

# The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
ISSUED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 663, Craig Street, by

J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

## TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription from that date.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 31, 1871.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH.—1871.

Friday, 31.—Our Lady of Pity.

APRIL.—1871.

Saturday, 1.—Of the Feria.

Sunday, 2.—Palm Sunday.

Monday, 3.—Of the Feria.

Tuesday, 4.—Of the Feria.

Wednesday, 5.—Of the Feria.

Thursday, 6.—Holy Thursday.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

We have given on our sixth page the telegrams from Paris, describing the progress of the insurrection in that unhappy City. What are the plans of the insurgents, it is hard to say; but one thing is clear, that the revolution they propose to accomplish is neither dynastic nor political, but simply social. This is clear from the decree which they have put forth, postponing the maturity of all commercial bills, and forbidding landlords to compel payment of rents due to them by their tenants. The insurrection is, in short, an insurrection of the poor against the rich, and an attempt to realize the great idea expressed in the formula "Fraternity." The old aristocracy being suppressed—the bourgeoisie, having realised their idea, "Liberty and Equality," are disposed to rest, and be thankful; but what avail "Liberty and Equality" to men who have nothing to eat? who are as much the slaves to capital, as were their fathers to the old nobility? and who are ruined by competition, and the consequent lowering of the price of labor, which is the sole commodity that they have to dispose of? What these men want is "Fraternity," i.e., the equal distribution amongst all, of wealth, the product of labor; deliverance from their thralldom to capital, and the abolition of competition or "la concurrence," as Louis Blanc and other Socialist writers term it, in the labor market. To make matters worse the two infamous sons of an infamous father, Garibaldi, are at the head of the insurgents, stimulating them by precept and example to deeds of bloodshed, and the cowardly murder of their prisoners.

The so-called government by the Assembly, with poor old M. Thiers at its head, is paralysed. The Prussians threaten to return to Paris unless order be restored; and as yet there are no symptoms of any change for the better. Some talk of calling in Louis Napoleon; but without an army at his back to enforce his commands, he would be as impotent as M. Thiers; and after the proof that he has given to the world of his military incapacity, it is not probable that Louis Napoleon will again be hailed by the French army as Imperator. We are happy to see that the report of the murder of the brave General De Chanzy by the insurgents is contradicted, and that he has been released; but it would fare but badly with either Trochu or Ducrot should they fall into the hands of the ruffians under the orders of Garibaldi.

Louis Napoleon is in England. The marriage between the Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne was celebrated with great pomp at Windsor on Tuesday, 21st inst. No doubt, as in the case of the marriage of the Prince of Wales, the season of Lent was selected for the ceremony in order to show the world in what contempt the remnants of ancient Catholic discipline still theoretically retained by the Protestant Church Established by Law, are held by its Head. The High Joint Commission is pursuing its labors at Washington, but nothing whatsoever is known as to the results. In Ontario, or Upper Canada, the periodic struggle between the Ins and the Outs for place, patronage, and the manipulating of the public money, has just terminated. Both parties are well satisfied with the result.

By latest advices, though there had been no more bloodshed at Paris, the Communists were masters of the situation. The Thier's gov-

ernment is virtually defunct; if it had 100,000 men on whom it could rely it would attack Paris—but it has not got them. Prussian intervention to restore order is very probable; if it should occur, the Garibaldi clubs will have a good chance of partially expiating some of their crimes, and the crimes of their sire, upon the scaffold. There is trouble brewing in the Southern States; the people of the latter are restive under the yoke imposed on them by their Northern tyrants, but they are few too weak to offer any serious resistance to the arbitrary and anti-constitutional acts of the Northern Government. What Ireland is to England, that is the South to the North on this Continent.

## CONSECRATION OF HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF QUEBEC.

Sunday, the 19th inst., Feast of St. Joseph, was a great day for the City, and Province of Quebec. The days of its mourning for the late lamented Mgr. Baillargeon were accomplished, and in the person of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Taschereau, the vacant See was again filled.

To take part in the important and imposing ceremony of the Consecration, there were assembled the chief Pastors, and rulers of the Church from all parts of the Dominion. The ecclesiastical Province of Toronto, was represented by His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, accompanied by their Lordships the Bishops of Kingston, of Hamilton, and of London; from the Ecclesiastical Province of Quebec there attended their Lordships of Montreal, of St. Hyacinthe, of Ottawa, of Three Rivers, and of Rimouski; Mgr. Goebriand, Bishop of Burlington, was also present. There were present also the heads and representatives of our great ecclesiastical institutions. Prominent amongst these were—from Montreal the Very Reverend M. Bayle, Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and the Rev. Father Lapointe, S.J., with their Clergy; from Quebec the Very Reverend M. Cazeau, Vicar General, and the Priests of the Seminary, together with all the members of the clergy from all parts of the diocese. In a word, every part of the Dominion was well and ably represented on the august occasion.

Amongst the laity there were present on a seat of honor near the balustrade, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, Sir Narcisse Belleau, with his aide-de-camp, Major Arthur Taschereau; their Honors the Judges Caron, Monk, McGuire, Doucet; the Hon. Messrs. Gingras, Thibault, and Tessier; Messrs. Rheaume and Genest, M.P.P., and all the officers of the Volunteer forces at Quebec under the command of Lieut.-Colonels Panet and Duchesnay.

The Cathedral was splendidly decorated, gorgeous with lights, and flowers, and costly ornaments. Above the Great Altar were to be seen the armorial bearings of the Sovereign Pontiff, together with the French, and British ensigns. The arms of the Archbishop were also displayed.

The religious ceremonies, grand and impressive, occupied four hours. The consecrating Prelate was His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto assisted by the Grand Vicar the Very Reverend M. Cazeau, the Rev. M. Buteau, Superior of St. Anne de la Pocatiere, and the Rev. M. Lagace, Principal of the Laval Normal School. His Grace the Archbishop had for assistants, Mgr. Horan, Bishop of Kingston, and Mgr. Larocque, Bishop of St. Hyacinthe.

During the ceremony and towards its close, Mgr. Langevin, Bishop of Rimouski, ascended the pulpit whence he delivered a splendid oration adapted to the circumstances. The music was from Haydn's sixteenth Mass, and was admirably rendered by the combined choirs of the Union Musicale and of the Little Seminary.

The religious ceremonies concluded, an elegant repast was served in the large hall of the Seminary to which all the members of the clergy were invited. At the close the Archbishop of Quebec returned thanks to his entertainers, and expressed his gratitude for the costly golden chain with which they had presented him. The Archbishop of Toronto made also a short speech which was well acknowledged; after which the guests withdrew to the hall of the Students where they were greeted with music, and an address of felicitation to the newly consecrated Prelate.

The following high ecclesiastics have been appointed his Grand Vicars by Monseigneur of Quebec. The Rev. M. Thomas Hamel, Rector of Laval University and Superior of the Seminary, the Very Rev. M. Cazeau, and the Rev. MM. Mailloux, Proulx and Racine.

THE HOLY SEE.—Throughout, not only the City, but the Diocese of Montreal, Meetings of the Catholic laity, numerous attended, have been held during the past week to protest against the rascality of the Piedmontese Government—and to invoke the intervention of the British Sovereign in behalf of a brother Sovereign now by brute force, and alien bayonets pushed from his throne. In the City there

have been meetings for this purpose at the Mairie St. Pierre, the Schools of the Christian Brothers, St. Denis Street, and at the Bishop's School, St. Margaret Street, the latter presided over by His Lordship the Bishop of the Diocese. At all these meetings there was but one feeling of abhorrence at the outrage upon the Pope, and of determination never to rest until that wrong be redressed.

In like manner in the country districts have the Catholics, expressed themselves. At Lachine there was a great meeting presided over by the Parish Priest in the Parish Church on Sunday the 19th inst.; and the movement is spreading, and the feeling of indignation is growing stronger day by day throughout the Catholic world.

His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec has issued his first Pastoral to his Clergy, making such disciplinary changes for his diocese as circumstances called for, and confirming the appointments of his illustrious and lamented predecessor, Mgr. Baillargeon.

On his return from Quebec to his Archiepiscopal See, Mgr. Lynch, Archbishop of Toronto, was accompanied from St. Hyacinthe by three religious of the Order of the Precious Blood. There is already a branch of this Order in Toronto.

His Lordship the Bishop of London in a Circular to his Clergy, which we will publish in our next, has adopted the petition of the Metropolitan City of Quebec in behalf of the Sovereign Pontiff, and has earnestly recommended it to his diocesans for their signatures.

The Catholic ladies of Quebec are, we understand, preparing an address of condolence to the Sovereign Pontiff. A Committee has been named for the purpose, of which Lady Belleau, the wife of the Lieut.-Governor, is the head.

A correspondent of the Montreal Gazette of the 23rd ult., who writes over the very (in his case) inappropriate signature of an *Irish Catholic*, makes some remarks upon the restrictions which the Papal Government imposed upon aliens and non-Catholics in the matter of their places of worship within the City walls; to the accuracy of these remarks we take exception. He writes as follows:—

It will not be disputed, I presume, that the Queen and Parliament of Great Britain, with Mr. Gladstone as premier, have as much power and as legitimate authority in Great Britain and Ireland as had recently "Pio Nono" and the Roman authorities with Cardinal Antoninelli at their head. Well what would be said if this same Queen and Parliament, this same Prime Minister, were to proscribe all over the Dominion the worship of God in any other form or under any other belief than their own church inculcated. What would be said if in London no Catholic dare meet publicly to worship God according to his own conscience, according to the form and belief of his fathers? What would be said if policemen were constantly employed to watch them and prevent them from doing so during all their lives, and at their death, if decent burial were refused them within the walls of London? Yet this is precisely the condition of things heretofore in Rome.

In the first place we observe that this was not precisely the condition of things heretofore in Rome. It is true that by the laws of the Papal Government, aliens, and non-citizens, being also non-Catholics were not at liberty to set up their meeting houses wherever they pleased within the City limits; but places, or buildings in close proximity to the City, and wherein the Protestant foreigners, who from curiosity as tourists, or as attached to the Embassies of their respective countries—[and to one or the other of these two classes was the Protestant population of the Papal States limited]—were temporarily resident in Rome, might worship after their fashion without molestation of any kind—were always recognised and tolerated by the Papal Government. In their own quarter too the Jews, the avowed enemies of Christianity, were undisturbed in the exercise of their religious worship.

In the second place we would remark that any Government calling itself as does the British Government Christian, would in like manner assuredly assume to impose analogous restrictions upon alien and non-Christian visitors to its shores; to refuse liberty to Chinese for instance to erect joss-houses, or temples for their peculiar worship, alongside of Westminster Abbey, or under the shadow of St. Paul's; to restrict the right of a handful of Mormon proselytizers from Utah to preach publicly their peculiar tenets in the immediate vicinity of Buckingham Palace. There would in such restrictions be no violation of what are vulgarly called the rights of conscience, or the principles of civil and religious liberty; nothing analogous to the hypothetical absolute prohibition of any religious worship within British Dominion other than that which the ruling powers for the time being approved of, or themselves practised.

And in the third place—and this argument, the *soi-disant Irish Catholic* if he be not a rank impostor will feel to be *ad hominem*—we deny most emphatically and positively, "that the Queen and Parliament of Great Britain with Mr. Gladstone as premier, have as much power and as legitimate authority" to legislate upon

spiritual matters, or matters connected with Christian faith and Christian worship "in Great Britain and Ireland, as had recently" the Pope, Christ's Vicar on Earth, and Sovereign Pontiff, to legislate in like manner, and upon the same matters, within his dominions. It is here, in this reckless assertion which no real Catholic acquainted with the rudiments of his religion would have dared to make, and which we positively deny—that the cloven hoof of the *soi-disant "Irish Catholic"* betrays itself. The Queen and Parliament of Great Britain, have never received from God, from Whom alone all right and all authority proceed, authority to legislate in matters of religion; their legitimate functions lie, not in the spiritual and supernatural order, but in the civil and natural order; and were they to attempt "to proscribe all over the Dominion the worship of God in any other form, or under any belief than their own church inculcated, they would be guilty of usurpation of functions that do not rightfully belong to them; and for the due discharge of which, as destitute of all authority from God to legislate in the premisses, as destitute of all spiritual authority whatsoever, they are utterly incompetent.

On the other hand the Pope, as every "Catholic" whether "Irish" or "French" must admit, has authority from God in the spiritual or supernatural order. As Bishop of Rome it is his duty to restrict, as far as in his power lies, and by every means within his power, the spread of false and heretical doctrine, to banish or drive away error, and to support the truth. This is his duty as Pontiff. As Sovereign it is, or rather it was, and will soon be again, within his power to carry out his duties as Bishop, as Christ's Vicar upon earth, as the supernaturally appointed guardian of Christian truth; and therefore we emphatically deny upon Catholic principles—that the British Government has as much power and legitimate authority in religious matters within British Dominions, as has the Pope, the Sovereign Pontiff, Christ's Vicar on earth, to legislate on spiritual matters, or matters of religion within his dominions. Thus do we strip the "Irish Catholic" of the disguise under which he most impudently presents himself before the public.

The Montreal Gazette of the 23rd inst. has a notice of a Blue Book lately laid before both Houses of the Imperial Parliament, and published under the title, "*Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of Rome.*" The Gazette gives a fair view of the actual state of the question, and hesitates not to say that the revelations now before the public prove that, with regard to her treaty engagements, and most solemn and official pledges—"Italy violated every one of these dispositions, and with the most flagrant national indecency exhibited herself to the world as incapable of the honorable maintenance of her pledged faith." This is just what the Catholic world has been repeating ever since the invasion of the States of the Church by the troops of Victor Emmanuel occurred, and reduced the Sovereign Pontiff to his present position.

What are the facts of the case as gleaned by the Gazette from the official documents now, by authority of the British Imperial Government, laid before the world?

Writing from Rome on the 29th of July last, Mr. Jervoise acting in the absence of Mr. Odo Russell as British *Charge d'Affaires*, notifies Earl Granville that, previous to the departure of the French troops from Rome, the Government of Victor Emmanuel had given fresh guarantees that the Pope's dominions should be protected from revolutionary attempts from without. About the same time the Duc de Grammont, announces that by the withdrawal of the French troops, "the two Powers"—France and Piedmont—"find themselves again placed on the basis of the September Convention, in virtue of which Italy binds herself not to attack the Pontifical Territory, and in case of need, to defend it from aggression. And, so writes from Florence Sir A. Paget "nothing can have been more clear than the declaration of the Ministry"—(Victor Emmanuel's Ministry)—"in Parliament of their determination to uphold the Convention, that is to say, not to invade, or allow to be invaded, the Pontifical States." The same high authority writing under date August 23rd also expresses his conviction "that with the exception of the Democratic and Revolutionary party few persons cared to have Rome as the capital."

The flimsy excuse for the violation of these solemn engagements, and armed invasion of the Territory of an inoffensive neighbor, urged in palliation of the treachery, and deliberate falsehoods of Victor Emmanuel and his statesmen—to the effect that Rome was on the eve of revolution, and that the Sovereign Pontiff was unable to maintain order in his dominions—is very summarily disposed of by the Gazette in these words:—"The King had no very powerful arguments to justify his position," for order had by no means been threatened. In fact though the Papal soldiers though brave, well disciplined,

and of excellent dispositions were unable to resist the overwhelming masses of troops that Victor Emmanuel hurled against them—they were amply sufficient to preserve order within, and to meet any external dangers with which another Garibaldian raid, not supported by the Piedmontese army, might menace the Papal throne.

All the world knows how—so soon as the fortune of war had declared against France, and that it was evident that she was no longer able to compel by force Victor Emmanuel, and his statesmen to keep their pledged faith—the latter hurled their troops upon Rome, and invaded the dominions which they had but a short time before solemnly pledged themselves not to invade, and even to defend against invasion by others. Is it necessary to comment upon such falsehood and treachery? It would be superfluous to do so. As well might we enter into an elaborate argument to show that the pickpocket is no gentleman, and that the swindler is not a man of honor.

In this light does the Roman question present itself to every person, no matter what his religion, whose sense of honor has not been obliterated by his No-Popery prejudices; and therefore is it that we read without surprise the judgment which a gentleman like the editor of the Montreal Gazette passes upon the actors in the events, the true story of which is now before the world in a British Parliamentary Blue Book. That judgment is conceived in the following terms:—

The above is a faithful epitome of the singular progress of circumstances by which the Roman question has been for the present, if not for ever, solved. To our mind it is impossible to acquit Victor Emmanuel's government of conspicuous want of faith and contempt of treaty obligation in this forcible annexation of guaranteed territory—territory which, so far as international compact could protect it, should have been inviolable as Belgium. The accident of French disaster made a very paltry excuse for the violation of kindly covenant, nor had the slightest occasion arisen in the shape of internal tumult to warrant the high-handed interference.

There is in short no plea in mitigation of sentence that can be urged except this—"That it is not obligatory to keep faith with Popes."

RITUALISM.—Looking on "*Ritualism*" as a desperate effort of the High Church party to reconcile Anglicanism and Catholicity; as a revival of sacerdotalism, and an attempt to hold, and historically set forth, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist within the bosom of an essentially Protestant community established by law, whose faith and practice are prescribed by Act of Parliament—we should say that "*Ritualism*" had received its death blow from Lord Chelmsford, in the judgment by him pronounced in the case of Mr. Purchas. This judgment finally condemns the use in the Protestant establishment of chasuble, alb, tunic, dalmatic, or any other distinctively sacerdotal vestment. Nothing is allowed except the white surplice, and the traditional white-choker, the *ephod* of all the Protestant clergy. It condemns anything and everything which connects the idea of sacrifice with the Anglican communion service; and in short determines against the "*Ritualists*" every point on which for years past these much afflicted men have relied, to establish their identity with the Catholic priesthood, and to illustrate the famous or rather ludicrous "*Branch*" theory of the High Churchmen.

The charges against Mr. Purchas, which have been proved against him, and on which sentence condemning him has been given by the Privy Council, are these:—That in the administration of the Anglican communion service, he put on a chasuble and other vestments of a Catholic priest; that he mixed water with his wine; and that he officiated with his face to the communion table, and his back to the audience. We must do the "*Ritualists*" the justice to admit that in all this there was something deeper than mere man millinery, or a love of pretty clothes. They held out for the vestments no doubt; not for the sake of the vestments however, but of what those vestments indicated, or symbolized—to wit, priest, and a sacrificial act in the Eucharistic celebration. They relied upon the rubric in the Prayer Book which in express terms enjoins that—"such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in the Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth."

Now this rubric was re-enacted in 1662; it has never since been repealed, or modified by any authority known to the law; and it is also certain, indeed it has never been denied, that in the second year of the reign of Edward the Sixth, chasubles, and all the ancient distinctive, and to evangelicals the obnoxious, vestments of the Catholic priest were still in use.

On this point the law was therefore clearly on the side of Mr. Purchas and his brother Ritualists. Nevertheless, by some strange sleight of hand, or rather sleight of tongue, Lord Chelmsford made out that the positive and unrepented injunction to use such ornaments of the church, and of the ministers—"thereof"—as were in use in the second year of Edward the Sixth—meant clearly that such