

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT No 663, Craig Street, by J. GILLIES. G. E. OLBERG, 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.

MONTEAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 18, 1870.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR. FEBRUARY—1870. Friday, 18—St. Simeon, B. O. Saturday, 19—Of the Immaculate Conception. Sunday, 20—SEXAGESIMA. Monday, 21—Of the Feils. Tuesday, 22—Of the Passion. Wednesday, 23—Vigil of St. Peter Damian, B. O. Thursday, 24—St. Matthias, Ap.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

As will be seen on our sixth page, the arrest of M. Rochefort was followed by disturbances at Paris, which however were promptly quelled. The armed force, and the bourgeoisie, are in favor of order, and with these on his side Louis Napoleon has little to fear from a Parisian mob.

We have not as yet any details of the Ministerial Land Bill for Ireland. From the hints in the Times we are led to believe that it will be thorough, and strike at the root of the great cause of Irish disaffection.

If we may rely upon Roman Correspondents—no very reliable authorities however—the great question of the limits and conditions of Papal infallibility will soon be before the Council.

The story about the design on the life of Prince Arthur at New York, turns out, as we expected that it would—in his honor. H. Royal Highness returned to Montreal last week, after a pleasant trip in the United States which has won for him golden opinions from all men.

The Dublin Irishman copies from the Freeman a most important item of religious news from the correspondent of the last named journal, who writing from Rome under date 21st ult. says:—

Rome, January 21.—I did not intend to have written to-day, but I have just this instant received a communication that will be of importance just now in Ireland. It has been at times debated in Ireland whether the Pontifical Bull of last October, in which various censures were pronounced against several societies, had any reference to Irish or American Fenians.

Our Provincial Parliament met at Ottawa on Tuesday last, but we must reserve to our next report of the proceedings.

The latest news from Europe is to the effect that all is quiet in Paris.

PROGRESS, AND MODERN CIVILISATION.—In the London Christian World, as quoted by the Montreal Witness of the 31st December last, we read as follows:—

"After all the activity of the thousand Christian congregations in the metropolis, manifesting itself in schools, lectures, entertainments for the working classes, meetings for mothers, benevolent visitation, city missionaries, and Bible women—a third of the population stand outside the churches, and are, for the most part, utterly ignorant of the meaning and message of Christianity, and brutally insensible to the claims of religion."

And this is what that "Progress and Modern Civilisation," with which Pius IX. refuses to be reconciled, have to show as the crowning result of their labors in the reign of Queen Victoria; in the latter part of the nineteenth century of the Christian era, and the fourth century of an

"open bible," and Gospel light, in the metropolis of Protestant England.

Let us look back to the sixteenth century, before the sun of the blessed Reformation had dawned on Catholic England. We have by many writers, writers most bitterly hostile to the old faith, descriptions of the intellectual, moral, and religious condition of the people of England in the days of Henry VIII. We are told that the higher clergy were dissolute, the lower clergy corrupt in their mode of living, that the people were often ignorant, and much given to superstition; but we are not told—it is not even hinted—that one third were "utterly ignorant of the meaning, and message of Christianity"—that one third of the population of London were "brutally insensible to the claims of religion." No. It required three hundred years of Protestantism, and the influences of "Progress and Modern Civilisation" to degrade the mass of the people to this brutal level.

Let us take another instance. Our authority in this instance is the well known M. Rochefort, one of the foremost leaders of modern progress: one of the best exponents of its tendencies—because one of the most advanced. This great apostle of civilisation and progress—of that progress and civilisation at all events which alone the Pope and the Catholic Church oppose and denounce—thus honestly avows his objects, and those of his fellow laborers in the same cause, in a Pastoral letter by him lately addressed to the citizens of Lyons:—

"The first duty of a people which wishes to become free and if we don't become free now when shall we? is to reject that barrier Religion, which leads either to fatal slavery or to madness."

Our next illustration of the tendencies, or rather the avowed objects of that modern progress and civilisation with which the Pope refuses to be reconciled, is to be found in the principles of the anti-Council, or Protestant Synod lately held at Naples, and published by the *Born Publico* of the 17th ult. The speaker is a M. Reynard, a French delegate:—

"Our programme has for its basis the denial of God, the suppression of all authority, and of every religious idea. Religion is the chief, and most ancient source of all our sufferings and the instrument by which, in every age, Sovereigns have enslaved the people. God is only a chimera, the pedestal of every despotism; and this chimera must be destroyed before we can obtain liberty."

No wonder that with these facts before his eyes the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* frankly admits that it is impossible to reconcile any form of systematic Christian theology with what we call civilisation, and progress.—*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 12, 1869.

Do we want further illustrations of Progress and Modern Civilisation? Let us look at what daily occurs before our eyes in the U. States; the most advanced, and according to the boast of its people, the most civilised of modern communities; that one, no doubt, whose moral status is most in harmony with the Spirit of the Age, and the most faithfully reflects its features. What do we see? Protestant ministers of the Gospel—an obscene Beecher and his worthy brethren—invoking God's blessing upon lust, and celebrating adultery with a blasphemous mockery of religious rites. We need not dwell upon the filthy spectacle, on which the devils may indeed gaze with complacency; but from which all Christians, all men not dead to every feeling of decency must recoil with disgust—disgust for the actors therein, disgust for the social condition and for the civilisation under which alone such a filthy exhibition is possible, or conceivable.

Now it is with this phase of modern progress and of modern civilisation—to this social progress, under which one third of the population of the capital of Protestant England with its "open bible," are "brutally insensible to the claims of religion;" of which M. Rochefort, is the prophet, and the late anti-Catholic meeting at Naples is the Grand Council, and which openly aims at the overthrow of all religion; of which the divorce laws of the U. States, and the blasphemous obscenities of a Beecher are the evidences, and the consummate fruits—that the Pope refuses to be reconciled.

But to civilisation in the Christian sense of the word—but to progress, moral, intellectual, and industrial, not only the Pope is no foe, but of them he is, as have been all his predecessors, the warmest friend. Though it is not the function of the Church to minister to man's material welfare, or to promote his physical happiness, to build railroads or to lay submarine telegraphs, she has not only never discouraged, but has always warmly applauded and patronised those who by the exercise of their talents, or by their invention, have in any manner really advanced the happiness of mankind. Of the arts and sciences, of learning, and of literature, she has ever been the first and most liberal patron; and indeed one of the greatest material triumphs of the XIX. century—the Suez Canal and the joining of the Mediterranean with the Red Sea—was as we learn from Ranke, one of the projects of a Pope, Sixtus V., to whom, rather than to Mr. Lesseps, belongs the credit of the late triumph of daring ingenuity combined with patient labor.

The progress, in a word, which the Pope condemns, is but a relapse into the social status of

the heathen world in the days of the Roman Empire—an era of highest intellectual and material culture, but of lowest moral depravity; a state from which Christianity, and Christianity alone, redeemed the human race. To the civilisation of that age, so bright and blooming on its surface, and yet so dark and rotten beneath, mankind, in so far as they throw off with M. Rochefort & Co., the trammels of religion, are fast relapsing. Its principles, its maxims, its objects, its manners and customs are already to a considerable extent the principles, the maxims, the objects, the manners, and the customs of the non-Catholic world in the XIX. century; and if we have not already sunk altogether so low as the moral and social level of the Augustan age, it is only because the old Christian traditions of our fathers are not as yet entirely extinct; because the Church, because Rome, still opposes her inexhaustible ramparts to the hordes of modern progress, more fell, more threatening to Christian civilisation and morality, than the barbarian hordes whom of old the North precipitated upon the Imperial City.

We trust that the remarks which we prefix to the subjoined document may not expose us to the reproach of making attacks upon the Protestant clergy of Montreal. Nothing is further from our intention; amongst them, we are happy to believe, are to be found as high-minded, honorable men as are in the world; and we are sure that the amiable gentleman who presides over our Anglican fellow-citizens would never tolerate amongst his clergy, such conduct as that which we propose to hold up to public reprobation.

The daughter of respectable Catholic parents, herself a minor, or child in the eyes of the law, contracted an affection for a young man, a Protestant, much to the displeasure of her parents, who forbade him the house. Hereupon the pair sought out a Methodist minister in Griffintown, a Mr. G. Brown, who, like too many of his brethren, seems to be a very unscrupulous sort of person. Without a question asked as to the age, or the religion of the girl, or as to whether she had the consent of her parents to contract marriage, without making a single inquiry of any kind, he published the banns betwixt the two young persons in his own meeting house, and then immediately proceeded to solemnize their union.—When the unhappy parents heard of this sad business, they were almost distracted, and proposed to institute legal proceedings against the Methodist minister whose conduct was as illegal as it was immoral. Touched, however, by his entreaties for mercy, they, the parents, suspended legal proceedings, on the receipt of the subjoined confession of wrong doing from Mr. Brown. We need hardly say that the "good faith" to which, at the close of his letter, he alludes, is of a very peculiar kind; as with most men, "good faith" can only be pleaded in extenuation of errors of conduct, when every possible precaution to ascertain the truth has been previously taken. Now Mr. Brown did not take the most simple, the most obvious precaution; that of ascertaining the age of the young girl, her religion, and the feelings of the parents towards the contemplated marriage. His conduct, therefore, was most infamous throughout; and in we fear, by no means a solitary instance of the means to which ministers of his class resort, to shake the faith and morals of young, impetuous, and imprudent Catholics.

Here is the letter of apology he wrote to the wronged parents:—

Montreal, 3rd February, 1870
Mr. John Rodgers, Sir.—On the seventeenth of January last, I united in matrimony your daughter Margaret, a minor with one Arthur Kane, having previously published the banns of such marriage. I did not enquire about the parents of the young lady being under the impression that she was of the age of twenty-one years, and thinking that the publication of banns sufficiently authorised me to celebrate the marriage. Since then, you have complained of my conduct in the premises, stating that I should have obtained your consent to the said marriage; having taken advice upon the subject, I find that your complaint is well founded; I should have taken information about the parents of the girl, and not proceeded to make the said marriage without your authority. My good faith will I hope, be received as an excuse, in this unfortunate affair.

G. Brown, Methodist Minister.

A writer in the *Gazette* treating of the "silver nuisance" and how to abate it, says:—

"A remedy must provide a better currency to supply its place."
We differ in opinion from the writer. A bad or depreciated currency will drive out a good currency, but a good currency can never drive out the bad. The surest and quickest way of putting down the silver nuisance would be to issue a still worse, a still more depreciated currency and the silver would then take to itself wings, and flee away.

We have much pleasure in transferring to our columns, the following rebuke administered by the *Evening Telegraph* of Monday, 14th inst., to a Mr. Jenkins, who has been distinguishing himself by an anti-Catholic tirade at a public meeting held for Educational purposes:—

"There can be no objections to Dr. Jenkins stating, as a fact, that the Bible is taught in Protestant schools; but it was extremely bad taste to say anything provocative of controversy in presence of a

number of Roman Catholics invited to be present at a public demonstration, and among them the Minister of Public Instruction. Mr. Chauveau properly declined to enter into the discussion suggested by Dr. Jenkins' remarks, and concluded by administering a rebuke which was received with applause. But though Mr. Chauveau was not called upon to combat Dr. Jenkins' propositions, as Protestants quite as firm as Dr. Jenkins, we must be permitted to say that we do not entertain the uneducated belief that Roman Catholics do not "honor" the Bible, or that in their schools they do not teach 'its principles, moral and religious.' We have always understood that the Christian controversy was as to what is taught by the Bible, not whether it was authority. There is, however, a still greater objection to Dr. Jenkins' speech than its being the expression of prejudice, and that consists in the attempt to make the Prince responsible for his blunder. However admirable the sentiment, it was Dr. Jenkins and not His Royal Highness who said:—

"That we must have all classes of our Protestant people educated on the basis of our common Bible."

What the Prince said was perfectly unobjectionable, and resumed in a few words the common ground taken up by all denominations in Canada save by a few political fanatics, who don't know the meaning of the words they use. What the Prince said was this:—

"I assure you I regard the spread of general education, combined with religious teaching, as of the most vital importance, not only to each individual person, but likewise to the progress, welfare and safety of the country."
The principle invoked by the Prince in these words forms the basis of our Common School Act. Unless school teaching is to be totally secular in a mixed population, the system must be either tyrannical or sectarian. In spite of the fanatics we have chosen it shall be the latter. Mr. Chauveau put it very fairly:—

There was one satisfactory thing, and it was this—that they had most heartily agreed to disagree. (Applause) We have agreed and found out—what ever might be a id about it elsewhere, whatever may be tried elsewhere—that the best mode of giving a sound education was to make no pretence of excluding the religious views of the parents from the schools of the children. We have found out and carried into practice in our schools, at all events as far as the two great divisions of this country are concerned, between Catholics and Protestants, that there shall be sectarian schools. The law admits mixed schools, and if in any township or municipality the people are too poor to save a separate school, or have the wisdom to agree to carry on a school common to Roman Catholics and Protestants, they are welcome to do so; but whenever either party chooses to separate they are allowed to do so, and have religious education to the fullest extent, and not exclude from their schools the religious views of the parents."

MISSION OF THE JESUIT FATHERS IN HAMILTON.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

SIR,—A mission was commenced here on Saturday, 29 ult., in the St. Mary's Cathedral by the Jesuit Fathers Damia, Massellia, Archambeault and others from Chicago, assisted by our own, and several of the Clergy from the surrounding parts of the diocese. As the mission continues, the Cathedral is constantly crowded from 4 o'clock a.m. to 11 p.m., to receive instruction and approach the holy sacraments.—Protestants assemble in great numbers to hear the Rev. Father Damia, whose eloquence and power of argument have already converted many of our Protestant neighbors to the true faith. The pressure on him for advice, and reception into the Church, is so great that he has very little time to hear the confessions of Catholics.

The following is a brief outline of his lecture on "The Confessional, or, The Sacrament of Penance instituted by Christ." To report it according to its real merit, is a task which I am unfit to undertake. Next week I will send a sketch of his lecture on "Only One True Church, and that Church the Holy Catholic Church." I will afterwards send his lecture on "Transubstantiation and the Real Presence in the Blessed Eucharist. Upwards of three thousand attend his lectures.

The Rev. Father began his discourse from Matt. 18 ch., 18 v. "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven. And John xx., 22, 23. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

Jesus Christ has given to the Apostles and they have given to their successors, the ministry, the power of forgiving sins, if the sinner is fully determined to avoid all sin and occasions of sin, in future, and to make reparation to the full extent of his power for the crimes he has committed, with a sincere sorrow for them because they are offensive to God. Then the priest can forgive him in the name and with the authority of God. He denounced in strong language, the false accusations put forward by Protestants, of forgiving sins for money. An English clergyman has overshot the mark by laying down the price, such as £5 for adultery, £20 for murder, 1s. for wife kicking, stealing £7. Protestants guided by prejudice, cannot believe that a priest has the power to forgive sins. They judge before they examine the case. When asked if they have ever examined the doctrine of the Catholic Church, they generally answer, No; but I pity the poor ignorant bigotted Catholics who believe it. They act like the Yankee judge, when the police brought a prisoner before him and said, "he is guilty of such and such crimes," "Let us hang him," replied the judge. "Oh! your honor," said the prisoner, "give me a trial, I can bring several credible witnesses to prove my innocence." "No matter," said the judge, "let us hang him anyhow."

They will not listen to our arguments; they will not read our books; they know nothing of the doctrine we practice; yet condemn us without trial or a shadow of reason. He proved the Catholic religion to be the Divine religion from reason; from the Holy Scriptures, and from the testimony of eighteen centuries. Cannot God give power to man to forgive sins, if he chose to do so? Now, in St. Matt. xvi., 19 v. Our Saviour said to his Apostles, whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven; "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." In those days, in giving authority over a city, a country, &c., it was usual to give the keys to the person authorized to govern. As the keys of a house are given to the house-keeper: By the kingdom of heaven is meant here, the Church of God. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained. In Genesis, it is said, "God breathed into Adam a living soul," and Adam was made Lord of the universe. When Christ wished to raise his Apostles to higher dignity, he breathed upon them, and said to them before ascending into heaven, "Receive ye the power of God." We read in ch. 1 of the Acts of the Apostles, that they received the power of God to forgive sins. The words of Christ are so plain and explicit, that they cannot be explained in any way but that of the Church during 1837 years. He (Father Damia) once attended the sick call of a lady in St. Louis, and after attending her, a Yankee Doctor who was there, asked him what he had been doing with that lady. I heard the lady's confession, was the reply. An extraordinary power, indeed, said the Dr. I don't believe in such nonsense.—The Father, asked, what did Jesus Christ mean, when he said—Receive ye the Holy Ghost, &c.? Well said the Dr., that is a tough question, I will think on it. The Rev. Father requested him to procure Catholic books and read them. He did so—returned to Father D. after a few days, saying, I believe in confession and all the tenets of the Catholic Church. He made his confession, was baptized, and became a thorough practical Catholic. How can Protestants arrive at the truth when they never read a book in which our doctrines are defended? Do we ask anything unfair when we demand an examination of our doctrine, and request a hearing? Protestants constantly read bad books; and all the lies and slanders invented and written against us.—Why not read our defence? Did the Apostles not believe and glory in the power given them by Christ? St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, says, we are the ambassadors of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God. An ambassador is a power given to one sent with authority. We act, says St. Paul, in the name of Christ. In the second epistle, we have the ministry of reconciliation. This is effected by forgiveness of sin. God has placed in us the word of reason. One of the Corinthians had been guilty of adultery, and confessed his crime to St. Paul, who said, "I forgive thee." He also said, "I have forgiven in the person of Jesus Christ." Did St. Paul know his business or the powers with which he was invested. It is said in the Acts of the Apostles, "A multitude came and confessed their sins." This multitude were all Catholics, and confessed their sins 1800 years ago. They knew that Christ gave these men extraordinary power. St. James says—Let him bring the priests of the Church, &c. He also says, confess your sins one to another, that you may be saved. Acts xv. 19. Many that believed, came and confessed and showed their deeds. Some Protestants are ahead of us; they believe even the "sisters" can forgive sins, but I fear the "sisters" will let out the secret.

While I was in St. Louis, the son of a Presbyterian minister was dying; his wife called on him repeatedly, even for her sake, whom he loved, to send for some minister—even any minister, but his answer was constantly, No. I care not for them, they can do nothing but offer up a prayer; and you Mary can pray as well as any of them. She continued to entreat him, and he asked her to send for Father Damia. Oh! my dearly beloved husband! Oh! Oh! A Catholic priest, will you disgrace us? No, no, she cried. At length she consented and sent for the priest. Well, Father Damia, can you do anything better than to offer up a prayer? Yes, was the reply. I can forgive you your sins. If you can, you are the man I want. I am a great sinner. Can you prove yourself to have this extraordinary power? I proved my power—he made his confession—was baptized and died an edifying death. If ministers can do nothing but offer up a prayer, we had better dispense with them, and get the old ladies to attend to sick calls.

In the first century, St. Paul says of Clement that his name is written in the book of life; he was successor of St. Peter, and 4th Pope. St. Clement, disciple of Peter, says, let him who is concerned about his sins, confess them to the bishop or pastor that he may obtain forgiveness. Let him not be asked to confess to him that he may be cured. This man is instructed by St. Paul in all the doctrine of Christ. Dionysius, in Acts of the Apostles, after conversion, St. Paul instructed him and made him first bishop of Athens. He had two priests: one had the misfortune of sinning, he confessed to his brother who refused him absolution. He complained to