

The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 195, Fortification Lane, 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.

MONTEAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1874.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR. AUGUST—1874. Friday, 28—St. Augustine, B. C. D. Saturday, 29—Beholding of St. John Baptist. Sunday, 30—Fourteenth after Pentecost. Monday, 31—St. Raymond Nonnatus, C.

SEPTEMBER—1874. Tuesday, 1—St. Giles, C. Wednesday, 2—St. Stephen, C. Thursday, 3—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

A WORD TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS. We would wish now in the commencement of our twenty-fifth editorial year to draw the special attention of our subscribers, as to the necessity of paying up all arrears. We are determined on giving them a paper worthy of this Catholic city and its Catholic subscribers in every part of the country; but we must be assisted, and we ask for nothing but our own. We have always been reluctant to go as far as law proceedings, so we would urgently request to have all arrears forwarded to this office at once.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Legal proceedings have been instituted against Le Temps, Nationale, and Le Bien Public, because of publication of M. Bazaine's letter in relation to his escape. The proceedings are based upon the law prohibiting the printing of articles signed by persons deprived of civil and political rights. Marshal Bazaine has written a letter to the Minister of the Interior in which he says that neither Col. Villette nor any of the other prisoners now in custody are responsible for his escape from prison. He declares that he had no accomplice in the fort or elsewhere except his wife and nephew. The Marshal describes how he eluded the surveillance of his jailer, and in conclusion says: "Resenting the humiliating prison regulations, I felt justified in my attempt to recover my liberty. As I was not tried by my peers, my sentence was illegal." Russia has refused to recognize the Spanish Republic, which has caused other powers to hold back. Germany and Austria, however, are said to have forwarded credentials to their representatives at Madrid. A Russian Prince named William Radzine has become a Catholic. In Russia all converts to Catholicity forfeit their property and lose all prospects of favours from the government. The Spanish Government has made a claim on the United States for indemnity in the affair of the Virginias, and for other alleged wrongs. The American Government declares Spain's position in the matter to be untenable, and replies by counter claims. The War Department of Spain has signed a contract for 130,000 American loading rifles. Spanish advices by way of Paris report a Ministerial crisis at Madrid, and Sagasta and Contaran are expected to quit the Cabinet, also that the inhabitants of Madrid refuse to submit to a fresh conscription. In consequence of the confiscation of property of the Carlists by the Spanish Government, Prince Alphonso, brother of Don Carlos, has issued an order to the troops under his command, announcing that retaliative measures will be taken. The British Foreign Office has received information that the Spanish Republican troops have fired upon some officers of the British war ship Fly, which is cruising off the north coast of Spain for the protection of British interests. None wounded. Five hundred people have been thrown out of employment by the burning of a stocking factory at Nottingham, England, the monetary loss on which is half a million dollars. In Hong Kong, a very severe typhoon raged on Saturday. Great damage was done to property on shore and shipping in the harbor, and a considerable number of natives lost their lives.

VOX POPULI, AUT VOX DEI.—By a Layman. John Durie and Son, Ottawa.

We have read this little tract with some attention and no little amazement, and so have come to look on it as a sort of moral, or rather intellectual, monster. A most rare monster: faith, with its two voices: the one Catholic, or very like a Catholic voice; the other intensely Protestant, as Protestant in short as the most devoted frequenter of Exeter Hall should desire to listen to. With one voice he speaks well of the Church, with the other or backward voice, he utters foul Protestant breath, and detracts. The author is an enigma, and though if he be logical, he must at last become a Romanist, this only can we say for certain, that at the time of writing he was intensely Protestant. Protesting against him whom he calls his bishop, and as far from the Catholic Church, as the Reformers whom he vilipends.

Before he can become a Catholic, he must renounce utterly, and for ever the right of "private judgment;" and so long as he pretends to be competent to determine truth for himself, by the exercise of that judgment, and from the study of what was the order and doctrine of the "primitive church," he is as thoroughly a Protestant as are the good people of whom he disdainfully speaks, p. 10, as worshipping God after the fashion of some bog district in the north of Ireland, and imported to Canada by the people's churchwarden, who played the clarinet in the choir, whilst a wash head basin did duty as a font, and for a chalice the worshippers were content to avail themselves of a pewter pot.

We will instance our meaning. At page 10 the author speaks with his Catholic voice:—"The One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Bride of Christ, the Infallible Pillar and Ground of the Truth. "This Great living body is Ours."

Now listen to the Protestant voice:—"No matter how a branch of the Church may ignore or obscure any one dogma or rite, it does not bind the whole Church to its views, any more than it does an individual member in its communion who is at perfect liberty to repudiate any denial, or gloss on the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints."—p. 12. "If this faith will not admit of any diminution, neither will it allow any accretion to the deposit of divine truth; and if any branch or private member builds upon the one foundation any opinion which the Church does not teach, it is perfectly competent for any other branch, or member to protest against the heresy, even though a majority may believe in it."—p. 13.

"In this the Church of England is perfectly Catholic. In protesting against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome she is at one with the Eastern Church which equally denies such authority"—though at the Council of Florence speaking by her Bishops the Orientals fully and explicitly acknowledged such authority.

Again the author speaks with his Catholic voice when he says, p. 15, that:—"As Protestantism is mere incipient Rationalism, the first duty of Catholicism is to throttle. To this end the Church herself must be heard. She must speak with authority, and tell her children what is right, and what is wrong." The Italics are our own.

But to speak at all the Church must have some organ of speech. If she be, as our author evidently assumes no longer One, but broken, or split up into branches, any one of which may err, every one of which indeed has erred; and which are not in communion with one another—how can she speak at all? where is her mouth? If Lambeth or Constantinople have the right to repudiate what Rome tells her children is right; if Rome be not bound by what Lambeth says, nor the latter by the dogmatic utterances of Constantinople, where is the authority of the Church? of that "ONE INFALLIBLE GUIDE" our author speaks of? A Church without a mouth, or organs of speech is a dumb Church and might as well be dead. Now we put it to our Anglican friend to tell us, where, or what, is the mouth of the "One infallible Church" from which he must learn "what is right, and what is wrong" in the present day? If there be no such mouth or vocal organ, competent to speak infallibly on the controversies of the nineteenth century, then is the Church virtually dead, and the promise of Christ a lie; if there be such a vocal organ, and if it be not at Rome, then where or what is it?

And again; when on the same page the author tells us that the Church when speaking "must appeal to primitive use" when she claims to be heard, and to lay down the laws, he betrays his crass ignorance, his incapacity to grasp the very first principle of Catholicity. When the Church speaks, when to-day she tells the world "this is true and to be believed; this is false and to be rejected," she does so, not by appealing to the past, but to the present, ever present Holy Spirit within her, guiding her to the knowledge of all truth; in the nineteenth century as in the first; and whose organ or mouth-piece she is. There is no need for the Church, when speaking to say more than this: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;" and we listen to her and believe her, not because we in our private judgment feel assured that what she teaches accords with Primitive Truth, but because we know that what she teaches must accord with all truth, ancient and modern simply because she so teaches. The Church in the first and second centuries was no more infallible than she is to-day; the Church of to-day is competent to speak with authority and without appealing to the past because she is in the days of Pius IX, as infallible, as she was in the days when St. Peter, and St. James were actually presiding over her synods—unless indeed the gates of hell have since then prevailed against her.

We speak of the author of the protest against the Protestant Bishop of Huron's charge, as being himself a Protestant, and intensely Protestant. We do so because although he may hold on to many points of Catholic truth, he does so by the exercise of his private judgment, and not upon the Catholic principle of submission to a living authority. A Catholic might of course differ with his Bishop; but in such a case the Catholic layman would appeal to some authority higher than any individual

What does the man mean by "branches" if the Church be "Ours?"

Bishop, to decide the controversy—to the Archbishop or to Rome. But who is to decide between the Protestant Bishop of Huron, and his Protesting diocesan? who though styling himself a "Layman" yet boasts—p. 23,— "that we will not be hindered in teaching others what we know to be the Faith."

So in this comical "Branch" of the One Church, the laymen are teachers, the bishops, poor simple men, the taught.

One or two minor absurdities—absurd at least from a Catholic stand point, we will venture to indicate. We have noticed the absurdity of the Branch theory and its utter incompatibility with the doctrine of a Church, One and Indivisible—such as Christ appointed to teach all nations, and need say no more. The Branch theory is in short but a variation of the National Church theory; and the term Branch or National Church, is the contradictory of the term Catholic Church.

But we will point out the absurdity, on the part of one calling himself a Catholic, a member of the Church which recognises no ethnological, no national, no political lines of demarcation, of the assumption that "in an English speaking colony," the Church which he calls Roman, "is devoid of mission," and has an "intruded jurisdiction." How can the spiritual authority of the Bishops shops in Canada who receive their mission and their jurisdiction from Rome, be affected by the consideration whether Canada be a French, or an English speaking colony? But for the fortune of war, Canada might still be a French speaking colony; the Bishops named by the Pope would be even according to the Anglican theory the true Bishops. Will our author seriously maintain the proposition that, by a military or political accident; by reason of a battle won, or a battle lost; because of a Treaty concluded between secular Powers, the spiritual status of a Bishop or priest can be affected, or that the spiritual allegiance of the faithful can be transferred from one authority to another? Did the victory of Wolfe, and the consequent Treaties between France and England, which gave Canada to England, deprive the then Bishop of Quebec, or his successors of their rightful spiritual authority, of their mission, or rightful jurisdiction? From whom did the Bishop of Huron derive his mission, or right of spiritual jurisdiction?

Again our author errs grievously when he pretends that the so-called Orders of the government church of England are recognised as valid either by the Oriental schismatics, or by any members, large or small hearted—of what he calls the Western Branch, if by that term he means those who look upon the Pope, because successor of St. Peter, as the Vicar of Christ. No Roman Catholic can admit the validity of Anglican Orders, since his Church has, by implication, declared them to be null and void in that ministers of the Anglican sect admitted into the Catholic Church, are always ordained, if it be their desire to serve at her altars; whilst it is a doctrine of the same Church that Orders cannot be conferred twice on the same person and that re-Ordination like re-Baptism would be a sacrilege. Therefore whilst on one converts from any of the Protestant sects the Church, as a salutary precaution, confers only conditional baptism, (because the baptism even of the ministers of the Anglican denomination or other heretics) is—other things being observed—a true and valid baptism; the Ordination conferred upon converts from Anglicanism is always absolute and unconditional. This is conclusive that the Western Branch considers Anglican Orders as upon a par with Methodist or Baptist Orders, and looks upon Anglican bishops and ministers as simple laymen.

For the rest the pamphlet is written with much ability, and in a gentlemanly and scholarly spirit. The author, if, by the Grace of God, he be enabled to purge his bosom of its perilous stuff, that is to say, of his absurd idea that the One Catholic Church, the Ground and Pillar of Truth, the Infallible Guide is split up into Branches; all fallible; none having the right or power to speak with authority—since every one is at liberty in virtue of his private judgment to repudiate what any one Branch teaches; having no common, no universally recognised living organ or mouth piece by means of which the Church of to-day may speak with authority, and in the midst of the prevailing confusion "tell her children what is right"—if we say by the Grace of God he can once get rid of this supremely absurd, and anti-Catholic conception of the Church, we have no doubt that in a short time he will get rid of the rest of his Protestantism, his reliance on private judgment, his silly habit of appealing to a dead past, and will seek reconciliation with the living Church, one to-day, infallible to-day, and altogether ignorant of the Branch theory to-day, as she was when in that upper chamber in Jerusalem, the Holy Ghost descended from on high on the heads of the Apostles to enable them and their successors to teach all nations, whether English speaking or French speaking, even to the end of time.

The fourth and last session of the first Manitoba Parliament closed on the 22nd of July.

Is the Pope a Prisoner?—Since the occupation of Rome by the Turin government and the consequent restriction of His Holiness to the Vatican, many of our Protestant papers have sought to deny that the Pope is in any way a prisoner. Facts however being against them, they have recourse to ridicule, and make merry at the Pope's expense. "The holy old man is emulous of a martyr's fame." "His self imposed captivity." Because Peter is not in chains, Peter they say is free. Well! we do not blame them for thus endeavouring to hoodwink their readers. In fact we rather like them for it. It shows that shame at least is left to them. They feel their condition and seek to cover it. There is hope of them yet. That the Inquisition should exist so late into the 19th century, and that that inquisition should be this time a Protestant one, and not a Catholic one, is so damnable that we do not wonder at their anxiety to conceal it. In fact, as we said before, we rather like them for it. But alas! for this concealment the semi-official Liberta has been so indiscreet, as to speak the truth, and Europe now knows, that Pius IX, acted wisely in confining himself to the Vatican. Jew Arbib says: "Though Pius IX, might have safely walked or driven in Rome, in the early days of his self imposed captivity, Government (Jew Arbib speaks for the government mind you) will not be answerable for the consequences should the Pontiff now attempt to quit his palace."

This is sufficiently conclusive then for the present time. Now at least the Pope is a prisoner. The government and Jew Arbib admit it, and give him notice accordingly. But what of "the early days of his captivity," Jew Arbib? How long a period do they comprise? How long was he certainly not a prisoner? How long was his captivity doubtful? And when did it cease to be any longer doubtful and to be a bona fide captivity in every sense of the word? These are all questions which immediately arise on this refreshing admission of the Jew Arbib in his paper sacred to Liberty. Meanwhile prudent men will find in this admission a confirmation of their belief that the Pope—our Protestant papers to the contrary notwithstanding—has always, since the first days of the Bomba usurpation, been in fact and in deed a prisoner in the Vatican, and that the denial hitherto of this fact has arisen from a want of moral courage to acknowledge that under an Italian liberal Government an Italian Inquisition exists in regenerated Italy, even so late as the 74th year of the 19th century.

Another question which will naturally arise in the mind from this admission is: if that Government for which the Jew Arbib speaks, cannot guarantee to the Pope, whom it looks upon only as a subject, that safety and immunity from outrage, which every good citizen has a right to demand, why does not that Government go about its business? A government that cannot keep order is no government, and an admission of the fact is a virtual abdication. Every true citizen must look upon that government as an incalculable and obstructionist which coolly and calmly confesses that it has no longer power to guarantee order. Jew Arbib! has given a cruel blow in the eyes of all honest men, to King Bomba and his unregenerate government! Had King Bomba come to Rome in the days of the Papal protectorate, Pope Pius IX, would have guaranteed him the most perfect immunity from the slightest insult or disrespect with so much more firm a hand did the "weak old man of the Vatican" hold the reins, than the sportsman King whose ancestors bought from King Sigismund their feudal title of Duke of Savoy, for a few pieces of gold and six hunting dogs. SACRADOS.

RICHMOND STATION, AUG. 18, 1874.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

MR. EDITOR.—In his last paper, the Editor of the Richmond Guardian, the famous W. E. Jones, has thought proper to place before his readers the leading features of the bill of education, and at the same time to appreciate it in his usual manner.—From the few words which read as follows: "It will be seen that so far as Roman Catholic schools are concerned, they are placed by it more completely than ever under a Clerical control even as regards scientific education; but few, however, who are conversant with the lessons of history, and experience will venture to hold out any hope of an improvement in the educational and intellectual standard of the French Canadians of the Province under such circumstances," one can easily judge of the little progressive and religious spirit with which Mr. Jones is animated, as well as of his shortsightedness in educational proceedings.

In reply, if a reply can be given through your paper, as I presume it can, I would say, Mr. Editor, that this projected bill of education, which places the teachings of our schools both religious and literary, under the wholesome control of our clergy, is the greatest boon of our time, since it has in view the one grand object which is to fully train up youths at one for religion and society. Let Mr. Jones bear in mind that religion constitutes the most essential element of education. Without it, it is altogether impossible to bring up a child for any useful purpose whatsoever. To educate is not merely to awake by some means or other the dormant faculties of the soul, or to fit one for pure temporal pursuits, or money-making. No, to educate, is to rescue the rising man from the perdition entailed upon him on account of Adam's fall, and thereby to rescue him from the grasp of those subversive principles, the base of society so prevalent now-a-days. To educate, therefore, is to imbue man with the true principles of Christianity, which are to be found in the Roman Church only, to imbue him with those principles, which form men, men of standing, true to their religion and to their country, and ever able to steer on their course in the sphere of action in which Providence intends them to move. Ay, without religion there is not such a thing as love of a firm and of one's neighbor; not such a thing as a self and enduring attachment to king and to country, not such a thing as a sincere union of heart and hand for the advancement of the common weal.

As Christianity unites men to God, so it alone unites man to man. Therefore if we banish from education the spirit of Catholicism, the schools will then be but haunts or dens teeming with the ravens of anti-Catholic principles, such as now prevail over Europe. History and experience are both there to prove it. Now, you, Mr. Jones, you who are so wise and so conversant with these two branches of knowledge, or at least pretends to be, do you ignore the disasters and misfortunes which have befallen humanity, on account of irreligious and immoral education? Are you not aware of the happiness and prosperity of those times, called the middle ages, when education was wholly under the beneficial control of the Church? Are you not aware of the deprivations, wars and revolutions which have stormed the world, and which have been blasted forth by those diabolical principles taught in schools and universities not Catholic? Are you

not aware of these things, you who profess to be the type and personification of learning, the demigod of English journalists, the mentor of youth, presiding over the destiny of nations, and pouring upon them your most abundant blessings? Ah! Dearly beloved Jones, remove from before your face the veil of race prejudices which obstructs your mental vision, and you will behold, if intellectual eyes you have, the folly of your ideas and the wholesomeness of our new system of education, which may be rationally termed the greatest possible contrivance of any government.

I will now close, Mr. Editor, in beseeching you to publish in the True Witness these remarks which I most earnestly submit to Mr. Jones' consideration. I trust that he will not henceforth display before the public his sour reflections on French Canadian proceedings, studying with more good faith, if such he can do, the lessons of history of which he is grossly ignorant.

I remain, Mr. Editor, yours ever truly, ARTH CHARLAND.

ORDINATIONS.—On Sunday, the 23rd inst., at the Cathedral, Mgr. the Coadjutor, conferred Holy Orders on the following:

Deacons.—MM. Joseph Daignault, Alp. Avilla Cherrier, Jean-Bapt. Vaillancourt, George Whittaker, of Montreal; Adelard Lemay, of the Congregation de Sainte-Croix.

Subdeacons.—MM. Charles Adelard Barolet, Pierre Edmond Grenier, of Three Rivers; Joseph Lafortune, Clement Seguin, of Montreal; Daniel Henry Murphy, of Dubuque.

Minor Orders.—MM. Francois Avilla Lapalme, Joseph Tancrede Archambault, Remi Prud'homme, Gaspard Berard, of Montreal; Edward Francis Doyle, of Marquet.

Tonsure.—MM. Francois Georges Belanger, Louis Olivier Dufault, Conrad Olivier Lafertiere, Etienne Michel Pinault, of Montreal.

On Monday, Mgr. the Coadjutor, also ordained the following:

Deacons.—MM. J. Lafortune, C. A. Barolet, and P. E. Grébler.

THE HOLY FATHER.—The list of subscriptions published of the amount subscribed in the diocese of Dublin in aid of the Holy Father for the past year, show a total of over \$10,000.

A HOME RULE VICTORY.—We are proud to be able to announce that the members sent from Ireland at the last election, to act as a compact body, and not under the beck of any minister, have succeeded in gaining at least one very important victory before the adjournment of the English Parliament. As we announced in our last issue, the Government wanted to continue the Coercion Bill amongst thirty-two others in the "Expiring Laws Continuance Bill" for another year, it being already enacted till the autumn of '75; but, from the constant and determined opposition shown by the Irish Home Rulers, as well as a few Liberal members, they had to abandon the idea, and announced that they only wished to continue it for three months, viz., to the 31st December, '75; also that never again would an important bill such as that be hurried on at the end of the Session in such a manner. This was more than the most sanguine expected; there was no idea, although opposition was determined on, that the Government would receive such a defeat, and it shows that everything constitutional and reasonable, even Home Rule itself, will be ultimately carried by moral force agitation, when proper discipline is sustained. That detestable creature The O'Donoghue had his speech in the course of the debate, and said that it was necessary to have the Bill continued as seizures of arms were constantly making in Ireland; gangs of assassins were constantly going around threatening farmers' lives, and that such proceedings should be put a stop to. He supported the Press Clauses because they restrained writers, who, by their odious libels on the Government, had endeavored to stir up sedition and civil war. He denied that Ireland was coerced or had not her Constitutional rights. The miserable man having had his say, he took to his heels as quickly as possible out of the House, knowing that he could not suffer to be cornered the same as he was on a previous occasion during the Home Rule debate.—Mr. Mitchell Henry administered a scathing rebuke. He regretted the hon. member was not present as he would rather speak to his face. When the hon. member for Tralee made light of Ireland's liberties, she felt the pang involved in the defection of one of her hereditary champions. "Yes, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his hands against me." He did not know what bread the hon. member sought for now, but he knew that if violent language was used at any time in Ireland it was by the hon. member, when he was deprived of the commission of the peace for using most seditious language at the time of the American war. Mr. Phillip Cullen (Dundalk) also said he was never at a rebellious meeting in his life only one that The O'Donoghue brought him to. This was a home thrust, and it is now seen that the ex-chieftain is despised both by Irish and English members of every section of politics; in fact the Government would not give him an office as he is looked upon as faithless and fickle-minded. The only vote taken on the three months' continuance was one in which the whole Home Rule members and those who voted previously with them lodged a protest against it in any shape, but it was carried by 137 votes against 56. Mr. Dignell put the following compliment to Mr. Butt. He said: "I have pleasure in admitting that the hon. and learned gentleman has addressed the house in a fair and moderate speech, and also that it is not the first fair and moderate speech which he has made on public affairs," and in concluding his speech, he said, "I have again to acknowledge the becoming manner in which the hon. and learned gentleman under circumstances, I freely admit, of some difficulty, has conducted himself throughout this discussion—(cheers). He has shown a proper sense of the dignity of the House and his own position as a not undistinguished member of the House, and I trust that the general spirit which his conduct has elicited may not be a useless lesson to those who have not so much experience as the hon. and learned gentleman—(cheers). Irishmen every where have reason to be proud of all this."

NEWSPAPER LIBELS.—The whole Irish Press are now crying out against the law of newspaper libel. The cause of present indignation is: damages amounting to \$250 and costs have recently been recovered from the Editor of the Limerick Reporter for publishing a paragraph about the Mayor of that city at the time of his last election, which was taken from the Cork Constitution. The paragraph alleged that undue influence was used—which was indeed seen and believed by every one—and was published in the Protestant Constitution. Mr. Lenihan, the Catholic and liberal editor of the Reporter, cut it out and gave it in his issue which came out the same evening, stating that he did not vouch for the accuracy of the statement. Yet the Mayor took an action against him and did not mind the Constitution, for which he is condemned by every section of politics. We are glad however to see that a "Defence Fund" is getting up and that Mr. Lenihan will not be allowed to suffer any loss; and we would remind his numerous friends in Canada and the States that they can take a prominent part in augmenting the fund.

Verdict in South Eastern R. R. Inquest: That the deaths had been caused by accident.—The Company were in no way to blame, their officers having performed their duties to the best of their ability under the circumstances.