

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,

At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.

To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1852.

We most earnestly request of our Subscribers to remit to us, without delay, the amounts due to this Office.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The proceedings in Parliament, during the past week, have been singularly barren of interest. Indeed, they may almost be called *dull*, and dull they would have been, had it not been for the amusement afforded by the vagaries of that very eccentric senator, the member for Nottingham, who, by way of enlivening the debate, varied the dull routine, by pitching into his neighbors, right and left, poking them in the ribs, and indulging in practices which were, to say the least, very unparliamentary; the hon. member has been committed to the care of the Serjeant-at-Arms, and will probably be transferred to a lunatic asylum.

Mr. Horsman, not contented with the ministerial *bonâ fide* enquiry into the case of the Rev. Mr. Bennett, and the alleged misconduct of the Government Bishop of Bath and Wells, in instituting the above-named reverend gentleman to the vicarage of Frome, has felt himself obliged to bring the case again before the notice of the House, and to state the additional facts which have come to his knowledge. These are—that Mr. Bennett had attended Mass at Kessengen, “and had travelled upon the continent with a consecrated stone (?) in his possession, as Catholics were accustomed to do.”—Mem.—We have heard of a man going about “with a brick in his hat,” but we were really not aware that it was the custom for Papists to travel about the continent with “consecrated stones” in their possession.—However, from the fact of his having attended Mass, and gone about with a “consecrated stone” in his possession, Mr. Horsman triumphantly concluded that the Rev. Mr. Bennett was not at all the man for Frome, and that the Government Bishop of Bath and Wells had been guilty of gross dereliction of duty in instituting him as Vicar of that very intelligent and evangelical parish. Mr. Gladstone attacked Mr. Horsman, and Sir J. Pakington retaliated by giving it to the poor Government Bishop. On a division, Mr. Horsman’s motion for an enquiry, was carried against the Ministry, by a majority of 44—the numbers being 155 to 111.

No practical results, from this victory of the Low Church party, are likely to be realised during the present Parliament; its days are numbered, and the 26th ult., was spoken of as the day when her Majesty was to inform her faithful Commons that she had no more demand for their services. But, for the fun of the thing—just to see how a Government Bishop will act, when summoned before the bar of the House of Commons to give an account of himself, and of the manner in which he exercises his spiritual (?) functions—it is greatly to be hoped that Mr. Horsman will renew his motion during the ensuing Session of Parliament. Mr. Bennett may, perhaps, plead that, however supreme and absolute may be the spiritual authority of the Queen, or rather of the House of Commons, in England, that authority does not extend beyond her Majesty’s dominions; that the spiritual allegiance of every baptised person is due to the Bishop of the diocese in which he is, for the time being, residing; and that, as no Bishop can have any authority or jurisdiction in any other Bishop’s diocese, he, Mr. Bennett, whilst at Kessengen, was absolved from all allegiance to his Anglican Diocesan, and bound to submit himself to the authority of the Bishop of the diocese in which he found himself; and that, therefore, it was as much his duty, whilst in a Catholic country, to go to Mass, and conduct himself like a good Catholic, even to the carrying about with him a “consecrated stone,” as when, in Protestant England, it was his duty to worship God by Act of Parliament, to believe according to Statute, and to do as the Pope as the Man of Sin. Much fun will yet flow from this motion of Mr. Horsman.

The most remarkable circumstance connected with politics during the past week, is the appearance of Mr. D’Israeli’s address to the electors of Buckingham, in which the eloquent, but versatile Chancellor of the Exchequer sings his palinody, and proclaims to the world the abandonment, by the Derby administration, of the Protectionist policy. The following are amongst the most important paragraphs from this quasi-official document:—

“The time has gone by when the injuries which the great producing interests endure can be alleviated or removed by a recurrence to the laws which, previously to 1846, protected them from such calamities. The spirit of the age tends to free intercourse, and no statesman can disregard with impunity the genius of the epoch in which he lives. But every principle of abstract justice and every consideration of high policy counsel that the producer should be treated as fairly as the consumer, and intimate that when the native producer is thrown into unrestricted competition with external rivals, it is the duty of the legislature in every way to diminish, certainly not to increase, the cost of production.

“It is the intention of her Majesty’s ministers to

recommend to parliament, as soon as it is in their power, measures which may effect this end.

“One of the soundest means, among others, by which this result may be accomplished is a revision of our taxation. The times are favorable to such an undertaking; juster notions of taxation are more prevalent than heretofore; powerful agencies are stirring, which have introduced new phenomena into finance, and altered the complexion of the fiscal world; and the possibility of greatly relieving the burthens of the community, both by adjustment and reduction, seems to loom in the future.

“But nothing great can be effected by any ministry unless they are supported by a powerful majority in parliament.”

By the “Atlantic,” we learn that her Majesty has been graciously pleased to prohibit Catholic ecclesiastics, and members of religious orders, from exercising any of the rites or ceremonies of Catholic worship, except within doors, and from wearing the habits of their order in public; this fresh proof of her Majesty’s regard for civil and religious liberty, will not fail to endear her, and her Government, to her Majesty’s Catholic subjects. Of course, the prohibition does not extend to ministers, and mountebanks, of the holy Protestant faith, who, from stumps and inverted tubs, are, and have long been, accustomed publicly to perform the rites of the holy Protestant religion—said rites, consisting in insulting Catholics, and telling lies about the Church of Christ. The proclamation has been issued, but it remains to be seen whether any Government will dare to enforce it, or if a man, whether layman or ecclesiastic, can be prevented from walking about the streets in any costume he may think fit to adopt. It was a difficult job, after the 45, to compel the Highlanders to encase their nether limbs in the bifurcated garment of the Saxon, in spite of the cruelties and atrocities perpetrated by the Hanoverian Government upon the brave and loyal adherents of their exiled sovereign; and, if we know aught of the temper of the Catholics of the British Empire, it will be a still more difficult task to compel obedience to a law which forbids the Catholic priest to wear his time-honored vestments, whenever, and wherever he thinks fit. But, now, that gracious Majesty is deigning to occupy herself with the wearing apparel of priests and religious, what mighty revolutions in costume may we not soon expect? Will her Majesty come out strong as a Bloomer, or as an anti-Bloomer? Will she encase herself in Albert’s princely—“Oh-no-we-never-mention-them”—or will she, by gracious proclamation, reinstate the petticoat in possession of its former dignity? These are important points to which, when her Majesty shall have satisfactorily settled the question of ecclesiastical garments, we hope she will turn her royal attention. We have an Albert hat, why not a Victoria pantaloons, or *culottes à la Reine*? Shall not that supreme authority which can make or unmake Bishops, and proclaim articles of Faith, decide upon the cut of a coat, or the orthodox dimensions of a pair of breeches?

Turning from these impertinent, but, thank God, impotent attempts at interference with the rights of Papists, it is pleasant to contemplate the cool, and calmly majestic demeanor of the Catholic Church. Whilst Royal Proclamations are being launched at her,—whilst from Senate-house and Meeting-house,—from the pulpit, the tribune, and the pot-shops, her enemies assail her with abuse—despising the *brutum fulmen* of the one, and scorning to notice the low ribaldry of the other, she still holds on her way, relying upon the assistance of Him who promised that the “gates of hell should never prevail against her.” Acts of Parliament prohibit her, and declare the exercise of their functions, by the successors of the Apostles, felony, and she answers Acts of Parliament and Penal Laws, by summoning her Bishops to meet in Holy Synod, there to take such measures, and to devise such plans, as to them in their wisdom, shall seem best, in order to set at defiance the malice, and to counteract the machinations of her foes; this is the only answer the Church deigns to afford to Protestant Legislators. On Tuesday next, the 6th inst., for the first time for many centuries, the Bishops of England will meet in Provincial Synod, at St. Mary’s College, Oscott; and, whilst the Prelates of the Catholic Church are there assembled, and deliberating—whilst kneeling before the altar, the faithful are giving thanks to the Most High, that He in His mercy has been pleased once more to restore England to the rank of a Christian and Catholic country,—whilst the fanatics of Exeter Hall are clamorously invoking the arm of the civil power to repress the audacious aggressions of God’s Holy Spirit, and the Government Bishops—the pampered menials of the State Establishment—are humbly, yet in vain, craving permission from Parliament, and Lords of the Treasury, and Downing street officials to meet in Convocation and set their house in order,—we, the children of the One, Holy, Catholic Church, should join our prayers to the prayers of our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, that every power that presumes to set itself in opposition to that Church may be put to shame, and that all the deliberations of her assembled Prelates, may redound to the honor and glory of God’s most holy name, and the good of His Church. For this purpose, and in order to excite the pious ardor of the faithful, his Lordship the Bishop of Salford has addressed the following circular to all the priests in his diocese:—

Ad Clerum.

“Rev. and dear Sir—We have received official notice that the ‘Provincial Synod’ will be solemnly opened on the 6th day of July. In order to implore the light of the Holy Spirit upon the Bishops therein assembled, we direct the Collect, &c., ‘*De Spiritu Sancto*,’ to be added after Mass, after the conclusion of the Jubilee in our diocese until the termination of the ‘Synod.’ We also appoint that the hymn ‘*Veni Creator Spiritus*,’ with the versicle and prayer, be sung or recited in Latin or in English before the principal Mass on all Sundays and holidays during the same period. You will also request the prayers of

your flocks that the Holy Spirit will deign to enlighten our mind, that so whatever may be done by us may be done for the greater honor and glory of God, and for the welfare of the holy Church.”

From France we have little of interest. M. Courgeon, Professor of History at the College of Bourdeaux, has declined to take the oath of allegiance to the President. Several other functionaries, amongst whom one naval officer is mentioned, have followed the example of the Professor.

The affairs of Switzerland are becoming more and more complicated. By the telegraphic report of the news brought by the “Atlantic,” we learn that on the 1st June,

“The Federal flag of Switzerland was brought from Basle to the city of Neuchâtel, and set up in the centre of a square formed by officers of the Canton. The Major of the Neuchâtel Rifle corps then addressed the officers, calling on them to be true to that flag, and, if necessary, the Federal Government would assist them in maintaining their independence.—A large crowd witnessed the ceremony.”

The telegraph from Washington on the 29th ult., announces the death of Mr. Clay:—

WASHINGTON, June 29.

“Although Mr. Clay’s death has been momentarily expected for this some time, those in attendance on him did not seem to think this event so near. He seemed to be perfectly resigned, and died with the utmost composure at a quarter-past eleven o’clock today.”

The Kossuth mania in the United States has, by this time, pretty generally subsided. The “great patriot” appears before the people in his true colors, and is now known as the “great humbug;” in a word, the man has been for some months before the public, and is now thoroughly known and appreciated. The N. Y. correspondent of the *Montreal Pilot* thus describes the late wretched failure of the attempt to revive the Kossuth excitement by a great meeting, and talk at the Tabernacle, on the evening of Monday the 23rd ult.:

“The fact cannot be concealed, however, that the enthusiasm in the cause of Hungary, which spread itself so rapidly on Kossuth’s arrival in America, has been lately declining with equal rapidity. He returned to New York, after his recent tour, scarcely noticed. The nation on reflection has found out that ‘hero worship’ is not the soundest policy.—Some still seek, and doubtless with sufficient honesty, to prolong the excitement; but the public mind has pronounced emphatically against their efforts. Intervention is a thing impossible; and the mission of Kossuth, so far as that is concerned, could not have proved anything else than a failure.”

THE JESUITS AND THE MONTREAL WITNESS AGAIN.

In a late issue, we flattered ourselves that we had given as plain, and as explicit a denial of the infamous libel published by the *Montreal Witness* against the Jesuits, as possible. We were not sanguine enough to hope that any thing we could say, or do, would suffice to induce our evangelical cotemporary to enact the part of a straight forward, and honest man, or to follow the line of conduct pointed out to him—viz., either to prove, or to retract his scurrilous accusation, and the event has shewn how accurately we had estimated our opponent’s character. His reply to us consists of nine paragraphs, to each of which we shall give a short and concise answer.

The first three paragraphs contain the writer’s profession of faith, as to the Jesuits, Monks, Nuns, Priests, and religious generally. He believes the Jesuits to be capable of anything. He believes that no Monk or Nun, can leave his, or her, convent, or order, without undergoing great and dangerous persecutions. He believes that Jesuits and Priests can incite their followers to use any amount of intimidation and violence, so craftily, that it is next to impossible to prove their complicity—(we should like to hear his opinion of the noble-minded Protestant ministers of Boston, who excited their equally noble-minded followers to burn the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, on the night of the 11th August 1834, and to insult and outrage the inmates, a few charitable ladies, whose lives were dedicated to the worship of God, and the service of their fellow creatures.) Finally, our cotemporary assures us that he believes that the “individual alluded to”—but without mentioning who the “individual alluded to is”—“escaped from among the Jesuits, and was afterwards, in various ways, cajoled, threatened, and molested by Roman Catholics (whether at the instigation of the Jesuits or not, would be difficult to prove) until he, and those with whom he had taken refuge, believed his personal safety endangered, and he had to flee to the States.” It will be seen, that in this recapitulation, our cotemporary omits the gravest part of the original charge against the Jesuits. “At last he was entrapped and taken back, but escaped again,” and that (the individual in question) was in dread of being either “murdered, or taken to the cells of the new *Holy office*”—he has dropped the recapturing part of the business—and concludes by asking, whether “he is to understand the TRUE WITNESS as affirming, authoritatively, that the person in question was never among the Jesuits, wearing their garb; that he did not escape from, or leave them, and that they made no efforts to get him back, or to drive him away from the country?”

Upon our cotemporary’s belief we have but this little to say: firstly, if he really believes all that he says he does, he is a greater goose than we took him to be, and we never had a very exalted opinion of his intellectual faculties; secondly—that because he is credulous enough to believe all the silly lies that he has enumerated, that gives him no right to avail himself of the accident of possessing types, and a press, in order to publish these, his silly conceits, to the world, as truths. To his questions we reply as follows:—When he shall have informed us who “the person in question” is, we shall be able to answer his query, as to “whether he ever was among the Jesuits?” We

affirm, authoritatively, that no person, whether member of the order of Jesuits, or inmate of their establishment, has ever *escaped*, or *run away*, from them, in the ordinary acceptance of the words—that is, has ever left the college of the Jesuits, surreptitiously, or violently, or that any person has ever left the establishment without the knowledge and hearty concurrence of the Superior, and other members of the Order. Although, with his usual candor, the editor of the *Montreal Witness* classes *escaping*, and *leaving* as one and the same thing, we beg leave to remark that they are essentially different, and convey two totally opposite ideas. We will illustrate our meaning. We believe that our cotemporary was once a resident in, if not a native of, Scotland. Would he think that we gave a fair account of his exodus from his native land, or did justice to his many excellencies, if we were to speak of him as having “escaped from Glasgow,” or “run away from Scotland?” Would he not have cause to complain that we placed him in a very unenviable light? he would at once perceive the difference between *escaping*, *running away*, and simply *leaving*. We can not say whether the “individual in question” has left the Jesuits, because we must first be told who the “individual in question” is. Individuals constantly arrive at, and leave the Jesuit’s College—it is an affair of every day occurrence; but, as we said before, we distinctly assert that no person has *escaped* or *run away* from the Jesuits—that is, has left them without their knowledge and consent, first asked and obtained, since the first establishment of the order in Montreal; and that the Jesuits have never made any efforts, directly, or indirectly, by themselves, or by others, to induce any person that has ever left them, to return to them, or else to leave the country. We trust that this time we have been clear and explicit enough.

In his fifth paragraph our cotemporary complains that we do not “say a word more about Savings Banks;” well, perhaps, we shall leave him nothing to complain of on that score. If he challenges us we will give to the world some extracts from the Parliamentary Report upon the said Montreal Provident and Savings Bank, for which, we assure him in advance, that his friends will have no cause either to thank us, or him. We will prove, firstly—that the failure of that Bank was occasioned by the gross dishonesty of the Directors, who lent the money of the poor depositors to their friends and relatives, and made use of their influence, as Directors, to compel the Bank to purchase their almost worthless, and certainly, greatly depreciated Railroad Stock, at a price far exceeding its value, thereby entailing a serious loss upon the depositors, and feathering their own nests, at the expense of the public—that Directors of the Bank used the money of depositors for electioneering purposes, and lent the money of the poor widows and orphans, in order to secure the votes of the electors for the city of Montreal; these and similar mal-practices on the part of the Directors, we will prove, by unimpeachable testimony—from the Parliamentary Report, published last Summer by order of the Legislative Assembly. We will prove, also, that, gross as was the dishonesty which caused the failure of the Bank, the dishonesty of those who were charged with winding up its affairs was, if possible, still more glaring. We assure our cotemporary that before we are done with the subject, he and his evangelical friends will curse the folly of the *Montreal Witness*, that provoked us to make the exposure. Perhaps our cotemporary imagines that all the copies of the Report have been bought up and destroyed; he is mistaken.

In the sixth paragraph, the TRUE WITNESS is upbraided with not noticing the case of poor Marcotte, who, according to the *Montreal Witness*, was sued by a “rich parish Corporation,” or *Fabrique*. “for masses, &c., at his father’s funeral”—and who died in consequence of the annoyance and vexation thereby produced. We did not notice this complaint against the said “rich parish Corporation,” for two reasons, of which it will be sufficient to give one, and that is—that the story bears “lie” imprinted on the face of it, as any one acquainted with the customs of the Catholic Church must at once perceive. The *Fabrique*, or “Parish Corporation,” (and if our cotemporary will take the trouble to enquire he may easily satisfy himself as to the accuracy of our assertions) has nothing whatever to do with the saying of “masses,” or with the trilling sum that is paid for them, and, consequently, has no legal power to sue for their amount, and therefore, never did sue for them. The payment of the price of a mass is an affair solely between the parishioner and the *Curé*, and one with which the *Fabrique*, or Parish Corporation, has nothing whatever to do: the latter provides the ornaments used at the funeral, the *drop mortuaire*, the hangings, or draperies, the wax-lights, furnishes the bell ringer, charges for the bell ringing and other incidental expenses, which are all regulated by the individual who conducts the funeral of the deceased. These expenses may be small or great, but the man who regulates them has no cause to complain if he is subsequently compelled to pay for his love of ostentation, and desire of having a brilliant and pompous funeral; neither is it surprising that the *Fabrique*, the Corporation which furnishes the goods ordered and consumed, should demand payment, and that, if not paid, it should take legal steps to recover its dues.—However, we know nothing personally of Marcotte or the *Fabrique* of Cap Sante; but we will endeavor to obtain the particulars.

It is true that we have not a word in reply to our cotemporary’s very impudent letter to his Lordship the Bishop of Montreal. We are not aware that it is customary for gentlemen in the position of the latter, to notice such silly impertinencies, and, assuredly, what his Lordship does not think it necessary to do for himself, we have not the presumption to do for him. The old proverb says—“a cat may look at a