

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLES.

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.
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.
Single copies, price 3c, can be had at this Office; Puck's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickett), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.
Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 24, 1862.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE past week has not been fertile in great events, either in the Old, or in the New, World. From Europe the most important item that reaches us is to the effect that "brigandage,"—or in other words the armed resistance of the people to the rule of the King of Sardinia—is on the increase in the Kingdom of Naples. The Piedmontese maintain an overwhelming force in the newly conquered country, and their cruelties towards the unhappy Neapolitans, far exceed all that malice ever invented of Austrian rule in Italy. The Government of Victor Emmanuel is, emphatically, the Government of the stick; and the bastinado, and wholesale fusillades, are the means by which alone it seeks, or can expect, to consolidate itself in the lately annexed Southern section of the Peninsula. The people, however, seem to be more irritated than daunted, by the cruelties of their conquerors, whom they hate with a thorough and perfect hatred—a hatred surpassing in intensity, if that be possible, the hatred which the Southerners entertain as towards the Yankees. By the aid of his armed mercenaries and of the unscrupulous butchers, his generals, Victor Emmanuel may perhaps succeed in imposing for a time his detested and alien yoke upon the unfortunate people whom treason, rather than the fortune of war, has delivered over to his hands; but the "sheer conquest," which according to the London Times' correspondent is the only process for establishing Italian unity, is to all appearance as far off as ever.

The accounts which reach us from Rome as to the state of the Pope's health are very consolating, and all was quiet at the holy City.—From his dungeon, and his sick bed, Garibaldi has addressed a long rignarole of a letter to the British nation, which even the Times, his steady champion and eulogist, is compelled to qualify as recalling to mind "the bombast of the Republican School," and which is but a bad copy of the worst productions of the Jacobins of the last century. In this "strange address," as the Times calls it, the writer holds up to the admiration and imitation of nineteenth century Protestant and Conservative England, infidel and revolutionary France of the Reign of Terror. "Call" so he exhorts the people of England, "call the French nation to co-operation with you," in establishing the reign of Liberty, Equality, and universal Brotherhood, after, of course, having cut the throats of all opponents; and though "for the moment she is under the domination of the spirit of evil"—which being interpreted means Louis Napoleon—France will come—France who in a "solemn moment gave to the world the Goddess Reason"—(under the guise of a naked prostitute)—"levelled tyranny to the dust, and consecrated free brotherhood," etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Our readers will surely excuse us for not inflicting upon them more of the jargon of the sans-culottes, and the gibberish of modern Liberals.

This is indeed strange language for any one to address to the nation, which above all others distinguished itself by its unrelenting hostility to the principles of 89, and on whose soil the worship of shameless harlots in flesh coloured pantaloons, even under the name of Goddesses of Reason, has not as yet found many proselytes. It shows however the opinion which Continental Liberals have formed, and very naturally formed, from the disgraceful foreign policy which of late years Great Britain has adopted; it shows too, what manner of Protestantism it is that is alone in vogue amongst the non-Catholics of Italy, who being logical, look upon the pulling down of Popery as the setting up of the Goddess of Reason; and who make no secret of their hostility, not to Romanism alone, but to Christianity, and to every form of religion which presumes to put restraints upon the free indulgence of their animal lusts; and, as the Times by its strictures admits, this language addressed by a revolutionist to the Protestants of England, gives a striking instance of the strange, or rather dirty and low bred bed-fellows with whom Liberalism brings in contact all those who venture even to coquet with the nasty strumpet. Low indeed, very low indeed the "English Nation" have fallen in the estimation of foreigners when a Garibaldi holds up

to their admiration revolutionary France of the eighteenth century; and plainly tells them that if they design to be consistent, they should inaugurate the worship of the Goddess Reason in St. Paul's; and bow down before a naked harlot enshrined upon the Altar of Liberty in Westminster Abbey. Garibaldi is no doubt right; for it is absurd for those who are "hail fellow well met" with the leaders of the present anti-Catholic movement in Italy, to affect squeamishness at the impieties, blasphemies and obscenities of the blood stained destroyers of Popery in France, in the last century; but Englishmen are so puffed up with an extravagant conceit of themselves, that to be reminded of this by an Address from Garibaldi startles and disconcerts them. It would be well if it should have the effect of inducing them to pause in their career, and of asking whether does this down hill road lead?

No progress has been made by the combatants on either side on this Continent towards bringing the disastrous war to a conclusion.—There have been skirmishes, marchings, and countermarchings; but since our last no decisive action has taken place. Attempts to enforce the draft in Boston, Philadelphia and other Northern cities have been violently opposed by the people, and in consequence have had to be abandoned. A strong determination to resist the draft in various sections of Pennsylvania, has, as we learn from the N. Y. Tribune, led to a collision between the Irish and the military, during which several of the former were killed. Irishmen it would appear are becoming tired of fighting for the Yankees, who much prefer fighting by proxy to fighting in person.

We copy from the Montreal Gazette of Friday last, the subjoined paragraph respecting the conversion of a sick lady near Toronto. Of course we express no opinion as to the accuracy of the statements therein contained:—

PROTESTANTISM vs. CATHOLICISM.—Under the above heading the Toronto Leader gives a lengthy account of a death-bed scene closely resembling that of the late Sir Allan MacNab. In this case the principal character is a lady, and the locality Toronto. It is stated that, about two months ago, Rev. Mr. Darling, a clergyman of the Church of England in that city, was called to attend a woman who had been seized with a serious, and, it was feared, fatal illness. Mr. Darling repeatedly visited the lady, who was one of his parishioners, and administered to her the consolations of religion. On his departure for the Synod, at Montreal, he requested Rev. Dr. Scadding and Rev. Dr. Givins to attend her, which they did till his return, when he resumed his visits. About ten days ago Mr. Darling learned, much to his astonishment, that a week or more previously, a Roman Catholic clergyman had visited the lady and at intervals subsequently, and had administered the rite of baptism, received her confession, admitted her to full communion with the Roman Catholic Church, and, the symptoms of approaching dissolution becoming more apparent, had administered also the rite of extreme unction. Rev. Mr. Darling now inquired of the lady respecting the matter, when she admitted the Catholic clergyman had visited her in obedience to her own request. Mr. Darling asked, as to her motive for such a step—one which he conceived of such momentous bearing as regards her future welfare. She answered that her Roman Catholic nurse had persuaded her to do so, representing that should she become a Catholic her sight, which had been impaired by her illness, would be restored. She also stated that the fact of the Roman Catholic Church authorizing prayers for the dead, was one that afforded consolation, for if such prayers were beneficial they might be needed in her case, if she had not effectively made her peace with God. Though holding this opinion, the invalid did not say she had joined the Roman Catholic Church, nor did she deny it. She asked Mr. Darling to continue his visits, which he promised to do till she should state explicitly if she had changed her mind. Meantime several Roman Catholic ladies, including Sisters of Mercy, visited the sufferer, striving on every opportunity to win her to their faith. These visits occurring at the same time as those of Mr. Darling, have given rise to painful scenes. The ladies on one occasion protested against his visits, saying the patient was no longer under his ministrations. Mr. Darling offered to leave the question as to who should be the future visitor of the lady to her own decision; but this the R. C. Bishop refused. However, after a great deal of squabbling between the representatives of both religions, the matter has been disposed of as follows: two nurses, one of each faith, have been appointed to attend the lady till she regains consciousness, when both parties will abide by her own decision as to which persuasion she will adopt, and the visits of those of the opposite faith will thereafter cease.

From the above version, which comes from sources exclusively Protestant, it is clear that the sick lady, proprio motu, invited the ministrations of the Catholic priest; and it is certain also that the latter would not have administered to his penitent any of the Sacraments unless she had first explicitly declared her desire to be received into the Church. There is however much ambiguity in the latter part of the story by us taken from the Gazette. It says, speaking of the sick lady, "till she regains consciousness," though we were not informed that previously she had at any time during her sickness lost her "consciousness;" or that she was not perfectly sane and conscious when questioned by Mr. Darling as to the motives which had induced her to send for the Catholic priest. From this ambiguity, we suspect, or rather, more than suspect, that there is something connected with the business which Mr. Darling, or his Protestant friends desire to keep obscure, as not tending to support that charge of undue proselytism against the Sisters of Charity, which it is their evident object to insinuate. We may however shortly expect to obtain full particulars of the case from our Catholic contemporaries of Toronto, and these we will lay before our readers.

We may be permitted in the mean time to point out one very curious assertion made by the Protestant narrator of the events, which throws considerable doubts upon the accuracy of his

other statements. He says that the sick lady, who of course was perfectly conscious when explaining to Mr. Darling the motives which had induced her to become a Catholic,—assigned as one of those motives, the consolation afforded by the practice in the Church of praying for the dead:—

"She also stated that the fact of the Roman Catholic Church authorizing prayers for the dead was one that afforded consolation, for if such prayers were beneficial they might be needed in her case, if she had not effectively made her peace with God."

Such language, such an explanation of the teachings of the Catholic Church with respect to "prayers for the dead," and the efficacy of such prayers, could not have fallen from the lips of one who had just received those very teachings from the mouth of a Catholic priest. Prayers avail not for the dead who have "not effectively made their peace with God" whilst in the flesh; but are profitable to those only who have departed this life in a state of grace. For those who have not whilst on earth, effectively made their peace with God, and who are therefore at enmity with Him, when they appear in His dread presence to answer for the deeds done in the flesh, there is no redemption, no place of purgation, no need therefore of the prayers of the faithful on earth. The Church prays for those only who fall asleep in a state of grace, or peace with God.

THE "CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN" ON "SAINT WORSHIP."—Whether to invoke the prayers of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven, in behalf of us poor sinners upon earth, be derogatory to the sole mediatorship of Christ? was the question which we proposed to discuss with our Methodist contemporary. We cited the language of one of his own obituary notices, to show that even Protestants attributed a saving, though subordinate saving, efficacy to the prayers of their fellow-sinners; and we concluded that, as in kind this in no wise differed from the efficacy which we Papists attribute to the prayers of the glorified Saints, we were no more obnoxious to the charge of denying the sole mediatorship of Christ because we attach a high value to the prayers of the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints, than are our separated Methodist brethren, in that the latter attribute to "a mother's holy prayer" the salvation of an erring son. To this line of argument, our Methodist contemporary replies in his issue of the 8th inst., and to the following purpose.

He argues first, that to condemn the practice of invoking the prayers and intercession of the Saints "it would be sufficient to say that the Scriptures do not authorise the practice, but rather condemn it; that, amongst Protestants, the custom of 'praying for one another here is designed to interest us in each other's salvation which is the only means of spreading the Gospel;" and "finally that there is no evidence from the writings of any of the Fathers during the first three or four centuries that such a thing was approved of, nor during the first five centuries that such a practice existed in the Christian Church."

To the first reason assigned by our contemporary, as sufficient to condemn the doctrine of the Catholic Church upon the subject of saint-worship, to the effect that the practice is not authorised or sanctioned by the Scriptures of either the Old or of the New Testament, we reply that this reason is worthless, unless our opponent can first prove that all Christian doctrine is contained in those Scriptures; and that they were appointed by Christ Himself as exclusively the rule of faith to His disciples throughout all ages. In our private judgment,—and we are fully as competent to interpret rightly the Christian Scriptures as are any or all of the doctors of the Protestant world—there are many passages in the Bible which authorise the practice, and not one to condemn it; but as Catholics never condescend to chop Scripture with heretics, and as we do not presume to impose our private interpretation of the Bible upon others, we do not insist upon this point—only we call upon the Christian Guardian to show reason why it is sufficient to condemn a practice, to say that it is not sanctioned in the Christian Scriptures.

To his second reason—that the sole object of praying for one another here is to interest us in each other's salvation—we reply that this, if true, would entirely do away with the objective value or efficacy of prayer. True, prayer is a great mystery, and how it can have any efficacy with God who is unchangeable is beyond the reach of our limited faculties; and yet it is positively stated in those Scriptures to which our opponent so often refers, that the continual prayer of the just man availeth much with the Lord—as in the case of the prophet Elias. Protestants, many of them at least, may admit this in theory; but we fear that in practice they attribute merely a sub-

* The entire doctrine of the Church on the cultus sanctorum is comprised and set forth in the following decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess. 25:—
[Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus episcopis, et ceteris docendis manus curamque sustinentibus ut
* fideles diligenter instruant, doceant eos, sanctos una cum Christo, regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile, esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, operum, auxilium confugere.]

jective efficacy to prayer, and value it only as a means of arousing within themselves certain conditions of feeling, and stirring up a wild abnormal excitement.

To the third reason urged by the Christian Guardian against the Catholic doctrine concerning the invocation of the Saints—viz., that there is no evidence from the Fathers that such a practice existed during the first five centuries in the Christian Church—we give a flat denial. This is simply a question of fact; and if our opponent will publish them, we undertake to furnish him with extracts, from St. Augustin alone, and sufficient to fill several of his columns, to show that the practice of invoking the prayers of the Saints was universally prevalent during the days of that eminent Father, and that it received his full approval.

But not content with the line of argumentation given above, the Christian Guardian contends that invoking the prayers of the Saints, as practised by Catholics, differs not only in degree but in kind from the practice which obtains amongst Protestants of asking the prayers of their friends upon earth. "We assert," says the Christian Guardian, "that they are different both in kind and degree;" and he supports his thesis in the following terms:—

"There is a difference between asking and praying, the greatest of the apostles asked the prayers of the very humblest of the disciples. We ask our friends to pray for us, but we do not get down on our knees, the attitude of worship, and pray to them, as Catholics do to the departed spirits."

Wherein there is a difference in kind "between asking and praying" our contemporary does not inform us, and we are at a loss to conceive. If we turn to the Dictionary—say Worcester's—for information on the subject, we find that "to ask" means:—

"To request; to solicit; to petition; to beg; to beseech; to entreat; to crave; to supplicate; to implore."

And that "to pray" means:—

"To ask for earnestly; to petition; to entreat; to supplicate; to implore; to beseech; to ask."

Thus according to the Dictionary, "to ask" if it differ at all from "to pray," differs only in degree and not in kind; whilst by our Lord Himself the term "ask" is employed, according to the English version, as the synonym of "to pray," and as significative of those petitions which we are enjoined to offer to the Most Highest. Thus:—

"Ask and it shall be given you."—St. Matt. vii.

"How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"—Ib. ii.

"And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer believing, ye shall receive."—St. Matt. xxi. 22.

We might multiply examples to any extent; but we have given enough to show that "between asking and praying there is"—according to the Dictionary and the Bible—"no difference whatever;" and that consequently the assertion of the Christian Guardian is as false, as his argument deduced from "the attitude" in which we invoke, or ask the prayers of the Saints is ridiculous. Idolatrous worship differs from that legitimate worship or honor which, for God's sake, we Catholics offer to God's best and noblest creatures, not in the attitude of the body, or in the angle of inclination which the dorsal column makes with the horizon—for that would be indeed only a difference of degree—but in kind; for all idolatry consists essentially in giving to creature that which belongs exclusively to Creator; and that worship honor, reverence or respect which we offer to the Saints could not in any posture, in any attitude, sitting, kneeling or standing, be offered to God without a positive insult to His Supreme Majesty. In that we ask the prayers of the Saints we distinctly assert their subordinate position; and acknowledge that there is a difference, and an infinite distance between them—and that Being to whom we ask them to address their prayers in our behalf.

It is because Protestants have no worship worthy of God, because they withhold from Him that which is His due, that they accuse us of giving to God's creatures too much, when we invoke them, and honor their memories. There is but one act of worship worthy of God, and that is sacrifice; there is but one victim which is worthy of God, and that is Himself. That sacrifice, that victim, is indeed daily offered on our Altars, for thereon we offer the very body of our Lord Who once suffered for us on the Cross.—This it is which constitutes the essential difference betwixt Catholic, and all Protestant worship, and which at the same time renders it impossible for the most ignorant amongst Papists to confound the worship which they offer to God, with that which they offer to His creatures. So when the Christian Guardian tauntingly inquires—"what is this distinction between two kinds of worship different from heathenism itself?"—since, "the heathen had superior and inferior gods, and these superior and inferior worship?"—we reply that the distinction is patent to the meanest understanding, not obscured by malice or invincible prejudice. Betwixt the superior and inferior worships offered by the heathen to their superior and inferior Gods there was no essential difference, because to both they offered sacrifice; whilst Catholics offer sacrifice to God alone, and in the words of St. Augustin replying to the Christian Guardian of his age, no one ever heard the Priest say, I offer sacrifice

to thee Peter or Paul, or any other saint; but to God alone Who crowned them.

It is almost a waste of time, of ink and paper, to argue with one who is so grossly ignorant of the meaning of words, as to contend that to attribute to the Saints a power derived from God to know what is taking place amongst the faithful on this little earth, this diminutive speck in the vast universe, is to "ascribe to them the two incommunicable attributes of omniscience and omnipresence." With such stupendous folly, it is impossible to deal; it is impossible to reason with one who confounds omniscience, with a knowledge of what is transpiring upon such an inconceivably minute fraction of creation as is this little globe which we inhabit. Before such stupendous ignorance, or rather stolid stupidity, we bow down abashed, almost worshipping it, as some idolatrous Indian tribes are said to adore fever, and small-pox, and other malignant deities.

We will nevertheless reply to a question which the Christian Guardian proposes to us respecting St. Bonaventure, and the psalter, which in ignorance of the results of criticism he erroneously attributes to that holy, and learned Doctor. We have heard that there is such a work, but we have never seen it; it has not, however, received in any manner the sanction or approbation of the Catholic Church, and it is only spoken of by Catholic writers as a work altogether unworthy of the great Saint to whom by some it has been falsely attributed. The Christian Guardian will therefore trust understand from this fact, that the work is repudiated by all the admirers and panegyrists of St. Bonaventure, and that its style and language, are repugnant to the religious sentiment of the Catholic Church.

DR. HOOK'S LIVES OF THE ARCHBISHOPS.

—It seems strange that the popular religious systems of an age which boasts of being in a peculiar manner the age of light and reason, should be the most irrational. Rationalism has become the synonym in our age for irreligion; and the folly of the fool who has said in his heart there is no God, is cloaked by that pretentious name. Our shallow age has been called the age of reason, on the same principle of lucus a non lucendo; and Protestantism, the history of whose contradictions is the standing monument of human folly, is popularly spoken of as the religion of the intellect.

It will not do to trust to names. The post-reformation era has been prolific of a false nomenclature. It has given names to things at hap-lazard, or with a malicious design of perverting the truth. Liberty, fraternity, and equality are still the watchwords of the Revolution; Jesuitism is yet used as the synonym of falsehood and fraud by those who regard the author of the "Provincial Letters" as a model controversialist, and lend their names to endorse the frauds of the Maria Monks and Garazzis of our day.—Superstition is the epithet in vogue to designate the dogmas of the Catholic Church, amongst those who practise devil-worship, and meet in solemn conclave round dining-tables in darkened rooms, to summon the spirits of the dead; and the time-honored ritual and ceremonies of Rome are mummeries to the Protestant Premier, and working head of that Church which was convulsed by the surplice question, and three-fourths of whose members regard the placing of a couple of candles on the communion table as a more heinous offence in a minister than the rejection of the Athanasian Creed.

The variations of Protestantism are the favorite theme of those who would dilate upon the weakness of fallen humanity; and yet it may be truly said that the variations of Protestantism are its sole claims to respect. Dogmatic Protestantism—Protestantism which is not Protestant—rejecting the principle of free enquiry, seizes some dogmas of the Catholic Church, distorts and mutilates them, patches them together, calls its handiwork a system, sets it forth as a confession of faith, and, with the Bible in one hand, and its new creed in the other, says—believe this, or be damned; who can away with that? Who can endure a ruler who, claiming no divine right to govern, insists upon unreserved obedience?—who will follow a guide who in the same breath tells him to seek out the path for himself, and to follow blindly in the footsteps of his leader?

The truly consistent Protestant, and so-called critic of pure reason, who, beginning with doubt and denial, and following his principles to their logical conclusion, ends with doubting whether he doubts, and denying that he denies, may be an object of pity; but what shall we say of his illogical and unreasoning brother Protestants, who, accepting the principle with which he starts, refuse to push it to its last consequences; who assert from day to day their stereotyped formulas, without troubling themselves about their sense; who accept articles of religion teaching one system, and whose form of worship is a liturgy that teaches its contradictory opposite; who, having started on the downhill road, and had a view of the gulf to which it invariably leads, close their eyes, lock the wheels of their car, and come to