

finds itself compelled to make a shuffling addition to the original story, by admitting that the Priest had previously visited S. R., in order to prepare his penitents for the reception of the Holy Communion. Still, even this is not enough. Mass had to be said, and all the Communicants, as well as the Priest, must have been fasting from the previous day. But who is the Priest? Find out who can. It was not the Rev. Mons. Faucher, but some other Priest whose name is not given, but who is said to have officiated at Somerset. We protest against all these new versions of an old story. We have nothing to do with them. Why, we may be kept dodging about all the parishes in Lower Canada. When Andre Solandt wrote his letter from which the editor of the *Montreal Witness* took his particulars, either the name of the Rev. Mons. Faucher did, or did not, occur. If it did not, the infamy of the lie rests with the *Montreal Witness*: if it did, what becomes of the previous assertion of the same paper, that "the Colporteurs are exceedingly scrupulous to state, on all occasions, so far as they know, the truth, the exact truth, and nothing but the truth."—Vide *Montreal Witness*, Oct. 14th. Even those who might be willing to acquit the Colporteurs of deliberate and malicious falsehood, (if any such simple persons there be,) must at least admit that they are far from scrupulous, and that they are too ready to insert in their journals calumnies against the Clergy, without ascertaining their truth, or previously making the necessary inquiries. For, had Andre Solandt made the inquiries he should have made before the issue of the *July Record*, he would not, in the month of October, have written the name of Faucher, for that of some other Priest. That is, supposing that he did really write that rev. gentleman's name, and that the whole is not a pure invention of the *Montreal Witness* and the F. C. M. Society. The same remark holds good, with respect to the members of the Committee of that Society. As gentlemen, it was their bounden duty to have ascertained the truth of any anecdotes published with the sanction of their names, and containing insulting or offensive allusions to a body of men, who are at least to be respected for the sacred office to which they lay claim. What an outcry would be justly raised against a Catholic paper, which should insert, without any previous enquiry, a series of anecdotes insulting to some of the Protestant Ministers of Canada, giving the initials of their Churches or places of residence. For instance, were we to state that on Monday last, the Rev. —, of —, had been seen beastly drunk, riding down Great St. — Street, on the back of a Rhinoceros; or, that he had from the pulpit challenged any of his congregation, to fight him for ten pounds a-side, and a bottle of rum—we know what would be said of us. But, there is one law for Protestants, and another for Catholics, it would seem. However, we think that most impartial men will admit that there is little difference between the guilt of him who publicly accuses another, knowing his accusation to be false, and of him who publicly accuses another, not knowing his accusation to be true. In the latter case the F. C. M. Society certainly finds itself; for, even by their own admission, the members had given themselves so little pains to ascertain the truth or falsity of the charge against the Priest at S. R., that, though published in the month of July, they were not able to give the name or place of residence of the accused party, in the month of October. And yet we believe that in the Society, there are persons calling themselves gentlemen, and who have had the honor to hold her Majesty's commission, and to wear her uniform.

One word more to the *Montreal Witness*, and we have done. We have proved the falsity of its charge against the Rev. Mons. Faucher, and we have compelled it to confess its falsity. It is needless for us to do more. A false *Witness* we have called it, and a false *Witness* it has confessed itself to be. Its calumnies against the Clergy can do no harm now. Surely even Evangelical credulity must have its limits. We will not soon forget the story about the Rev. Mons. Faucher; and when again we see in its columns, or in those of the F. C. M. Society's *Records*, other libels against other priests, we will remember the exposure to which we have subjected them, and treat the writers with the contempt which detected liars and slanderers so richly deserve.

We have received a communication from Mr. Osgood, containing certain queries, to which we give the following replies:—The first question is, "Why are the prayers of the Church in her solemn services, offered in Latin, when so many of the common people do not understand that language?" We answer, because the Church offers her prayers, not to the people, but to God, for the people, and it is likely that God understands Latin as well as French or English.—The second question is, "Why are prayers directed to the Blessed Virgin, when Christ is our only mediator through whom we have access to God the Heavenly Father, and Protestants are unable to believe in the ubiquity of the Blessed Virgin or any mere mortal being?" Mr. Osgood should remember that Protestant ability or inability to believe, is not the measure of truth, and that the Blessed Virgin is not a mere mortal, but an immortal being. Her ubiquity is not an article of faith, nor is it necessary that she should be everywhere present to hear the prayers of those to whom the mother of the Redeemer is dear; we ask her intercession, because the Church by a decree of the 25th Session of the Council of Trent teaches that the Saints reigning with Christ, do offer prayers for the faithful on earth, and that it is good and useful for us to ask their intercession. It is because the Church teaches it, that we believe in the Divinity of Christ, and offer prayers to Him as God.—The third question is, "Do we think that the tortures of the inquisition were calculated to promote

the prosperity of the Church?" We leave out the word tortures because the real meaning of the question is, do we believe that the inquisition was calculated to promote the prosperity of the Church? We answer that so far as the inquisition acted in accordance with the instructions of the Church, (which it did not always do) it was useful to the Church, and to the extirpation of Heresy, or else the Church would never have tolerated it.—The fourth question is, "Has not the Roman Catholic Church been noted for inflicting pains and penalties upon those who think for themselves?" To this we answer—No—at the same time we do not admit that in religion men have any right to think for themselves. If God has proposed a religion to man, it is man's duty to accept it without hesitation. Man has no choice in the matter. He must accept, or be damned. Mr. Osgood has many more questions to put to us. As a newspaper is not a place for theological controversy, we would recommend him to peruse some works on the Catholic religion, such as "*Milner's End of Controversy*," or even the *Catechism* in use in the schools of the Christian Brothers, where he will find all his questions fully answered.

We are sorry to see that some remarks of ours have drawn upon us the censures of the *New York Freeman's Journal*. We will therefore endeavour to set ourselves right with a contemporary whose good opinion we are anxious to possess, by a full confession of our faith respecting the suppression of the Jesuits. We believe that Clement XIV., of blessed memory, suppressed the order of the Jesuits from motives of temporary expediency. We believe that it was necessary and good for the Church in the XVIII. century that the Order should be suppressed, and we believe so simply because the Pope, who is Christ's vicar on earth, did suppress it. We believe that the Pope regretted the existence of the necessity for suppressing it, hence his exclamation, "*Compulsus, compulsum feci*."

We believe also, that it was expedient and necessary for the Church to re-establish the order of the Jesuits, and for the same reason, simply because another Pope did re-establish it. We believe that its existence at the present day, is expedient and necessary for the Church, and still for the same reason, because our beloved father, Pius IX., allows it to exist as an established Order in the Church. Finally, we believe that that Catholic who presumes to object to the suppression of the Jesuits—to their subsequent re-establishment—or to their present existence, is an undutiful son, who deserves not to be called a Catholic, because he sets himself in opposition to that authority which it is the duty of all men to respect and obey.

In alluding to the fact, that the clergy of France, headed by the Archbishop of Paris, did refuse to publish the brief of Clement, and did remonstrate with the Pope in energetic language, it was not our intention to approve their conduct, but simply to contradict the unfounded assertion that the Catholic clergy as a body rejoiced in the suppression of the Jesuits. It would have been more becoming to the clergy of France, more consistent, to have accepted with deference and due submission, the decision of the Sovereign Pontiff, as did the Jesuits, who proved themselves in this, as in all else, to be the worthy children of the Blessed Saint, Ignatius Loyola.

Every mail from Europe brings fresh accounts of murders and outrages on person and property in Great Britain. Barbarism is outstripping civilisation with giant strides. The *Times* draws the following fearful picture of the state of Protestant England. Railroads and electric telegraphs have not done much to diminish crime as yet, perhaps in time men will learn that it would be as well to try the effects of a little religion, instead of steam, as an agent in the great work of civilisation:—

"Its most frequented and fashionable counties are literally overrun with thieves, less expert from practice than fearless from impunity. On the borders of Berkshire, Middlesex, Hampshire, and Surrey, within half an hour's ride of Scotland Yard, and in the centre of the district distinguished by the names of Windsor, Richmond, Hampton, Eton, Clarendon, and Strathfieldsaye, bands of daring robbers have established themselves, in utter contempt of law and police. For at least a twelvemonth past these marauders have levied contributions on the houses in the neighborhood, and notably upon those of the magistrates themselves. The facts were notorious, and the alarm universal; but nothing was done. Even large and populous towns usually thought secure from this species of danger were plundered with the most insolent audacity. In Reading, burglaries occurred for nights together; and few persons could retire to rest in the country adjoining with an assurance that they would wake in safety the next morning. At last came the catastrophe at Frimley, distinguished from the rest rather by the incident of murder than by any general novelty of features. Let the reader consider for a moment what a state of things is disclosed by the circumstances of this lamentable tragedy. Three men lay their plans for a robbery. They select a house standing in a village, and within a hundred yards—that is to say, within easy call—of half-a-dozen other houses. In this Frimley parsonage there resided a clergyman and his wife, their two sons almost grown up, two maid-servants, and a man-servant. With no disguise but a bit of green baize round their faces, the thieves walk into this abode of four men and three women, strike a light, go up-stairs, and proceed to search the rooms. That their presence, under such circumstances, should be discovered, was of course a matter of certainty; but instead of decamping on detection, they endeavor to carry their point by violence, wrestle with the inmates for some minutes together, and at length shoot the master of the house, and make off. They do not condescend, however, to run many yards. Within half a mile of the scene of murder, they coolly settle down again, and regale themselves with cold meat and wine carried off from the premises, leaving the traces of their good cheer to be found in the morning. Life and property could hardly be less secure in Texas or Athens."

BROWNSON'S LAST LECTURE!

We are most happy to announce to all our readers that Dr. Brownson, yielding to the wishes of his many friends, has consented to deliver another of his masterly lectures, on Tuesday evening, the 12th inst., the subject will be **POPULAR LITERATURE**. As this will perhaps be the last opportunity of hearing Dr. Brownson, we cannot too earnestly recommend to all our readers, to all those who love to see the truth and its noblest institutions vindicated, not to fail to assist next Tuesday evening, at the Odd Fellow's Hall.

We copy from Scobie & Balfour's Almanac for 1850, the following singular testimony to the effects of Protestantism in Upper Canada:—

"It is quite impossible to get anything like a correct Religious census of Upper Canada, because the numbers of various denominations are so many, and such sectional jealousies exist, that the exclusion of any class from the census rolls, causes dissatisfaction, and to include all would have the effect of swelling the rolls to an enormous extent. Consequently in this census a large deficiency must occur. In 1842 the deficiency amounted to 80,000, or 1-6th of the whole population, while in 1848 it is 25,000, or about 1-29th of the whole; in addition to the actual deficiency in 1848, we find no less than 60,000 classed under the head of no creed or denomination, a circumstance which of itself is sufficient to render this branch of the census perfectly useless for any practical purpose, nor could it be attended with any beneficial result to institute a comparison between the denominations given in both years.—"*Remarks on the Census of 1848, by the Board of Registration and Statistics for Canada.*"—The Italics are our own.

It is a pity that the French Canadian Missionary Society does not direct its energies to the conversion of the 60,000 of no creed in Upper Canada. Perhaps the reason they do not do so, is, that their conversion would not entail the confiscation of any Ecclesiastical corporation property. There is no prospect of making money by their conversion.

We see by the Upper Canada papers that the trial of Michael Doherty, and John and Denis O'Rourke, charged with the murder of James Campbell, on the 12th of July last, has terminated in the acquittal of the accused. The deceased had taken part in an Orange procession, when of course the usual insulting party demonstrations took place. A party of armed Orangemen and a body of Catholics also armed came into collision—a fight ensued, and James Campbell received some severe blows on the head, from the effects of which he died a few days afterwards. It was proved that both parties had made previous preparations in anticipation of a conflict, and it does not appear that any steps had been taken by the authorities to put a stop to an illegal procession or to prevent the disturbances which might be expected to ensue. The whole affair is very discreditable, and it is to be hoped that measures may be taken to prevent a recurrence of the events of 12th of July. An Orange procession is not like the St. George's, St. Patrick's, St. Andrews, or St. Jean Baptiste procession, a national commemoration. Its sole object is to insult the Catholic population of Ireland, and to recall to mind the sad war of 1689, and the infamous violation of the articles of the treaty of Limerick by the Protestant government of Great Britain.

The *Montreal Witness* wonders why we have not noticed the Rev. Digby Campbell's pamphlet. As it never has been sent to us, we have never had an opportunity.

We thankfully acknowledge the receipt of the following amounts:—Mr. Michael Brennan, Belleville, 15s.; Rev. Mr. Carrier, Baie du Febre, 12s. 6d.; Rev. Mr. Proulx, Oshawa, £2; Mr. Mathew Enright, Quebec, £10; Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, Douro, £1 5s.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the *True Witness and Catholic Chronicle*.

ULSTER PROTESTANTISM AND PROGRESS.

DEAR SIR,—There appears at the head of your last editorial, an extract bearing upon the prosperity of Ulster, the credit of which is therein claimed by Protestantism. And as it is not enough to deal with this incorrect and insolent pretension, in a purely Christian sense,—that being appreciable by Catholics alone,—I should like to see this and all other charges of the same nature, met by a flat denial, and a challenge to the proof. If men will expose their truth in this manner, it behoves them at least to substantiate their words. If Ulster can boast of some little revived prosperity and commercial energy above the rest of Ireland, it should be shown then, whether no good Catholics contribute to this energy and share in this prosperity of "the North;" and whether the dark Statute Book of England cannot afford as good a clue as the Bible, to a proper solution of this entire matter. But no, this view of the case answers not the political bawler or learned Charlatan, who rants of Protestantism and "Anglo-Saxonism," now-a-days; and yet what earthly business should religion have, or has the Church of God ever claimed to have in the commercial concerns of any people, except, perhaps, in the projecting of a civil constitution, or the like, for society to repose on? Wherefore, then, should the Church be held responsible for the political degeneracy of this people, or of that, any more than she is for the sins of mankind, over which she mourns? But wherein consists this boasted superiority and adaptation of Protestantism, of which we hear so much? Man to man, throughout every circle of society, is the Protestant gentleman more accom-

plished, the scholar more profound and variously informed, the artisan more clever, or the peasant more peaceful and industrious, than his Catholic peer, even in Ireland, where a Priest's head and a Welsh wolf's, were of like value to the Crown, and where the poor teacher became *de facto* a criminal, fit for the antipodes or the Devil? Who is the first orator, even of the British Senate; who the first geologist and chemist, and who the first journalist? Well, but surely our religion, being only adapted for Heaven, cramps our genius on earth, and makes laggards of us all; while this wonderful Protestantism, or Anti-Theocracy, with lightning touch, emancipates the mind, and sends the busy thought flying, by electric pulsation, around or along the globe! Now, what rule or dogma of God's Church prohibits the use of our faculties or the exercise of our energies, or stands as an anathema upon science? None. Graze from the list of the world's moral and military heroes and scholars, all Catholic names, and how many remain to Protestantism? In truth, this senseless boast, by which heresy presumes to live, happens thus: The mind, whose ideal lies in its own creations and discoveries, becomes like the *Sibyl* on her tripod, frantic from its own imaginings, and becomes inspired over steam, magnetism and matter; while, to the Catholic ideal, these discoveries are not so much phenomena brought under the sovereignty of genius, as a few of the qualities, or rather accidents, of matter, made useful unto commerce by the lust of gain. Nor does this sober view preclude their utility, but only fits us for their appreciation, and prevents them from becoming Gods to us.

Surely it is not only blasphemy, but stupid blindness of where this wonderful nineteenth century is running, to say that religion—that the Church of God—unfits her children for life. And were commerce better indoctrinated in the honesty which she inculcates, we would not see to-day the monstrous fact of *millionaires* 'mid misery so poignant and so vast, or behold nintenths of society in virtual slavery to the rest: and so the boasted monuments of this so civilized age, are but grim beetling precipices without stay, which only the mercy of God can avert from their natural gravitation upon society.

O, Religion! thou who evokest in man the recognition of a God, and all the charities, and art sublime as the Eternal One, and as far as Heaven beyond the scope of mind, and the paltry rivalry of science, thou needest now no vindicacy, and art only angry with Knowledge, when, like the Devil, she aspires above her sphere, to insult thee, as in the case of that astronomer who presumed to illustrate thy theology, by the solar system, and would not be apprised of his impiety and error.—Yours, &c.,

BELFAST.

THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY.

The Holy See, in the reconstruction of the English Hierarchy, has, in a manner, added another nation to Christendom, or rather, it is a greater miracle than the conversion of a nation, it is the recovery of a lost one. Perhaps some reader may think it strange that we should look upon it in this light, and ask whether we should call Sweden a Catholic country if it pleased his Holiness to name a Bishop to the long-desolate sees of Upsal or Lincoping. But this is unfair reasoning. The Holy See never acts suddenly—never allows its actions to be other than the expression of facts. It is because, simultaneously with the Providence of God having removed the shackles of the Church in England, she has partly Catholicised with unexampled rapidity, partly received accessions of Catholic inhabitants from this island, until, as it were, a nation has arisen within it as numerous as the Catholic people of England before the dissolution: it is because of this, surely, that the Holy Father considers that the time has arrived for making the external correspond to the internal order of things. The Faithful of England might, in a manner, expect as much of their venerated Pontiff; they might expect that the moment his Holiness felt himself enabled graciously to promulgate such a blessing, they would no longer be reckoned in *partibus infidelium*, but, as in ancient times, the waste places might be built up, and the familiar names of their native English towns be made, as heretofore, holy and venerable by the blessing of Catholic Bishops of their own. The "Archbishop of Westminster" commences a new era for Catholicity in England—a happier and nobler one, we hope in God, than it has ever had before. We have passed through great and terrible trials; the sins of a corrupt age—its desertion, be it observed, of that very Rock of Peter that would have been a tower of strength against the fury of a schismatic sovereign—brought on us three hundred years of persecution and sorrow, in which the remnant that remained of Catholicity was purified as the gold in the furnace, and has even changed into itself much of the dross with which it was mingled. The new state of things is now acknowledged. It is not, indeed, the same, but it may be a great deal better and more satisfactory state than if the nation had not passed through its three hundred years of penance. In the discussions of that schism, which still reigns over, perhaps, the majority of the English people—in its endless subdivisions (only this last week a second split has been made in the Puseyite party), the nation may discern how impossible it is to keep unity without a centre of unity, and at least Catholics must have learnt how strength is turned into weakness. What was once the spirit of Faith cringes to secular majesty, truth withers away, charity is dried up, the Church herself becomes barren, unless there is a loving, trustful, zealous obedience to the Chair of Peter, the Rock of the Church, and the Centre of Unity. After what the successor of St. Peter has thus done for England, anything short of this would be the basest ingratitude, as well as folly and wickedness.—*Tablet*.