

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

BY THE PROPRIETOR,

JOHN GILLIES,

AT NO. 135 FORTIFICATION LANE.

Editor—M. W. KIRWAN.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country subscribers, Two Dollars.

To all City subscribers whose papers are delivered

by carriers, Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, April 6, 1877.

CALENDAR—APRIL, 1877.

- 6th—Octave. St. Celestine, Pope, C. St. Celestine was a native of Rome, and held a distinguished place among the clergy of that city, when, upon the demise of Pope Boniface, he was chosen to succeed him, in September, 422, by the wonderful consent of the whole city, as St. Austin writes. During his pontificate the Nestorian heresy was condemned. He also commissioned St. Patrick to preach to the Irish.
- Badajos stormed, 1812.
- Richard Cœur de Lion died, 1199.
- 7th—Octave. St. Aphrasates, Anchorite. This saint battled nobly against the Arians who under the Emperor Valens mercilessly persecuted the Catholics of Antioch.
- Treason-Felony Bill introduced into the British Parliament by Sir G. Grey, 1848.
- 8th—Low Sunday. B. Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem. Albert was born at Castro di Guadiferi, in the diocese of Parma, and of a noble Italian family. He entered the monastery of Mortura in the Milanese when very young. He was chosen by Pope Clement III. and the Emperor Frederic I., surnamed Barbarossa, to be umpire of their differences. 1204 he was appointed Patriarch of Jerusalem. In 1214 he was assassinated. He is honored among the saints of his Order on the 8th day of April.
- Special Commission for trial of Fenian prisoners opened in Dublin, 1867.
- 9th—Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (March 25). Thomas Addis Emmet imprisoned at Fort George, 1798.
- Mgr. Montbrion, Bishop of Quebec, died, 1741.
- 10th—St. Francis of Paula, C. (Apr. 2). A short sketch of the life of this saint appeared in our columns last week.
- The *Dacia* wrecked in Clam Day, 1827.
- Magdala captured, 1868.
- 11th—St. Leo, Pope and Confessor. St. Leo, surnamed the Great, was descended of a noble Tuscan family, but born at Rome. He was made archdeacon of the Church of Rome under Pope Celestine. After the demise of Sixtus III. Leo was chosen to the papal see in 440, by, it may be almost said, the universal consent of all Christendom. He was called to the Government of the Church in most difficult times. His signal victories over the Manichees, Arians, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Novatians and Donatists, are standing proof of his zeal for the purity of the faith. St. Leo reigned twenty-one years and some months.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop England, a native of Cork, died at Charleston, S.C., 1824.
- George Canning born, 1770.
- Battle of Ravenna, 1512.
- Napoleon signed his first abdication, 1814.
- Great Fire in Montreal, 1768.
- Peace of Utrecht, 1713.
- 12th—St. Isidore, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church (April 4). A short sketch of this Saint's career appeared in our last.
- Allies entered Toulouse, 1824.
- Gold discovered in Australia, 1851.
- Attack on Fort Sumter, 1861.

HOME RULE.

The Home Rule cause goes bravely on in the old land. At last some earnest men have come boldly to the front, and with resolute purpose, have resolved to meet the British House of Commons some of the legislation that that same House has so often meted out to Ireland. For four years the Home Rule party has tried conciliation. For four years the members of the Irish team have tried to obtain justice by following the usual customs which direct debate in Parliament. For four years the majority of the Irish representatives have asked for an "enquiry into the grounds of the demand made for Home Rule in Ireland." For four years they have tried all the arts of peace, all the logic of argument, all the force of numbers, and still refusal and rebuff have met them, session after session. The majority of Irishmen asked for Home Rule—the majority of Englishmen refused it. The majority of Irishmen asked for a new Land Bill—the majority of Englishmen refused it. The majority of Irishmen asked for a grant to the Irish fisheries—the majority of Englishmen refused it. And so the work of Irish representation has failed to accomplish what the Irish people required, and Ireland was ruled not as Irishmen thought fit, but as Englishmen required. Of course, and why not? Why should not Squire Oakland of Somerset, know what suited the Irish, far better than the Irish themselves? Like Gladstone and Disraeli, the Squire might not indeed ever have seen the Island of Destiny. What matter, he was an Englishman, and knew far better what was likely to benefit Irishmen than men who were racy and to the manner born. Of course he knew all about it. The turbulent Irish were incapable of self-government, and it takes John, surnamed Bull, to teach the Irish the knack of governing a people against their will, but for their benefit all the while.

And so the work has been going on. Since the Union, the British Parliament has now and again doled forth the stunted measure of its charity to Ireland, and during troublesome times that same Parliament has astonished itself by voting Catholic emancipation, the disestablishment of the Church, and the instatement of a Land Act. And do you know that those Irishmen are not grateful after all! Astounding fact! Yes those troublesome Irish are not down upon bended knee, and do not make the welkin's ring with plaudits in praise of the wondrous benefits they have derived from the sturdy yomen who graciously condescend to make their laws. What matter if Englishmen are never "grateful" for just laws; ah, that is different, those Irish are a conquered race, and spaniel-like they should lick the hand that spurs them. But that day will never come. No no friend, the Irish people will never bend the knee to British rule over Ireland, nor shall they ever cease to labour to secure the making of Irish laws by Irishmen. We want a dual representation in the working of your Imperial system. First of all we want our share in the good things provided by the Empire at large. Our blood and our treasure have helped you to build up the structure of your vast power. Irish blood has been shed in India and in China, at the Cape, and in "this Canada of ours." We want our share of all those good things, but shall leave the Imperial Parliament the right of regulating all questions which affect the Imperial Crown, the army, the navy, the postal regulation, the appointment of foreign ambassadors, the making of peace and of war, &c., &c., but on all questions affecting the internal condition of Ireland—our highways and our byways, our railways and our canals, our laws affecting marriage, and our fisheries, our education and our own volunteers, these we want to see under the control of a Parliament assembled in the capital of our native land. But you say that it cannot be. The conflicting elements of political life would throw us into constant antagonism, and we should see perhaps a Conservative Government in Ireland, and a Liberal Administration in Westminster. This is one of your strongest cards, but it fails. You have solved the problem here in Canada—Quebec with its Conservative Chamber, and the Dominion with its Liberal House, gives you the reply. You say we cannot define what we mean by Home Rule. Can you define what you mean by the "British Constitution?" What are your ministers paid for but to overcome such difficulties as you yourself, in this instance, create. No, no, it will not do. You must not split us up upon the details before you admit the principle. First of all answer this question—"Is Ireland entitled to Home Rule or not?" You say "no." You have said "no" for many years. Very well, we'll teach you a lesson you will never forget. We'll block legislation in the House of Commons. You will not give us what the Irish people demand—justly demand—and now we'll see if he cannot prevent you having what your people demand. We repeat,—We'll block legislation in the House of Commons. So say the earnest men of the Home Rule party, and we wish them God speed. Pay them back measure for measure, Messrs. Biggar and Parnell and the rest. Let them know what a terrible thing it is to refuse the constitutionally expressed demand of the majority of a people. We are prepared to hear of all the terrible things the House will do, but be earnest gentlemen, be earnest—heed not the threats of a House of Commons, that has sneered down your legal demand—work with an energy and with a will, block legislation, and when that fails take advantage of all the forms of the House to carry on your mission, and the Irish people all over the world will invoke blessings upon your head. Home Rule will never be won on the lines hitherto cut out—there must be a new policy, and that new policy is—Treat the British House of Commons as the British House of Commons has treated you. And what can we in Canada—in this free land of ours—do to help on the good work. The duty of the Irish abroad is to follow the Irish at home, and to give loyal allegiance to the will of the people. The Irish at home look to the scattered children of their race to stand by them in this crisis of their history. Home Rule may not be what some men desire, but no Irishman can deny that Home Rule will do good for Ireland, and we can all send our assistance, and wait our sympathy to the few true men who lead the storming party, and who are determined to fight the issue to the end.

BISHOP BOURGET.—We have received a handsome chromo of Bishop Bourget. The resemblance is excellent, and we can cordially recommend it to our readers. We understand that it is the intention of the artist to complete a gallery of all the Bishops in the Province, and in such an effort he should be encouraged by the Catholic people.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ALLIANCE.

Civil and religious liberty is the right of every man. Whoever advocates otherwise will find an enemy in the TRUE WITNESS. In this Dominion, as well as in any other part of the world, to labour for, or to defend, civil and religious liberty is a patriotic duty. No man should be subject to disabilities because of his original nationality or because of his creed. Let our Protestant fellow-citizens point out to us a single wrong that they labour under; let them show us a single injustice which we can remove; let them note a single instance in which the Catholics attempt to treat them unfairly, then we venture to predict that the Catholics will be found battling for the dual rights of civil and religious liberty for all. In our article on the "Catholic vote" we have treated the question in another light, but we shall now confine ourselves to the Province of Quebec alone. We shall simply review the utterances of speakers at the "Civil Rights Alliance" meeting, which was held in the Mechanics' Hall last week. The object of that meeting was to "broaden" the Constitution of the Protestant Defense Alliance, and to consider the advisability of changing its name. The speakers were satisfied that both results had been accomplished. Of the speakers we must pass most of them by. The tolerance of the Rev. Mr. Stevenson, the folly of the Rev. Mr. Gaetz, the bigotry of the Rev. Mr. Bray, or the piety of "Father" Chiniquy, we shall not stop to criticise at present. But we search in vain for any argument which could induce us to believe that the civil rights or the religious liberty of any man at that meeting, or of any Protestant outside of it, was in any way in danger. The entire proceedings evinced a desire, not to defend the civil and religious liberty of Protestants, because there was no attempt to invade them, but it was a covert attempt to organize a society to induce *habitants* to rebel against ecclesiastical authority. That is the object in the change of name, and if the *habitants* are, as some of the speakers implied, tyrannized over, then we wish the Civil Right Alliance a hearty God speed. But we have seen nothing so far to warrant such an assumption. The *habitants* do not complain, but the members of the Civil Rights Alliance complain for them. The *habitants* are happy in their way, and the Civil Right Alliance is organizing to create mistrust between the *Cure* and his flock. But when we say there were no arguments advanced worthy of attention, there was one statement made that is worthy of note. Alderman Clendinneng is reported to have said that:—

"He and some other gentlemen, all Protestants, owned some land close to the city, at St. Cuneonde or St. Henri, he did not know which, and they had to pay a certain sum every year towards the instruction of the children in the Roman Catholic religion; they had to pay to support worship they did not agree with. Was that right? [Cries of no! and applause.] They were willing to pay the school taxes, but they wanted they should be educated, not in the Roman Catholic faith, but should be given a good sound English education (applause). Now they wanted to make the Alliance so large that everybody who was attacked should be defended by it."

This statement was more in harmony with the ostensible object of the meeting than any statement made during the evening. It was in fact the pivot of the proceedings, and if it could not be refuted it would have been a strong argument to sustain the outward objects of alliance, and to secure the sympathy of the Catholic people. But what is the meaning of it all.—Nothing—absolutely nothing. Alderman Clendinneng, says that he has to pay for the support of a "worship" in which he does not believe. We deny it. He is not compelled to do anything of the kind. "He has property in the parish of St. Cuneonde or St. Henri, and he is forced to pay the school tax." Well why not start a Protestant school? If there is no Protestant school in the parish why not send his money as the law allows him to do, to the next Protestant parish, provided said parish is not three miles away. Of course he has to pay the school tax, but he is not forced to pay it to support a "worship" in which he does not believe." Would Alderman Clendinneng prefer to see the children uneducated rather than see them educated as Catholics. It would appear so. Does he not know as well as we do that the Protestants have only to ask for a separate school and they get it. Nay, it is not even necessary to "ask" for the school—all that is required is to start one, and it will be recognized at once, and will be visited by the Protestant inspector. Nay more, still, if the funds of the Protestant school are not sufficient to pay the schoolmaster a portion of his salary will be paid out of the general school fund. This is the law, and Alderman Clendinneng and all who endorse his utterances may see with shame that they refuse to do to the Catholics as the Catholics are doing towards them.

If the members of the Civil Rights Alliance mean what they profess, then let them send a deputation to Protestant New Hampshire, where Catholics are denied civil and religious liberty. This Alliance is a ruse, and is meant only to create distrust between a Catholic and a contented people and their pastors.

"THE CATHOLIC VOTE."

We remember hearing of a correspondent who had occasion to telegraph "The Angel's Whisper" to the editor of an English contemporary, and when the telegram appeared in print, by the alteration of one letter, it read, "The Angel's Whiskers." The change was startling, but it was amusing, and the excellence of the joke more than soothed the irate correspondent. The editor exhibited a pleasant fury when he discovered the mistake, and swore, as editor only can swear when they see their paper full of errors, many of which offend taste, and outrage all the laws of choice composition. We feel in a somewhat similar mood to-day. We accepted a telegraphic report of Mayor Waller's speech in Ottawa as correct, and on the strength of the wires, charged him with having advocated "the abolition of the Catholic vote." We rejoice, however, to find that the telegram played us false, and we publish a letter from the worthy Mayor which places the question fairly before our readers. We rejoice that this is so. There is little, very little, in Mayor Waller's letter to which we could object. It is sound and logical. Perhaps indeed he makes a little too much of our Scotch neighbours, but no one will deny that their enterprise and their zeal entitle them to the respect of all sensible men. They bravely work their way to the front in every land, and it would, in our opinion, be both unjust and unwise not to accord to them the full measure of their deserts. Thrifty and intelligent, there is much in the Scottish character which is calculated to build up a struggling colony, and we are sure no Irishman will hesitate to admit that their good sense and perseverance entitle them to the respect of their Catholic fellow-citizens. But we must not go too far. Statistics prove that the Scotch, on the whole, are not at present better educated than the Irish, notwithstanding that for 180 years it was a crime to teach a school in Catholic Ireland. But still the broad fact remains that Scotsmen succeed because they lend a willing hand to their fellows, and he would be a sorry Irishman indeed who could find fault with them for such a laudable national characteristic. The editor of this journal is not sufficiently long in Canada to express an opinion on the cry of undue Scotch ascendancy, and must hesitate for some time before he ventures into such a plunge. If there is any truth in it, then it is certainly time to kick against the traces. In Canada there should be no ascendancy of race, and while we can never forget our allegiance to Ireland and her cause, yet in this Dominion, and upon Canadian questions, the distinction of races should be allowed to stand aside. We can be good citizens of Canada, without ceasing to remember and to labour for the land of our forefathers. As much attached as we ought to be, and as we are, to Canadian institutions, still we should be sorry to advise our countrymen to forget the duty they owe to Ireland. By all means then let the Catholic Irishmen of the Dominion be faithful Canadians, but let them be faithful Irishmen as well. So far we think there is not much, if there is any, difference between Mayor Waller and ourselves, and upon the question of the "abolition of the Catholic vote," we rejoice to notice that here, too, Mayor Waller is with us, and that he never advocated anything so "ridiculous." Upon this point our leader of last week was pronounced, and to that pronouncement we stand. Without the "Catholic vote" we would become simply the pariahs of political life. We want to hear more, far more, of the Catholic vote than we do. We do not indeed care to hear it belloped from the house tops, but we should still wish to see the Catholic vote better organized than it is. Look at the condition of the Irish Catholics of this Dominion. Think of it, Irish Catholics, think of it. We are about 500,000 souls in all, and yet what share have we in the making of the laws. Scarcely any. We are politically almost extinct, and instead of six representatives in the Dominion Parliament we ought to have twenty. Just think of it. The 200,000 Irish Catholics in Ontario are unrepresented in Ottawa by a single member. Surely if the genius of Protestantism is to promote civic liberty, as we are told, this ought not to be the case. In the Province of Quebec, where the Protestant population is only 171,000, out of a total population of 1,196,115, still they have 13 members in a House of 65, and six representatives in the Legislative Council of 24. In face of such facts it behoves us to do all we can to quietly organize the Catholic vote. But what is happening here in Canada is happening in Great Britain and Ireland. We hear so much of the liberality of Protestantism, that we are induced to note a few facts for the benefit of the men who think that freedom comes from Protestant institutions.

In Great Britain there are about 2,000,000 of Catholics and there is not one Catholic from Great Britain, in the House of Commons. Some time since Lord Robert Montagu re-

presented an English Constituency, but when he became a convert, he was turned out, and he now sits for an Irish Co.—Westmeath. This is a specimen of civil and religious liberty in England.

In Ireland on the contrary, a good number of Protestant M.P.'s are elected for Catholic Constituencies—Limerick, Cavan, Meath, Galway, Sligo and many others all sending Protestant representatives to plead their cause in the House of Commons. Where is the genius of liberty here?

Look across the border, to New Hampshire, where Catholics are proscribed and where the Constitution of that Protestant State, denies the Catholic people the common rights of citizenship.

And so the question stands, England, Protestant and intolerant; Ireland, Catholic and generous; Ontario, Protestant and intolerant; Quebec, Catholic and generous; New Brunswick, Protestant and bigoted, and—where does the genius of liberty dwell?

In face of all these facts, we welcome Mayor Waller's letter as to the necessity of the "Catholic vote," and while there are a few phrases in his letter which we hesitate to accept, yet on the whole we are glad to notice that he was misrepresented upon what is to us the most important issue—"The Catholic Vote."

THE LATE SISTER FORBES.

Died, at the Mother House, Guy street, on Wednesday 28th ult., Catherine Forbes, aged 73 years and 11 months. We make the announcement with deep regret. Who has not heard of Sister Forbes—who did not esteem her?

"To know her was surely to love her, to name her, but to praise." It falls to the lot of few persons in this world to die so universally regretted, so generally mourned, as did Sister Forbes. She was born in St. Andrews, Ont., in April, 1804, of Scotch parents. She joined the Sisterhood when scarcely eighteen years of age, and since that time she has worked and toiled in the interest of the poor of Montreal. It is a remarkable fact that during the course of her long religious life, she held but three offices. In 1823, the fatal year of the cholera, she succeeded, after various obstacles, in founding an asylum for the orphans of Irish parents, and in the fall of that year she was placed in charge of her young community, on the old premises, Grey Nun street. This position she held for 15 years, at which time she was elected Mistress of Novices. Perhaps no more eloquent tribute of affection can be offered to her memory than the tears shed over her coffin by those whose footsteps she directed in the path of virtue. Many of her novices are now aged nuns, and it was a touching sight to see them cluster around her humble coffin, and take a last look at the features of their beloved mistress.

In the general election of 1833, Sister Forbes was named Superioress of St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum, and that position she held ever since, that is to say, for a period of 23 years. What a long life and what a useful one!

Her equal! The Irish poor of Montreal would find it difficult to believe that an equal could be discovered to Sister Forbes, and we do not blame them. If ever an Angel of Mercy was sent on Earth to dispense graces and blessings to those around her it was Sister Forbes. There never breathed a more self-sacrificing, charitable, and withal humble creature. Thousands of hearts endorse this, and her name will be a household word for years and years to come. We feel we cannot do justice to the many noble qualities of heart and mind possessed by this angelic Sister, but to residents of our city, she was as well-known as she was loved, and to others the fame of her piety must be familiar.

Little then remains in our power but to add our condolences, to those received by the community. A few years ago we were assembled to witness the celebration of Sister Forbes golden wedding—It seemed then as if "Our Mother" was to see many more anniversaries—God ordained otherwise. We can only bow in submission and resignation. Our readers may feel interested in the details of Sister Forbes last illness.—We give them in a few words. On Friday 23rd March she felt unwell, and was removed to the mother house on Guy street. No alarming symptoms appeared until Tuesday evening, when she became suddenly very weak. A doctor was sent for, but even then no fears of immediate danger were entertained. It was deemed prudent, on account of her great age to watch her, and Sister Harkins remained by her bedside all night. The venerable patient never lost consciousness for a single moment, and warned the infirmarian to wake her at three o'clock for mass. A few moments after this, the attending Sister noticed a change in the features, and called some of the nuns, one of whom went for a priest.

The chaplain anointed the dying nun, and about an hour after midnight Sister Forbes