

The True Witness

AND

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1870.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1870.

Friday, 30—Office of Sunday within Octave.

Saturday, 31—St. Sylvester, P. C.

JANUARY—1871.

Sunday, 1—Circumcision of Our Lord.

Monday, 2—Octave of St. Stephen.

Tuesday, 3—Octave of St. John.

Wednesday, 4—Octave of Holy Innocents.

Thursday, 5—Vigil of the Epiphany.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Nothing can be gathered from the litter of messages transmitted to us by the cable. Paris is on the brink of famine, says the first. By no means says the second: Paris is amply supplied for two or three months. The bombardment is about to begin; and nothing can withstand the new and powerful Prussian artillery. Not a bit of it, says a fourth: The Prussians cannot get their guns in position, and when they do, their batteries will be snuffed out in less time than it takes to write it down. And so on the end of the chapter. We honestly confess that we can find no reliable data on which to form any opinion whatsoever as to the actual conditions and prospects of the belligerents. The Prussians advanced upon and occupied Tours we are told, but then again we learn that they immediately afterwards evacuated the place. On the whole it does not seem as if they were making much progress.

The Parliament at Florence has, in so far as it is given it to do so, annexed the States of the Church to Piedmont; and has had the sublime effrontery to enact, what with amusing imbecility many of our exchanges call the *Magna Charta* of the Papacy. Having broken into his house and robbed him, the burglars guarantee the inviolable integrity of the person and property of their unarmed victim. They forget however that, if there were any virtue in Treaties, any reliance to be placed in their word, and the pledged faith of the Piedmontese Government, they would never be in Rome at all. The Catholic world therefore scorns them and their promises—knowing well the true worth of Piedmontese honor, and the reliance that is to be placed on the word and oath of a perjured and excommunicated King. The Pope, the Church want nothing, will deign to accept nothing from these men, except the unconditional surrender of that which by fraud and violence they have stolen. We laugh at the folly, the stupidity of those who flatter themselves that the Pope can be frightened or flattered into betraying his sacred trust, or sacrificing his rights, and the rights of the Church. To threats and cajolery he is alike indifferent, and in due time, we shall see him trample his enemies under foot. In the meantime the Parliament at Florence has prudently postponed the transfer of the seat of Government to Rome to this day six months.

The young Duc D'Aosta is promised a very warm reception should he ever attempt to enter Madrid; hints are thrown out that his life will be in danger, and so intense is Spanish hatred of foreign rule that this is very probable.

The subjoined are the most interesting items of latest telegrams:—

LONDON, Dec. 24.—The Germans are making a retrograde movement upon Orleans, and the French have much advanced on the north and north east of Paris.

Murders in the streets of Rome are of nightly occurrence. The life of the rector of the Armenian college was attempted.

Austria, Prussia, and England have offered an asylum to the Pope. He will probably accept Malta.

Advices from Berlin say that part of the terms of peace demand that France resigns Savoy and Nice to the Pope.

Herald's Special.—BERLIN, Dec. 21.—The uncertainty of the fall of Paris is the topic of conversation. The demands for a speedy bombardment are clamorous, and the official organs

assure the public that the military chiefs are fully awake to their duty, and that they will leave nothing undone to speedily reduce the capital. The belief prevails that the bombardment has been postponed by the influence of the Queen of England. In reply to this belief the official organs say it is owing to the difficulty in reaching the city effectively, the Prussian batteries not being complete, and lacking munition. In the capital the Germans will take a firm footing, and occupy it until the French elect a responsible Government. In regard to the manner of accomplishing this, whether by upsetting the present Government, and recalling Napoleon or the Orleans family, or by the convocation of a Council General, the widest opinions are framed, although the best informed express their conviction that the only way is to recognize the Constitutional Government under Napoleon. Wonderful efforts are still being made for the prosecution of the war, and the oldest classes of the Landwehr are being drafted, equipped and sent to the front. Calls are made upon officers formerly in service to return to active duty, and the officials of various departments are sent with muskets on their shoulders to fill civil posts in the conquered territory. The great gun factory at Spandau is incessantly at work manufacturing ordnance of the largest calibre. A single factory sends to the army 80,000 cans preserved meats daily.

LYONS, Dec. 20th.—The occupation of Nuits by the enemy caused a panic here. Meetings were held at which the orators made frantic appeals to the multitude. The tocsin was sounded, the National and Mobile Guards mustered, and the delegation assembled. A procession of women in mourning passed through the streets. The red republicans gathered in large numbers before the Hotel de Ville and clamored for vengeance. Gen. Armand, commander of the National Guards, refused them admission to the Hall. He was assailed and his sword broken; in self-defence he discharged his revolver at his assailant. The mob then rushed in and overpowered him, and after a mock trial he was condemned to death and shot a few minutes after the sentence. The troops remained passive during the disorders.

NEW YORK, Dec. 24.—Some days ago a Washington correspondent telegraphed that the British Minister, Sir Edward Thornton, had received instructions to settle the complications that had arisen from seizure of a number of fishing vessels by Dominion officers. There seems to be a prospect that this question will soon be disposed of, and will not enter into Gen. Schenck's instructions. It is understood that Minister Thornton has already taken the initiatory steps for a new treaty between his Government and the United States to cover the question.

OFFICIAL.—We are authorized to give an official denial to a statement which, over the signature of M. L., appeared in the *Montreal Witness* of Thursday, the 22nd instant, to the effect that:—

"Great consternation has been created in the convents and Roman Catholic boarding schools, wherein the young inmates expected to have a vacation at the time of Christmas and New Year, by an order of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal prohibiting such vacation, as a sacrifice to be made in sympathy with the imprisonment of the Pope, in his formerly loyal city of Rome! And the R. C. Episcopal order further provides that any child who shall transgress that order by visiting her parents on the previously appointed day, will be refused the entry of her convent if she attempts to return, or of any R. C. convent whereto she may seek admission hereafter."

No such order has been given by the Bishop, or by any other ecclesiastical authorities of the Diocese of Montreal; and the fact, of which from personal experience in his own house, the writer is cognisant is—that the pupils of some of our Catholic Colleges and Convents are at this moment in the enjoyment of their usual Christmas holidays in the bosoms of their respective families, with the exception of those whose parents do not desire to have them at home, and of those whose parents reside at a great distance in the U. States.

Having thus stated what the Bishop has not done, we will state what he has done. In a *Circular of Dec. 11th, addressed to the pupils*, he suggests to such of them as may feel disposed to do so of their own free will ("de votre plein gré," are the words of the letter,) and in consideration of the calamities with which the world in general—through the cruel war now raging—and with which the Catholic Church in particular—owing to the wanton outrage upon the Pope by the Piedmontese troops—are afflicted, to offer to God the sacrifice of their usual New Year holiday and its expenses, and to apply the proceeds of this sacrifice and its economies to the succor of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, who has been robbed of all his revenues. Not a word of command is there in the Letter; a mere hint or suggestion is thrown out; and

the pupils are expressly told that they are at perfect liberty to do as they please in the matter. Upon this slender foundation has the writer in the *Witness* built up his superstructure of falsehood with the object of creating a prejudice against Catholic educational institutions.

ANGLICANISM.—The Ritualists of the Anglican denomination have received another heavy blow—one which one would think ought to prove fatal to them—from the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. Mackonochie, proceeded against for the violation of a previously issued monition, in which amongst other things, the elevation of the Paten, and genuflections before the consecrated elements, were, together with other ritualistic practices, clearly prohibited as repugnant to the letter, and the spirit of the Church of England as By Law Established.

The defence as set up for Mr. Mackonochie was most puerile, and altogether unworthy of educated gentlemen, and of sincere, even if mistaken men, such as we have always tried to believe the Ritualists to be. It was urged on the part of the defendant that he obeyed the monition in question; that he had ceased, since its publication to elevate the Paten, but had merely elevated the consecrated bread without the Paten; that he did not even, at consecration, elevate the bread higher than the level of his eyebrows, whilst all that the monition enjoined was that he should not elevate it above his head; and lastly, that he had ceased altogether from genuflections, that is to say the bending of his knees, before the consecrated elements; and had contented himself with the bending of his spinal column, whilst keeping his legs perfectly straight, so as to bring his forehead in contact with the upper surface of the altar. This bowing or bending of his back he, the defendant, admitted; but the genuflection or bending of the knees, he denied altogether.

The Court would not recognise such fine distinctions or evasions of the law, and sentenced the Rev. Mr. Mackonochie to three months suspension from the performance of any clerical functions, together with the payment of all costs in the suit.

What the Ritualists will do next we cannot conceive, because they do not seem to be amenable to the moral laws which govern the conduct of other men. We do not tax them with conscious dishonesty; but it is hard for others to see how they can reconcile their peculiar religious views, with their position as office-bearers in a church which expressly repudiates those views. The sentence just pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in which the two Protestant Archbishops fully concurred by implication, repudiates the theory of any divine presence after consecration in, or with, the consecrated elements of the Eucharist, since it explicitly prohibits the rendering to them of any external marks of worship—or reverence. The Ritualists profess to believe that in, under, together with, or in some supernatural manner, the consecrated elements of the Lord Supper, and in virtue of the consecration—the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man is indeed objectively present, and is therefore to be adored. Now the problem which they, the Ritualists, have to solve, and to which to all non-ritualistic persons must seem insoluble is this:—How are they to reconcile their belief, with the law of the land as laid down by the highest authority to which Anglicans can appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?

When the three months' suspension of the Rev. Mr. Mackonochie shall have expired, and he shall again commence his clerical services, how will he celebrate the Lord's Supper? The law is clear and explicit; he must offer to the consecrated elements no act of adoration, or external respect; he must make no public acknowledgment of the faith that is in him; he, the teacher, and the Christian priest—for so he deems himself—must, in obedience to the law of the land, suppress these outward signs of love, reverence and devotion to Our Lord Jesus Christ, which hitherto he has believed that he was bound to make. Any man, not a Ritualist, being placed in such a dilemma, would at once break his legal bonds asunder, and cast the fetters of the law far from him; he would renounce the emoluments of his office, so as to be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his heart and conscience.—This, we fear, is what neither Mr. Mackonochie nor his ritualistic brethren who share his religious opinions, will consent to do. They will, we fear, as heretofore, temporize, or trust to some legal quibble, and at all costs will cling to the loaves and fishes of the Establishment.—This is why it is so difficult for either Catholic or Protestant thoroughly to respect the Anglican Ritualists. Both may admit their many good qualities; their yearnings after a higher spiritual life than that which the Erastian atmosphere of a mere national church, or church

established by law, can sustain; but neither can recognise in them aught akin to the true martyr-spirit; whilst the objects at which they aim as in the man-millinery business, are often puerile; and the manner in which they contend for the more serious objects is too often unworthy of Christians and high-minded gentlemen.

There is no place in the Anglican Establishment for any honest man, who really believes that, either before consecration, or after consecration, the bread is anything but simple bread such as may be bought at the baker's shop, or the wine in any respect different from the wine usually sold at the corner grocery. This, according to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, is the doctrine of the Church of England as By Law Established; and the *London Times*, in language more forcible than polite, reminds the Ritualists that, though they may call themselves Bishops and Priests; though they may play at Sacerdotalism, and fancy themselves invested by their ordination with some peculiar privileges—they are, after all, merely the officials or servants of the State; commissioned by the State to perform certain functions in a particular manner; and authorised to wear, during the performance of these State functions, a particular uniform or livery which the State likewise prescribes. This is the true position of the Anglican clergyman: he stands, as towards the State, in the same position as does the Custom House officer or the clerk in the Commissariat Department: and like them he must either obey orders, or leave the service.

Another very important and interesting case, as illustrating the tendencies of religious thought in the Protestant world in general, and in the Anglican section of that world in particular, has also just come off before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The defendant in this case was a Rev. Mr. Voysey. This gentleman belongs to a very numerous school in the Church of England, whose views were some years ago put forth and ably advocated in *Essays and Reviews*. Just as the Ritualists seek to put a Tridentine gloss upon the 39 Articles and the other formularies of the Established Church, so does the school to which Mr. Voysey belongs seek to strain or pull them out in the very opposite direction, so as to make them comprehend every possible phase of unbelief. Comprehensive or elastic as are the Articles, this seems more than they can bear.

Mr. Voysey, protests against, or denies everything hitherto supposed to be distinctly Christian. The miracles recorded in Scripture; the inspiration of Scripture; to a great extent the historical credibility of Scripture, find no favor in his eyes. The Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Ascension of Christ, are to him mere myths, incredible, and to be rejected by all intelligent men. With much ingenuity, for he pleaded his own cause, he attempted to show that all these views might be held and taught without any infringement of Anglican formularies; and by a long *catena* of quotations from eminent Protestant divines of the Anglican church, he shewed conclusively that all these views had been held and set forth by men reckoned by their contemporaries as sound churchmen. Not indeed by any one man; but, just as it is easy to find thirty-nine men who betwixt them believe all the 39 Articles, though it is morally impossible for any one man to believe them all, so he showed that this man was esteemed a Churchman though he denied the Trinity—as the late Protestant Archbishop Whately for instance; and that that man was in good Anglican standing though he rejected some other dogma. Mr. Voysey therefore argued that what had been done by others, piece-meal, might be done in a lump by him, without prejudice to his legal status as an ordained Anglican minister. Loud cheers, which elicited the indignant comments of the Lord Chancellor greeted Mr. Voysey at the close of his defence, showing how warm and how general was the sympathy with his views amongst his auditory. Indeed amongst the best educated of the Protestant world, and the men of intellectual culture, especially amongst the ministers of the Anglican persuasion, those views are very generally held by all who have not participated in the Romeward movement.

"The *True Witness* persists in defining baby farming as baby murder, and however far wrong philologically, we think he is pretty nearly right as a matter of fact. But what, then, must we think of those who systematically let or farm out babies to be nursed?"

We clip the above from the *Montreal Witness* of the 21st inst.; and in reply we would observe that the composite word "*baby-farming*" is a new word, not to be found in any dictionary that we know of; and the meaning of which being purely conventional, must be gathered from the peculiar circumstances connected with its origin, and under which it was first employed. Thus when the horrid crimes of Burke and Hare in Edinburgh were brought to light some forty years ago, a new word, "*to burke*," was adopted to indicate a phase of crime then for

the first time brought to light, and for which no term existed.

So with the newly adopted word "*baby-farming*." It was adopted into the English language as a short and expressive term to denote the peculiar crime for which the woman Margaret Waters lately suffered the penalty of hanging, and for which there had previously been no name in the English language. It is not for us to discuss whether the term has been happily chosen, or whether it be philologically accurate; but the fact is, that, as the word was coined expressly to meet the case of the newly discovered crime for which the wretched woman Waters was hung, so it is understood, and so only is it used—in an invidious sense, or as a term of reproach. So much for the philological side of the question raised by the *Witness*.

Turning to the moral side, the reader will notice that the *Witness* admits that, "as a matter of fact," *baby-farming*, and *baby-murder* are much the same thing; and as he insinuates that the Sisters of the Grey Nunnery are "*baby-farmers*," we are logically correct in repeating that he, by implication, puts them on much the same footing as "*baby-murderers*." We have only to congratulate our Protestant fellow-citizens upon the courtesy and truly Christian charity which characterizes their champion and spokesman in Canada. No! We will not say "like master, like man;" for we firmly believe that the great majority of our separated brethren, differing as they do from us on many and most important questions, repudiate indignantly the cowardly slanders of the fellow who presumes to speak in their name. Such is our confidence in their honor, and manly feeling that we have no hesitation in leaving the vindication of our Sisters in their hands; we know how Catholics would act were some fellow calling himself a Catholic to speak and write of the good ladies at the head of the Protestant Orphan's Home, and other Protestant benevolent Societies of Montreal, in the tone in which habitually the *Witness* speaks of the humble Sisters of Charity. We therefore say no more on this head.

The *Witness* asks us, "what must we think of those who systematically let, or farm out, babies—to be nursed?" That depends altogether upon circumstances. Of those who, to shirk their parental duties, or with the object of getting rid of an encumbrance, let out their babies, whom they are able to nurse and bound to nurse themselves—to be nursed by others, we can scarce think too harshly.

Not so, however, should we think of those who, having no other means of saving the lives or prolonging the flickering existence of babies for whose existence they are in nowise responsible, but who are cast at their doors, give those babies out to be nursed by others; paying a good round sum for the services of the nurse, and exercising a diligent supervision over the treatment which the babies receive from the hands of those to whom they are committed. Of "*baby-farmers*" of this description, who from motives of pure Christian charity undertake so heavy a burden, we cannot, if we be Christians, or possessed of a single grain of philanthropy think or speak too highly. Even if hygienic errors could be brought home to them, we should none the less respect them for their motives, and the painful sacrifices which for the love of God, and of God's little ones, they make.

We have answered the question put by the *Witness*; will he favour us with an equally explicit answer to a few questions we address to him:—

He insinuates, rather than directly charges, crime of some kind against the Sisters of Charity in charge of the Foundling Hospital. We ask him to be more explicit, and to condescend to particulars. What is it that he accuses the Sisters of Charity of having done, or left undone? What would he have them do with the babies cast at all hours of the day and night, summer and winter, at their doors? Would he have them leave these helpless little creatures out in the rain and snow, there to perish certainly and miserably? Or, does he prefer that they should take them in, and try at all events to save their lives, difficult always, hopeless generally, though their efforts must necessarily be? And if the Sisters take them in, how are they to have these babies nursed, unless they hire the services of mothers able to nurse them?

Of the extent to which child-murder prevails in England we may form a slight idea from a paragraph on the subject which we find in the *Montreal Witness*; the writer, speaking of a case lately brought before the Lambeth magistrates, says:—

"The police records show an extraordinary number of dead children found about in this district; in fact, the suspicion would seem to be that children are adopted by the 'farmers' in heaps, starved to death, and flung away,—a state of affairs which most makes one long for founding hospitals, had their moral effect always is."—*Witness*, Aug. 11.

Here the inconsistency of the Protestant *Witness* amusingly betrays itself. He argues on the assumption that it was, and is the founding