

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1874. ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR. APRIL—1874. Friday, 17—St. Leo, P. C. D. (April 11.) Saturday, 18—Of the Immaculate Conception. Sunday, 19—Second after Easter. Monday, 20—Of the Feria. Tuesday, 21—St. Anselm, B. C. D. Wednesday, 22—St. Soter and Caius, PP., MM. Thursday, 23—St. George, M.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The troops on their return from the Ashantee expedition met with an enthusiastic reception, which they deserved. The chief result of the war is the capture of the negro monarch's State Umbrella, which has been presented to the Queen—an event commemorated by Punch's Poet Laureate in spirited stanzas, which in every respect are superior to the wretched doggerel of the Queen's poet on the occasion of the Duke of Edinburgh bringing home his bride. It is to be feared that Tennyson is high played out. Lucie and Capt. Brown, the notorious witnesses for the defendant in the Tichborne case, have been tried for perjury, found guilty, and sentenced, the first to seven, the other to five years penal servitude. Whalley is still at large. The fighting in the vicinity of Bilbao still continues. The Carlists are badly supplied with artillery; but in all other respects, especially in the morale of their troops have the advantage over their enemies. Late telegrams from Spain tells us that Marshal Serrano commanding the revolutionary forces in the North of Spain, has made proposals for a settlement—nature not given—to the General commanding for His Majesty Charles VII. These proposals the Royalists have definitively rejected. Latest news from India assure us that the famine is subsiding, and that the measures taken by the government have been found adequate to the emergency. Here in Canada, the question of the week has been, what will Riel do? and what will the Ministry do? Since his taking the oath, he has not been seen, and no one knows where he is, or where he is likely to turn up. It is a sad business, and has been made much worse by bad management from the beginning of the North West troubles. The remains of the late Dr. Livingstone in a good state of preservation, have arrived in England, and will be received with public honors. DOMINION PARLIAMENT.—The Parliament met at Ottawa on Tuesday the 7th inst. The Hon. M. Dorion moved to bring in a Bill for voting by ballot, and it was read a first time. M. Dorion assured the House that it contained stringent provisions against the malpractices too prevalent at elections. In reply to a question from Mr. Palmer, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie stated that it was not the present intention of the Government to apply for an amnesty in the case of the North West troubles of 1869. On Tuesday when the House of Commons met Mr. Riel was not in his place, neither did he make his appearance during the sitting.—The Order of the Day was postponed to Thursday, and after some unimportant business the House adjourned. On Thursday the time of the House was taken up with the discussion of the Riel question. Mr. Clarke, Attorney-General of Manitoba was examined at length, but nothing new was elicited. After a somewhat desultory conversation Mr. Bowell gave notice that on Monday he would move, seconded by Dr. Schultz, that Louis Riel being a fugitive from justice—a warrant for his arrest on a charge of murder being out against him; and having failed to obey the orders of the House to attend in his place, be expelled from the House. Mr. Bowell cited as a precedent justifying his proposed mode of procedure, the action of the Imperial House of Commons towards the notorious Sadleir. Fifteen taverns, two saloons and eight grog shops in Woodstock, Ont. Not so bad for a small town.

The object of the annexed communication, addressed, and sent to the Montreal Witness more than two weeks ago, but which that journal has refused to publish, is to show that, even if false, the charges urged by a "Jesuit Father" against the moral tendencies of Luther's writings and preachings, are not Jesuitical pervasions of history—since they have been made by Protestant historians of the highest standing. To calumniate Romish priests in the columns of his journal, and to refuse to them, or their friends, the opportunity of justifying themselves, is however perfectly consistent with the career of the Montreal Witness. It is the object of the conductors of that journal, in so far as they can, to prevent their readers from hearing both sides of the story:—

(To the Editor of the Montreal Witness.)
Sir,—I crave permission to offer a few remarks, through the columns of your widely circulated journal, on the strictures of your correspondent Luther, upon a sermon lately delivered by "a Jesuit Father," on the life and teachings of Luther; and in which sermon the preacher charged the great reformer of the 16th century—1st, with having held and taught the rankest Antinomianism; and, 2nd., with having formally sanctioned vice and immorality amongst the high placed and powerful on earth.—These accusations your correspondent denounced as "Jesuitical Perversions of History."

As against the general morality of these Protestants who call themselves "of Luther," or against that of those who in Montreal are known as Lutherans, I have not a word to say; and I beg it to be distinctly understood that I repudiate all intention of giving offence. No! The morality of Protestants of the Lutheran denomination, is not the question I propose to discuss.

Neither do I pretend to enter into the question as to whether the allegations made by "a Jesuit Father" against the moral teachings of Luther be "Perversions of History?" but I ask whether they can in any sense be called "Jesuitical Perversions of History?" that is to say, "Perversions" which have the Jesuits for their authors and propagators. This is the question I propose to consider.

1. Luther taught the rankest Antinomianism, or, in other words, the liberty of dispensing with the obligations of the moral law.

2. Luther sanctioned, in the high placed and politically influential at all events,—the filthiest immorality, as not incompatible with the highest professions of Christianity.

Such, in substance, were the charges urged against Luther by the "Jesuit Father." The question at issue is, not—Are these charges true; but, if false, if "Perversions of History," are they "Jesuitical Perversions?" or perversions for which the Jesuits in general, or the Jesuit preacher in particular, are, or is, responsible?

The reply I would offer to this question is: that the charges against Luther have been made by Protestant historians of the highest reputation for candor, critical acumen, and extensive erudition; and that therefore, even if false, they are not "Jesuitical Perversions of History." In support of my thesis, allow me to cite the Protestant historian Hallam, whose works justly rank amongst English classics. I might cite many other Protestant writers, but I fear to trespass too much on your columns. Now, speaking of the first effects of Luther's preachings, Hallam thus expresses himself. See Introduction to the Literature of Europe.

"A more immediate effect of overthrowing the ancient system was the growth of fanaticism, to which in its worst shape, the Antinomian extravagances of Luther yielded too great encouragement."

Alarmed at the fierce outbreak of licentiousness with which his doctrines were swiftly followed, and which found practical expression amongst the Anabaptists, Luther, listening to the counsels of the more wary Melancthon, permitted, so Hallam tells us— "his early doctrine upon justification to be so far modified, or mitigated in expression, that it ceased to give apparent countenance to immorality."

Yet was this modification, or mitigation of his extreme Antinomian doctrines, more apparent than real on the part of Luther, since, as Hallam continues,—

"in his own writings we may find to the last such language as to the impossibility of sin in the justified man, who was to judge solely by an internal assurance as to the continuance of his own justification as would now be universally condemned in all our churches, and is hardly to be heard from the lips of the merest enthusiast."

Again, in c. iv. of the same work Hallam thus sums up the peculiar doctrines of Luther—

"In maintaining salvation to depend on faith as a single condition, he not only denied the importance, in a religious sense, of a virtuous life, but asserted that every one who felt within himself a full assurance that his sins were remitted (which according to Luther is the proper meaning of Christian faith) became incapable of sinning at all, or, at least of forfeiting the favor of God, so long, but so long only, as that assurance should continue. Such expressions are sometimes said by Suckendorf and Mosheim to have been thrown out hastily and without precision; but I fear it will be found on examination that they are very definite and clear, the want of precision and perspicuity being rather in those which are alleged as inconsistent with them, and as more consonant to the general doctrine of the Christian Church."

I might multiply the quotations, but I fear to be tedious; and I have given enough to show that, if it be a "Perversion of History" to charge Luther with having taught rank Antinomianism, the perversion is not a "Jesuitical Perversion." Let us pass to the next head.

The "Jesuit father" said that Luther deliberately sanctioned, amongst the great and powerful, the filthiest immorality. But Protestant historians have done as much; for they have admitted as true, that Luther and the other leading reformers, did formally and deliberately sanction polygamy or adulterous intercourse amongst professing Christians; e.g., in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse. If this be a "Perversion of History" it is certainly not a "Jesuitical Perversion." Your correspondent Luther prudently abstains from any allusion to it.

But he cites a passage from the Augsburg Confession of Faith on "Good Works" to show that the early Protestants did not ignore the necessity of holy living. This does not touch the question at issue, and the document cited is of no value as evidence either as to the teachings of Luther, or as to the apprehension of those teachings, by his first nominal followers. Since 1530, the year when the first Confession was drawn up, it has—(such at least is the verdict of competent critics)—been subjected to several alterations. Again we cite the testimony of the Protestant Hallam, c. vi. of the work above quoted.

"The Lutheran princes who the year before had acquired the name of Protestants, by their protest against the resolutions of the majority in the Diet of Speire, presented, in 1530, to that held at Augsburg, the celebrated confession which embodies their religious creed. It has been said that there are material changes in subsequent editions, but this is denied by the Lutherans. Their denial can only be as to the materiality, for the fact is clear."

And that it is so, Hallam in a foot-note shows, by placing in juxtaposition extracts from the edition of 1540, with others from one of an earlier date, but both on the subject of the Lord's Supper. If then the allegation that the text of the original Confession of Augsburg has been doctored, be a "Perversion of History," it is not at all events a "Jesuitical Perversion."

Q. E. D.
Montreal, March 30th, 1874.

A FALSE ALARM.—That reverend wag the Rev. Sydney Smith expressed a strong opinion on the difficulty of driving a joke into a Scotch head; indeed he opined that without a physical operation, the thing could not be done. As difficult, to say the least, is it to make a Protestant understand what is the essential characteristic of the religious system, to which he applies the name of Romanism; wherein consists the formal difference betwixt the Protestant and the Catholic. They, that is Protestants, are so exceedingly obtuse on this subject, that they all assume that by merely adopting some of the religious practices of Romanism—their style of church decorations, their ecclesiastical costumes, their liturgical language, their mode of worship, their Eucharistic and other doctrines, they the Protestants aforesaid by this process of adoption, approximate, or draw closer to Romanism, and cease to be distinctively Protestant.

Never was there a grosser blunder or one more dangerous in its consequences. That any should fall into it, is but a proof how intense is the ignorance of the Catholic, or "Romish" religious system that obtains amongst Protestants. To disabuse them therefore if possible, to comfort the hearts of timid low churchmen and evangelicals, and to repress the absurd ecclesiastical snobbery of their high church opponents, we beg to assure them that in the eyes of the Catholic Church, that in sober fact, the most extreme Ritualist in the Anglican communion, though he may go in for lights on his communion table, for vestments, for gaily communions, for fasting, for confession, for prayers for the dead, for the invocation of saints, &c., &c., is quite as far from the Romish Church as is any of the spiritual subjects of Brigham Young is as sound a Protestant as Mr. Newdegate, or as Mr. Whalley himself; and that all his apings of Romish ceremonies and doctrines have not brought him nearer to the portals of the said Romish Church by one single hair's breadth; have not given to the evangelical world the slightest excuse for suggesting doubts as to the soundness of his Protestantism. Indeed the staunchest Protestants, the most remote therefore from the Romish church, are generally to be found amongst the extreme Ritualists. For what is it to be a Protestant?

It is no matter what, in matters of religion, a man may, or may not, hold or believe; so long as he adheres to the principle of private judgment he is a Protestant. Not the what a man believes, but the why he believes, is it that constitutes the essential difference betwixt the Catholic and the Protestant. We can conceive of one who by the study of history, of the Fathers, and the Bible, should convince himself of the truth of all the several articles of the Catholic faith; but such a man would still be as far from the Catholic Church as the heavens are from the earth, as the East is from the West, unless he believed those articles upon the grounds—and upon none other than these—that the "Catholic Church so believes and teaches." In a word, Romanism consists in this: that its "Rule of Faith" is the teaching of the Church, whilst Protestantism asserts the right of private judgment. Until, by an act of faith, a man makes absolute, unqualified submission to the authority of the Church, as the one divinely appointed, and therefore infallible medium, whereby God's revealed will is to all communicated, he cannot take even the first step towards the portal of the Romish Church.

The low churchmen of Toronto have therefore no cause to doubt of the sound Protestantism of their ritualistic brethren, although the latter do publish and circulate books of devotion, in which certain ceremonies and modes of cultus, objectionable in evangelical eyes, do prominently figure. What though, as the Globe tells us is the case, a book compiled from a Catholic work known as the Garden of the Soul "is given to the children in Toronto," and is distributed among "the children of a Sunday school;" what though in this book, the making of the sign of the cross, the cultus of the saints, prayers for the dead, the duty of confession, transubstantiation, the Real Presence, and the adoration of the consecrated host, are insisted upon! As it does not seem to be taught in this book that these things are to be done and believed because they are taught and commanded by one living, visible, infallible Church, there is no danger that thereby the holy Protestant faith will be undermined, or that by its perusal one soul will be brought one hair breadth's nigher to Romanism than it is at present.

No! The particular sect or denomination of Protestants known as Anglicans may be endangered by the dissemination amongst its mem-

bers of books inculcating such anti-Anglican customs and doctrines; but the great cause of Protestantism in general, cannot be affected thereby. The fundamental, or formal principle of Protestantism, to wit, the right of private judgment is not assailed; the principle of authority, and of absolute submission thereunto, is not insisted upon; and the reader of the denounced book is not referred to one Catholic Apostolic Church as to the living, infallible teacher of all nations, to whose authority all, learned or unlearned, are upon peril of eternal damnation bound to submit themselves without reserve. There is in fact no taint or flavor of Romanism to be found in the book; it is thoroughly Protestant, for it does not assert the supreme authority of one visible Catholic Church.

What shall we do with our dead? is a question that is now provoking much discussion. In view of the crowded state of our urban cemeteries, and of the dangers to the living from the poisoning of the waters which percolate through a soil composed in great part of the decomposing animal matter, it is by some seriously proposed to revert to the ancient practice of cremation or burning. By others this proposal is condemned as anti-Christian.

From a purely material or hygienic point of view much may be said in favor of cremation, if only any process could be discovered, and made easily and generally available, whereby the poisonous gases of the body might be speedily given off by the action of intense heat.—From a sentimental stand-point, nothing serious can be said against it; but the religious difficulty, that is to say the objection that cremation is anti-Christian, is more serious.

This is a question for theologians to discuss. It is certain that with Christians inhumation has ever been the favorite means of disposing of the dead, whilst cremation was in vogue amongst the heathen. For this uniformity of practice amongst believers in the resurrection of the body, there should we think be some powerful motive; still the Church has not pronounced any formal decision upon the subject, and we cannot therefore actually call "cremation" anti-Christian, though it may be said to be un-Christian, or contrary to the Christian usage.

Simply as a matter of taste, but one of perfect indifference in so far as the spiritual welfare of the deceased is concerned, * most men we think would prefer, after death, to be burnt up at once, to slowly rotting, and stinking, and breeding corruption amongst the living, always endangering the health of the community. But then cremation if generally adopted would be very expensive, though perhaps science might discover some means by which the cost of the process would be diminished.

The question is not yet of much importance in Canada, but will become so. In England it is of supreme importance, for we doubt if in England there be a river, stream, lake, or spring, whose waters are not more or less contaminated by having passed through soil charged with the rotting, corrupting remains of former generations.

A very important meeting of the Board of Health—at which His Honor the Mayor presided, was held in the City Hall on the afternoon of the 5th inst. The topics discussed were the ravages of small-pox in the City and suburbs; the means of stamping it out; and the erection of a special hospital for the reception of those stricken with, after leprosy, the most loathsome plague known to man. The opinions of McGill, Victoria, and Bishop's Colleges represented by their respective delegates were received. Of these three institutions, the first advocated the erection of an isolated small-pox hospital under Corporation control, and compulsory vaccination. The second was in favor of allowing the Ladies of the Hotel Dieu to erect an isolated hospital on their own grounds, and to be under their control; compulsory vaccination was also recommended by the delegates. Those from Bishop's College adopted the views of the McGill College Faculty, and added that a small pox hospital need not be solidly built, since in a short time its materials would be contaminated and it would have to be pulled down; and in our opinion all the materials should be burnt, as utterly polluted or unclean. The site of the proposed hospital was not mentioned, but it should be remote from town.

On the question of making vaccination compulsory there was great unanimity of opinion. Dr. David cited as an argument in favor of the process statistics of small pox mortality. During the month of March there were in all 71 fatal cases, but of these 65 had no marks of having been vaccinated. Dr. F. W. Campbell stated that he had made a few years ago a house to house visitation, and that of 2,000 persons examined by him in the St. Lawrence Ward alone, scarce ninety per cent. could show a good vaccination mark. Another medical gentleman, Dr. Campbell who had practised for forty-one years in Montreal stated that

amongst those whom he had vaccinated, he had never had one fatal case of small-pox. The City medical officers then gave their opinions, Dr. Dugdale endorsed the views of the McGill College Faculty in favor of an isolated hospital under Corporation control, but doubted whether it would be possible to carry out a compulsory vaccination law. Dr. Larocque was in favor of accepting the offer of the Ladies of the Hotel Dieu to erect on their own land, and at their own cost a small-pox hospital on condition of receiving a share of the Civic grant made for the erection and maintenance of small-pox hospitals. The meeting separated without having arrived at a decision.

After a somewhat protracted trial, the editors of the Montreal Witness, in spite of the exertions of two of the ablest lawyers in Montreal, Messrs. Doutré and Davlin, were on Saturday last found Guilty of libel. Sentence was deferred, the prisoners being held to bail in the meantime.

The libel complained of was contained in an article that appeared in the Witness of the 17th of February last, accusing M. Mousseau, M.P., of indulging in ("renewing") orgies at a place of entertainment in this City; and of having there tried to decoy a young woman with whom one of the guests, or other parties to the so-called "orgies," cohabited, and to whom the latter seems to have been much attached. Of the publication of the article there could be no doubt; on the other question, whether the article was libellous, it does not seem easy to understand how there can be two opinions. If it be not libellous to accuse a man of good standing in society, a married man, and head of a family, of indulging in orgies, of attempting to debauch another man's paramour, and of treachery to a guest, we must confess ourselves ignorant of what the word "libellous" means. The jury after a short consultation came to the conclusion that the article was libellous; and we see not to what other conclusion twelve honest and intelligent men could possibly have come.

In the course of the trial several of the witnesses testified that they had often before the appearance of the article of the 17th February, read articles in the Witness which, in their opinion, were libellous. This is strictly true; as, for instance, in the case of a Scotch nobleman whom the Witness some years ago accused of having cruelly shot two little children; and for which libel the editor of the only "daily religious paper in the world" had, under threat of legal proceedings, to do public and most ignominious penance. Again, but a short time ago, the Witness published another false and malicious libel on the Director of the Catholic Deaf and Dumb Institution of this City; accusing him of having been privy to the clandestine burial of one of the pupils who had died under pretended suspicious circumstances, and without an inquest on the body; the truth being, that the Coroner, Dr. Jones, was himself called in by the Director. For this wicked libel, again under the menaces of "legal proceedings," the editor, or editors of the Witness had again to make public and abject apology. In short, libelling, or slandering is, and long has been, the habitual practice of the Witness.

The name of Brother Arnold is familiar to the Catholics of Montreal, who are also acquainted with the strenuous and hitherto very successful exertions of the good Brother, to establish and extend the La Salle Institute in Toronto.

Yet great as has been Brother Arnold's success, he has had, and still has many serious obstacles to overcome. The site for the building of the Christian Brothers, and the edifices erected thereon have cost very large sums of money, of which the whole has not as yet been paid. To meet the deficiency, and to clear all debts of the property, it is now intended to hold a Bazaar in the month of June next, in aid of this undertaking Brother Arnold appeals to the public, to whom tickets for the coming Bazaar are offered at the trifling rate of 50 cts per ticket. We hope that Brother Arnold's appeal will be generously responded to; but indeed the appeal is not in behalf of that good Brother, but in behalf of the Catholics of Upper Canada, who in the La Salle Institute possess a first rate educational institution, second to none in the Province of Ontario. We direct the attention of our readers to an article on the subject in another column, clipped from the Irish Canadian.

The Montreal Gazette confesses itself startled by a remark that fell from the lips of Lord Montagu during the debate in the Imperial House of Commons on Mr. Buti's proposed amendment to the Address in reply to the Royal Speech. "Liberalism means Centralisation," said Lord Montagu; now this train of the Gazette finds opposed to all its preconceived notions.

And yet what truth was ever more obvious to the readers of history and to him who with impartial eye, takes cognizance of what is going

* St. Aug. De Cura Pro Mortuis Gerenda.