

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 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.

M. M. PETTINGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1873.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1873.

Friday, 2—St. Athanasius, B. C. D.
Saturday, 3—Finding of the Holy Cross.
Sunday, 4—Third after Easter.
Monday, 5—St. Pius V., P. C.
Tuesday, 6—St. John before the Latin Gate.
Wednesday, 7—St. Stanislaus, P. M.
Thursday, 8—Apparition of St. Michael, Arch.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

It is as well to caution the public against placing any reliance upon the telegraphic reports as to the illness and critical situation of the Sovereign Pontiff. These reports are unauthenticated, and are in all probability the invention of speculators. No doubt the Holy Father is advanced in years, and it is very likely that he suffers from the infirmities of age, and from occasional indisposition; but as yet there is nothing to create serious alarm, though we should all pray earnestly that a life so valuable may be spared.

The lull in the storm of European politics seems to be nearly at an end, and stormy days are at hand. Monarchists and Revolutionists appear determined to bring matters to an issue. In France the extreme Radicals have won some important elections, and the Royalists are said to be preparing to put forth their strength. In Spain the issue seems to be between Communism, and Legitimism, as represented by Don Carlos. The revolutionary party in Madrid have raised the standard of the Commune; the army is in thoroughly demoralized condition; and there is in a word no authority in the country which can command respect. We may expect to hear soon of the outbreak of a social convulsion, and of wholesale massacres in that distracted country, whose last chance of salvation, under God, depends upon the speedy success of the Carlists, and the restoration of the rightful monarchy.

Emperor William of Germany is on a visit to his Imperial brother of Russia, and has been enthusiastically received at St. Petersburg. Whether this bodes an *entente cordiale* between these two great military Powers we can hardly say; but that it has some kind of political significance, we may be sure, and may be taken as indicative of an approaching storm.

In England the Prince of Wales has been making himself prominent in taking a leading part in some Masonic tom-fooleries connected with the reinstitution of the Order of the Knights' Templar—which being accused of gross immoralities, and of anti-Christian tendencies, was suppressed, with the consent of the Holy See. It is laughable to see stout, middle aged gentlemen of the XIX. century, Protestants to boot, and therefore very indifferent to the fortunes of the Holy Places whose defence against the infidel was the object of the Templar institution—taking part in the farce of the resurrection of such an Order; but when we remember that now-a-days this is but one of the many forms which Free-Masonry assumes, it is something not laughable, but sad, to see those in authority giving the semblance of encouragement to an organisation whose aim is the subversion of every throne, and of every altar in Christendom. With the simplicity or rather stupidity of lambs, though without their innocence, these infatuated lords and princes, fawn upon their enemies, and lick the hands up raised to shed their blood. One of the chief agents in the great Revolution of the last century was as the arch-revolutionist Louis Blanc shows in the 3rd chapter of the second volume of his great work, *Les Revolutionnaires Mystiques*—Free-Masonry in its several branches; and to-day it is through the agency of the same mystic, wide-spread organisation that it is proposed to carry out the work then inaugurated. Of course it is a master stroke of policy on the part of the hidden directors of this gigantic conspiracy against Christianity and modern society, to enroll amongst their subjects men of high social and political standing, and thus make these unconsciously accessory to their own destruction. One would have thought however that the fate of the Duke of Orleans,

once Grand Orient, would have served as a warning to all Princes of the Blood against being decoyed into taking the livery and doing the work of their bitterest foes. Philip no doubt thought that as "*Grand Orient*," he was himself a leader; whilst in fact the silly dupe was but a tool in the hands of men of far higher standing in the Masonic hierarchy, men far more astute than he was, and who hung him to the scaffold when he had served their turn.

SIN AND DEATH.—Doctor P. Carpenter has published a letter on the subject of infant mortality which he has addressed to the *Montreal Gazette*, and which that journal lays before its readers. The facts therein revealed are hideous, God knows; but, alas! what remedy to apply to them we know not. Sin, even in this world, brings with it its own punishment; and sin cannot be put down or checked by human law, but only by the grace of God.

Some few comments, however, we will venture upon. We admit with the writer of the letter that the amount of infant mortality is most shocking; but it is not the young victims of the parents' sins who are most to be pitied. If out of the 683 children born and sent to the Foundling Asylum in 1872, only 41 have been saved to the earthly community, 642 have been guinea to the heavenly Jerusalem. True, the Foundling Hospital has for one of its objects—an object which it does its best to attain—the physical relief of the tender infants committed to its care, and the prolongation of their existence upon earth. But its main objects are spiritual. First, it proposes to itself the diminution of the crime of child-murder, the amount of which will always and everywhere be in the inverse ratio of the means of providing shelter for the offspring of unchaste unions; secondly, the procuring for the issue of those unhallowed unions the ineffable advantages of the Sacrament of baptism "whereby"—in the words of the catechism of the Protestant Church of England—"being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, they are made the children of grace," and heirs of the Kingdom of heaven. The diseased infants left naked, bleeding, covered with sores, and leprous with disease, at the door of the Foundling Hospital, would, in many instances but for the existence of that institution, have perished without baptism, and by the hands of their own parents; would themselves, therefore, have for ever been excluded from the kingdom, and supernatural beatitude which is for those only who have been baptized; and would thus have been a cause of deeper and more damning guilt to those who, by their sin, had been the means of bringing them into the world, as well as of prematurely hurrying them out of it, and defrauding them of the benefits which Christ has merited for all who have been baptized, and have not sullied the purity of their robes by mortal sin. Did it do nothing else—did it not save a single life, or prolong the earthly existence of one of those whom it receives, the Foundling Hospital would be an institution of the very highest utility in the best sense of that word.

We would also make a remark which, had it occurred to him, would we are certain have been made by so excellent and courteous a gentleman as Dr. Carpenter, one so anxious to do justice to the Sisters, often most ungenerously blamed for the amount of mortality in their Foundling Hospital, as if that were owing to their neglect, or want of due vigilance; and whom some ungenerous creatures have had the insolence to brand as "baby farmers"—a newly coined term applied to those only who for nefarious purposes, undertake the charge of illegitimate children, for a pecuniary consideration, and with the intent of killing them, or perhaps rather of letting them die.

It is perfectly true that the foundlings whom the Sisters put out to nurse are fed on "unnatural aliment," that is on an aliment never intended by nature for the sustenance of baby life. But how can it be otherwise? we remark. Of the foundlings a very large number, 564, are put down as certainly syphilitic; many more may be tainted with the same foul disease; all are suspected of being so tainted. Now under such circumstances, how is it possible, or even conceivable that any healthy woman would, for any consideration whatsoever, allow such a child to draw its nourishment from her breast? The well grounded fear of the dread syphilitic taint interposes an obstacle insuperable to the administration of the one natural aliment, and makes the administration of an "unnatural aliment," a sad but inevitable necessity. We think however, that cow's milk is in most cases the food which the Sisters stipulate shall be given to the babies whom they place out at nurse to be taken care of; and

*The Catholic Church does not teach as does Calvin, that untainted children, guiltless of mortal sin, suffer eternal torture with the other damned. They are excluded from the enjoyment of the beatific vision; they do not see God; but it is not forbidden to believe and hope that they enjoy a natural beatitude, perhaps the highest of which human nature is capable.

though barley and water may be sometimes resorted to, it is only in exceptional cases, and when, during the long winter months, milk is scarce, and with difficulty procured. We must remember that it is not the rich, or people in easy circumstances who can be persuaded into taking charge of the wretched creatures, cast upon the mercies of a Foundling Hospital.

In conclusion we contend, as we have contended before, that, though the mortality of the Foundling Hospital is great, though the percentage of lives prolonged to the age of puberty is so small as to be scarce worth mentioning—this mortality is not to be attributed to any want of assiduous care on the part of those in charge of the Hospital; that, if it only saves one per cent of those whom it receives, still that one is so much clear gain * since but for it all the babies left at its doors would have been murdered by their parents, or cast living into the gutter to be devoured by the dogs and the swine. Indeed, even with a Foundling Hospital, this last mode of disposing of the fruits of illicit intercourse is becoming very common in some parts of Canada, as may be seen from the annexed paragraph from the *St. John (Quebec) News*:

"Of late it has been getting the fashion to scatter infants promiscuously about our usually quiet town. A week or two since one was found on the steps of a prominent citizen and within a day or two another poor little innocent was surreptitiously deposited in the Roman Catholic Church. The unnatural parents ought to be tracked out."

With the concluding words of our esteemed friend's letter—we must all agree. Let us be careful to bring up the young in purity before the Lord: "let those whom the Lord has lent to our care be *forewarned and forearmed before the time of special temptation come*."—Yes indeed: but how and by whom are they to be thus "forewarned and forearmed?" It is here that the Confessional comes in; and this is the only remedy, implying as it does the due use of the Sacraments, that we can suggest as the remedy for the crying evil which the worthy Dr. Carpenter deplors; whose fruits may be seen at the wicket of the Foundling Hospital; which gives us on earth a breed of tainted babies doomed to a premature death, and which is daily, hourly driving down the souls of grown men and women to hell.

* Even in the Moscow Foundling Hospital, a State institution with immense resources—of the babies who survive the first month, the most critical period of baby life, and who are then reported "healthy," 50 per cent die within the first year. Our authority is the correspondent of the *London Times*. What the rate of mortality amongst those who are found to be *not healthy* four weeks after birth, we are not told, but it must be something very great; and upon the whole we have good reasons for believing that in the Moscow Foundling—held up as the model institution of Europe, and within whose walls surrounded by all necessary appliances, one-sixth of the babies are actually born—the mortality is as great as it is amongst the cast away children whom our Sisters in Montreal pick up for the most part half frozen, wounded, bleeding and moribund in the street before their door.

TEACHERS AND THEIR INFLUENCE.—"Did you ever think that we, as teachers, have a greater percentage of mankind beneath our influence than all other professions? . . . It is plain that we have more to do than to instruct those beneath our care from the text-books furnished."

These very true words we find in the *Selected Matter* of the *Montreal Witness* of the 17th ult.; and they so fully justify the opposition of Catholics to State-Schoolism, and the being compelled to pay for the support of non-Catholic schools and teachers, that we may be permitted to insist thereon.

We argue that it is nonsense to pretend that the Common Schools are not dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholic children, because the State provides that the text-books therein used shall be free from all matter which can offend the Catholic conscience. Granting, for the sake of argument, that such be the case, that the text-books are expurgated and cleansed from all perilous stuff, this does not in the slightest degree modify our aversion to these schools. It is not only to the text-books that we object, but to the teachers.

As parents, we are, as towards God, in duty bound to exercise the utmost discretion in the selection of teachers for our children; so great as the above Protestant article shows—is the influence, altogether apart from the text-books, that the teacher exercises, and must exercise over the pupils entrusted to his charge.

And as the corollary of this our duty towards God, is our right, our exclusive and absolute right as against the State, to determine for ourselves—each one for himself, and as he shall render an account of his conduct to God—who shall be the teachers of our children. In this matter the State has, can have, no right of interference; and the simple fact, that a parent, in the exercise of his divine and inalienable right, objects to any school teacher, is a sufficient, all conclusive reason why in justice the parent so objecting should not, directly or indirectly, be taxed for the support of the school in which the obnoxious teacher officiates. By brute force—and that it is the only argument that on the School Question Protestants ever appeal to—Catholic parents may be forced to pay for such schools; yet for all that the State exercising this might, is a tyranny to be resisted, if possible; not a legitimate government to be honored and obeyed.

We object to the teachers of the Common Schools, no matter what the text books therein used, no matter what the course of instruction pursued, or the topics taught in those schools. A teacher, if he be worth the salt of his porridge, must exercise a powerful moral influence over the pupil, who, unless he look upon his teacher as something far his superior in every respect, can never profit by his instructions. It is the constant argument of our Protestant contemporaries against the sending of Protestant children to the Convent that, insensibly, the moral influence of the Nun affects the pupil favorably towards Popery. In the same way the influence of the Protestant teacher over the Catholic pupil, or of the infidel teacher over the Christian pupil, must be unfavorable to the Catholicity of the one, to the Christianity of the other. Indeed in the same selected article in the *Witness* as that from which we have already quoted, appears an anecdote illustrative of this truth.

A weeping father implores his darling child on her deathbed to pardon him if ever he had wronged her. The dying girl turns on him a sad despairing look, and asks him:—"Father do you recollect the teacher you hired when we lived in P—?"

This teacher we are told was an infidel; and the girl, whom by his influence he had robbed of her belief in Christ, thus draws the moral:

"Well, father, for these years since he left, I have been walking in the way pointed out by him; and father you hired that man to ruin my soul. No Heaven, no rest for me! All is darkness!"

Yes! When their own interests are concerned, Protestants can see clearly enough that the parent incurs a heavy moral responsibility in the choice of a teacher for his children; that he is bound to exercise that choice, in the fear of God; and as knowing that God will one day call him to a strict account for the manner in which he has exercised it. All then that we as Catholics do, in that we protest against being forced to hire Protestant teachers for our children, is the counterpart of what conscientious Protestant parents would do, if forced by a tyrannical State, to hire or pay for infidel teachers for their children.

We object to the teachers of your Common Schools, and this is enough. We alone as parents, have a right to a voice in the matter. We will not place our children in the hands of a Protestant teacher, because, as you yourselves admit, the teacher has "a greater percentage of mankind beneath his influence than all other professions;" because, as you yourselves recognise, it is plain that the functions of the teacher extend to far more than the instruction of these beneath his care "from the text-books furnished."

This argument against State-Schoolism, to all morally capable of discerning right from wrong is unanswerable. "We object to your Common School teachers; we will not place our children under their care; we will not pay their hire."

SUDDEN DEATH OF THE REVEREND M. VILLENEUVE OF THE SEMINARY OF ST. SULPICE.—The painful task of announcing the very sudden death of this hard working servant of God devolves upon us to-day. On Friday the 25th ult., he was returning on foot from an afternoon visit to the sick at the *Hotel Dieu*; when at the corner of St. Urbain and Laguchetiere Streets, he felt unwell and took refuge in an asylum situated at the corner of these two streets. Dr. Schmidt was called in, but on his arrival the reverend patient was already speechless, and lived only long enough to receive from the hands of the Rev. M. Rousselot the last sacraments of the Church which he had served so long and faithfully on earth.

This sad event has plunged the Seminary into the deepest affliction in which the Catholicity of Montreal participate. To the poor the reverend deceased was well known as the dispenser of the Seminary's liberalities and large handed charities. They will mourn the loss of a kind friend and protector whose visits were wont to cheer the hearts of the desolate, and to bring comfort to the homes of the widows and fatherless children. The last rites of our holy religion were performed for him in the Church of Notre Dame, on the 29th ult.

The reverend deceased who, we believe, was a nephew of the gallant but unfortunate Villeneuve who commanded the combined fleets of France and Spain at Trafalgar, was born in France on the 7th Jan., 1808. He was raised to the Holy Order of the Priesthood in 1830, and eight years later he came to Canada, where he labored indefatigably to the hour of his death as a member of the Seminary of St. Sulpice.

The trial of the Titchborne claimant on the charge of perjury, commenced on the 24th ult. The case for the Crown was opened by Mr. Hawkins.

We are pleased to see by the Report of the Parliamentary proceedings that on a Divorce case coming up in our House of Commons, the Hon. M. Langbein moved the six month's hoist; this motion was however rejected by a majority of 86 to 73.

The *Westminster Gazette* publishes an advertisement inviting subscriptions in the form of a free gift, in aid of the Carlists in Spain, now again bravely standing up for their rightful king, and those provincial liberties of which Liberalism has robbed them. The attention of the British Government has been called to this advertisement by the Spanish Minister; and the matter was brought under the notice of the House of Commons on the 7th ult., by Mr. Stapleton.

Mr. Gladstone in the name of the Ministry replied that the question of legality of such a subscription as that advertised for by the *Westminster Gazette*, had been submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, who had given it as their opinion:—"That the advertisement being a request for gifts did not amount to an infraction of the law, though a contract for the purpose of raising funds for the Carlists would be illegal. "There is nothing to prevent any person asking, or any person giving money for such a purpose"—so Mr. Gladstone concluded: "that being so it is not in the power of Her Majesty's Government in any way to go beyond the law."

Upon the law, thus laid down it is not for us to comment. We remember, however, that when funds by subscription were raised in England, in 1860, in aid of the piratical expedition organised against the undoubtedly legitimate King of Naples by Garibaldi, and treacherously encouraged by the hypocritical Piedmontese Government, and the arch-lar at its head, the English Liberal press loudly approved of the proceeding which they now, in the case of forwarding pecuniary assistance to Don Carlos, denounce. Their theory seems to be that it is lawful to raise funds for the encouragement of all revolutionary movements against legitimate sovereigns; but that to subscribe in aid of a legitimate sovereign, is an offence against the law of nations. But perhaps some of our readers would like to see the grounds upon which the claims of the present Don Carlos to the throne of Spain are based.

The present claimant is—this is not contested—the descendant and inheritor of all the rights of the deceased Don Carlos, younger brother of the late King Ferdinand the Seventh. By an organic law of Spain, in virtue of which the said Ferdinand was King, his younger brother was in case of the failure of heirs male to the former, heir apparent to the throne.—The same law which made the one king, made the other his legitimate successor to the throne should he die without male issue. The status of the one as legal heir apparent was as good as that of the other as legal king.

Shortly before his death, Ferdinand VII., when in a state of dotage, as some pretend, and when entirely under the influence of his wife the Queen Christina, a very worthless woman, was persuaded to violate, or annul, this Organic Law of the Kingdom; the law which constituted his sole claim to be King of Spain—thereby robbing his brother Don Carlos of his right of succession, and assigning it to the daughter of his wife, Isabella. But the right of succession or quality of heir, vested by the Organic Law of the Kingdom in the younger brother in case of failure of male issue to the actual king, was just as valid and sacred as the right of possession which, in virtue of the same Organic Law and of that alone, Ferdinand actually enjoyed; he could not therefore repeal it, or any of its provisions as against his brother, and retain it in favor of himself.

Don Carlos therefore on his brother's death protested against the wrong that had been done him by transferring his right of succession to the daughter of his deceased brother's wife; and for many years, aided by the loyal Biscayaes, whose political rights, and provincial liberties or *fueros* had been trampled under foot by the Liberal party, or *Christinos*, maintained a gallant struggle for his rights; in which, but for the armed interference of other European Powers, he would have been successful. A British Legion—known in history as the "*Scarlet Runners*," partly because of the color of their uniform, partly on account of the celebrity which, whether truly or falsely we cannot pretend to say—they are said to have manifested in their occasional retreats before the Carlist troops—was organised in England, and sent over to help to crush Don Carlos, and the liberties of the brave and loyal Biscayaes. The object succeeded at last, and Don Carlos died in exile—leaving however, his rights and claims to the present gallant young Prince whom we trust God will preserve and restore to the throne of his fathers. The stories about Carlist cruelties, and atrocities by priests, leaders of Carlist bands, are but a pack of lies invented by the Liberals to throw odium on the legitimate cause. The simple fact, however, that in the last Carlist uprising, the Liberal party in Spain had to invoke the material aid of foreigners; to call in foreign mercenaries and an alien hireling soldiery, to help them to make head against their unaided opponents, is of itself a conclusive rejoinder to those who seek to confound the cause of Spanish Liberalism with that of Spanish Liberty.