

The True Witness.

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 698 Craig Street, by J. GILLIES, G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half. 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 True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies 3d. The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription from THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 26, 1869.

ECOLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1869. Friday, 26 Of the Holy Shroud. Saturday, 27 Of the Feria. Sunday, 28—Third Sunday in Lent. MARCH—1869. Monday, 1—Of the Feria. Tuesday, 2—Of the Feria. Wednesday, 3—Of the Feria. Thursday, 4—St. Osimir C.

REGULATIONS FOR LENT—All days of Lent Sundays excepted, from Ash Wednesday to Holy Saturday included, are days of fasting and abstinence. The use of flesh meat at every meal is permitted on all the Sundays of Lent, with the exception of Palm Sunday.

The use of flesh meat is also by special indulgences allowed at the one repast on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays of every week from the first Sunday after Lent, to Palm Sunday.—On the first four days of Lent, as well as every day in Holy Week, the use of flesh meat is prohibited.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The political news from Great Britain and Ireland is of little or no interest. In France the extreme Communist party which was deemed crushed by the *coup d'etat*, seems determined upon proving that it is yet alive, powerful, and prepared for action. Italy is in a state of ferment. The people, groaning beneath a load of taxation of which neither they nor their fathers ever had experience under the mild rule of their legitimate princes, seem ready for another revolution: and are only kept within bounds by the numerous Piedmontese mercenaries who lord it over the unhappy peasantry. Rome is quiet, but another raid is expected in the early summer, as the Garibaldians are evidently meditating some fresh rascality. An amusing story is told at the expense of the pet of Exeter Hall, of the well-beloved of the evangelical world, which if related of an Irishman would be called a "bull." It seems that a body of "Freeholders," or Italian Protestants, are about to hold a great meeting in Naples under the presidency of a Count Ricciardi, who wrote to Garibaldi informing him of the circumstance. The latter replied, "May God bless this holy enterprise!" an answer which much disconcerted those to whom it was addressed—as the very end of their projected great assembly is to do away with God, as something *de trop* in the present state of the universe, and of the actual conditions of society. God is an obsolete idea according to the Italian Free-thinkers: an idea, entertained only by fools, old women, and Papists: and the Garibaldian invocation to God to bless an assembly about to declare His non-existence, about to wipe Him out of the *cosmos*, is exceedingly embarrassing.

The U. States Senate has disallowed the so-called Alabama treaty. The English papers scarcely regret this, as though it will in their opinion only delay a settlement, it will also deliver England from certain concessions unworthy of her, and leave her free to insist upon better terms. This seems to be the meaning of what the *Times* says upon the subject.

By latest accounts from Paris we learn that the Government has been aroused to action against the violent meetings lately held in that City for the promulgation of Communist principles. We should not be surprised if serious disturbances were to ensue.

On the 22nd inst. the question of the release of the Fenian prisoners was brought before the House of Commons by the O'Connor Don. Mr. Fortescue announced that the government had it in contemplation to pardon, or mitigate the sentences of, some 45 convicts, including several of the leaders. Warren and Costello have already received a pardon; and it is to be hoped that the clemency of the government may, conjoined with other good measures, have the effect of allaying the discontent which long years of misgovernment have generated in Ireland.

Among the many recent conversions to the Catholic religion, that of Colonel Blair of the Scott's Fusilier Guards, is reported by a correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

"We are passing without doubt through a serious crisis, and the present state of things cannot last at all events. Logical minds that cannot bear the shifting vagueness of Protestantism, or the assumptions of Rome, are likely to give up all definite faith, unless a system is put before them which, like the English Church properly understood, tempers liberty with law."

The *Evening Telegraph*—for we quote from an able, and by no means unfair review in that journal of the controversy raging betwixt Dr. Ewer of New York, and the Rev. Mr. Cardner of Montreal, as to the effects of Protestantism—the *Evening Telegraph* we say, is pleased to speak in riddles. We understand, and agree with, him when he lays down the proposition that logical minds that cannot either bear the vagueness of Protestantism, or submit to the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, are likely, are indeed certain, to renounce all definite faith: but we are at a loss to understand what he means by the alternative betwixt Protestantism and Rome—in other words betwixt the right of private judgment, and authority—which he proposes; and which like the English church system is to temper liberty with law.

If we may be permitted to guess at our contemporary's meaning—(if in error we shall be most happy to retract)—it seems to us to be this:—That the English Church system tempers "liberty," or the principle of private judgment, with "law," that is to say the principle of authority. That in short the English Church system is a *via media* betwixt Protestantism on the one hand—and "Romanism" on the other. That it both admits the right of private judgment, and asserts the principle of authority: and that being thus tempered or seasoned with two incompatible ingredients, it is a system which should—though in fact it does not—commend itself to the "logical mind."

We marvel that one so clear sighted as on most other matters is our contemporary of the *Telegraph*, does not perceive that "liberty," in the sense of private judgment, cannot temper but must be destructive of "law," understood as the principle of authority. Authority is the contradictory, or negation of the right of private judgment; one cannot therefore temper, cannot even co-exist with the other.

And herein lies the absurdity of the *via media*, or English Church system: in that it attempts to reconcile irreconcilables. It asserts the fallibility, not merely of the Pope, and of national churches, but even of General Councils, Art. 21: and yet in the article immediately preceding, it asserts that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith." But, and here is what staggers all logical minds, how can any body, corporation, or Church, call it what you will, have authority in controversies of faith, unless it have received that authority from God? and how can it be fallible or liable to error, if its authority be from God? Never will any man capable of reason, and worthy of the name of man, submit himself or his private judgment, to the teaching of a body which like himself is fallible, and whose decisions therefore are nothing better than the utterances of private judgment. The logical man, the man with a spark of self respect, or honest pride, will stick to his own private judgment, and spurn with contempt the insolent assumptions of men, who, acknowledging themselves to be, whether individually or collectively, fallible like himself, have the impudence to speak as having authority on matters, or controversies of faith!

If to his Church—because he believes her to be infallible, because having authority from God, not from Queen, or Parliament, or Privy Council, but from God Himself, to determine all controversies of faith—the Catholic unreservedly submits his reason, and his private judgment, he acts logically: but on the other hand, there is no man more resolute than is the Catholic, at all costs, to assert to the uttermost the principle of private judgment on all matters of faith, and in its most unrestricted sense, against man, against all men, against every body, or Church which does not claim, at least, to speak infallibly, because with the authority of God. For it is a self-evident proposition, that there where God has placed authority to determine controversies of faith, He has also placed infallibility, or the power of so determining. A being who should act otherwise, who should give authority in controversies of faith, and yet withhold infallibility from the Church so endowed, would be no more worthy of an honest and intelligent man's worship, than is the hideous Fetish, compounded of glass beads, bones, old rags and feathers, before which in mute adoration African idolaters bow down.

Again authority on the one hand, always implies an obligation to submit, on the other: and if there be a body, as the 20th of the Anglican articles asserts there is, endowed with "authority in controversies of faith," all men, no matter what their learning, what their condition, what their country, are bound under pain of eternal damnation, to submit themselves and their reason unreservedly to its decisions, and to accept its utterances as the "oracles of God." Nor is this unreasonable, for it must be infallible, if its authority be from Him who can neither deceive, nor be deceived. There is therefore in contro-

verses of faith no room for "liberty," or private judgment, if there be a Church endowed with authority therein from God Himself. "Law," or authority, in such a Church must be all in all.

On the other hand, if there be no infallible Church on earth—and the 39th article by asserting not only that particular churches such as those of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome have erred, but also that General Councils ("forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God") may err, and have erred, Art. 21—by implication asserts that there is no such an infallible body in existence—then it is as plain as any proposition in Euclid, that there is no body, or church in existence with authority from God in controversies of faith: none therefore to which any one is bound to submit himself or his private judgment. There is therefore upon this hypothesis, no room in the Anglican system for "law," or authority in matters, or controversies of faith—but the private judgment of the individual, or "liberty," is all in all.

"Liberty" and "law" therefore are utterly incompatible, and mutually destructive, if by the one we are to understand the principle of private judgment; by the other the principle of Church authority—obligatory on all, because from God; and because from God, like God infallible. Now as a matter of fact, Anglicans, whether High or Low, Ritualists or anti Ritualists, all base their religion upon the principle of "liberty," or private judgment only. Nor can it be otherwise: for even the highest of Anglican churchmen would be sorely puzzled to define what, and where, is the Church which has "an authority in controversies of faith:" or through what organs its decisions do now find utterance. To the High Anglican, as well as to the Low Anglican, the Church is a mere abstraction; it is a word as void of all definite meaning to him, as are the words of the creed "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," to the low Churchman who parrot-like repeats them without even pausing to enquire, "what do I mean by this formula?"—The High Churchman, or Ritualist, not only asserts his right of private judgment against the law of the land to which his church owes its being, which created it, and gives to him what of Orders and of Apostolic succession he and his can truly boast of: not only does he plead his "liberty," or private judgment against Parliament, and Privy Council; but he pleads it against those whom in vague phrase he styles his ecclesiastical superiors—against his bishop and the convocation itself. Even when he appeals to the Fathers, he appeals to them as interpreted by his private judgment; and falling back on antiquity and the primitive Church, he is but asserting his present right of private judgment as to what was the faith of antiquity, as to what were the doctrines and rites of the primitive Church. But never does he dream of appealing to an actual living Church, as possessed of authority to determine all controversies; to which authority therefore he and all men are bound without question, without reserve, to submit themselves, and their reason, in all matters of faith.

A correspondent of the *Witness* asks why the editor of that journal does not "defend Protestantism from the attack now being made upon it, under the caption *Is Protestantism A Failure?*" The editor replies, "that Protestantism, so far as it is identical with Evangelical religion, needs no defence, and any other kind of Protestantism admits of none."

The readers of the *Witness* will admire the caution with which that journal's editor shrinks a controversy with the Unitarians or non-dogmatic Protestants. He shrinks, with an intuitive certainty of being worsted in the *mêlée*, should he be foolish enough to allow himself to be entangled therein: he feels that he would but appear in a comical aspect to the world in a controversy in which, by his position, he would be compelled to fight the Catholic with Protestant or rationalistic weapons; and to fight the Liberal Protestant who has eliminated all dogmas from his system, with Catholic weapons, or weapons drawn from the armoury of authority.

And this gives us an opportunity of explaining in what sense we term the evangelical or dogmatic phase of Protestantism a grovelling superstition, or tyranny exercised over the intellect.

"Dogmatic Protestantism" is an absurdity, because it necessarily involves a contradiction in terms—as if in geometry we were to speak of a four-sided triangle, or a round-square. It is absurd, not because of any necessary absurdity in the dogmas that it professes to hold and teach: but in that it holds and professes to teach dogmas without any reason for so doing: because the very idea of dogma is at variance with the fundamental idea of Protestantism *i.e.* private judgment. Protestantism and dogma, are terms contradictory, indeed destructive one of the other.

The evangelical, or he who adheres to dogmatic Protestantism, may hold many supernatural truths, most important in themselves; but in that he can assign no reason for holding them, in that he holding them he sins against, or acts in flagrant vio-

lation of, his fundamental principle—his belief is a low form of superstition. Let us say that he holds the Christian doctrine that "God was made man" for instance. Now if he believe this on authority of any kind, and not as a fact of which he has personal knowledge, or as one of the truths of which reason has assured him, he sins against the fundamental principle of his system: he substitutes authority for reason, and is therefore no better than is the Papist.

But the "dogmatic Protestant" will perhaps say "I believe the dogma in question because I find it in the Bible, and because the Bible is the inspired Word of God." But here we have one supernatural dogma, "the inspiration" of a book, made the basis for holding another supernatural dogma. Prove the inspiration of your book: show that it is the "Word of God" in the sense in which you appeal to it, in support of your dogma that God was made man, that Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and was born of a pure virgin. The writers called Matthew and Luke who made these statements, could have had no personal knowledge of the case. They may have learnt them from others; but nowhere does either of them pretend that they were supernaturally revealed to him, or that he was inspired by God to write. If then the evangelical Protestant, who bases his supernatural dogma of the incarnation, on what the bible says, and his belief in what the bible says on the supernatural dogma that it was supernaturally inspired, wishes to give a reason for the faith that is in him—he must prove by reason, the supernatural inspiration of the book to which he appeals, and on which he rests his case. In the case of the particular dogma in question, he must either prove that the short biographies of Christ called, the one the Gospel according to St. Matthew, the other the Gospel according to St. Luke, were supernaturally inspired: and that the marvellous facts concerning the birth of Christ therein related, but of the truth of which the writers could have had no personal cognizance, were supernaturally revealed to them by God, or were derived from other equally competent authority. If the evangelical Protestant cannot do this, he must expect that we should look upon his belief in the incarnation as destitute of any reasonable basis, and therefore as a mere superstition: and if he can do it, we will gladly undertake—(if they be not of inordinate length, and if the *Witness* will strictly confine himself to the thesis)—to lay his proofs before our readers. Now the thesis is—that the brief memoirs of Christ vulgarly attributed to St. Matthew, though certainly not written in the form that we now possess them by an Apostle; and that the other biography of Christ written by one named Luke, were written under divine inspiration: and that the facts therefore, therein narrated, are infallibly true—since the narrators thereof could neither have been deceived, nor deceivers.

So too with the dogma of the Trinity—and with all other dogmas that some forms of Protestantism may have retained. If without appeal to tradition,—or to authority of any kind,—to what this man has said—to what that man may have written, the Evangelical Protestant can by reason alone, show that the dogma of the Trinity is true, we will admit his belief therein to be a reasonable belief: if he cannot do this, it be appeal to authority in support of his belief, he need not marvel if we treat it as—in his case—nothing but a superstition.

The Montreal *Witness*, with others of his brother sectaries, is much at a loss to know what is meant by the "Feast of the Purification," as celebrated in the Catholic Church, and as ordered to be celebrated even in the Protestant Church of England:—

The *Courier du Canada*, Quebec, says: "The principal celebration of the ladies of the congregation, the Purifying (Purification) of the Holy Virgin has taken place with much solemnity in the congregation of this city, upper-town. Nany wonder what this anniversary can properly signify."

The above is from the *Witness* of the 11th inst.; and the "wonder" that the writer expresses is but a proof of the ignorance very prevalent amongst the men who prate incessantly of their "open bible." To that book, therefore, we refer the *Witness*, and his brethren, who, with him, "wonder"—for the explanation of the meaning of the Purification of the Holy Virgin; and of the other great event, the Presentation of the Christ of the Lord in the temple, commemorated by the festival lately celebrated throughout the Catholic world. If our contemporary will turn to the twelfth chapter of *Leviticus* he will find that the Jewish law imposed certain observances upon every woman who had given birth to a child; and by referring to the second chapter of St. Luke he will also see that, in obedience to this law, and although she could have contracted no uncleanness by giving birth to that "holy thing" spoken of in the 35th verse of the previous chapter, Mary the Mother of God, "when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished"—*i.e.*, forty days after the Nativity, or Christmas—brought Him Whom she had borne in her virginal womb to Jerusalem, to present Him to the Lord. Our contemporary, if he read further, will also see how an aged man,

and a just one, by name Simeon, and also an aged widow who was a prophetess, blessed the Lord for this great manifestation of Him Who was destined to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of His people Israel. These are the great events in the history of Christianity, which the sacred penman disdained not to record for the edification of future ages; which the Catholic Church celebrates with sacrifices of praise, and joyous canticles; and at which celebration the *Witness* and his brother sectaries wonder exceedingly.

THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—Letters have been received from Mgr. Bourget, announcing his safe arrival in France. This will be gratifying intelligence to the Catholic population of his diocese.

The Papal Army at present consists of 16,334. Of these upwards of one-half, 8,240 are Italians, and the remainder Catholic volunteers from all parts of the globe, who have chivalrously devoted themselves, their lives, and their fortunes to the protection of the Holy See; just as many centuries ago, the best and noblest of Christendom rushed to the defence of the Holy Sepulchre, and thus saved Europe from being overwhelmed by the infidels.

From a paragraph in another column it will be seen that steps are being taken for the erection of a Catholic House of Refuge and Correction in this City; and that a meeting, at which were present the Reverend M.M. Ramsay and Huberdeault together with many of our prominent citizens, has been held for the purpose of making the necessary preliminary arrangements.

The Montreal *Witness* seems vexed at this, and complains that if the English speaking and Protestant portion of the population "make a move towards establishing a Blind Asylum, or Female Home, or House of Industry" the French Canadians do the same thing. What would the man have? Is he afraid that there will be too many good works done? or that the field for the exercise of charity is not large enough for both races, and for both denominations? The *Witness* may take comfort from this reflection: That when both Protestants and Catholic shall have done their best—there will always remain some cases of human wretchedness unprovided for: and that therefore the best policy for both to pursue, is that of striving which shall be foremost and most active in good and charitable works.

The filthy immorality of some of the educational institutions of the United States, where adult pupils of both sexes are admitted, has long been the subject of comment. By some it has been strenuously affirmed, by others, equally strenuously denied.

The vexed question has been set at rest by the verdict of a jury. An editor of the *Democratic Watchman*, some months ago, denounced one of these public educational institutions as a "sink of iniquity," and cautioned its readers against allowing any of their friends, of their sons and daughters, to assist thereat, unless they wished to see them ruined "mentally, morally, and physically." Hereupon the Rev. Principal of one of the "sinks of iniquity" took up the cudgels in behalf of this very mixed system of education pursued in the United States, and brought an action for libel against Mr. P. Gray Meek, the offending editor. The trial came off on the 27th ult., and having lasted three days, during which the defendant brought forward his evidence in justification, terminated in a verdict of *Not Guilty*, tantamount in fact to a verdict of "Guilty" against the educational institution.

And yet, we believe, that with the evidence before their eyes of the unmentionable filthiness that flourishes in the mixed schools, seminaries, &c., of the United States, there are some here who are aiming at introducing the same abominations into Upper Canada, and taxing the public for their support.

In a letter addressed by him to the *Church Times* the Rev. Mr. Mackonochie relates some curious facts as to the marked contempt with which in some Anglican churches, and by some ministers of that sect, the consecrated elements of the Eucharist are habitually treated. It is impossible that the doctrine of a real, objective divine presence can be held in a sect where such things as the following are tolerated. For instance. In one church, according to Mr. Mackonochie, it is the custom to pour back into a black bottle, any of the consecrated wine that may remain after communion, to be served up and reconsecrated on occasion of the next celebration; whilst what remains of the consecrated bread is handed over to the clerk, or sexton as one of his perquisites. The editor of the *Tablet* testifies that of his own knowledge these practices were almost universal in the Established Church some years ago. It is a comfort to know that, after all, the ministers of that sect are but mere laymen—with no more power to consecrate, and therefore desecrate, the body of Our Lord than has any other member of the congregation.