together the “churchyard question,” and the “Trinity question”—for both are questions in the Church by Law Established—really holds himself, if he held anything at all—it is impossible to tell; but he is so far right, that it is quite true that the only solution of the difficulties now distracting Protestantism, is to be found in what the Dean calls Latitudinarianism, and others call Indifferentism. For Protestants ever to agree to hold any creed however short, or simple is impossible. Unity of faith amongst them is unattainable, unity of disbelief is however within their reach; and to the prosecution of this attainable end, the Dean exhorts them as the nearest approach they can ever hope to make towards Catholicity. Papists are one, because they all believe all that the Catholic Church believes and teaches; Protestants will be one when, and only when, they shall discard all dogma; and to this form of Unity every thing shows that the Protestant world is fast approaching. If they will but treat the “Trinity question,” the Atonement question, the Incarnation question, the Holy Ghost question, and the personal God question, as they have agreed to treat the churchyard question, and the surplice question—that is as open questions scarce worth disputing about, then, but not before will the sects of Protestantism present the aspect of a house no longer divided against itself.

A CARD.—We have been authorised to give a formal contradiction to a report set in circulation by some very ill informed, if not unprincipled persons, to the effect that, in the Grey Nunnery, corner of Guy and Dorchester Streets, small-pox has for some time prevailed to a considerable extent, that several of the Sisters had fallen victims to the disease, and of the orphan children in the Asylum, a still greater number.

There is no foundation in fact for this report. Since the taking possession by the Sisters of their new house, in the month of October last year, there has been but one single fatal case of small-pox within the walls of the establishment. The victim in this case was one of the novices, who contracted the disease in her attendance upon the sick whom she visited in the City; amongst the Sisters, and amongst the orphans, there has not occurred a single case.

We indulge the hope that our City contemporaries will not refuse to give their aid towards the contradiction of a false report, which, if generally believed, might prove injurious to a most salutary, as well as most excellently conducted, charitable institution.

Its recent calamities do not seem to have taught the French capital wisdom. Paris is still the gayest, the most extravagant, and if the correspondents of the London papers may be believed the most immoral city in Europe. The extravagance in dress, so ruinous to domestic happiness, of which the second Empire set the example, is as bad as ever, and this by itself is no unimportant sign of the times. We give some extracts from the correspondence of the London Times; and as we read them we feel what a powerful argument may, and will, there, be built by the Communists. “Why should we starve?” these men exclaim, “why should our wives and children be, in spite of our never ending toil, still in want of the commonest necessities of life, whilst this indolent bourgeoisie which toils not, and spins not, but fattens on our sweat, can indulge in these costly frivolities?” There can be no doubt that much of the hostility of the poor towards the rich is kept alive, and intensified by the costly not to say snobbish display of wealth in which the snobocracy delights to indulge, and of whose extent we may form some idea from the Times’ correspondent:—

A more accurate criterion of the social tendencies of the day is to be found in the “toilettes” which flaunt on high days and holidays, and indeed on most days in the Champs Elysees and the Bois de Boulogne—in the extravagance and luxury which seem only to have been waiting for a quiet moment to come out of the hiding places in which they have taken refuge during the last two years, and thus bring out into sharper contrast the traces of ruin and bloodshed which should make any such exhibition impossible. Public opinion has universally attributed to the rage for dress and profligate expenditure many of those bold speculations of a political as well as a commercial nature by which fortunes were to be lost or won upon the Bourse in a day under the Empire; and, if the nation is to be saved again from catastrophes such as have already overtaken it, the habits that have led to them must be abandoned. The best proof that they exist is to be found in facts. In no former year will one eminent dressmaker’s receipts be larger than this year if business goes on at its present rate. It is calculated that the total amount of the sales at this establishment for the will be £240,000, which represents the purchase by the ladies of Paris and its visitors of 6,000 dresses at £40 a dress—of course, there are dresses far more expensive, and £100 is by no means an uncommon price. On the other hand, there are the “petites robes Republicanes,” which affect a great simplicity out of compliment to the name they bear, but which nevertheless cost £20 a piece, not because they are intrinsically worth that amount, but because they

bear the stamp of the greatest millinery genius of the age, and a “*crêpe*” gown which has undergone receives an enhanced value; for the President of the Republic himself is not more absolute and autocratic than the President of the Republic of Fashion with his “*petites robes Republicanes*.”

There can be no doubt, moreover, that many ladies have moderated their expenditure since their country’s troubles; those in whom the least change is to be seen are those who appertain to the fallen regime, and who acquired their extravagant habits under it. Still, if the figures furnished to a friend of mine are correct, the exigencies of a moderate toilet are still considerable; and as a matter of curiosity I add them. This is what a lady of fashion may be reasonably expected in the present depressed condition of the country, and in her own depressed condition in consequences of its misfortunes, to spend, annually upon clothing her person:—Bonnets, £96; “*coiffures*,” £72; false hair, £20; corsets, £10; under linen, £200; shoes, £48; gloves, £40; dresses, £300; making a total for the fortunate husband of £1,282. I have not included jewelry, but it is evident that anything short of £1,000 would be out of keeping with the rest of the costume. This is, of course, the “*budget*” of a quite correct lady of fashion, or, in the words of my informant, “*une dame elegante mais honnete*.” To know what expenditure really means, we must go into the category of those who confine themselves to being *dames elegantes*. Here there is no limit to the profuse extravagance. I may give, as an illustration, one item in the accounts of one of these superlatively elegant ladies. The natural flowers in her rooms cost over £1,000 a year.

The “social tendencies” of the day do not certainly inspire us with very strong hopes for the moral regeneration of France.

We propounded the other day the question as to whether life or property were the more secure in the Protestant United States or Romish Lower Canada? The following paragraph which we clip from the Montreal Witness of the 10th inst., may serve as a reply:—

THE REIGN OF TERROR IN NEW YORK.—Rowdism is so rampant in New York that even Christians who attend church on the Sabbath are in danger whilst passing through the streets, and many churchgoers are in the habit of placing a revolver alongside the prayer-book previous to leaving their domiciles. The police dread these rowdies and their haunts as much as the civilians who seek their protection; and, when asked to arrest any of them, the officers themselves will relate the dark deeds that these well-known characters have committed in justification of their non-interference with the outlaws of New York city.

A police officer recently said, when a warrant was placed in his hands for the arrest of a well-known rowdy, “If you tell me where he sleeps, I will arrest him; but I do not care about coming in contact with him when he is with his ‘chums,’ as he has the name of having murdered two or three policemen already.” The warrant remained in his hands for two months, and a detective, whose business it is to look after the performance of such duties, called upon the person who had the warrant issued once a week to know if he had found out where the delinquent put up at night.

The following, from a recent number of the N. Y. Witness, is a striking illustration of the reign of terror in that city, where, it will be seen, even magistrates have to go armed to preserve their lives.

“The terror inspired by ruffians is very clearly shown by an incident in the Jefferson Market Police Court very recently. Mr. John Lang noticed an intoxicated man fall from a wagon on West Eleventh street, on Wednesday morning, and received a severe blow on the face from the drunken ruffian as a reward for assisting him. He then caused the arrest of his ungrateful assailant. It was not until the case came up in Court that Mr. Lang learned that the prisoner was the notorious ‘Reddy the Blacksmith,’ and fearing the revenge of the villain, he refused to make a complaint. Justice Cox had to place Mr. Lang under \$1,000 bonds to prosecute. A more striking proof of the reign of terror of ruffianism in New York is the fact that a resolute and determined magistrate, who often sentences criminals, considers it necessary to carry a revolver to protect his own life in the public streets.”—Witness, June 10th.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS.

SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS.

No. II.

“Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land.”

Having spoken in general of the obligation children are under to obey their parents, it becomes now our duty to consider in particular in what this obedience consists. As children have received from their parents three great benefits, their existence, their sustenance and their education, the holy Fathers and theologians tell us, that they have therefore incurred three great obligations, the obligation of obedience, the obligation of love, and the obligation of respect. These then are the three things, which God exacts from children, when he commands them to honor their parents.

After God; we received our existence from our parents. Next then to God, we owe to our parents gratitude for this existence. Do you wish to know how precious to you is this life, which you have received from your parents and therefore the deep debt of gratitude you owe them? Let me hold you at arm’s length over a yawning abyss; or let me cast you into a foaming stream of headlong waters, and you will then begin to realise its value. As you see the abyss yawning beneath you—as you hear the turbulent waters gurgling in your ears—as you feel them rushing into your mouth and nostrils; as you see death approaching, you will begin then at least, if never before, to feel how precious a thing life is—how great the blessing you have received from those, who gave you birth. Above riches and all earthly goods, not all the treasures of the world can purchase one moment of it; though racked by the most excruciating pains, the sick man would still prefer to live and suffer! And this is the boon—this the precious gift you have received from your parents. Can you then have received it, and not have incurred a most grave obligation?

Proving our duty to obey our parents St. Thomas says—“God is the general principle of all things; and as we are bound to obey God