

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

WILL BE PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3, McGill Street.

T. E. R. M. S.:
To Town Subscribers . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do . . . \$2 1/2 do.

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. Subscribers not receiving their papers regularly, are requested to make their complaints known to the Editor of the Journal.

The Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—

Quebec.—Mr. MATTHEW ENRIGHT, 24, Mountain St.
Three Rivers.—Mr. JOHN KEENAN.
Terrebonne.—M. PREVOST, Esq., N. P.
St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. PATRICK FLYNN.
Alexandria.—D. M'GILLIS.
Oshawa.—REV. MR. J. B. PROULX.
Pictou, C. W.—REV. MR. LALOR.
Toronto.—Mr. THOMAS HAYES.
Norwood.—REV. MR. BERNARD J. HIGGINS.
Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. STUART McDONALD.
Perth, C. W.—Mr. JOHN DORAN.
Bytown.—Mr. EDW. BURKE.
Carillon.—A. E. MONTMARQUET, Esq.
Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. JAS. DOYLE.
County Dundas.—Mr. ALEX. McDONALD (INCH).
Brantford, C. W.—Mr. JOHN CONERFORD.
Eastern Townships.—Mr. PATRICK HACKETT.
Chambly.—Mr. JOHN HACKETT.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 18, 1850.

THE MONTREAL WITNESS AND THE
F. C. M. SOCIETY.

Having advanced certain charges in this journal, against the F. C. M. Society, it is but an act of justice, even at the risk of tiring our readers, to give admission to the defence of the Society, such as it is, published by the *Montreal Witness*, of Monday last. We insert what seems to us the essential part of the defence, not pretending to copy a long article of nearly three columns; expressing our readiness to insert in a future number, any part thereof which the editor of the *Montreal Witness* may deem essential to his cause, but omitted in the present.

Whilst we accused the *Records* of the Society, as containing calumnies against the Clergy of Canada, perversion of Scripture, and other grave offences, we especially pointed out one statement as a manifest lie, a lie with a circumstance. We mean the story about the priest at S. R. falsely quoting Scripture, and who is said to have "administered the Sacrament to all who would receive it"—the first thing he did upon his arrival at the place where a woman had been delivered.

The substance of the defence is this—that in preparing the pedlars' journals for the press, the Society mistranslated a portion of Andre Soland's journals, thus rendering an ambiguous story more ambiguous still. A pleasant word that same ambiguous. The ancient Pistol objects to the vile phrase "steal,"—"convey" is the word he approves of; and so in the phraseology of the tabernacle, a palpable lie is softened down into, "an ambiguous expression." But it should be remembered that nearly two months have elapsed since we first exposed the lie, before this excuse of mistranslation was discovered: a very ample time for the Society to forge, alter, or add unto, any part of its *Records*, which, after detection, might seem to require forging, altering, or adding into. By such mean and pitiful shifts, the *Montreal Witness* cannot clear the *Records*, as they originally stood, of the charge of falsehood; but, in its awkward attempts at justification, it merely renders itself ridiculous, and makes the last state of the F. C. M. Society worse than the first.

S. R. is Sault Rouge, Township of Nelson, county Megantic. The priest, who, upon his arrival, administered the first thing he did, the Sacrament to all who would receive it, is the Rev. Mons. Faucher, curé and archipetre; at Lotbinière, but not resident at Sault Rouge. The Sacrament referred to, the Holy Communion, or, in the words of the *Montreal Witness*, "what the Church of Rome substitutes for the Lord's Supper."

The explanation of the circumstance is as follows:—First, we give the story as it originally appeared, which alone concerns us, for we have nothing to do with the newly-discovered amendment, which is so funny that we will certainly lay it before our readers.

First story, as it appeared in the *Records*:—

"June 1st I set out for S. R., where I found our friends truly rejoicing. They have had severe trials since I saw them last. The priest has paid them a

visit. What took place, on that occasion follows:—A young member had just been added to the family. No sooner was this known to the neighbors, than, unknown to the mother, they called in the priest. The first thing he did, on his arrival, was to administer the sacrament to all who would receive it. When this ceremony was finished, he approached the sick woman and asked, if she did not wish to have her child baptized," &c.

Translation of the story as revised and corrected by the *Montreal Witness*:—

"1st June. I set out for Sault Rouge, where I found these friends truly rejoicing. They have had trials since the last time that I saw them, for the curé, as I mentioned above, has paid them a visit. This is how it happened: as soon as that person was delivered of her child, the neighbors, unknown to the mother, sent for the curé. Then the curé made all those who were willing, perform the Paschal duty (*faire les Pâques*). When this ceremony was finished, he went to the sick person," &c.

Here we find "administering the Sacrament to all who would receive it," changed into "making all those who were willing, perform their Paschal duty." In the first story, when the ceremony was finished the priest approached the sick person. Now, we put it to any person of common sense, to say, if that does not signify that all that had taken place, had taken place in the presence of the sick person. Who ever heard, going from one house to another, termed *approaching* another person. It is too ridiculous. And to suppose that all the discrepancy between the two different versions of the same story, arises from mistranslation, is to suppose the F. C. M. Society as ignorant of the French language, as it is of Catholic faith and practice; and as regardless of Grammar, as it notoriously is regardless of truth.

It was not so much by the administration of the Sacrament in a private house, as by the immediate administration of it "the first thing he did on his arrival," that we were at once enabled to detect the lie, or, rather, *ambiguity* of the statement. Let us then see what was necessary to have been done, before the priest could possibly administer the Paschal Communion.

Referring to 21st Can. Conc. Lat. and Can. 9, Sess. XIII. Conc. Trid., we find that the Paschal duty consists in approaching two Sacraments—Penance and the Holy Communion; and, by the discipline of the Universal Church, within a stated period; extending from Palm Sunday, or the Sunday immediately preceding Easter, to Low Sunday, or the first Sunday after Easter. The communicant must also communicate in his Parish Church. Under peculiar circumstances, the time may be extended, and the necessity of communicating in the Parish Church, dispensed with, by the lawful ecclesiastical authorities. Now, before the priest could possibly administer the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, or, in the language of the *Montreal Witness*, "what the Church of Rome substitutes for the Lord's Supper," to any single individual at S. R., a considerable time must have elapsed, and a great many ceremonies previously performed, rendering it impossible for the priest to administer the Sacrament "the first thing he did on his arrival." Let us see what these ceremonies were. First, the priest must have heard the confessions of, and administered sacramental absolution to, all who desired to be partakers of the Holy Communion. Next, he must have celebrated Mass. For this purpose, as there is no Church at Sault Rouge, some room must have been erected into a temporary Chapel, and that by the permission of the *Bishop of the diocese*. The priest must also have brought with him the necessary vestments, altar cloths, and a portable altar; for a consecrated stone is absolutely essential to the construction of an altar, without which no priest would presume to celebrate Mass. Next, the priest who celebrated Mass, *must have been fasting* from the previous midnight, at least: then, all the lay communicants must also have been fasting from the previous day. This is a rule which is never dispensed with, except when the Communion is given to the dying—as their Viaticum. Now, had the compilers of the F. C. M. *Records*, had the editor of the *Montreal Witness*, been aware of all this, we should never have seen either the story as it originally appeared in the *Records*, or as amended and revised in the pages of the *Montreal Witness*. It is sufficient for us, that the *Montreal Witness* has found it requisite to make the slightest alteration in the original story. By so doing, the first is confessed to have been false; and with the first story alone have we anything to do.

The *Montreal Witness* says that the Sacrament which the priest administered immediately upon his arrival to all who would receive it, was the Lord's Supper. We have proved the impossibility of the priest's so administering the Sacrament, and have therefore made good our statement, that the whole story is a lie with a circumstance; and that, therefore, all the contents of the *Records* may fairly be assumed to be false, no matter how trifling the circumstance by which the lie was detected.

A very trifling circumstance suffices to detect a lie,

or, if the *Montreal Witness* prefers, an ambiguous story. Thus Daniel, by questioning the two false witnesses separately, as to the tree under which the crime was committed, exposed the innocence of Susanna, and the perjury of her accusers. The two witnesses named two different trees—the first, a balm; the second, a mastic tree: just as our two witnesses, the F. C. M. Society and the *Montreal Witness*, give two versions of the transaction at Sault Rouge. No great matter: a palm tree, and a mastic tree: a very trifling circumstance; yet, trifling though it be, sufficient to prove the falsehood of the two witnesses, and to cause the rejection of all their previous statements.

We have no doubt that this will be a warning to the F. C. M. Society, to be more careful in future. They will, we doubt not, avoid the circumstance, if not the ambiguous expressions. Had that very evangelical young lady, and worthy precursor of the F. C. M. Society, Miss Maria Monk, done so, she might have escaped detection, and infamy. Alas, for Maria Monk! She was a true evangelical confessor and martyr, one of the real no-papery sort, whose petticoat, not to say whose mantle, has descended upon worthy successors; and it would be but a decent mark of respect to her memory, on the part of the Society, to elevate her to the dignity of their patron saint, and to get her picture hung over the platform, at their next anniversary meeting.

"It is not," says the *Montreal Witness*, "and will not be the custom of any one connected with the F. C. M. Society, to give names and dates, with reference to the missionary work now going on among the French Canadians." Of course it is not. Who ever accused the F. C. M. Society, of anything honorable, open, or straightforward? Who could expect that they would give names and dates, thus affording the readiest method of exposing their falsehoods and calumnies? No. We are well aware that the F. C. M. Society will do no such thing. They like to work in the dark. But, then, ought not the Society, for the future, to abstain from calumniating the clergy, from bringing charges against men, to whom they afford no opportunity for defence?

We thank God that we have never had any connexion with evangelical societies, or any intimacy with evangelical persons. But we know what are the rules and customs of civilised society, and we appeal to all gentlemen, no matter of what creed, Catholic or Protestant, in support of our opinion, for sure are we that they will be of our way of thinking.

No one is obliged to bring a charge against others. But having done so, he is bound to give names, dates, and every particular, which may be required of him, in order that the accused party may, if innocent, refute the charges, and clear his character. This is a rule which admits of no exception amongst gentlemen, whatever may be the case amongst evangelical societies.

He who brings an accusation against another, and refuses, when called upon, to give names and dates, and every particular, is a liar, a slanderer, and a coward; and no man of common sense or common honesty, will dare to contradict us.

THE IRISH BAZAAR.

We visited the Irish Bazaar during the last two evenings; such of our readers as have not yet visited it have a great treat before them. It is well, 'tis true, to have a few dollars in your pocket, and you may calculate on getting rid of them; but the ladies are so agreeable, so fascinating, every thing so well arranged, so orderly, so pretty, such real good humor and rational enjoyment, that you must be really charmed with your visit. Strangers visiting the city for amusement, during this *all-exciting* week, would do well to visit the Irish Bazaar; and as it will close this (Friday) evening, an early visit to-day would be advisable. We wish especially to encourage the intercourse of friendly feeling between our neighbors in the States and ourselves, we wish therefore they should see every thing worth seeing in our city, now that they have come *en masse* to be present at our Industrial Exhibition. But whilst in the name of the poor and the naked *little ones* we crave a portion of that which would, perhaps, be otherwise unprofitably spent, we can assure them that even in the score of pleasure they will be delighted with their visit to the Irish Bazaar. Charity on her own account, should be always held in high estimation, but in the Irish Bazaar she puts on an aspect so truly agreeable that you find yourself irresistibly compelled to venerate, to love her. The variety, usefulness and elegance of the objects exhibited for sale, reflect the highest credit on the taste and zeal of the ladies whose "handy work" they are. As the Bazaar will close this evening, we would again request the public to mingle charity with innocent amusement, and visit the Irish Bazaar at an early hour.

THE JESUITS.

Few subjects are dwelt upon with more complacency, by the no-papery orators, than the mysterious expulsion and temporary suppression of the Jesuits, in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The subject was discussed, on Wednesday evening last, by Mr. Lord, who has been lecturing in Montreal.

It is an old saying; "show me your friends, and I will tell you what you are." "Noscitur a sociis." The rogue may be known by his associates: the just may be known by their enemies. The friends of the impious, will, in all probability, be impious; whilst those whom they hate, and persecute, will, most assuredly, be those who are entitled to be called, in the language of the Gospel—"the salt of the earth."

Who then were the enemies of the Jesuits? In Portugal, where the Order was first suppressed, Carvalho, the execrable Marquis of Pombal,—whose dismissal from office was signaled by the liberation of 800 squalid wretches, the miserable remnant of 9600, victims of the minister's tyranny,—was the cause of the expulsion of the Order, and the confiscation of their property. For that little circumstance, the robbery of their victims, has ever been a mark of the modern religious reformer. Nineteen chests, laden with the spoil of the shrine of St. Francis Xavier, were sent back to Goa, by the Queen, after the fall of Pombal. In France, the same expulsion, the same spoliation, was effected by the arts of the infidel philosophers, "savants" and "demi-savants," seconded by a prostitute, and daughter of a prostitute, the infamous Pompadour. In Spain, the jealousy of an imbecile sovereign—a jealousy caused by the active and successful exertions of the Jesuits, to suppress a tumult, which the monarch's silly interference with the costume of the Spaniards had excited—brought about similar results. In Naples, Ferdinand IV., third son of Charles III., too young to judge for himself, was easily induced by Tanucci, to follow his father's example. Thus, from the four kingdoms subject to princes of the Bourbon dynasty, within a few years, the Jesuits were expelled, and stripped of all their property; and then, at last, wearied by the importunities of the French and Spanish ambassadors, —against the dictates of his own conscience, yet desirous to secure, at any price, the peace of Europe, —Clement XIV., on the 21st July, 1773, signed the famous brief, "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster," which, without condemning their doctrines, their morals, or their discipline, suppressed the Order of Jesuits, throughout Christendom. Bitterly did the aged pontiff repent this weak compliance with the passions of an anti-Christian generation; smiting upon his breast, and exclaiming, "Compulsus, compulsus feci," shame and bitter anguish soon brought down his grey hairs, with sorrow to the grave.

But the Jesuits fell. What then were their crimes? They were reputed rich, and princes hungered and thirsted after their wealth. They were the irreconcilable foes of infidelity, and the French philosophers hated them. "Jersez l'infame," was the order of the day; and she was crushed: and soon after, a nation bowed itself down, and adored a naked harlot, seated on the altars of the Most High God. The people, too, had imagined a vain thing. They had dreamed of liberty, without religion; and of freedom, exempt from the sweet yoke of Christ. So the Jesuits fell, and their schools and colleges were closed. The youths of '73, grew up to be the men of '93, and a tardily repentant world cursed their growth, and wept the fall of the Jesuits, in tears of blood. In tears, bitter; but not unavailing: for soon another Pontiff ascended the Chair of Peter, at whose bidding the Order of the Jesuits started once more into life and renewed activity. And those very countries which had been most active in procuring their suppression, were now the most clamorous for their recall.

The Jesuits arose, as it were, from the dead. The triumph of the wicked was but for a season, yet the cause of that short-lived triumph will always remain one of the enigmas of the xviii. century. It is silly to say that the Jesuits had departed from the original principles of their Order. In the xviii. century, the Jesuit missionaries still went forth to the uttermost parts of the earth; still courted tortures and death, with the same zeal as in the xvi., if they could but suffer and die in the cause of Christ. Their influence over the minds of the people they converted, was not diminished, before the unhappy treaty of 1750, between Spain and Portugal, which caused the destruction of the most prosperous, the most virtuous, colonies which the world ever saw. Not the Jesuits, but the nations, had changed: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together, against the Lord, and against his Christ. Let us break; said they, their bonds asunder, and cast their yoke from us. But He that dwelleth in Heaven laughed at them, and the Lord had them in derision?" and so may it ever be with the enemies of the Jesuits.

It is false that the clergy, as a body, rejoiced in the fall of the Jesuits. Calvinists rejoiced, infidels like Voltaire and D'Alembert, rejoiced; prostitutes, like Pompadour, rejoiced; but the Church mourned. If in Lisbon *Te Deum* was sung, it was through the all-powerful influence of Carvalho, over his creature, the Patriarch.

The clergy of France, headed by the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. de Beaumont, positively refused to publish the brief of Clement, and remonstrated with the Pope, in the most energetic language.