

## The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 210, St. James Street, by  
J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, 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.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

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 figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his subscription from that date.

S. M. PETERGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1874.

## ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH—1874.

Friday, 6—Holy Shroud.  
Saturday, 7—St. Thomas Aquinas, B. C.  
Sunday, 8—Third in Lent.  
Monday, 9—St. Francis, W.  
Tuesday, 10—Forty Martyrs.  
Wednesday, 11—St. John of God, C.  
Thursday, 12—St. Gregory, P. C. D.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The reports in the early part of last week of a severe engagement with the Ashantees, in which the British troops suffered severely, caused much unpleasant excitement, which subsided, however, on the receipt of a brief despatch from General Wolseley announcing the capture of Comassie, and the signing of a treaty of peace. The terms of this document are not given; but it was added that the army was about to retrace its steps to the sea coast immediately. We may indulge the hope that this nasty little war is at an end.

For every thing in this world must have an end; even the Tichborne case has been brought to a satisfactory conclusion. For nearly seven years, in one form or another, has this long pending case been in litigation before the Court of Chancery, in the Court of Common Pleas, and lastly in the Criminal Court on the charge of perjury, just concluded by a unanimous verdict of Guilty from the jury, and a sentence of 14 years penal servitude from the Bench before which it was tried. A new trial will, it is said, be moved for the ground of misdirection of the jury, but this motion will probably come to naught. After sentence, the convict Orton was immediately removed to Newgate, but it is expected that his presence will be again required in Court, in the case of Mr. Whalley's friend, Luie, or Landgren, whose trial for perjury is still pending.

The Tichborne case is, and will be remarkable for the amount of false swearing, and perjury, and subornation of perjury which it elicited on the part of the claimant—whom we may now call by his right name, Arthur Orton—and his backers. The case is also remarkable as showing the intensity of the anti-Catholic prejudices of a section of British society. Because the Tichborne family is one of the oldest Catholic families of England, settled on the estates which they hold, before the Norman Conquest, the opportunity of inflicting upon them material injury and indelible disgrace, by intruding upon them, as heir to the title and property, a low-bred, illiterate scoundrel, the consort of felons and Australian thieves, was eagerly seized upon, and no means for accomplishing the nefarious object, were left untried. False witnesses were hired to swear to so much per oath. Doubly convicted jail birds, ticket-of-leave men were engaged to perjure themselves, in open court; abuse the most violent, of the Jesuits, of the Catholic clergy was so copiously indulged in by the prisoner's counsel, that the Lord Chief Justice who presided at the trial was more than once compelled to express his disgust, and righteous indignation. In short a more melancholy exhibition of the lengths to which some men are willing to go, in order to have a chance of throwing dirt at the Catholic Church, was never exhibited before the British public. Whether the law will be able to get hold of, and punish according to their deserts, the parties to the wholesale perjuries of Luie, is not certain, but it will be very sad if the suborners of perjury be not made to suffer the penalty of the crimes which they instigated. No one can believe that Luie, for instance, came forward *proprio motu*; or doubt that at his back, and whispering into his ear, were others more guilty than he was himself.

A great Catholic meeting was held in London on Friday, the 6th ult., the Duke of Norfolk in the Chair. The large hall, says the *Times* in its report, was filled to overflowing, and "as a demonstration of numbers and feeling," says the same authority, "the proceedings were completely successful." We will lay before our readers in our next, a report of the meeting, which was designed as an answer

to the No-Popery meeting held a few days previously, and at which Earl Russell, because of a very bad cold in his head, could not preside—a meeting which was sneered at by all the leading journals of London as a most ludicrous failure. Catholics have good cause to be proud of the contrast to it presented by their meeting.

We have very good news from Spain. General Moriones, who was to have raised the siege of Bilbao but did not, has been thoroughly beaten by the Royalist forces, and clamors for reinforcements. Other successes of the Carlists are also reported, and on the whole, the revolutionary party seem to be having a bad time. The Biscayans are fighting, it should be remembered, for their *fueros*, in other words, for Home Rule.

It is also very pleasant to notice the bitterness that is springing up betwixt the Prince Emmanuel Government in Italy, and Victor Bismarck. These enemies of the Church are at loggerheads, calling one another liars, and other hard names; now we know what happens when rogues fall out.

There has been a serious railroad accident on the Great Western in Upper Canada, by which many lives have been lost. On Saturday night of last week, the Sarnia express was running about 30 miles an hour; when about midway between London and Komoka Station an oil lamp in a closet fell, was broken, and set fire to the cars. The flames spread with great rapidity; the train was not stopped for some time, and the panic-stricken passengers throw themselves headlong from the car; those who could not so escape were quickly burnt to death. Some seven or eight persons are reported dead, and about twelve more seriously injured. It would appear that, but for the resolution of the conductor, Mitchell, who, at much personal risk, ran forward, and finally succeeded in stopping the train, the loss would have been much greater.

Latest telegrams allude darkly to some bad news from the seat of war on the Gold Coast. These may probably be false; but we are not out of the wood yet, and should therefore not be in too great a hurry to halloo.

From Spain the tidings are of the most satisfactory nature. A large force of the revolutionists encamped within a short distance of Bilbao were attacked by a detachment of the Royalist army, and routed with great slaughter. About eight hundred were slain, and of the remainder, the greater part were captured by the Carlists, or drowned in their attempt to escape. It is reported that Bilbao has surrendered to the Royalist army.

In an account by the *Times* correspondent, dated the 6th ult., of the successful storming of Manresa by the Carlists, we read that amongst the brave who fell was "Captain Murray formerly of the Pontifical Zouaves, who was mortally wounded in the chest," and died the following morning. This, we fear, must be the gallant Captain Murray, nephew of the Bishop of Kingston, and of whom the Catholics of Canada were deservedly proud. If such be the case, he has died the death of a brave Christian soldier, and his fate is to be envied rather than deplored. Before going into action the storming party halted, recited the Rosary, received absolution, and then with a dash, rushed upon the enemy who were speedily discomfited. Such troops are invincible.

The famine in India is becoming more terrible every day. It has only commenced, and yet we hear that upwards of a million of people in one district are already starving; and help, or hope of help there seems to be none.

THE MONTREAL "WITNESS" THE CHAMPION OF STATE-CHURCHISM.—His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster, has clearly shown that, to-day, all controversies betwixt Catholics and non-Catholics resolve themselves into one betwixt Church and State, or in other words betwixt God and Caesar. Not content with claiming his own, Caesar now claims that which is God's; to wit, supremacy in the spiritual as well as in the civil order, authority over the Church as well as over the State, over men's souls, as well as over their bodies. Dogma, and morals are matters of but small account; and it is not so much because of corrupt doctrine, and superstitious practices that the Catholic Church is the object of such bitter hatred, as because of her persistent refusal to recognise in Caesar, or the Civil Power, any right to govern the Church, or to interfere in matters pertaining to religion.

This thesis was illustrated in a passage by us quoted from the London *Times*, showing that sound British Protestants might well rejoice in the marriage of one of their Royal Family with a Princess of the Russian Greek Church—since the Church though in doctrine, and forms of worship almost identical with the idolatrous Church of Rome, has never existed except in a condition of thorough subordination to the State. Another illustration of the same thesis we find in a series of articles in favor of State Churchism published in the Montreal *Witness*.

We think we do that journal no wrong if we say of it, that it is, in an especial manner, the representative of the non-conforming evangelical sects; of the Presbyterians, the Independents or Congregationalists, and the Baptists; and we do but state a fact when we say that it has always been hitherto the champion, with pen and ink of these ecclesiastical principles which the Scotch Covenanters defended with pike and gun against Claverhouse and his dragons; for which the English Puritans became exiles from their native land; for which but the other day a large body of the clergy of Scotland renounced their glebe lands and homes, and set up a "Free Church."

These principles are the principles of the Ultramontanes. Ultramontanism is the assertion that, in the Church, and over the Church, Caesar or the civil magistrate has no lawful jurisdiction whatsoever; that he should for the sake of his own soul be a member of the Church, but nothing more; that in the words of the often quoted worthies of the Scotch Reformation, Church and State form two distinct Kingdoms, over the former of which the chief of the latter has no authority, but to which he ought to be simply subject. It was in defence of these principles, and because they would not seem even to recognise any right in the King to rule their church, or to impose on it a form of episcopal government, that the Scotch rose in arms against Charles; that Whigs were hunted through the morasses, and over the hills of Scotland by Claverhouse's dragoons; and that in one day so many hundreds of the most consistent of Scotland's clergy, sacrificed all their worldly possessions rather than stoop to acknowledge the authority of the civil law in matters ecclesiastical, and in the appointment of parochial ministers by lay patronage. These however are the principles which to-day—and because to assert them would be to condemn the action of the German government—that the Montreal *Witness* has renounced, and combats to the best of his abilities with the aid of an anti-Catholic Canadian lawyer of Montreal, Mr. Maximilian Bibaud. So true it is, that to wage their unholy war on the Church, Protestants care not under what banner they range themselves, or what uniform they put on—God's or the Devil's. As against Catholics, the *Witness* has become the advocate of State-Churchism.

In plain English this is how the matter stands. The *Witness* at a loss for arguments of his own to sustain the monstrous thesis that the Civil Power has the right to govern the Church as well as the State; remembering also perhaps how thoroughly this thesis has been destroyed by men whom he is ever holding to the admiration of his readers as the champions of civil and religious liberty mindful of his own protestations in favor of the complete separation of Church and State—engages another to fight the battle for him; and with words of approbation reproduces in his columns a series of articles from the pen of the said M. Bibaud under the caption of "The Titles of The Civil Power To Govern The Church as Well as The State."

This document is scarce worthy of a moment's serious notice. So weak is it in its logic, so unfair or one-sided in its quotations, in so far as we have been able to verify them. We suspect that M. Bibaud indulges himself in the pernicious habit of "second hand quoting," which, if a correct surmise, would exonerate him from the charge of misquoting, or suppressing the truth, but not from the charge of being a pretender to a knowledge of ecclesiastical history to which his reading does not entitle him.

Of his vicious logic, unpardonable in a lawyer, we may cite his confounding of "Titles" with "Claims." Castro, Orton, or whatever the fellow's name may be, claims the Tichborne estates, but this claim of itself constitutes no "Title" thereunto. So with the claims of Emperors to govern the Church. Any pretensions they may have put forward cannot of themselves constitute a right, or "Title." Nor have these claims ever been recognised by the Church; even though it may be true that, amongst the Byzantines, who seem to have been a servile lot for the most part, some ecclesiastical dignitaries may have for the sake of personal gain, submitted thereunto. St. John Chrysostom however, the brightest luminary of the East, is very clear on this point; nor could the most Ultramontane writer of the present day assert in stronger and more explicit terms the supremacy of the spiritual kingdom represented by the Church, over the Kingdom of which Caesar was the head, than does this great Patriarch. Consult, we say to M. Bibaud, the 15th Homily on 2nd Ep. Cor., wherein, speaking of the two powers—the civil and ecclesiastical—of the latter, or *arky* of the Church, he says "but this power is as much above the civil power, as the heavens are above the earth, yea much more excellent." *Mallon de kai pollo pleon.* What Jesuit in the XIX. century has ever uttered more ultramontane doctrine than this?

M. Bibaud seeks to press St. Bernard into

his service, quoting the latter to the effect that the Pope is not "Lord of the Bishops;" but he is either ignorant of the fact, or forgets that the same saint, writing to the Pope, expressly says—"Nec modo ovium, sed et pastorem, tu unus, omnium pastor." Not of the sheep alone, but of all the shepherds thou art alone the shepherd."—*De Cons. b. ii., c. viii.* The *supplicatio veri* is no small sin against truth.

But the conclusive answer to all this balderdash as to the "Title of The Civil Power To Govern The Church," is to be found in the fact, that, were there any such right or title the Christian Church could not have existed a single day. It lived, it extended itself, only on the condition of refusing to acknowledge the claims of the Civil Power to govern the Church. Its first word was—"We ought to obey God rather than man;" and when it refused at the bidding of Caesar to bow down before his image, or to burn one little grain of incense on his altars, it declared in deed, as well as in word, the same great ultramontane truth. Of two things one. Either during the entire first three centuries of its existence the Christian Church was in a state of sin, in that it steadily refused to obey Caesar; or Caesar has no title to govern the Church. In the words of the Protestant historian Neander, during this period "the church stood to the State in the relation of an independent self-included whole, and was to the State for the most part an object of hostility"—as in fact is the case to-day. With the conversion of Caesar to Christianity a change took place. "The Emperors" says Neander "would be strongly inclined to transfer the relation they had stood in as pagans to the pagan State religion, over to their relation to the Christian Church. Yet they were here met by that independent spirit of the Church which in the course of three centuries had been developing itself and acquiring a determinate shape; and which made them see that Christianity could not, like Paganism be subordinated to the political interest." Amongst the Greeks indeed, a servile spirit manifested itself very early; and the Photian schism was to be speedily followed by subjection to the infidel, was the consequence. But in the West, and amongst those who were faithful to the See of Peter it was not so. In the West, the Roman Catholic Church, as Neander admits, maintained its independence, and refused to recognise the claims of Caesar to govern her.

To the Editor of The True Witness.

SIR,—Happening to read in the *Evening Star* of Monday of last week, a report of a lecture delivered by a prominent Protestant clergyman of this city, the Rev. Mr. Corder, I was much struck by the following passage:—

"Wickliffe was in 1372 elected to the Chair of Theology at Oxford where he became the author of a very copious commentary on the Decalogue . . . therein he took occasion to denounce the practice of the clergy in taking money in consideration of absolution from all sin, urging that the people under this regime cared not what sin, or what sins they committed."

What I would ask you Sir is this. In the 14th century, or in any previous or subsequent century, did the practice ever obtain, did the Roman Catholic Church ever directly or indirectly teach or sanction the teaching, that "absolution" from any one sin could be obtained in consideration of money payment? or on any other conditions than those of hearty sorrow for all sin, coupled with a firm determination to flee from it, and its occasions for the future, on the part of the sinner? and the consequent application to him in Sacramental penance of the infinite merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose blood cleanses from all sin? Yours respectfully,

SIR,

In this enlightened nineteenth century, we should have thought that it could scarce be necessary to ask, or reply to such questions as those propounded to us by *Senior*. The story that the Medieval Church, that the Catholic Church at any period of her existence, in any country, ever taught, ever permitted the clergy to teach in her name, or ever tacitly allowed her children to believe, that, by payment of money, or by works of any kind, absolution from, or remission of, sin could be obtained—without the presence, on the part of the sinner, of sincere sorrow, or contrition for all sins committed, is on a par with those other fictions originated by knaves, credited by fools, which in the days of Pagan persecution were current amongst the enemies of the early Christians: as for instance that these, in their secret religious meetings, were in the habit of eating the flesh of murdered children coated over with flour; and then of indulging in incestuous intercourse. The great father of lies who was the author of the Pagan fable was the author of that other equally absurd Protestant fiction that the Catholic Church taught, or allowed to be taught, that remission of sins could be obtained by money payment, or without the presence on the part of the sinner of the broken and contrite spirit which is the acceptable sacrifice to the Lord; without that spirit of contrition and of self-abhorrence which made the son who had been feeding on the husks which the swine rejected, cast himself at his father's feet, crying out in the bitterness of his heart—"father! I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am not worthy to be called thy son." Without these dispositions on the part of the sinner, the Church has always taught, as she teaches to-

day, that remission of sin is impossible, even to an omnipotent God.

We are indeed astonished that a gentleman and a scholar such as is Dr. Corder should have allowed himself to appear even as endorsing the vile slanders which bear the marks of falsity on their face; which are refuted by all the Liturgies, by all the writings of the saints and teachers of the primitive and medieval Church. These things do not become Dr. Corder; he should leave them to the Mavorms and Stigginses of the evangelical conventicle.

For the rest, his account of the life and labors of Wickliffe is in many details faulty—chiefly in this, that whilst challenging for his subject the sympathies of his Protestant audience, he did not tell them what were the characteristic tenets of Wickliffe, and of his disciples known as Lollards. Wickliffe was not singular in denouncing the luxury, the worldliness, the relaxation in discipline and morals, which in the fourteenth, as in preceding and in subsequent centuries centuries were to be found amongst the ranks of some of the clergy. Had Wickliffe done this, and no more, he would only have what others did, before, and have done after him; for at all epochs of the Church there have been abuses, in life and morals, amongst priests and people. But Wickliffe did far more than this; and it was on account of this something more, that he has been branded as a heretic. Animated at first perhaps by an honest zeal against prevalent abuses, he soon allowed himself to throw aside the virtues of humility and charity, devoid of which he became as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal, "*rebus ut sonans aut cymbalum tinniens*," as St. Paul says in his first letter to the Corinthians c. 13. From attacking the abuses prevalent amongst some of the Clergy and Religious of the day, he soon proceeded to attack Society and the rights of property; in a word he fell into the grossest of Communistic errors. By his intemperate exhortations he was in fact, if not in intent, the author of the *Jacquerie* in England known as "Wat the Tyler's Insurrection;" whilst his disciples the Lollards, were the precursors of the anabaptists of Munster, a class of Reformers, whose principles still survive amongst the Communists of the present century. We will support what we advance by quotations from Protestant historians.

Froude for instance, in the second volume of his History of England thus speaks of Wickliffe, his theories and their consequences:—

"His theory of property, and his study of the character of Christ had led him to the near confines of Anabaptism."—p. 28.

And it is not therefore wonderful that ignorant men excited by his preachings, soon attempted to better his instructions, and thus reduced his theories to practice:—

"In the year which followed Richard's accession, Consistory judges were assailed in their courts, sanctuaries were violated, priests were attacked and ill-treated in church, churchyard, and cathedral, and even while engaged in the mass."—*Id.*

Wickliffe may not have intended, may not even have anticipated this, but nevertheless it was the logical outcome of his teachings, and of the fundamental article of his creed that "*dominion was founded in grace*." Indeed, as Froude recognises, in the 14th century, the attacks on the Church and her doctrines were all more or less devised in the spirit of later Anabaptism, and of still later Communism.

"Innovation in doctrine was accompanied also with the tendency which characterised the extreme development of the later Protestants towards political republicanism, the fifth monarchy, and community of goods."—Froude, c. vi.

The omission on the part of Dr. Corder in his lecture on Wickliffe, of all allusion to the peculiar socialistic doctrines of the English reformer, was not fair; neither was he correct in his statement that the England of the days of Wickliffe was "the most submissive and orthodox of the countries acknowledging the jurisdiction of the Papal See." The truth is, that in the reign of Richard the 2nd, and of his predecessor Edward III. England was in a state of chronic revolt against the Holy See, and its Parliament was continually enacting fresh penal laws against "Papal Aggression," conceived in the very spirit of Henry the eighth's legislation, and of Johnny Russell's Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. Witness for instance the *Statute of Provisors* of Richard, imposing the death penalty on any man bringing into the realm "any sentence, summons, or excommunication" from the Pope; an act so bold says Froude "that it threatened nothing less than an open rupture." Witness too, the 25th Ed. III., Stat. 4, also quoted by Froude, wherein it is expressly asserted that, not by the Apostles or their successors, but by the civil ruler, Christianity was founded in England. The truth is, that in the 14th century, the attitude of the English monarchy and aristocracy towards the Pope and the Catholic Church was much the same as is that of the German Emperor, and Bismarck at the present day.

Yes! They were jealous of the Church, and sought to weaken her by depriving her of her independence, and reducing her to subjection to the State; above all they dreaded her, and