

The True Witness CATHOLIC CHRONICLE IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by J. GILLIES. G. E. CLERK, Editor. TERMS: To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 1862.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

It is not easy to arrive at a clear understanding either of the designs of Garibaldi, or of the position in which he stands as towards Victor Emmanuel and Ratazzi. Of course if a king's word were always to be relied upon, we should be forced to accept the conclusion that Garibaldi, in inciting to an immediate attack upon Rome, is acting in opposition to the wishes and policy of the Sardinian Government; but the opinion is very general that the opposition offered by the latter to Garibaldi is purely fictitious, and that whilst publicly condemning, they are in secret urging him on in the course which he is now pursuing.

Now the "other party," that is to say Garibaldi, has all along given his followers to understand that his proceedings were secretly countenanced by Victor Emmanuel and his Ministry; though for political reasons the latter could not openly approve of them until such time as they had been crowned with success. It was by these representations which were, and still are, universally believed by the revolutionary youth of Italy, that Garibaldi attracted them in numbers to his standard; and so well known is the duplicity of Victor Emmanuel, that even the publication of the royal proclamation against Garibaldi has not to any considerable extent affected the previous opinion of the King's complicity with the red-shirted filibuster. "Rome or Death" is still the rallying cry of the latter; and though some uncertainty exists as to the number whom he has collected around his standard, it is generally believed to amount to several thousands of armed men, with whom he designs to land upon the Continent, and to march to Rome. How he will be received by the French troops, should he succeed in carrying out his projects, it is impossible to predict; but as there is no amount of treachery and duplicity with which Louis Napoleon may not reasonably be credited, it is by no means improbable that the French Emperor is acting in concert with Garibaldi; and is by no means displeased at the prospects of a little gentle pressure being brought to bear upon him, so as to give him an excuse in the eyes of his subjects for withdrawing his troops from Rome, and abandoning the Holy Father to the hands of the enemies of the Church. The actual position of affairs seems to be this—Garibaldi, with his volunteers, is still in Sicily, having been prevented by the Sardinian cruisers from crossing the Straits of Messina; from all parts of Italy, the idle, the dissolute, and the dregs of society are flocking to his standard, though a real or simulated opposition to their landing in Sicily is still kept up by the authorities; and Garibaldi himself has given his ultimatum to the world in the following address:—

"The present state of affairs cannot continue; I go against the Government because it will not let me go to Rome, I go against France because she defends the Pope. I will have Rome at any price.—Rome or death. If I succeed, so much the better; if not, I will destroy the Italy that I have made myself."

The harvest prospects of most parts of Europe are reported to be good, and an average crop is expected. We are sorry to see however by some of our Irish exchanges that in Ireland there is still great suffering amongst the tenant farmers of the smaller class.

The Army of the Potomac is safe; Washington is safe, and the nation is safe. These are the tidings flashed by electric telegraph across the land; and strange tidings they are to receive from an army which we were boastfully told a few weeks ago was about to push its enemies to the wall. We may judge however of the seriousness of the scrape in which General McClellan had got himself involved, when we find that his evacuation of the peninsula, and his junction with General Pope are hailed as a quasi triumph. The Northern troops are said to be greatly demoralised.

This we can readily believe if one half of what we read in the Northern papers of the excesses and brutality of the Northern soldiers are to be received as true. The Boston Traveller

for instance gives the following account of how the Union conduct themselves:—Every citizen they found they shot or hung—every house they passed, unless positive proof was given of their Union sentiment, was burned to the ground with all its contents, while the women and children were compelled to stand by and see it burn. In this way some seventy-five citizens were made to pay the vindictive penalty for the guerilla attack, and, undoubtedly, many of them received a merited death. But some, alas, it is feared, suffered wrongfully the fearful punishment. Some sixty houses were burned also.

It is not my nature to justify such proceedings. But it can but teach the people of Tennessee that in this war there can be but two sides. They must either be for God or for the devil—for the Union or for treason. There is no stand between. Those who seek to occupy their position will invariably run the neutrality they have maintained."

No army, whose officers upon any pretence whatsoever tolerate such licentiousness on the part of their men, can long escape a thorough demoralisation; and if such scenes as that described above by the writer in the Boston Traveller are common, the Army of the North can be little better than a band of brigands and legalised murderers. The perpetrators, it is just to say, were chiefly Germans irritated by the death of a favorite leader.

There has been hard fighting on the Rappahannock River. The result is not certain; but from the fact that the telegraph has not announced a great victory for the Northerners, it may safely be inferred that the latter have met with a repulse. It is also said that General Sigel shot General McDowell through the head at Watertown. Both were Federal officers.

"LIBERALITY!"

"The True Witness, a Roman Catholic organ, published in Montreal, thus speaks of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury:—

"In plain matter of fact, the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury is as destitute of all sacerdotal or priestly character as is Mr. Stubbs the neighboring grocer; and Orders conferred by a Protestant Bishop's groom would be quite as valid as those which the reverend gentleman himself pretends to confer upon the candidates at an ordination service."

"Our Popish conferees seem to take a great delight in vilifying and abusing Protestants of all denominations, for what cause he does so is a mystery to us, enjoying as he and all his co-religionists do more true liberty in Protestant Countries than is granted where Popery is predominant. We know our conferees is a firm believer in apostolic succession, and if he is sincere in the belief that dogmas of his church, we think he is somewhat inconsistent in the remarks he makes with respect to the Archbishop of Canterbury."

"By reference to the history of the Church, as given by Roman Catholic writers, we find that the See of Canterbury was one of the first settled in England, that it has furnished a goodly quota of eighteen to the Calendar of Saints, and that nine of its Bishops were Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church."

"It is true that one of these high dignitaries was murdered by Catholic Rebels under Wal Tyler, that another, Thomas Cranmer, was burnt at the stake, that Archbishop Laud was beheaded, and that in 1697 another was deprived of his See for refusing to take the oath to King William of Glorious Memory. If Apostolic succession conferred any sacerdotal or priestly character on these Bishops, from St. Austin or Augustine in the year 596 by virtue of succession, we see no reason why the True Witness should seek to deprive his Grace, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, of the benefit or character derived from his predecessors."—British Canadian.

If we notice the above virulent effusion, which we clip from the British Canadian, it is in order that we may repudiate any design of "vilifying and abusing Protestants" in general, or members of the Anglican sect in particular, in that we refuse to recognise the validity of their Ordinations. Gentlemen holding government situations as bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of England as By Law Established, refuse in like manner to recognise as valid the Orders of other and non-Episcopal Protestant sects; and yet it would not be just to assert that because of that refusal, Anglicans "take a great delight in vilifying and abusing Dissenters of all denominations." As amiable and accomplished gentlemen, richly endowed with all natural virtues, we highly honor many, very many, of our separated brethren; but at the same time, we have as little regard for the value of their pretended Orders, as we have for any other well established sham.

It is because we are firm believers in what is known as the doctrine of "apostolical succession;" because we do not believe that any one can give or confer that which he has never received—such as a divine Commission to preach the Gospel, and to administer the Sacraments—that we do not acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders. The last real Archbishop of Canterbury was Cardinal Reginald Pole, who died the same day as that on which Queen Mary departed this life; and it is because we do not believe that his pretended successor in the See, Matthew Parker, was ever consecrated at all, that we do not believe in the reality of the Episcopal Orders pretended to be conferred by those who derive all their episcopal authority from and through the said Matthew Parker. The chain which connects Dr. Sumner with the Archbishop of Canterbury of the olden time was broken in the middle of the XVI century; and one link broken in a chain the whole is vitiated.

So much has been said and written upon the subject of the consecration of Matthew Parker—upon the validity of whose Episcopal Orders depends that of all the clergy of the present Established Church—that we need only recapitulate a few of the chief reasons assigned by Catholic writers for rejecting Anglican Orders; reminding the British Canadian, at the same time, that the burden of proof rests with those who as-

serts that the said Matthew Parker was really consecrated.

In the first place, during the life-time of Matthew Parker, and during the entire reign of Elizabeth, the reality of the former's consecration was openly denied by Catholics; and the government, and the Protestant Bishops who were most deeply interested in establishing the validity of Anglican Orders, never, though repeatedly challenged by their opponents, attempted even to bring forward any evidence, oral or documentary, to show, that Matthew Parker had ever received any Episcopal Consecration.—On the contrary—when Bonner, the most obnoxious of all the old Catholic Bishops, was called upon by Horn, the Protestant Bishop of Winchester, to take the oath of supremacy, the former refused to do so; and when legal proceedings were taken against him for his recusancy, Bonner boldly pleaded that the oath had not been tendered to him, as the law required, by a Bishop—thus directly impugning the validity of Horn's consecration, and by implication that of Matthew Parker. This plea, after a long and careful consideration of all the circumstances, was admitted to be good by the Judges; the Government, though irritated to the last degree against Bonner, dropped proceeding against him; and the next Parliament—St. Elizabeth—was reduced to the ignominious necessity of passing a Bill declaring the Protestant Bishops consecrated by Parker to be "legal Bishops"—whilst Elizabeth issued her proclamation wherein she, by her supreme royal authority, undertook "to supply" what was wanting to the valid consecration of her batch of Protestant Bishops, and to dispense with all and every defect.

And yet if that arbitrary Queen's Government had had it in their power to produce any legal evidence of the fact that Matthew Parker had really received Episcopal Orders, they would have been able not only to put to silence their Catholic adversaries and slanderers—such as Allen and Bristow and Stapleton—who openly declared that the pretended consecration of Parker was a sham, but to bring to the block Bonner the most detested of all the Prelates who in the previous reign had distinguished themselves by their severity against Protestants. And yet this government, so arbitrary, so strong, so enraged against Bonner, so insulted by him in the person of their pretended Bishops, and so vitally interested in publicly establishing the validity of their pretended Orders, had to acknowledge that Bonner's plea, that Horn was no Bishop, was a good and valid plea, and were compelled to drop all further proceedings against him! Would they thus have acted, can any sane or unprejudiced person believe that they would thus have acted, if it had been in their power to show by documentary evidence such as the pretended Lambeth Register, that Matthew Parker had indeed been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, by men who had themselves received Episcopal Orders!

The Lambeth Register, upon which alone Anglicans base their claims, was never produced in evidence, never even heard of, or alluded to, during these important proceedings. For more than half a century after the pretended consecration of Matthew Parker it remained unknown to the entire world, buried in oblivion. The register of that consecration was often indeed loudly called for; Catholics challenged their adversaries to produce it, and taunted them with their silence. At last, when another generation had appeared on the stage, when the contemporaries of Parker had passed away, a Mr. Mason, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, announced to the world that in turning over a lot of musty and long neglected papers, he had discovered the important, long lost, and long looked for document! Under such circumstances are we not justified in treating it as a forgery: would not under analogous circumstances, Protestants treat a document so "providentially discovered" as a most impudent attempt at forgery.

These are some, though far from all, of the reasons why we refuse to recognise the validity of Anglican Orders; but we do hope that we may be permitted to call the validity of those Orders in question, without again being accused of a desire to malign Protestants, or of an intention to insult a body of men, eminent in spite of a few exceptions, for their natural virtues, their great learning and their exemplary morality. We have the honor, the happiness, we may say, to be acquainted with numbers of that body; and though of course, we altogether repudiate their sacerdotal pretensions, we defy the British Canadian to show wherein we have been wanting to them in that respect or courtesy which one gentleman owes to another. Should our contemporary adduce an instance of this kind, we promise him that we will immediately, and cheerfully make the amende honorable.

\* Vide Hallam, Const. Hist.

HIS LORDSHIP THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—We regret that it is not in our power to announce the restoration of our beloved Bishop's health. He is still suffering severely, and is obliged to abstain from all work, and exertion of every kind. It would be superfluous to exhort our Catholic readers to pray for one so warmly beloved as is Mgr. Bourget, the saintly Bishop of Montreal.

The London correspondent of the Montreal Gazette honors us with notice of some remarks which, in our issue of the 18th ult., we made upon the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. He disclaims the "diatribe and vulgar abuse" which we then attributed to him, and which we must confess surprised as much as it pained us in the writings of one whom we can respect as a scholar and as a gentleman, even whilst we most widely differ from him in his conclusions. But we would ask, may not such expressions as the following, which we copy from his first article on the Temporal Power, be considered as well worthy of the epithets which we applied to them:—

"March out before your mind's eye the possessors of priest-craft who are now grasping with uncertain hands, wealth and its enjoyments—and temporal power—and the delight which it gives to ambitious minds, and mark how the gummy trail of the serpent is visible upon the robes of those who are the dedicated initiators and teachers of a religion sent from Heaven, the plighted followers of the Divine Exemplar of that faith. Listen to the new thunders from the Vatican breathing curses against all who dare assert and maintain the doctrine of popular self-government for the people of Rome—mark how the Bishops, receiving their mot d'ordre, are coming away to preach a crusade in favor of the 'right divine to govern wrong,' and then ask yourself if they, and such as they in other lands and other churches, can be accepted as exponents of Christianity."—Cor. of Gazette.

We call the above "diatribe and vulgar abuse;" because it is a feeble imitation of Exeter Hall's worst thunder; because it implies a most wicked accusation against the entire Catholic episcopacy; and because it is false in fact.—The Bishops of the Catholic Church support the temporal power of the Pope, not because it leaves them in possession of "wealth and its enjoyments," not because it gratifies or ministers to their ambition, but because it is the means, the only means with which we are yet acquainted, by which the spiritual independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, and free communication betwixt him and all parts of the Catholic world, can be secured and maintained. And it is false that the Prelates who signed the document in favor of that power, and who by their eloquence and influence support it in their several dioceses, have received the mot d'ordre to preach in favor of "the divine right to govern wrong;" for the doctrine which they preach on the subject of the relative duties of governors and governed, is still that preached of old by St. Paul; and the principles which they maintain in behalf of the authority of Pius IX. are identical with those which the Montreal Gazette would, if called upon, assert in behalf of Queen Victoria over her Irish subjects.

Our contemporary proposes the following test for Rome; will he accept of it for Ireland or India? If he will not, then he is grossly inconsistent:—

"Take away all foreign troops from Rome. Let the Pope dismiss his mercenaries from other lands. Let those born in Rome exiled during the last 13 years return to their old homes; exclude all other Italians from participation in the debate. Then let the people be asked whom they will choose to rule over them."

But how are "all other Italians" than those of Rome to be excluded "from participation in the debate?" We still remember how, when on the Voltorno, Francis II. was on the point of defeating Garibaldi and his hordes of filibusters, the robber-King of Piedmont turned the scale against the King of Naples by pouring an overwhelming force of Sardinian troops upon the territory of a prince with whom he had no pretended, even, cause of quarrel; and we cannot but fear lest were all foreign troops to be withdrawn from Rome, the robber hordes of Garibaldi from the South, and those of the robber-King from the North, would pour down upon the abandoned and defenceless city; and, as did the Gauls of old, cast the weight of their swords into the scale, and against the old man who sits in the Vatican. Besides, how is the City to be purged of the swarms of revolutionary filibusters who from every part of the Peninsula are there gathered together? The plan proposed by the Gazette's correspondent may seem fair upon paper; but in practice it would amount to an invitation to Victor Emmanuel to make himself master of Rome, if not by means of his regular troops, at least by the aid of the hired cut-throats whom he entertains in his employment, and for the spoliation of his weaker neighbors.

But apply this test to Ireland. Take away from Ireland all British troops; let the Queen dismiss her mercenaries; let those born in Ireland, and exiled during the last fifteen years, to the United States, return to their old homes;—exclude all but Irishmen from participation in the debate; and then let the people of Ireland be asked to choose a government for themselves. It is a poor rule that won't work both ways; and the test proposed by our opponent for Rome, must, if equitable, be equally appropriate for Ireland.

Could it be shown that the subjects of the Pope were cruelly oppressed and misgoverned; that Pius IX. had broken faith with his people, violated their Constitution and deprived them of their liberties—then indeed we could understand how men who profess Conservative principles might consistently appeal to the "right of revolution." But none of these things can be urged against the present occupant of the Papal throne; and if in any respect his reign is to be distinguished by future historians from those of his

predecessors, it will be by his, perhaps, greater efforts to confer upon his Roman subjects those very privileges of self-government, upon which, according to the Gazette, "the thunders of the Vatican are breathing curses." Not only has Pius IX. never attempted to abridge, or encroach upon, the civil and political liberties of his subjects, but he has done his best to extend those liberties, and to place them upon a solid and permanent basis. If he has failed in accomplishing all he meditated, the fault is not his, but that of the Jacobins, or revolutionists, who aim, not at the overthrow of the Papal government in particular, but at the destruction of all governments, of all constituted authorities, in general.

PROTESTANT CIVILISATION.—We learn from our American exchanges that the Sioux Indians have been committing horrid atrocities upon the white settlers in Minnesota. "All the Missionaries," so we are told, "have been killed;" and it is significantly added:—

"The civilized Indians exceeded their savage brethren in atrocities."

This corroborates what we have often asserted of the moral effects of Protestant missions and Protestant, so called, civilisation, upon the savage. They make of him a child of hell ten fold worse than he was before he was subjected to missionary manipulations; and when we behold the Protestant convert from heathenism, sitting clothed and in his right mind, we may be assured that we have before us the nearest possible approach to a diabolical incarnation. It is everywhere the same. At New Zealand and at the Cape of Good Hope, the disciples of the Protestant Missionaries have approved themselves the most bitter and dangerous foes with whom our settlers and troops have had to battle; and there is no exception to the rule that, by their contact with Protestants, the native tribes have everywhere been degraded, and brutalised.

THE "GLOBE" AND THE BISHOP OF HAMILTON.—In the Globe of the 15th instant was published the Rev. Geddes' own version of what transpired on the day of Sir Allan's death; and in that version we find the following passage:— "He—Mr. Andrew Stuart—said Sir Allan had voluntarily changed his faith; that he had requested him to send for the Romish Bishop; that it was not for him to interfere with Sir Allan's wishes, and accordingly he complied with his request, and sent for the Bishop."—Globe.

This statement, we say, appeared in the Globe, and over the signature of Mr. Geddes. A more explicit declaration that Mr. Stuart was the person who sent for the Bishop of Hamilton to attend Sir Allan McNab on his death-bed, it would be difficult to draw out; and yet the Globe, troubled with a short memory, utterly oblivious of what had actually appeared in its own columns, and as part of a statement made by Mr. Geddes himself—but determined at any cost to throw discredit on His Lordship the Bishop of Hamilton, has the impertinence, or shall we not rather say imprudence, to attack that Reverend Prelate in the following strain.

Alluding to His Lordship's letter, the Globe says:—

"But on the Thursday Bishop Farrell was sent for by letter, he does not say from whom. It would be very important if that letter could be produced. It might throw some light upon a dark affair."—Globe, 18th inst.

The only reply to this inuendo upon the credibility of Mgr. Farrell, which it is necessary to give, is that given by the Rev. Mr. Geddes himself—to the effect that it was from Mr. Andrew Stuart that the message inviting the attendance of the Bishop of Hamilton at Sir Allan's bedside, was sent. Had the editor of the Globe's memory been a little stronger, or its malevolence a trifle weaker, he would not have been so foolish as to ask a question which had been already fully answered in his own columns. Mr. Andrew Stuart tells us that he sent for the Bishop of Hamilton, and at Sir Allan's urgent request; how the former can be justly blamed for complying with such a request from a dying man, is more than we can conceive, or the Globe explain.

An esteemed correspondent writes to us from New Brunswick for particulars concerning the career of a Mr. Ligier in Canada. This Mr. Ligier is a fallen priest, who of course was taken by the hands on his first arrival in this country, by the leaders of the several "Swaddling" Societies which abound, but of late they seem to have become ashamed of their precious convert, and to have cast him off. At all events we have not seen the unhappy creature's name mentioned either by the Witness or by the Christian Guardian for some time past, and are altogether ignorant of his proceedings, or place of abode.—He will however turn up somewhere some day. All we know about the fellow is that he has fallen so very low, that even the Baptists repudiate any connection with him, and are anxious to contradict the report which appeared in the Christian Guardian (Methodist) to the effect that his preachings in Montreal had been in connection with the Baptist body.

Our correspondent throws some light upon the antecedents of this babe of grace. It seems that he has been going about amongst the Academics, who are a simple innocent people, persuad-