

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 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. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription FROM THAT DATE.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1872.

Friday, 27—St. John, Ap.
Saturday, 28—Holy Innocents.
Sunday, 29—Sunday within the Octave of Christmas.
Monday, 30—St. Thomas, B. M.
Tuesday, 31—St. Sylvester, P. C.
JANUARY—1873.
Wednesday, 1—Circumcision, Obl.
Thursday, 2—Octave of St. Stephen.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The French Legislative Assembly is about to indulge in a Christmas holiday, thus giving to M. Thiers a short respite, but his troubles will recommence as soon as the legislators of the country meet again, in January; before adjourning they passed a Bill restoring to the Orleans Princes their confiscated property. This would indicate that the monarchical party in the Assembly is strong.

Not so strong, however, it is to be feared, as is the extreme revolutionary, anti-Catholic, and communistic party out of doors. As signs of the power of the latter we may cite one or two instances. The other day a member of the Institute, a certain Professor Robin, had his name erased from the jury list in consequence of his ostentatious repudiation of belief in a God. This was enough to arouse the sympathies of a large body of the students in Paris, of whom three thousand made a public demonstration in his favor on Saturday 21st. In like manner the Mayor of Nantes having been deposed by the Government for having allowed, if not encouraged the brutal outrages perpetrated by the Liberals of that City on a number of nuns, priests, and unarmed inoffensive private citizens returning from a pilgrimage—all the members of the Municipality have resigned, as an act of protest against the quasi protection afforded to Catholics by the Government. The Liberal press is very angry indeed; for surely it is an infringement upon liberty if it be not allowed to Liberals of purest water, to pelt, beat, and insult nuns and priests *ad libitum*.

Victor Emmanuel has been again ill, but is now reported out of danger. An increase in the Italian army is spoken of, and a most rigorous system of conscription for military service is to be enforced upon the wretched, over-taxed people of the Peninsula. They can't stand it much longer; but will no doubt soon arise in their strength and throw off the monstrous despotism beneath which they groan.

The *Mercure* assures us that the health of Sir George Cartier is so far restored, as to enable him to return to Canada in time to take part in the business of the approaching session of the Federal Parliament, which will, we suppose, commence as usual about the month of February.

THE OUTRAGE ON REV. CHARLES TANNER AT POINTE AUX TREMBLES.—This is the caption of an article in the *Witness* of the 17th inst., of which we make the following abridgment. Of course our readers will bear in mind that it is only a one-sided statement, and that when the other side shall be presented to them the affair may well appear under another and very different aspect; that this Mr. Tanner may then turn out to have been the aggressor, as an impertinent intruder into a Catholic place of worship. We will however give the particulars as furnished by the *Witness*.

We must, however, make at the outset a few observations; which have a direct bearing on the case, and which are of general application. Protestants cannot, as a right, demand access to any Catholic place of worship at any time, or under any circumstances. If they are admitted, they are admitted only on sufferance, and during good behaviour, the authorities of the Church having the sole or absolute right to determine what conduct is good. Unfortunately it very often happens that the conduct of some of our Protestant visitors to our Catholic Churches is the very reverse of good; the men behaving themselves like ill bred rowdies;

the women like * * * well we will not soil our paper with the appropriate term. Indeed the blackguardism of English and Yankee Protestant tourists, visiting Catholic Churches in the Old World is proverbial; and it is a fact that in Canada their behaviour on several occasions has been not one whit better. Now it is just as well once for all to tell these gentry, male and female, that they obtain access, even though they be Reverends! to our churches only through our courtesy; and that if, whilst therein, they cannot restrain their instincts; if they cannot conduct themselves, we do not say like Christians, or even like ladies and gentlemen, but in an inoffensive manner—they must not be surprised if they find themselves unceremoniously kicked out of a building which they have no legal right to enter, and which they desecrate by their unseemly conduct. Of course we do not intend that these remarks should apply to all, or even to the majority of those Protestants who enter our churches. This would be unjust; for we are happy to acknowledge that, in Montreal, the majority amongst our separated brethren give no cause of complaint. Still all would do well to bear in mind that as no one compels them to set foot in a Catholic Church, so, if they do attend our services they must submit to any rules and regulations which the authorities may draw up. If this shocks them, the remedy is in their own hands; they have but to keep away, and no Catholic will meddle with them. Now to come back to our muttons.

This Mr. Tanner, one of the F. C. M. Society's agents, thought fit to attend High Mass the other day in the Church at *Pointe aux Trembles*; and strange to say, a person calling himself a Catholic, and knowing that Mr. Tanner did not seek to assist at the holy sacrifice with any devotional or reverential intention, but rather in a hostile spirit, gave him a seat in his pew. Still this did not release Mr. Tanner from the obligation of submitting whilst in the church, to any rules or discipline which the authorities saw fit to adopt. Now Mr. Tanner so conducted himself as to show his contempt for the services being performed, and to draw attention to himself by his unseemly conduct. Remonstrated with by the Churchwarden he refused either to change his conduct, or to leave the Church. Here upon this point are the words of the *Witness*, recounting the "outrage":—

"When the people knelt again the *marguillier*, (i.e. churchwarden) told Mr. Tanner either to leave the church or kneel, to which the latter answered nothing, being anxious to hear what Father Caisse was saying."—*Witness*.

Now under these circumstances we contend, that the churchwarden had the legal right, and was in duty bound, to turn this impertinent fellow Tanner out of the church, using for that purpose just as much force as was absolutely necessary; but even to this exercise of strict right the authorities unfortunately did not resort, and Mr. Tanner retained his seat. When the sermon commenced and the priest was addressing the people, Mr. Tanner "taking out a piece of paper proceeded to make notes"—*Witness*; when again the churchwarden remonstrated with him saying—"Don't write here, it's not an office."

Now let any impartial Protestant answer this question. How would a Catholic priest voluntarily obtruding himself into a Protestant place of worship during time of service, say in Montreal or Toronto; who in spite of reiterated remonstrances from the Sexton, or other official charged with keeping order, should refuse either to comport himself as one of the congregation, or to leave the church; and who during the sermon should, in spite of remonstrances, take out his writing materials, and proceed to take notes—how we say would a Catholic priest under such circumstances, and so conducting himself, be treated? Scarcely would he escape with his life; and from one end of the land to the other, the Protestant press would teem with glowing accounts of "*Romish Insolence*," and "*Papal Aggression*."

What happened in the case of Mr. Tanner is thus told in the *Witness*. After Mass, and when the people came out of church, Mr. Tanner took his stand on the high way, and commenced to deliver an oration in reply to the Priest. Hereupon, so the *Witness* says, some snow-balls were thrown at him, and one man pushed and kicked him, which, if true, we heartily condemn. A magistrate interfered and told Mr. Tanner that his controversial preaching in the open air must cease, as tending to provoke a breach of the peace—in which action surely no one can deny that the said magistrate was justified. Let us only try and fancy what would occur in Toronto were a Catholic priest, coming out of a Protestant place of worship, and before the congregation had dispersed, to commence an open-air reply on the Queen's highway to a sermon just delivered within the walls.

Here the *Witness*, account of the outrage becomes involved; all that we can make out clearly is: that after the magistrate's interference Mr. Tanner effected an entrance into the priest's house, whence he was immediately

"shoved forth again by the irascible cure"—a terrible outrage indeed; and one to which surely our supposed Catholic priest would never have been subjected in Toronto, had he obtruded himself into the private house of the Protestant minister, whose services he had been attending and criticising. But as it seems that the *Witness* claims for Protestants the right to enter Catholic churches and therein comport themselves as they please—so it is but fitting that they should have the right to thrust themselves into the priest's house without consulting the wishes of that individual. The rule in short laid down by the *Witness* in such cases is analogous to that laid down with respect to negroes in the days of slavery in the U. States. "The Catholic priest or layman, has no rights which an evangelical Protestant is bound to respect."

After the shoving out of our intrusive "man of God" from the priest's house, the story as told by the *Witness* becomes terribly mixed up. If our contemporary is to be believed, the priest punched the "man of God," and tried to knock Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Extreme Unction into him. This Mr. Tanner stoutly resisted, holding on to a post of the gallery, and speaking disparagingly of the sacred oils used by the Church. On these points, however, we need not dwell, seeing that in the legal investigation that followed, they were not brought before the Court, as no doubt they would have been had they been susceptible of proof.

The church-wardens took legal action against Mr. Tanner for his indecent behavior in church. It was proved that when requested either to kneel, or leave the church, the impertinent intruder refused to do either the one thing or the other, saying "I do not believe in that," &c.—*Witness*. The upshot was that the case was dismissed, both parties paying their own costs.

Not the least singular feature in the affair is,—that it would seem as if the presiding magistrate at the trial, was the very same person who, as Mr. Tanner's friend, gave the latter a seat in his pew; and who, therefore, was morally an interested party in the case, since, to condemn Mr. Tanner, would have been to condemn himself—he being assuredly morally responsible for the good behavior of him whom he had introduced and accommodated with a seat. Similarity of names, and designation may have deceived us. There may be two persons styled each Dr. Perrault in *Pointe-aux-Trembles*; and if so we shall be prompt to avow ourselves deceived. But in the meantime this we hesitate not to say:—That if the Dr. Perrault who admitted to his pew a man whom he knew to be a salaried agent of the French Canadian Missionary Society, and a hireling calumniator of the faith which Dr. Perrault professes, be the same as the Dr. Perrault who as a magistrate presided in Court to adjudicate upon the charges preferred against his friend for indecent behavior in Church—then the conduct of the magistrate in so adjudicating in a case to which he was, morally, an interested party, was as indecent, and as unbecoming a magistrate, as his conduct in giving a seat in church during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, to one whose object he must have known was not devotional or reverential, but the very reverse, was indecorous and disgraceful on the part of one pretending to be a Catholic. If a Catholic, Dr. Perrault must believe that during Mass, the Holy of Holies, God before whom the angels veil their faces, in whose awful presence the Cherubim and Seraphim bow down in humble adoration, is really and truly present upon the Altar. Dr. Perrault must also have known from the position and antecedents of his friend Tanner, that to introduce the latter within the church during Mass, was to expose that awful Presence to irreverential treatment, to insult, and contempt; and his conduct, therefore, was analogous to, though infinitely more disgraceful than, that of one who should give access in his family to one whom he had every reason to believe would treat his wife with contumely, and his mother with scorn. As Catholics we blush when we think that men who can so act should be reputed members of our Holy Catholic Church.

REFORMATORIES.—In its discussion of the policy that the Quebec Government has seen fit to adopt with regard to Juvenile Reformatories, the *Montreal Gazette* is unreasonable; it so states the terms of the problem as to render its solution impossible. Our contemporary, for instance, assumes that, in the treatment of juvenile criminals, there are two distinct elements to be taken into account—the punitive, and the reformatory:—

"There is"—he says—"the punitive and industrial element, and there is the moral and religious training. Now the former should, emphatically, be under the direction of the State, and the latter under the direction of the Church."—*Gazette*, 20th inst.

entire management be, essentially distinct from the Penitentiary, or Penal institution. The first object of the latter, to which everything else must yield, is to punish or to inflict upon those condemned to it, such pain, such sufferings, moral and corporal, as shall deter or frighten others from imitating their conduct. If to this can be superadded the moral reformation of the inmates—a thing which we, from very good reasons, believe to be almost impossible except under very rare and exceptional circumstances—well-and-good—let it be tried; but, above all, let it be remembered that a Penitentiary is a place of punishment, and not a moral hospital.

But the very reverse of all this is true in the case of the "Juvenile Reformatory." The primary object of the last-named, the one object to which everything about its management must be kept strictly subservient—if it is to be worthy of its name—is the moral reformation of its inmates, not the infliction on them of pains and penalties. What the *Gazette* calls the "punitive and industrial element" therein must be kept subservient to the moral or reformatory element; nor should any punishment, or any labor therein be imposed or inflicted which has not for its primary object the moral reformation of the young persons subjected to it. A Reformatory must be a moral hospital, above all things, or it is not worth having at all.

But as religion is the only force that can work any moral reformation, or purify the character; and if moral reformation and purification be the one object of the Reformatory to which everything else must be made subservient,—it is evident that the Reformatory must be entirely managed or controlled by the ministers of religion, or by what the *Gazette* calls "the Church." For the same reason, in the Penitentiary, or the Penal institution, in which the punishment of the convict, with the object of deterring others from crime, by example, and not his moral reformation, is the main object to which every other consideration must give way—the State must be the ruler.

The two systems, the truly Penal, and the truly Reformatory, cannot be combined. The attempt has repeatedly been made, and has always failed; the result has been a costly ugly hybrid, neither one thing nor the other; a heavy curse and a heavy cost to the community. Pentonville gives us a case in point; and we well remember how even amongst the felons of N. S. Wales, when that Colony was a Penal settlement, the "*Pentonville-ains*," as they were appropriately called, enjoyed the distinction of being, even amongst the vilest felons of the British Empire, the most hopeless reprobates, the very hardest cases in the country; scoundrels of whom, even in Norfolk Island, in those days the Botany Bay of N. S. Wales, or in Port Arthur, it would have been difficult to find the equals in rascality. Such a Reformatory as the *Gazette* dreams of has been tried; it took young scamps, and after a few years of training them, turned them out accomplished devils—the most dangerous to society because often the most finished hypocrites, brimful of cant, and of stock religious phrases.

We must then, we repeat keep the Reformatory distinct from the Penitentiary. The latter, in so far as it is a Penitentiary, must be managed by the State, though from it the ministers of religion should not be excluded. The Reformatory, if it is to be a Reformatory or moral hospital, must be managed by the power to which the *Gazette* gives the name of "Church"; though of course we recognise the right of the State to exact results, and to demand accounts of sums expended. But in one house there cannot be two masters.

We are not arguing for Reformatories at all, at present; only this we say, that, if we would have them at all, we must take them upon the only condition on which they are possible or desirable. In this sense—[we are not competent to discuss the financial aspect of its scheme]—the Quebec Government has acted well and consistently in giving the charge of the Reformatory for the young Catholic delinquents to a body of Catholic instructors; and if in like manner, as we suppose will be the case, a Reformatory for juvenile Protestant delinquents be established under the charge of some exclusively Protestant body of management, our separated brethren will have no just cause of complaint.

But upon one point it is well that we should be explicit. No institution, not exclusively under the control of "the Church," that is of some professedly religious society, can be a Reformatory. It may be a modified Penitentiary, with a milk and water discipline; a place of detention or gentle punishment, but not a "moral hospital." For any such institution we hope that Catholics will never consent to be taxed. Better have no Juvenile Reformatories at all, than such a nasty hybrid as that which, in very good faith, but in utter ignorance of the very first elements of what we may call the *Criminal Question*, the *Montreal Gazette* proposes for our adoption.

And if the Reformatory is by its very nature

an institution essentially distinct from the Penitentiary, it in like manner stands to reason that the Catholic Reformatory must be kept entirely separate from the Protestant Reformatory. In the religious order Catholics and Protestants can take no action in common; they are essentially antagonistic, and no common *modus vivendi* can be so much conceived. We must then—it is a necessity of our position is we are to have a Reformatory at all—have two Reformatories; one under the management of the Catholic Church—the other to be managed as our separated brethren may see fit. The Quebec Government has seen this, and has thereon acted; and though we neither presume to criticise the financial details of its scheme, nor to applaud them—whilst allowing that it is perfectly possible that these pecuniary details may be susceptible of amendment—we feel bound to tender it our respectful homage for its intelligence in keeping the Reformatory distinct from the Penitentiary; and for its honesty in assigning to "the Church" that place in the reformation of juvenile delinquents which the Church alone, or, in other words, religion, is competent to fill.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS.

SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS.
No. XXI.

"THOU SHALT NOT KILL."

But if, Christian soul, you would know the enormity of the crime of murder, learn it from the punishment awarded to anger. There is as you well know an infinite distance between the huge crime of murder and the comparatively lesser crime of anger. And yet the punishment of anger is hell. You have heard (it is Jesus Christ who speaks) that it was said to them of old, *Thou shalt not kill*. But I say to you, that whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment, and whosoever shall say to his brother *Raca* shall be in danger of the council. And whosoever shall say *Thou fool*, shall be in danger of hell fire. This is a terrible denunciation. If the slightest word *thou fool* is so great an offence against Christian charity as to merit hell for all eternity, how great must that hell be for all eternity to which the murderer will be condemned? if the slightest term "*thou fool*" be so great a crime as to merit from an all just judge an eternal hell, how great a crime must that of murder be which is so infinitely greater?

In forbidding murder this commandment of the Jewish decalogue also forbids by implication the vice of anger which is indeed but the threshold to murder. But under the Christian dispensation we have from the mouth of Jesus Christ himself a most explicit command, one admitting of no doubt or uncertainty. *I say whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment*. Nor does this commandment stop here: it forbids equally the calling injurious names. *And whosoever shall say to his brother Raca shall be in danger of the council*. *And whosoever shall say Thou fool shall be in danger of hell fire*. But our Divine Saviour goes even further than all this.

Not only does he forbid you to use injurious words, but he commands you to love your neighbor as he has loved us (Jo. 13). Christian soul! what an immense gulf there is between the horrid hate of the murderer, and that supreme love with which Jesus Christ has loved us. Its depth who shall fathom? Its width who shall measure? And yet if a crime has to be measured by its distance from its opposite virtue, then undoubtedly the depth and width of that immense gulf is the true measure of the enormous crime of murder. Its depth is the depth of the crime of murder—its width is the width of this same most horrid crime. But the height of the love with which Jesus Christ has loved us who shall tell? He has loved you from all eternity. His love gave you your being and overwhelms you still with blessings. His love brought him down from Heaven to take flesh of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and to lead a life of toil of obscurity and humiliation. His love crowned his brow with thorns, tore his back with scourges, nailed his hands and feet to the cross, and let out his life's blood with a spear. And this, Christian soul, has to be the measure of your love to your neighbour as I loved you. From this immense height if you can scale it, Christian soul, look down to the deep dark depths of murder, if your eye can penetrate them; and from the immense abyss below you, learn the enormity of the crime of murder.

But think not, Christian soul, that the commandment *Thou shalt not kill* stops even here. Think not that you have even yet discovered the true depth of the murderous crime; for you have not yet discovered the true height of Christian love. You must mount yet higher. The love which Jesus Christ requires of a Christian soul and which he bore towards you, does not stop at the love of our neighbour, it mounts to that giddy height *Love thy enemies*. Christ died not only for the just, but the unjust—not only for Peter but for Judas. And dying he prayed for his enemies. *Father for*