

## 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. '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription from that date.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1871.

## ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE—1871

Friday, 9—Of the Octave.  
Saturday, 10—Of the Octave.  
Sunday, 11—Second after Pentecost.  
Monday, 12—St. John a Baptist, C.  
Tuesday, 13—St. Anthony of Padua, C.  
Wednesday, 14—St. Basil, B. C.  
Thursday, 15—Octave of Corpus Christi.

**THE PROCESSION.**—On Sunday next within the Octave of Corpus Christi, the usual Procession in honor of the Blessed Sacrament will take place. It will gather at the usual hour in front of the Church of Notre Dame, and passing across the Place d'Armes to Craig street, will follow the lines of Sanguinet, Lagachetiere, Visitation, St. Mary, St. Paul, and St. Francois Xavier streets to the place whence it started.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

In our last we reported the entry into Paris of the Versailles troops, and the complete collapse of the insurrection. The victors exercised their rights most rigorously, putting to death, without discrimination of sex, all of the insurgents who fell into their hands, and who were evidently guilty of the crime of arson. Men and women were shot down; and though it is impossible to feel pity for the victims, or to deny that they deserved to die, by every law human and divine, we fear lest the extreme severity of the conquerors excite a sentiment of compassion for the scoundrels of the Commune.

With the collapse of the insurrection the troubles of France do not come to a close. She has now to organize a Government. Perhaps, as seems likely to be the case, she is about to try and resume her ancient political organization under a legitimate monarchy. The Comte de Chambord, grandson of Charles the Tenth, is seriously spoken of as the ruler whom the French will call upon; and as he is now more than fifty years of age, and is childless, his death without issue would leave the Orleans branch in direct line of succession to the throne. This seems the best possible arrangement that can be made; the hereditary principle will be secured; and the restored monarchy will be at once legitimate, and constitutional.

We are not told however, and yet it is very important, under what title, and under what flag, the monarchy is to be reconstituted; whether the chief of the State is to be styled "King of France," or "King of the French?" whether the national flag is to be white, the old *drapeau blanc*, the symbol of legitimate Bourbonism; or the tricolor, the symbol of revolution, the right of insurrection, and elective monarchy? In 1814, when the Bourbons were first restored, they immediately hoisted the old white flag, thereby determining the legitimist and reactionary character of their dynasty, and breaking at once with the revolution, and all its traditions. In 1830 these principles were once more affirmed; and the elected King took as his flag the tricolor, thereby acknowledging that he reigned simply in virtue of the revolution, whose creature he was. It will therefore be of no small importance to determine whether the Comte de Chambord, if recalled, will bring with him the white flag, and consequently the traditions of the old monarchy; or whether by accepting the tricolor, he will identify himself with the revolution and the principles of '89.

M. Thiers is said through the French ambassador at Rome, to have assured the Sovereign Pontiff of the moral support of France against the Piedmontese; but that at the present moment, France is too much exhausted to attempt an armed intervention in behalf of the rights of the Holy See and the Pontifical States. We give below some of the most im-

portant of recent telegrams on the affairs of the Continent of Europe:—

VERSAILLES, June 3.—It is said that a majority of the Assembly favors the proposition for the abrogation of the acts for the banishment of Princes of the house of Bourbon from France, and also proposes to extend the power of Thiers as chief executive for two years.—The streets of Paris have been re-opened for traffic. The barricades have all disappeared, pavements have been repaired, and there is perfect order everywhere. The police are still arresting all suspected parties. Ten Courts-Martial have been established at Cherbourg for the trial of all persons sent there. The *Figaro* estimates the number of men who bore arms in the late insurrection, and who have not been identified or arrested, at 50,000. The Police is in constant danger from violence at their hands. Executions at Versailles are still numerous. Archbishop Darboy was to have been buried on Wednesday. On that day the Assembly would suspend its sessions. The insurgent who commanded the shooting of the Archbishop has been discovered through his own boasting. Another volatile insurgent boasts that the burning of Paris will be considered insignificant when the London Docks with all their wealth are consumed as a grand lesson to the middle classes of Europe. London, Liverpool, and Bristol, will, it is said, be the next scene of secret operations. Papers have been discovered which show that the operations of the Communists were directed from London. An order signed and sealed by the Commune to burn the Hotel de Ville has been discovered. All the Paris journals are discussing the question as to what shall be done with the Orleans Princes. Some appeal to their patriotism, and ask them to resign their seats in the Assembly. Guadon, in *Liberte*, demands the establishment of a liberal republic, after the model of the United States.

Is it to dishonesty, or to thick headed stupidity on the part of the writer, that we are to attribute the signature of "A Roman Catholic" attached to a letter published in the *Montreal Gazette*, wherein the writer "frankly acknowledges" that the late definition of Papal Infallibility has "rather led me to doubt whether there is such a thing in existence as an infallible Church even."

But as there is no middle ground betwixt doubting and disbelieving, so, if the writer of the above doubt whether there be such a thing in existence "as an infallible Church even," he does not believe that there is in existence such a thing; therefore he is a Protestant, not a Roman Catholic, and has no right to sign himself one.

We thank the writer however for this, that in his own person he shows that no one can doubt of Papal Infallibility under the conditions as defined by the General Council of the Vatican, without renouncing the Roman Catholic religion. For if the definitions of the Vatican Council are not to be received as infallibly true, what certitude is there of the truth of the definitions of the Council of Nice? What reason is there for believing the inspiration of the Bible, if the Church which so gives it to us, be herself fallible?

The writer in the *Gazette* has worked himself into a sort of intellectual indigestion, by indulging too freely in second-hand quotations, and by accepting as true all Dr. Dollinger's perversions of ecclesiastical history, and all the latter's bold assertions. It is to this that we must attribute the absolute absence of connection betwixt his premises and his conclusions, and his ignorance or misapprehension of facts. We point out a few of these blemishes:—

It is not true that two General Councils, and several Popes have decided "on the question of Papal Infallibility in a sense contrary to that of the definition on the same subject by the General Council of the Vatican."

It would not follow that, even had Firminian and St. Cyprian when "engaged in a wrong cause," denied the infallibility of the Pope, under certain conditions, therefore, the Pope under the peculiar conditions prescribed by the Council of the Vatican, was fallible. St. Cyprian was a great and godly man; but at one period of his career he was engaged in a bad cause.

We have never seen the work of the "author" whom the writer in the *Gazette* quotes; but if the extract be correctly given, "our author" has not correctly rendered the words of the passage in the Council of Florence to which he refers. Here is the extract as given in the *Gazette*, and attributed by its correspondent to a work by the Rev. Robert Manning, p. 208:—

Again, our author says: "The Council of Florence, in its definition of the Pope's supremacy, tells us expressly that in the person of St. Peter he has received from Our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the whole Church, in such a manner as is expressed in the acts of Ecumenical Councils and the holy Canons."

To this extract the correspondent of the *Gazette* appends the following comments:—"In direct contradiction to this, the Council of the Vatican teaches that 'definitions of the Roman

Pontiff are irrefragable of themselves, and not in virtue of the consent of the Church."

"So that Roman Catholics are now in this position; they are bound under anathema by the Council of Florence to submit to the teachings of the Pope so far as they conform to the decrees of general councils; and they are bound under anathema by the Vatican Council to submit to the teaching of the Pope without its being expressed in the acts of Ecumenical Councils."

Now it so happens that betwixt the mutilated Decree of the Council of Florence, rightly translated, and the definition of the Council of the Vatican, there is, not only no contradiction, or discrepancy, but the most perfect harmony. The true translation of the passage is this:—

"Full power to feed, rule, and govern the whole Church, as is also expressed—*Quemadmodum etiam continetur in Actis of Ecumenical Councils and in the Holy Canons.*"

The words "in such a manner as is expressed" are a forgery, or corruption of the original text, on which Dr. Dollinger relies.—But on this matter we cannot do better than quote the words of the Vatican, Feb. 19, 1870, wherein the dishonest trick by which so many have been deceived, is exposed; and the original text of the Council of Florence is established in its purity:—

"Canon Cecconi, of the Duomo of Florence, who has just published the first part of his *Studi Storici sul Concilio di Firenze con documenti inediti*, has addressed a letter to the *Armonia* in which the impetuosity of Dr. Dollinger receives a prompt and salutary correction. There were, originally, the learned Canon observes, five copies of the Decree of Union signed by the Greeks and Latins. Four have been lost. The one still extant is preserved in the *Biblioteca Laurentiana* of Florence. It is written in two columns, and has the original Greek and Latin signatures. It contains the very clause which Dr. Dollinger says, to the great satisfaction of Protestants, and other adversaries of the Church, was fraudulently altered. The clause *Quemadmodum etiam continetur in Actis of Ecumenical Councils, et in sacris canonibus continetur*, is plainly there. And this is not all. Besides the five originals, many copies of this decree were made at the time. Six of these are still preserved at Florence, and Canon Cecconi states, after personal examination, that each of them contains the same words, *Quemadmodum etiam*. The copy in the British Museum, Mr. Foulkes tells us has also the *Quemadmodum etiam*."—*Vat. Feb. 19th, 1870.*

Where then is there any discrepancy betwixt what the Council of Florence taught with regard to the dignity of the Papacy, and what the Council of the Vatican teaches?

Our correspondent of the *Gazette* also quotes from the writings of Cardinal Wiseman to make it appear that that great man, and sincere Papist, did not hold the doctrine of Papal Infallibility:—

I cannot refrain, however, from quoting a few lines from the late Cardinal Wiseman's lectures on the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church. It occurs in the 8th lecture on the Supremacy of the Pope. He says: "Not only do we know him," (the Pope) "however exalted, to be as much under the curse of Adam as the meanest of his subjects, but we hold him to be exposed to even greater dangers from his very elevation; we believe him to be subject to every usual cause of offence, and obliged to have recourse to the same precautions, and the same remedies, as other frail men."

Here the writer, as do also so many Protestants, confounds Infallibility with Impeccability. No one pretends that the Popes cannot fall into sin, or that they are not as liable to commit transgressions as are other mortal men. The Fathers of the Council of the Vatican never denied this; but they defined, as it is also defined—*Quemadmodum etiam continetur*—in the other Ecumenical Councils and holy canons—that the Pope as successor of St. Peter, has received from our Lord full power to feed, rule, and govern the whole Church, and has therefore received all that is necessary to enable him to execute that divine commission. Now a ruler, teacher and governor who is fallible, and may therefore lead the Church into error would not be worth having; and unless we look upon Our Lord as a charlatan, mocking us with worthless gifts, we must perforce acknowledge him whom He has commissioned to feed, rule, and govern the whole Church, as infallible in his teachings, when from the Chair of Peter, he addresses the whole Church. This was what the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster in substance, taught in all his writings.

\* Mr. Foulkes is a Protestant.

Our remarks the other day that a Catholic was one who believed *all* that the Catholic Church believes and teaches, "on all matters connected with the Christian revelation," because she so believes and teaches; and, not because her teachings are in accordance with the assumptions of his intellect, or private judgment—have provoked the subjoined criticism from our intelligent contemporary the *Montreal Witness*:—

"In other words, no one can be a Catholic (i.e. Roman Catholic) without going it blind; without believing and maintaining that black is white, if so instructed; or that the earth is as flat as a pancake, and that the sun goes round it. We do not know if even the Hindoo has such an extinguisher put upon his mental faculties, and should think that all sensible men would rather be counted out from such a system, leaving it to two classes: first, the smart men who profit by it, and second, the soft ones, who like to be led by the nose."

Certainly. No one can be a Catholic (i.e. a Roman Catholic) without believing that, on all matters connected with the Christian Revelation, the Church is infallible; and that therefore all she teaches on that subject—for on matters not in any way connected with the Christian revelation, or "with the Christian scheme of faith and morals," the Church makes

no pretensions to infallibility—is to be accepted unreservedly, by every one who believes her to be infallible, because the one, only medium by Christ Himself appointed for preserving and promulgating the contents of the Revelation by Him brought down from heaven to man. This is the reason, and the only reason, that any Catholic can give for the faith that is in him.

Now in precisely the same way, the Protestant, who is one degree higher than the Rationalist, and who believes anything in the supernatural order, or the order above reason, so believes on the authority of a book for which he claims, the quality of infallibility. "I believe"—so he will reply to any one asking him to give a reason for the faith that is in him—"I believe this doctrine, not because my senses, or my natural reason assure me of its truth; but because, and only because, this book which I believe to be the Word of God, and which I bought at such or such a book-store, attests its truth."

There is therefore just as much abnegation of reason on the part of such a Protestant, as there is on the part of the Papist. Both, "on all matters connected with the Christian revelation," submit their reason unreservedly to an external authority; and the only difference betwixt them is, as to whether a dead book, or a living Church, be the authority, by Christ Himself appointed, to which men are bound, unreservedly, to submit themselves, and their reason. In the nature of things it cannot be otherwise. Revelation deals exclusively with matters which human reason is incompetent of itself to determine; and it is therefore impossible to accept a Revelation, to conceive even of a Revelation, without admitting at the same time, the existence of some authority above reason, to which we are bound unreservedly to submit ourselves, and which must therefore be infallible; for no one can be bound to unreserved submission to that which is fallible.

Whether that infallible authority be the corporate body called the Church of which the Pope is the visible head upon earth; or whether it be the book called the Bible now being revised by the learned in England?—is a question that may be discussed, and is indeed the one only question to be discussed, betwixt Catholics and Protestants; but that if there be a Revelation from God to man, there is somewhere an infallible, because divinely appointed, authority to tell us wherein that Revelation consists, and to which we are therefore, bound to submit ourselves unreservedly, is what no one not an idiot can for a moment doubt. In short we would ask our critic to put to himself this question:—"Why do I believe that God is One in Three distinct Persons? Is it because that to this conclusion I have been led by my natural reason? or is it because I believe that the doctrine is taught in the Bible?" Indeed, in justice to many of the Protestant sects, it must be said, that when they talk about "private judgment" and its legitimate functions in the domain of the Christian revelation, they do not mean that it is competent to sit in judgment upon the teachings of the Bible, or to determine whether these teachings be true, or false, or exaggerated; but that its legitimate function, the sole function to which it is competent, is simply to determine what the Bible teaches; which, when determined, is to be accepted unreservedly, with entire submission of intellect. We ask the *Witness* if this be not what those Protestants who accept revelation mean, when they talk about "private judgment?"

In the same way do Catholics act as towards the Church, which is the only medium they know of, by Christ Himself appointed, for instructing all nations in the truths of revelation. They pretend to no more right to criticise the dogmatic definitions of their Church, than do "orthodox" Protestants to criticise the teachings of the Bible; but Catholics have this advantage over Protestants:—that whereas the former cannot agree as to what the Bible teaches, there is amongst Catholics no difficulty in determining, no difference of opinion as to, what the Church teaches.

For the rest we need only remark in reply to the silly criticisms of the *Witness*, that, as Revelation does not deal with physics, geology, cosmogony, or any of the natural sciences whose facts human reason is competent to deal with; so the Church never interferes therewith, except in so far as to condemn any theories of the naturalists which contradict the facts of revelation. For instance; the Church would condemn as incompatible with revelation the theories of these physicists who argue that man is only an improved or developed ape; and who thereby deny that God Who made the beasts of the field according to their kind, also created man "to His own image, a living soul—*factus est homo in animam viventem*."

**THE BITTER OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.**—Very bitter indeed to the poor is the observance of Sunday, as enjoined by law in Great Britain, and other Protestant countries. Of this the Police Courts in London have lately furnished a notable instance.

There is still in existence in England a Statute of the time of Charles II.—(motion for its repeal has been made in the House of Commons)—which was passed against Sunday trading, and, as the preamble asserts, with the object of compelling the attendance of the people on the ministrations of the Church by law Established. Not that we are to credit the dominant party in the dissolute reign of the second Charles with any respect for religion, or desire really to promote religious observances; but just as the Puritans, when in power, put down bull-baiting, not—as Macaulay tells us—because the baiting gave pain to the bear, but because it afforded pleasure to the spectators; so the dominant party after the Restoration sought to compel attendance on the Established Church, not because thereby God was honored, but because thereby Catholics, and Protestant non-conformists, were humiliated, and made to feel themselves an inferior race.

This Statute, though it has been left in comparative obscurity, is still in existence; and availing themselves of this, certain smart members of the army of evangelical informers who assume the role of Protestant ministers, and prefix Reverend to their names, make it a point on Sundays of hunting out the dealers in fruits, lolly-pops, and other commodities of that kind, who on Sundays carry on their illegal traffic in the London streets. These poor creatures, who by means of these small commercial operations contrive sometimes to eke out the price of a Sunday's dinner for themselves and hungry children, are by these informers haled before the Court on Monday mornings, and fined, or in default of payment, committed to jail as criminals. A case of this kind that lately occurred has excited much attention, and may it is to be hoped prove instrumental in bringing to an end these abominable laws for the Bitter Observance of the Sabbath, or Saw-a-bbath as it is pronounced in Scotland.

A young Irishwoman of irreproachable character, in so far as appears from the newspaper report of the transaction, was brought up the other day with her infant at the breast, before the magistrate, charged by one of these "reverend" informers with the heinous crime of having sold some fruit, or other trifles on Sunday morning, for the sake of making a few pence for the support of herself and baby, contrary to the provisions of the Statute Car. II. Convicted, and sentenced to the House of Correction, the culprit turned the tables cleverly upon the dirty rascal who had been the means of sending her and her little child to jail, by asking—"how it was that she was to be punished for trying to earn an honest penny by a process which injured no one; whilst her accuser was allowed to pursue his dirty avocation of informer on Sunday, and to make his dishonest livelihood, by running down poor women like her?" This is a difficult question to answer. Surely the Sabbath, if Sunday must still be so called, is as much dishonored by the informer who on that day plies his usual trade—that of hunting out the violators of ancient Statutes—as it is by the selling of oranges, ginger beer, and sugar candy, by a few poor women, in the streets.

The rich do not feel these laws. The wealthy have their servants and their own horses and carriages, wherein gorgeously, and in the spirit of a shoddyocracy, they drive about on Sundays whithersoever it listeth them. But alas! for the poor. To them all amusements are forbidden; the very breath of heaven is grudged them on that day; and the purse proud Pharisee who has perhaps been busy cheating his neighbors all the week, and calling it business, holds up his hands in horror at the poor widow woman who dares to sell a few oranges on Sunday. Very Bitter to the poor are Protestant Sabbath observances.

As a specimen of the petty falsehoods which habitually the *Montreal Witness* employs to bring odium and scandal upon Catholic ecclesiastics, we may point out that, to his report of the trial of the two scoundrels who swindled Mr. Woods of this City out of some watches and jewellery on the 21st of April last, and of whom one assumed the name of the Rev. Dr. Sackville, the *Witness* prefixes the caption "*Larceny By Ecclesiastics*," though he well knew that both the criminals were laymen, and had no connection of any kind with the Catholic Church, or any of her office bearers. The thing is in itself of little importance, and worth noting only to show to what dirty tricks the mean fellow who edits the *Witness* will resort in order to indulge his hatred of Catholicity.

Since, however, one of the two swindlers called himself Captain de Chatillon, it would have been just as truthful to have reported their trial, under the caption of "*Larceny by Military Officers*," but then this might have brought the *Witness* into a row with some military men jealous of the honor of their cloth, and might have made his back acquainted with a very useful article, and one much needed in his case, vulgarly known as a horsewhip. Now though a most unscrupulous liar as against priests,