

The True Witness.

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 606 Craig Street, by J. GILLIES. G. E. O'LEER, 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. 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 TRUE WITNESS can be had at the News Depots. Single copies 3d. The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1869.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARON—1869. Friday, 19—St Joseph, O. Saturday, 20—Our Lady of Pity. Sunday, 21—Palm Sunday. Monday, 22—Of the Feria. Tuesday, 23—Of the Feria. Wednesday, 24—Of the Feria. Thursday, 25—Holy Thursday.

REGULATIONS FOR LENT—All 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, with the exception of Palm Sunday.

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

There is literally no news from Europe this week to report.

The Witness complains that the allotments from the public funds of the Province of Quebec to Catholics benevolent institutions, are far in excess of those granted from the same source to Protestant benevolent institutions; that the former "get more than seven times as much."

Admitting the accuracy of his figures, we would ask him may not the reason for this difference be found in the difference of numbers betwixt the Catholics, and the Protestants? In proportion to their numbers, the latter get a fair share of the public money; besides the so called General Hospital of Montreal is essentially in so far as its management is concerned, a Protestant institution, though as does also, the Hotel Dieu, it receives patients of all denominations.

The Witness again complains that, whereas the grants for the latter—(or Protestant institutions)—all go for charity; the former—(the grants for Catholic institutions)—in a number of cases are more in the light of Subsidies to convents and orders.

This is the reverse of truth, as all Protestants know. The greater part of the liberally contributed funds for charitable institutions of the last named are for the most part expended in salaries to hireling nurses, and attendants, so that but a comparatively small portion thereof directly benefits the poor for whose use they were designed. In the Catholic institution, the paid nurse is replaced by the Sister of Charity; and every one will admit that the services of the latter are cheaper than are those of the Sairey Gamp or Betsy Prig who does the nursing in the Protestant Hospital. The one serves for cash, the other for the love of God; and is content therefore with a diet, and style of living which the hireling would spurn with contempt if tendered to her. Thus it is that, of the charitable funds administered by Catholics, a far larger share falls to the lot of the sick and infirm, than in the case of funds administered by Protestants. Besides the love of God is a more powerful stimulant to the nurse than can be any amount of wages, as was abundantly proved in the Crimean War by Miss Florence Nightingale whose name we mention with respect, and others her brave companions.

We intend no disparagement on Protestant charities. For liberality and open-handedness our separated brethren are worthy of all honor; but we claim for ourselves a better, because a more thoroughly organised system, of distributing the sums at our disposal. This in matters of benevolence, is the only superiority that we claim; and all who know the difference betwixt the effects produced by an organisation, and those which result from the desultory, uncombined efforts of a number of individuals, however well disposed, will admit the justice of our claims.

Mr. Bartley's Engine is now working well, and is supplying the City with an ample supply of water.

The Montreal Witness, of Thursday last, publishes, under the caption "More About Nunneries," an account of a case actually before the Queen's Bench in Dublin, and of which the full particulars have been given in the London Times. The story, as published in the Witness, runs as follows:—

"A young lady of sixteen in the Loretto Convent School, Rathfarham, wished to leave, to reside with her mother. The mother had frequently written letters to her daughter, but they had all been returned unopened, even the mother's solicitor had not been allowed to deliver a letter to the young lady."

The Witness carefully abstained, however, from giving the whole facts of the case, as published in the London papers. To wit:—That the young lady in question is the daughter of Lord French, her natural guardian, by whom she was sometime ago placed in the Loretto Convent school, with strict injunctions to the lady in charge, that no communication was to be held by the pupil, with her mother, Lady French, from whom his Lordship is, and has for sometime been, separated, on what grounds we know not. These facts of course were carefully suppressed by the truth loving Witness, in order to leave the impression upon the minds of his prejudiced readers, that the Superior of the Convent was the person responsible for the interruption of communication betwixt the young lady and her mother.

In the same article the Witness published a cock-and-bull story, which has been formally contradicted as a groundless falsehood, about a whole lot of young ladies having been imprisoned in a Belgian Convent, and rescued by the intervention of a Police officer. The author of this hoax upon the credulity of the Protestant public, we know not; but in our files by mail of the 20th ult., it was formally contradicted.

In the Montreal Daily News, of the 10th inst., we read as follows:—

"It is the settled determination of the British Protestants that the taxes levied on their property shall be exclusively devoted to the education of Protestant children."

Not a word have we to say against the justice of the principle involved in this determination of the British Protestants of Lower Canada: but, we say it with all charity, would not this enunciation of principle come from them with a better grace if they had heretofore approved their willingness to apply it to others; if they had manifested their readiness to allow all taxes levied on the property of Catholics to be exclusively devoted to the education of Catholic children.

From the Catholics of this Province British Protestants have nothing to fear. Would to God that in Upper Canada the Protestant majority would only so deal with the Catholic minority, as, in Lower Canada, the Catholic majority are anxious to deal with the Protestant minority! This, however, we fear that we shall never see.

That the State has no right to tax any man for the support of either church or school to which he entertains conscientious scruples; and that the mere existence of such conscientious scruples suffice to limit the action of the State, whether in regard of Church or of School, are principles upon which we are quite prepared to deal with our Protestant fellow citizens. They entertain conscientious objections against sending their children to the schools approved of by the majority. We ask not, we have not the right to ask, whether those conscientious objections are well or ill-founded—for the domain of conscience is not within our cognizance, is not within that even of the civil magistrate. We take record of the simple fact that the conscientious objections exist; and in that simple fact of their existence, we recognise the right of our Protestant fellow-citizens to claim exemption from all compulsory provision for the support of the schools to which they object. In so doing we lay no claim to credit for our liberality; but we do think that we have a right to ask that, as we deal with Protestants when we are in the majority, they in the minority—so, when our relative positions are reversed, they would deal with us. This is all that the Catholics of Upper Canada demand, and for long years have demanded in vain.

There is one point however, and one only on which there seems to be a difference betwixt us and the Daily News. It is this—Shall the tenant, or occupier of property, who in fact pays the school tax, determine to what school the amount by him paid shall be applied? or shall this privilege be accorded to the landlord?

To us it seems that the tenant—the man out of whose pockets the money comes—should have the right of determining whether it shall be applied to Catholic, or Protestant school purposes: and for the simple reason, that it is out of his pockets and not out of those of the land owner—that the money comes. This to us seems to be the question at issue in all the controversies on the school question, now raging in Lower Canada: and this is rather a question of political economy than one of religious liberty.

The object for which compulsory taxation for the support of school can alone be justified, is that of furnishing the means of education to those who would otherwise be unable to obtain it.—Now it is easy to conceive of a case in which, in

a given municipality or school district, all the landlords should be of one religion; all the tenants, or school tax payers of another. In such a case the very purpose of a school tax would be defeated, were it given to the landlord to determine that the sums so levied from his tenants should be applied to the support of schools to which the latter, the tax payers, could not in conscience send their children. We therefore must insist that if there be any State School system whatsoever maintained amongst us, the right of the school taxpaying tenant to determine to what school the amount of his taxes shall go, shall be recognised. This is merely what is just, and reasonable, and is as fair to the Catholic as to the Protestant landlord.

We are now in possession of the details of the murder of the Governor of Burgos in an *emette* provoked indeed, but not justified, by his insolent and indecent behaviour. The agent of a revolutionary government, to which no one is under any moral obligation to yield respect or obedience, differs in no respect, except in the extent and amount of his depredations, from an ordinary thief: and when to theft, he adds obscenity and sacrilege, it may be regretted indeed, but cannot be wondered at, that bloody reprisals should follow.

Having in virtue of orders from the revolutionary authorities obtained access to a Convent, where he made himself conspicuous by his indecent behaviour towards the nuns, compelling them to expose their faces to him, and addressing the youngest, and those whose appearance pleased him, in obscene language—the Governor of Burgos with his hat on, and a cigar in his mouth, walked into the Cathedral: and tapping with his cane upon the door of the tabernacle, where the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, asked in a sneering tone "What have you in here." Then at last the hardly suppressed passion of the spectators broke out; and rushing upon the blackguard, they so violently assaulted him, that the strenuous efforts of the Archbishop and Clergy who rushed to his assistance, came too late to save his life. And thus one crime of sacrilege was expiated by another bloody crime and sacrilege. Of course, the revolutionary authorities did their best to cast the blame of this wicked act upon the ecclesiastics. All their efforts, however, have signally failed, and there remains not the shade even of a suspicion against the Archbishop or his priests. The murder was the result of an unpremeditated row: and already some of the actors therein have been arrested, tried, convicted, and condemned to death, though it is probable that this sentence will be commuted to imprisonment for life.

Meantime the excesses and tyranny of the Liberals in Spain whom the revolution has placed in the ascendant, are provoking the censures of their admirer and panegyrist, the Correspondent of the London Times. The banishment without form of trial of the Jesuits, the spoliation of the property of the churches and convents, have of course received his loudest approbation: but he is not prepared to approve of their subsequent conduct, though it be strictly in harmony with Liberal principles, and identical with the course of action which in their day of power the revolutionists have invariably pursued towards Catholics, whether in '93 or '69, whether in France, or Italy, or in Spain.

The Times' Correspondent reminds his readers that this persecution of the Church and her clergy is no new thing in Spain, but has always followed the triumph of Liberal principles. He reminds them that the Spain of to-day is the same Spain as that "in which thirty-five years ago, a holocaust of priestly victims, by some computed at 7,000 or 8,000 was offered up on what was looked upon as the shrine of liberty:" that "it is the land in which that famous laconic bulletin was sent from a man to his friend, informing him that 'all was quiet there: the slaying of the monks continued.'" for the Paris massacres of '92 found their counterpart in Spain: and those who even in France were stigmatised as *Septembriseurs*, are in the other country simply known as *Liberals*.

"I am not a man," continues the Times' Correspondent "as you know, to be suspected of partiality to the priests: I am not one to give ear to all their complaints, or to believe all their assertions;" but even he is shocked at the utter disregard of all—we do not say justice, but even of—outward semblance of decency, which characterises all the dealings of the Liberal party with the Clergy, the nuns, and those of the Catholic laity who remain attached to their religion. And so he continues in the following strain:—

"but I cannot overlook such documents as the Governor's circulars which I have just been examining: nor can I deny that the clerical press is dealt with in a manner, according to my judgment, not very consistent with the unlimited utterance of opinion to which Spaniards of all classes were to be entitled."

What would the man have? Does not the experience of all times and countries show that Liberals are consistent only in this: that there wherever they obtain the upper hand, they immediately suppress all freedom of thought, of speech, and action; and that they are the irreconcilable enemies of personal liberty. But it is rather as impolitic than as unjust, rather as tend-

ing to provoke reaction, than as cruel towards its subjects—that the Times' Correspondent condemns the action of the Liberal party:—

"The priests may be mischievous beings enough in all conscience, but worse harm may often be apprehended from fear than from the more bugbear that causes it. Terror has been at all times the worst adviser of rulers, and we see that the murder of 7,000 to 8,000 priests in 1834 has not done much towards converting their survivors to less unfavorable views of that Liberal cause to which they were then supposed to be immolated."—Times' Madrid Correspondent.

The same writer, whom no one can suspect of partiality towards Catholic priests, then goes on to show how the Liberal policy, broached by Cavour, of a "Free Church in a Free State" is pursued in Spain:—

"The connexion between Church and State is not likely to turn out to the profit of the former body; nor, on the other hand, can the separation be effected so long as the hostile attitude of the Church continues to cause such serious apprehensions to the State, so long as the power of the Church is commensurate with her ill-will. As a clerical paper aptly puts it, there is mortal antagonism between these two bodies. There is an incessant though latent struggle between them as they are united, but it would break out into open conflict upon any attempt to realize the scheme of a Free Church in a Free State. The State has now the Church in its hands. It flatters her with hopes of separation with promises of emancipation. But in the meantime it keeps its iron grasp upon her; it robs her, and scourges her, and starves her into exhaustion. When long usage shall have rendered her harmless and helpless, when she shall have been beaten within an inch of her life, then, and not before shall the Church be allowed to go free."

And this is the freedom, the only freedom which Liberals, if they had their way, whether in Europe or in America would allow to the Church. This is their idea of "religious liberty;" this the meaning of their formula of a "Free Church in a Free State!" Are not Catholics then, are not all friends of liberty, justified in their opposition to Liberalism, and revolutionary principles!

* Protestants and Liberals, who are ever harping on the massacre of St Bartholomew three hundred years ago, seem strangely oblivious of the wholesale massacre of the Catholic Clergy perpetrated during the present generation by the Liberals of Spain—a massacre, in the numbers of its victims, far surpassing that of St. Bartholomew.

IS PROTESTANTISM A FAILURE?—No less a person than the Protestant Archbishop of York is taking part in this discussion. Here is what he says upon the subject:—

"The world offers just now the humiliating spectacle of millions of people clinging to their old idolatrous religions, whilst in Christian Europe, thousands of the most cultivated class are beginning to think Atheism a desirable thing."

In New York the rites of Paganism are being revived, and the worship of Mercury, the patron of thieves, has been inaugurated, most appropriately, in the residence of a Wall Street speculator. In the Daily News of the 2nd inst., we find the following details:—

"We learn that a few evenings since, grand exercises in honour of the Roman God Mercury, took place in one of the finest mansions in that aristocratic quarter. Each guest, upon entering was received by a young usher in classic dress, who invited the newcomer to dip his hand into a vase of perfumed water, after which he was crowned with a wreath of flowers and had a golden harp slung round his neck, which he was compelled to wear throughout the entire evening. Among the assembled throng were 'generals, admirals, poets, editors, lawyers, merchants, and dinians.' Among the last was the Rev. Dr. Osgood, one of the most celebrated Unitarian preachers in New York, and he confesses that he was compelled to wear the harp, and crown of flowers, and add, 'two of our preachers were there, and both spoke a good word for Mercury.' In the course of the evening there was a singing procession of priests, illustrations, sacrifices, libations, speeches, poems, recitations, and then the unveiling of the statue of Mercury, after which we are told that the company sat down to a sumptuous banquet."

Mr. Whittaker, the officer of the 53 regiment shot on the 3rd inst., in the skating rink at Quebec, by Mr. Chaloner, died on the night of the 10th inst., after having lingered for about a week in a semi-conscious state. His body was committed to the grave on Saturday with military honours.

A Coroner's inquest was held of course. The evidence, into the details of which for obvious reasons we cannot enter, proved conclusively that the death of the unhappy young officer was the result of the wound inflicted by Mr. Chaloner. The Coroner summoned up in a manner to make us proud of the administration of justice in Her Majesty's dominions; and after a somewhat prolonged deliberation, the Jury returned a verdict to the effect, that the deceased came to his death from a pistol shot wound on the left temple, from the hands of John Henry Chaloner. The latter was then committed to gaol.

In retiring from office, President Johnson publishes a long valedictory address to the people of the United States. He vindicates his conduct whilst in office: and though in that conduct there may be much that is open to censure, it must be confessed that throughout his tenure of office he had a difficult game to play. He had two masters to serve, and he could not but offend either one, or other of them.

Over and above him—and above the body calling itself Congress too, for that matter—he found a master calling itself the "Written Constitution," strictly determining, defining, and limiting his functions; to which master by his oath of office, he was bound to yield implicit obedience. But another master, calling itself "Congress"—and which, though in its functions like himself limited by the "Written Constitution," assumed unlimited powers, claimed the right to set aside

the clear behests of its creator, and master, and pretended that it, like the British Parliament was omnipotent, or had a legal right to do everything—claimed him as its servant. Compelled to elect to which of these two masters he should give his allegiance, the President elected in favor of the "Written Constitution;" and on several occasions reminded Congress that it too was like himself, but the creature and servant of that Constitution; bound therefore to obey it, and endowed with no legal rights over it, to set it aside, or to annul or even suspend its provisions. This Congress would not admit: but proceeding in its innovations, recognising no law but its own will, and setting itself over and above the Constitution, it rendered inevitable a collision betwixt the Constitutional President, and the Revolutionary Congress.

The logic of facts was against the President. The first shot fired in the war betwixt the Northern and Southern States, had destroyed utterly, and for ever, the old Constitution—so that not a shred of it remained. A new Constitution—one in many of its details perhaps like unto, though in its essence, the very contradictory of, the old was being formed, or gradually eliminated from the political chaos, during President Johnson's tenure of office, and this fact he failed to recognise. The revolution however is now accomplished: and that revolution, the most thorough the world ever saw—consists in this:—that whereas under the ancient regime Congress was strictly limited by the Constitution, Congress now limits and defines the Constitution. Like the British Parliament, Congress is now politically omnipotent.

In the following passage of his address this point is strongly, indeed unanswerably, put by the retiring President:—

"Among those rights is that of the people of each State to declare the qualifications of their own State electors. It is now assumed that Congress can control this vital right, which can never be taken away from the States without impairing the fundamental principle of government itself. It is necessary to the existence of States, as well as to the protection of the liberties of the people: for the right to select the elector is whom the political power of the State shall be lodged, involves the right of the State to govern itself. When deprived of this prerogative States will have no power worth retaining—all will be gone, and they will be subjected to the arbitrary will of Congress. Government will then be centralized—if not by the passage of laws, then by the adoption, through partisan influence, of an amendment directly in conflict with the original design of the Constitution. This proves how necessary it is that the people should require the administration of all the great departments of the Government to be strictly within the limits of the Constitution. Their boundaries have been accurately defined, and neither should be allowed to trespass on the other; nor, above all, to encroach upon the reserved rights of the people and States."

In other words; whilst of old the Constitution made the Congress, and was over and above Congress, Congress is now all in all, and can do as it pleases. Never was a revolution, or as the French call it, a political *bouleversement*, more complete.

President Grant was inaugurated on Thursday the 4th inst., with more than usual pomp. His address had one great and rare merit: it was short, and for the most part intelligible. In it he avows his frank acceptance of the Revolution, and engages himself to obey, not the old Constitution—which he has the sense to see is dead, and already stinks in the nostrils of the republican party (*jam fetet*) so that only a miracle can restore it; but the Congress—which he also perceives is now absolute and omnipotent. For the rest he insists emphatically on the necessity of keeping faith with the public creditor; he advocates the speedy resumption of specie payments; and concludes with a profession of respect for the rights of other nations, and of a firm resolve to be respected those which he believes to be the rights of his own. This would be satisfactory, were it not that in all their international dealings, the U. States have two different or rather contradictory codes; one for themselves, and another for other nations. Thus it is their right to encourage insurrection and rebellion in Cuba: but it would be a grievous wrong for any other nation to countenance an insurrection of the Southern against the Northern States.

A Bill for providing for the ecclesiastical government of the Anglican denomination in Montreal until the members thereof can agree upon a Bishop, has been introduced into the Quebec legislature. It is certainly strange, and strikingly illustrative of the anomalous position of Anglicanism, that the aid of a legislative body, of which the majority are Catholics, should be invoked to settle its internal economy, and to prescribe its form of government. Why can it not, as does the Catholic Church, as do all the other Protestant sects, arrange these matters itself?

There is, however, one point in this Bill to which the attention of Catholics should be directed: and that is the title therein accorded to the gentleman who may hereafter exercise the functions of the Bishop of our Protestant fellow-citizens of the Anglican denomination in Montreal. As in all official documents Mgr. Bourget, and his successors in office, are entitled the "*Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal*," so also it is but right and proper that the official designation of the successors of the late Dr. Fulford should be "Protestant Bishop" or "Pro-