

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 696, 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, a 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 copy 3c.
We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.
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, DEC. 21.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1866.
Friday, 21—Ember Day. Fast. St. Thomas Ap.
Saturday, 22—Ember Day. Fast. Of the Feria.
Sunday, 23—Fourth of Advent.
Monday, 24—Christmas Eve. Fast.
Tuesday, 25—CHRISTMAS.
Wednesday, 26—St. Stephen, Protomartyr.
Thursday, 27—St. John, Ev. Ap.

ROMAN LOAN.

THE PONTIFICAL LOAN BONDS are now being delivered to holders of receipts; and Subscriptions will be again received, and Bonds for \$25 may be taken at \$16.50.
ALFRED LAROCQUE.
Montreal, Nov. 12, 1866.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On Tuesday, the 11th inst., the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome was accomplished, and the Holy Father was left to his own resources against the perfidious designs of the Government at Florence, and the Italian Revolutionists of whom the Apostle of the Poignard, the notorious Mazzini is the prophet. Hitherto all has been tranquil in the Papal States, and it is asserted that fresh negotiations are on foot for securing the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, Louis Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel being the contracting parties. Whatever we may think of the good faith of the French Emperor, and however tortuous his Italian policy may seem, it is not probable that he can be so blind to his own interests and to those of France, as to desire to see the Supreme Pontiff either forced into exile, or degraded to the rank of a subject of Victor Emmanuel. The latter too, seems to consider it necessary to keep up appearances before the world; for at the opening of the Parliament at Florence on Saturday the 15th inst. he positively declared—not that any reliance is to be placed on the man's word or oaths—that he would respect the Territories of the Pope: and that he trusted that the wisdom of the latter—and the moderation of the Italians—together with a spirit of conciliation, on both sides, would tend to the removal of all differences. This would be more satisfactory did we not remember that Victor Emmanuel held precisely the same style of language to the King of the Two Sicilies, at the very time when engaged in fitting out a filibustering expedition under Garibaldi against the dominions of the Sovereign with whom he was at peace, and towards whom he professed the most amicable sentiments. Besides, if sincerely desirous of "conciliation" Victor Emmanuel may have his wish gratified any moment he pleases. It is all very well to talk about the Pope being reconciled to Italy, but so to talk is folly, for Italy has no cause of complaint against the Pope. It is Italy, or rather its present revolutionary government, that stands in need of being reconciled to the Sovereign Pontiff, since it is that Government that has robbed the Pope and despoiled him of his rightful domains. Now the first step towards reconciliation betwixt the thief and his victim, must be the restoration of the dishonestly acquired goods, and a clearly manifested intention to abstain in the future from picking and stealing. In the meantime we learn that Signor Torelli has been received at Rome as an envoy from the Italian government. The telegram reports a revolt amongst the wretched and half starved peasantry of Sardinia.

The alarm in Ireland is on the decrease, though the British Government is still on the alert, and keeping a smart look out upon suspicious persons, whom it arrests, and for arms and ammunition, of which seizures are constantly being made. It is hoped, however, that the extensive preparations made by the authorities will suffice to avert the much talked of uprising, and that the long impending storm will pass harmlessly away. God grant that it may be so, and that the soil of Ireland be not reddened with the blood of her children. The whereabouts of Stephens is still a mystery. A report, subsequently contradicted, reached us that he had been arrested in Norfolk; other reports again are to the effect that he is still in the United States.

In England there has been a terrible colliery

explosion, whereby between 300 and 400 persons are believed to have perished. A great Reform Demonstration in London on Monday the 3rd inst., seems to have passed off quietly.

Surratt, accused of complicity in the brutal murder of President Lincoln, and whose mother was hung on the same charge, though the evidence of her guilt was of the most flimsy character, is now in the hands of the authorities, and will soon be in America. His trial is expected to bring to light some strange facts; but whatever the result, we shall watch with interest the action of the Executive, to see whether it will stick to its rule laid down in the case of the Fenians, that it is barbarous to punish with death, crimes "eminently political," as the assassination of the late President undoubtedly was. The rule is a bad one; and certainly hanging is by no means too severe a doom for the assassin and murderer, no matter on what grounds he perpetrates his crime. Still the Washington authorities have laid down the rule; the question is "Will they adhere to it?"

RITUALISM.—It is a grave error to suppose that the ministers of the Church of England who have adopted, and are engaged in carrying on, what are styled "ritualistic practices" are solely, or even mainly actuated by a desire to wear fine clothes, to assert their authority over the laity as a separate class, or even to render the services of their denomination more attractive to the mass of the people. All those motives may exist in the so-called "ritualistic movement," but there are more important motives, more respectable agencies than these at work. There is, we say, in "ritualism" a good deal more than what meets the eye; much more than "man-millinery," as its opponents contemptuously and unphilosophically call it. The novel, or rather resuscitated ecclesiastical dresses in which the "ritualising" clergy scrupulously array themselves, the lights on their altars or Communion tables, and the incense which they delight to burn, are but the husks, or outward integuments, beneath which a kernel, or important dogma is symbolically preached.

Protestant so-called worship is essentially, almost exclusively, didactic; and though less so in the Church of England than in any other Protestant sect, still even in the first-named, the sermon has always been deemed of more importance than the eucharistic celebration; the pulpit has always taken precedence of the altar. In such worship all "ritualism" is out of place; it is an excrescence, an anomaly; and its introduction, therefore clearly implies a design of revolutionising the Protestant religion; of substituting a eucharistic, for a didactic, mode of worship; a worship in which, not the sermon, but the celebration of the Lord's Supper, no matter by what name called, or in what character regarded, shall bear the chief part. Now in many, indeed we may say in most Protestant sects, so lightly is the Eucharistic mode of worship esteemed, that, instead of daily, or even weekly, or even monthly celebrations of the one great, central and essential act of Christian worship, the Lord's Supper—considered merely as commemorative rite, and a symbolical communion of the faithful—is celebrated, or administered but once or twice in the course of a year. Ritualism has, therefore, for one of its objects, the restoration amongst Protestant communities, of the Eucharistic celebration to its proper and original rank, as the one all supreme act of all truly Christian worship—as that which above all other acts, distinguishes the "Church," from the Mosque, and the Synagogue; in both of which, as in the Protestant meeting-house, there is preaching, or religious teaching, but no sacrifice.

Another object of the Ritualists is to establish an argument for that corporate union of their sect with the Catholic Church, and the Oriental Orthodox, and Schismatic communities, of which they, the Ritualists, fondly dream. All history shows, all existing liturgies show, that not only has the Eucharistic celebration been always and everywhere the one central, constant and essential act of Christian worship, but that it has always, and everywhere been looked upon as a true and valid propitiatory sacrifice, even as it is looked upon by the Latin Church at the present day. To give to it this same character in the Church of England: to convert, apparently, the infrequent celebrations of a communion service, into the daily unbloody sacrifice of the New Law, is obligatory upon the Ritualists before they can expect that the meanest of the Oriental sects, which in spite of schism still retains a true priesthood, and a true sacrifice, will so much as condescend to listen to their overtures for union. But how is this character to be imparted to a mere "communion service"? How is the gentleman who ministers at the table to be vested in the eyes of Orientals with the characteristics of a priest? how are Russian schismatics to be convinced that the religious service, or act of worship, which in practice is deemed of so little importance in the Church of England, that it is only performed in most churches at long intervals; that almost invariably when it is to be performed, a majority of the congregation leave the church just as its most important part commences, and that few if any besides intending communicants remain—is indeed the all important, sa-

preme act of worship of the Church of England, as it undoubtedly is of the Russian Church?—This is the problem which presented itself to the High Church party in England, and they have sought to solve it by adopting the exterior rites and ceremonies with which the Catholic Church most appropriately celebrates her Eucharistic sacrifice—rites and ceremonies which are, however, idle and void of sense in the communion service of the Church of England. Many perhaps of the ritualistic clergy, and even of their congregations may accept the anti-Protestant doctrines, which these rites and ceremonies signify, and preach to the unlearned; but that they are repugnant not only to all that is Protestant within the Establishment, and to the general tone of the Prayer Book and its Rubrics no impartial judge will attempt to deny. For be it understood that the extreme Ritualists, not only ape the rites, ceremonies, and dresses of the Catholic Church, but that they hold up, or propound, the consecrated elements to the worship of their people; thus, by implication, doing one of two things. Either they tempt or provoke their several congregations to worship that which they themselves hold to be as much bread and wine after consecration, as before—which is undoubtedly idolatry; or they believe, and try to teach, that the consecrated elements are no longer creatures, but God Himself, which is manifestly repugnant to any interpretation however forced, that can be put upon the 28th of the Anglican's 39 articles.

What must Catholics think of this movement? we hear asked. It would be rash to attempt to prophesy, but we think that it is a movement which should excite our hopes, and to a certain extent may enlist our sympathies. As the old Law given to the Jews was a pedagogy to bring men to Christ, so happily may it turn out that this Ritualism may be, as it were, a pedagogy to bring back our misguided and long erring brethren to the Catholic truth, to the Church of Christ, and the fold of the One Good Shepherd. That so it may be, all Catholics will pray, whatever may be their opinions of the good taste of the ritualistic movement itself, or of the means which its promoters adopt for imparting, as it were, a flavor, or *soupeon* of Catholicity to the essentially Protestant communion service of the Anglican Church.

"THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION."—This is the name of a new weekly paper published in Toronto, having for its motto, the words "The Altar and the Throne," and for its object, apparently, the perpetuation of bad feeling betwixt Her Majesty's subjects in Canada, Catholic and Protestant respectively.

The *British Constitution* is, we are sorry to say, a very rabid Orange paper, and threatens to do much harm in the community amongst whom it circulates, by reviving and heaping fuel upon the embers of old national and religious feuds; by setting Irish Protestant against Irish Catholic, and by thus giving to the pretended friends of the latter in the United States, an excuse, or at all events the semblance of an excuse, for intermeddling with the affairs of Canada. This certainly is not a job which the Christian at any time, or the loyal subject of Queen Victoria at the present crisis, would willingly undertake.—Indeed in so far as our Orange contemporary shall accomplish anything, it will be entirely to the profit of the Fenians, and other enemies of that *British Constitution* of which it pretends to espouse the cause.

If our contemporary would but calmly consider it; if for one moment, laying aside the prejudices of the Lodge, and the vile cant of the Brotherhood, he would intelligently examine the question—"from what quarter does danger really menace the British Constitution?"—he would see that it proceeded, not from Catholics, but from non-Catholics; and that, which God forbid, should the Throne be upset, and the old mixed Constitution of Great Britain be torn to shreds,—the agents in this Revolution will be, not the co-religionists of a Manning or a Newman, but the political disciples of John Bright, the Liberal Protestant; but the vile rabble who, with much expenditure of stinking breath, gave ovation to Garibaldi, and who still cheer on in their assaults upon the Papacy, the cut-throats of European democracy, and the blood-bounds of the Revolution.

The Catholic Church is essentially Conservative. Her doctrine is, "Fear God and Honor the King;" she is the foremost and the uncompromising enemy of the Revolution, always and everywhere; and with the same accents with which she condemns the *Carbonari* of Italy, does she denounce and condemn, their political brethren the Fenians of Ireland. It was against her therefore, her influence and authority over the people, that the first attacks—as Mr. Stephens, as all the leaders of Fenianism tell us—of the Irish Revolutionists and Yankee Jacobins were directed; for well they knew that until such time as the Irishman had ceased to be a Catholic at heart, until he had renounced his ancestral faith, he never could be a Fenian, or a sympathiser with Fenians. Stephen's himself boasts that he has destroyed the prestige, or moral in-

fluence of the Irish Catholic clergy, as the preliminary indispensable to the success of his revolutionary designs. Is it not then a marvel of hypocrisy or stupidity to pretend that the safety of the British Constitution requires the eradication of Popery? No. That matters are not worse than they are in Ireland; that as yet the Government has been enabled to prevent a bloody outbreak, is due, under God, to the Catholic Church; to what of respect for her teachings, and obedience to her authority, still, in spite of Orangeism and Fenianism, linger in the hearts of the people of Ireland.

But we will give our contemporary credit for the honesty of his intentions, and we will believe his professions of attachment to the British Constitution. Well then! we demand equal courtesy, equal liberality of judgment from our opponent for ourselves, when we assure him that, as Catholics, we yield not to him in respect for, and attachment to, that Constitution—a Constitution which, in spite of its defects, in spite of democratic inroads, in spite even of the manner in which it was long applied to Ireland, is, we believe, the best in every respect, that now exists in the world. Nor is this to be wondered at: for is it not, after all, in its main feature, in its "common law," the out-growth or product of the Catholic ages? the only existing type of all those free Constitutions which once obtained throughout Europe: and which were overthrown, not by Catholics, but by anti-Catholic kings, who, jealous of the influence of the Church and the spiritual power of the Pope, and who astutely availing themselves of the civil dissensions to which the Reformation gave birth, contrived to concentrate in their own hands all authority, both spiritual and temporal? Hence modern Despotism; hence, too, its inevitable reaction, that is to say, Revolution.

How are we to maintain for ourselves and children the many blessings of that free and happy Constitution in Canada?—free and happy because therein democratic absolutism is tempered or modified by the monarchical and aristocratic elements which it still luckily contains.—Not certainly by arraying one class of Her Majesty's subjects against another class; not certainly by holding up that Constitution as an emblem of the ascendancy of these, as a badge of the political and social degradation of those; not certainly by insisting upon, and bringing prominently forward its defects, and making insulting parade of the manner in which it was long abused and perverted in Ireland; not by reminding those subject to it in Canada, that it once was made a bitter and cruel scourge to their fathers, because Catholics; not by endeavoring to limit its blessings to one denomination of citizens, but by freely extending them to all: not certainly by the encouraging of Orangeism, which will but provoke to the organisation of counter secret societies.—No; not by such means, but by cordial union under one banner, and on one platform. For this it is not necessary that either the Catholic, or the Conservative Protestant should sacrifice one of his conscientious convictions. It is enough that, recognising the fact that they are both the subjects of one Queen, having a common interest in upholding the free Constitution under which they live, and which is menaced, not by Popery but by Revolution, they should mutually offer, and mutually take one another's hands in friendly grasp, pledging themselves to make common cause against the common enemy, Liberalism and Democracy. These are the enemies whom the British Constitution has to dread.—Not Papists; but the political children of the men who once dragged the Crown of England through the mire; who actually upset the Throne; who stabled their horses in Cathedrals and in time honored churches; who voted the House of Lords a nuisance, and who spurned the Speaker's mace, the badge of the legitimate authority of the Commons of England, as a bauble. These are they whom the friends of the Constitution, whether Catholic or Protestant, have good reason to dread.

NATIONALITY.—The *Times* does justice at last to the honest intentions of the Austrians, who did all in their power to make themselves popular—or rather tolerated in Venetia; but all in vain, for the Venetians would not be conciliated, and rejected all amicable overtures from the foreigner.

"Some day or another it will be known," says the *Times*' correspondent. "how truly Austria tried to be reconciled with the Venetians, according to her lights—and yet the attempt failed." Shall we wonder then that the Irish—who are to the English in the position that the Venetians were to the Austrians, save that there were in the latter case no religious differences to embitter national feud—are not yet reconciled with the stranger race? Besides, is it so very certain that England has done its best to bring about this reconciliation? can it be affirmed that she has never enacted or maintained on her Statute Books; laws insulting and oppressive towards the Irish? Perhaps if England had but taken half the pains to conciliate the Irish, that by the showing of the *Times*, Austria took to conciliate the Venetians, we should have heard but little in the nineteenth century of Fenianism, or Irish disaffection.

THE CONFESSONAL.—Dr. Pusey has again written a long letter to the *London Times*, on the subject of "auricular confession" in the Church of England, or at all events as now practised by many members of that Church. He justifies the practice by appeals to Scripture, the Anglican Ordination Service, and the Rubrics. His argument is of course based on the assumption—which no Catholic, which no member of any of the Oriental schismatic communities admits—that the so called Orders of the Anglican Church are valid, that its ministers are really and truly priests, and its Bishops good and valid Bishops.

Setting aside the grievous sin against logic, fact, and historical truth implied in this assumption, the argument of Dr. Pusey is strong, indeed unanswerable. He quotes the Scriptures to show that Our Lord gave to His Apostles, that is to say to men, authority to remit sins; and that this authority must be inherent in their legitimate successors, or those to whom by the laying on of hands they have transmitted the same power or authority as that which they themselves received from Christ: for argues Dr. Pusey, if we deny the transmission of that power, if we assert that it was limited to the Apostles themselves, how and with what logic can it be argued—that the obligation of "baptizing all nations" was not also a mere personal obligation, to cease and become void by their demise? If argues in short the Doctor, if you insist upon the perpetuity of the obligation to baptize—you must by parity of reason admit the perpetuity of the authority to remit sin.

He quotes the very words of the Anglican Ordination service, which—unless they are to be looked upon as a mockery of God, as a mere mummerly, more offensive than the mummeries which the Low Churchmen impute to the Ritualists—do expressly attribute to the ordained minister the power and authority of remitting sin. The words of the Anglican Ordinal are "whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained;" now these words were by the framers of the service intended to mean something or nothing. If something, then undoubtedly the transmission by the laying on of hands to the recipient of Anglican Orders, of the very same power or authority that Christ gave to His Apostles: if intended to mean nothing precise, then what a monstrous, self-convicted sham must not Anglicanism be, by the showing of its own ministers, who deny having received in virtue of their ordination, any special power or authority, or privilege not common to them with every Christian?

Lastly Dr. Pusey appeals to the Rubrics, which are certainly altogether on his side: for in one of these, attached to the office for the visitation of the sick, the minister is not only permitted, but is enjoined to move the sick person to make a "special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter"—that is to say with sin, unless in the opinion of Low Churchmen sin be not a weighty matter; after which "special Confession," in the words of the Rubric "the Priest shall absolve him" using the formula—

"And by His authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

Now the question as raised by Dr. Pusey is not as to whether Christ has really committed such power or authority to any particular man, or to any particular body of men, on earth at the present day? but whether the Anglican Church, in and through its legal formularies, asserts that Christ has actually done so; and that its ministers, or ordained priests are the recipients of that peculiar power or authority of remitting sins? This is the question; and the Low Churchman's answer to this question is utterly irrelevant, since the doctrine may be false, and nevertheless be both explicitly and implicitly asserted in Anglican formularies.

And such being the facts of the case, we are not surprised to learn that the practice of "auricular confession" obtains extensively, and is rapidly extending itself in the Anglican Church. Its ministers encourage to it, and its people readily embrace it—in some instances, very possibly with good results, but, we fear, not in all. For the Anglican minister is no priest: as a matter of fact, he has no more power or authority to forgive or to retain sin, than his less presumptuous neighbor, the Methodist or Baptist minister over the way. He has no more right, or authority from God, to receive confession, or to pronounce absolution, than had Korah and his company to assume to themselves the functions of Aaron: and it is no wonder therefore that in spite of his good intentions, his ministrations are often in their results positively injurious, and give a semblance of force to the arguments against "auricular confession," which his Low Church opponents are not slow to urge against him. We will give an illustration of our meaning.

The Ritualists have just given to the world a volume, "*The Church and the World*," containing a series of *Essays* advocating their views. Of these one is from the pen of a lady, still an Anglican, but who, for some years, has been in the habit of going to Confession. The writer is evidently a pure-minded, amiable person, and from her youth upwards, according to her lights