

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
 IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,  
 GEORGE E. CLERK,  
 At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

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 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickups' News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Sons; 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, FEB. 14, 1862.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Since our last, the Northerners have succeeded in capturing a mud fort in Tennessee—Fort Henry—a work hastily thrown up the Confederates, mounting several guns, and containing a supply of arms and ammunition, which fell into the hands of the captors. This, following close upon the successful skirmish at Somerset, has greatly elated the Federalists; and the Confederates seem hardly able to hold their ground against their more numerous and better equipped enemies. It is reported also that the Burnside expedition has effected a landing upon Roanoke Island, after a smart contest, in which the Confederates were worsted, with the loss of two or three gunboats. We are not however in possession of the details. On the whole, the Federals seem to be making some progress towards the conquest of the South.

Our latest European dates are per steamer *Jura*. For the present, and it is said at the instance of Great Britain, Louis Napoleon refrains from interfering in the affairs of this Continent, and postpones his intention of recognising the Southern Confederacy and raising the blockade. We know not what reliance to place on the report, but it is said that the French Emperor has written to the Pope recommending the latter to abdicate in favor of the King of Sardinia, and announcing his design to recall his troops from Rome. In the Kingdom of Naples affairs remain unchanged. The loyalists here, since the death of the gallant Borge, no recognised leader, and do not therefore act in large masses; but their spirit is still unbroken, and their determination to maintain their national independence, and to purge their soil of the alien invader is strong as ever.

Brownson's Review—January, 1862.—For many years this has been justly esteemed the best Catholic Review published in the English language. Of late, we regret to say it, doubts have been freely expressed of the Catholicity of some of its views; and with respect to the language in which it is written, we respectfully submit that the following is not English:—

"Beatitude is in the palimpsest, not in the cosmos. Yet the cosmos is initial palimpsest"—p. 3.

This, and much more in a similar style, that we might cite, may be Brownsonish, or haply Grotianish, but certainly is not English—not the language in which Shakespeare and Milton wrote, and whose marvellous powers, and transcendent beauties are, by the *Reviewer's* own admission, displayed in the English translation of the Bible, and of those portions of the old Catholic Liturgy which the Anglican church has appropriated in its "Book of Common Prayer." We do not believe that a new terminology for old Catholic ideas, is at all needed; and we fear that the object the *Reviewer* has in view in adopting it, is mystification rather than edification. Were it not that it might be deemed presumptuous for one of our low estate to tender advice to the Goliath of the press, we should exhort him to "reform it altogether;" and to write, as of yore, in English, in that terse vigorous English of which he is a thorough master.

The contents of the present number are as follows:—

- I. The Reunion of All Christians.
- II. Archbishop Hughes on Slavery.
- III. Catholic Schools and Education.
- IV. The Punishment of the Reprobate.
- V. The Struggle of the Nation for Life.
- VI. Literary Notices and Criticisms.

To say that all of the above articles evince erudition, powers of argument, and a brilliant, even if somewhat erratic, genius—would be but to say that they are worthy of Dr. Brownson, and eminently characteristic of the writer. But were we to say that they were as strongly marked as were his writings of some six or seven years ago, by attachment to the Church, respect for her Pastors, and submission to her teaching, we should belie our own convictions. It seems to us that of late a change, a great and deplorable change, has crept over the *Reviewer*. He is now captious, querulous, and more prone to find fault, and condemn, than he is to repel the assaults of the enemy, and to vindicate the good name of his Spiritual Mother in the eyes of the non-Catholic world. We speak not of his some-

what sarcastic rejoinder to the Archbishop of New York; for that illustrious Prelate is well able to take care of himself, and to give as good as he gets. But we allude more especially to the first and third articles on list; which both contain much to offend Catholics, and to furnish matter for boasting to the enemies of Popery, and to those who represent her as the foe to the enlightened progress of humanity, and as opposed to the diffusion of education.

In his first article, the *Reviewer* complains of the difficulty of reconciling Protestants to Catholicity. This, he insinuates, proceeds from the false views which most Catholic writers take of modern progress, and their consequent hostility to the secular tendencies of the age. The Church embraces all truth, he argues; and that truth should be so represented or set forth, as to reconcile the actually existing secular society, with the Catholic Church, or spiritual society; and so as to demonstrate to an unbelieving world how the worship of Mammon may be brought into dialectic harmony with the worship of God.

The task is a difficult one—for the axioms of the disciples of modern progress are not merely contraries of, but the contradictories to, the fundamental axioms of the Cross; and though contraries may be reconciled, contradictories cannot. It is not that the Church is, or can be opposed to civilisation—for there can be no true civilisation without the Church; but because what the world, in the modern jargon, calls progress or civilisation, is a relapse into barbarism. Civilisation, as defined by Dr. Brownson himself, and as understood by Catholics, consists in the predominance of the spiritual, over the animal in man; in restoring man to, and retaining him in the normal state which he lost by sin; or to use his more recent terminology—civilisation is a work or process in or towards the palingsenic order; and therefore it is not correct for him to say, as he does at p. 14, that "religion and civilisation no longer walk hand in hand." That religion no longer walks hand in hand with what the non-Catholic world too generally terms civilisation, is most true; but this is the fault, not of the Church, but of the non-Catholic world itself, which seeks its final good in the gratification of the appetites, and makes civilisation to consist, exclusively, in material progress, or in what Dr. Brownson has happily branded as "*Carnal Judaism*." In a word, the tendencies of the non-Catholic world are not merely non-Catholic, but anti-Catholic; and contradictories cannot be brought into dialectic union or harmony, though contraries may.

The *Reviewer* complains that our Catholic theologians, learned, able, devoted, and zealous as they are, have not yet learned the secret of the nineteenth century; and to this ignorance, he apparently attributes their undoubted opposition to what, in modern jargon, is called "progress" of the age. We feel inclined to attribute that opposition to the fact that "our Catholic theologians" are learned, and have made themselves fully acquainted with the "secret of the nineteenth century"—and to the fact that they do see plainly whither society is drifting, and distinguish clearly the breakers ahead. The most decided tendency of nineteenth-century progress is to make the people not only Sovereign, but God, to subordinate the Church to this "*People-God*," and to subject to persecution all who will not fall down and worship before the filthy fetish which democracy has set up. The Paris *Siecle* is, in the Old World, one of the best exponents of the "secret of the nineteenth century"—if that may be called a secret which is loudly proclaimed from the house-tops; and the last word of the *Siecle* is, that the mission or duty of the Catholic Church is, to submit humbly to the civil power; to honor the true Sovereign—that is to say, the people; and to submit to any laws which it, by its organs, may be pleased to enact. This is modern progress, in the political order; but if the Church be from God, and if her mission be to teach and to regenerate, it is her duty to resist that progress, and to assert the absolute sovereignty of her God, as against the claims put forward in behalf of this nineteenth century "*People-God*."

That the worshippers of the latter are increasing, and that not only in Protestant countries, but in countries nominally Catholic, such as France, Austria, and Italy, is we fear only too true; and we differ from the learned *Reviewer* not as to the fact itself, but solely as to its causes. He attributes it to the blindness of "our Catholic theologians," who cannot discern the "secret of the nineteenth century," and to their narrow-mindedness, in arraying themselves in opposition to its "progress;" instead of accepting it, and striving to bring that progress into dialectic harmony with the teachings of Him Who required of all His disciples that they should deny themselves, and taking up the cross, should follow Him. But this is unjust on the part of the *Reviewer*; for the popular maxims of the age are the contradictories of the teachings of Christ, and cannot therefore be, by any means, reconciled or brought into dialectic harmony therewith. But whatever the cause, there is the fact; and its importance may be estimated by the admission of the *Reviewer*—who, speaking

of the fortunes of Catholicity in the U. States, tells us that—

"If in our own country we keep up, or even increase, our numbers, it is only by new accessions of Catholics from abroad"—p. 12.

This a fearful confirmation of the truth of all that we have been told respecting the wholesale apostasy of the children of Catholic parents in the United States; and a convincing proof that, either in their social or their political institutions, there must be something most destructive to Catholic life. The pressure on the means of subsistence in the United States is perhaps less than in any other country in the world, except Australia; and there is therefore every reason to believe—nay there is a physical certainty—that population increases there more rapidly than in other and more densely populated districts.—There is no reason again to believe that Catholic parents are less prolific than are Protestant parents—and indeed there are moral causes in operation to render the former the more prolific. And yet in spite of these physical and moral advantages, the Church in the United States is only enabled to keep her numbers from decreasing by means of immigration from the Catholic countries of Europe. In other words, the children of Catholic parents in the U. States do for the most part apostatise, and abandon the faith of their ancestors.

One great cause of this is to be found, no doubt, in the "Common Schools;" and upon these we shall say a word or two in our notice of the *Reviewer's* article on "Catholic Schools and Education."

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AS UNDERSTOOD BY LIBERALS.—Amongst our items of Italian intelligence will be found the following, under the caption of "Italian Parliament":—

"Moretti inquired whether any proceedings had been taken against Monsignor Speranza, Bishop of Bergamo, who had suspended, a *divinis*, a priest, Bravi, a worthy man, guilty of no other offence than being a member of Parliament."

"The Minister of Grace and Justice (Miglietti) censuring the malignant conduct of this Prelate, said that he had referred the matter to the Council of State, and that the Bishop's abuse of authority should meet with due punishment.—*London Times Correspondent*."

We beg of our readers to ponder well the above, and to ask themselves the question—What would be the condition of the Pope, if he were subject to a Government which inflicts "*due punishment*" on a Bishop for suspending a *divinis* a refractory priest?

The most amusing, or amazing part of the business is this—That the clamor against the Bishop of Bergamo is raised by the "liberal" party, whose watch-word for years has been that "Priests should not meddle in politics;" whilst the only crime of which the Prelate cried out against can be accused is, that in the case of one of his priests he has enforced this "liberal" canon; and has given the Rev. M. Bravi to understand that the faithful exercise of a priest's spiritual functions is not compatible with the duties of a member of Parliament.

It is not, however, because of its amazing inconsistency, or because of the ludicrous contrast which it presents betwixt "liberal" professions, and "liberal" practise, that we cite this case—but rather as another instance of the grinding despotism under which the subjects of a "*liberal*" government actually groan; and as a lucid explanation of the aversion which all Catholics entertain towards modern "*liberalism*." Wherein does the action of the Government of Russia towards the Catholic Prelates of Poland, differ from that of the Government of Victor Emmanuel towards the worthy Bishop of Bergamo? In Warsaw, the ecclesiastical authorities prohibited the performance of the sacred offices in buildings which had been desecrated by an intrusive and brutal soldiery; and an order from the agents of Russian despotism consigns the offending Archbishop to exile in Siberia. In Italy, a Bishop withdraws permission to say Mass, to hear Confessions, and to give Absolution within the limits of his diocese, from a priest who has actively engaged in secular politics, by accepting a seat in a secular political assembly; and to the *liberal* Government of regenerated Italy proceeds at once to visit the Bishop with "*due punishment*" for such "malignant conduct." In both cases—in that of Russian despotism as in that of Italian *liberalism*—the civil power arrogates to itself the right to dictate in purely spiritual affairs; and to inflict pain and penalties upon Bishops who will not submit to its blasphemous and most tyrannical assumptions of spiritual authority.

Nothing can be more clear—even upon principles laid down by all Protestants in their own behalf—that in matters purely spiritual, such as the administration of the Sacraments, and which in no wise, directly or indirectly, affect the civil status of any other person—ministers of the gospel, by whatsoever name called, owe no account of their conduct, or explanation of their motives, to the civil magistrate; and yet when those principles are violated to the detriment of Catholics, no men are so prompt to applaud the tyrannical act as are those very Protestants who, in their own behalf, would be the first and loudest to repudiate any such interference with their rights as citizens and their duties as Christ-

ians. The maxim upon which their conduct is regulated is, that no faith is to be kept with Papists; and that it is always lawful to do that to Catholic Bishops, which it would always be wrong to do unto Protestant ministers. Arguing for themselves against State interference, and in behalf of their own Church Courts, they say that no man can claim, as a civil right—or as a right which the civil magistrate can enforce—to be ordained or licensed to preach; and if the Government were to attempt, even, to compel our Presbyterian or Methodist friends to "lay hands" on, or to retain in the ministry of their respective Churches, one whom, for any reason whatsoever, they did not deem to be a fit subject for ordination, or for licence to preach the "Word" as one of their Ministers—it would arouse against it such a storm of indignation from the combined host of Protestantism as would oblige it to quickly withdraw its extravagant claims to spiritual authority. Yet, with marvellous inconsistency, when a liberal and anti-Catholic Government assumes the right to dictate to a Catholic Bishop how he shall exercise his spiritual functions, and visits him with "*due punishment*" for withholding license to preach and administer the Sacraments in his diocese, from one whom he deems unworthy to officiate in divine things—the act is applauded by all the pretended friends of civil and religious liberty throughout the Protestant world.

The value, or significance of the well-known *Cavour* formula, "*A Free Church in a Free State*," may also be tested by the action of the Sardinian Government towards this refractory and malignant Bishop of Bergamo. In a State, "*free*" in the *Cavour* and "*liberal*" acceptance of the term, there is no need of, there is no place for, a Church at all; for in such a State, the latter arrogates to itself all the functions of the Church. It asserts its rights of jurisdiction, not only in temporalities, but in spirituals; over the administration of the sacraments, as well as over the tithes, glebe lands, and other ecclesiastical endowments. If a Council of State is qualified to interfere betwixt a Bishop and his Clergy, and to decide upon the fitness of the latter to officiate in divine things, the sooner the office of Bishop is abolished altogether, the better. The tendency of modern Liberalism is, in short, not merely to subordinate the Church to, but to merge the latter in, the State.

STRANGE BED-FELLOWS.—Dr. Brownson has been lecturing in Boston before the Emancipation League, and to the great delight of the white-chokered fanatics of the North; who, having sold their own slaves to Southern planters, and pocketed the proceeds, now find themselves bound in conscience to insist upon the dignity of freedom, and the sinfulness of holding fellow-creatures in bondage. The learned Doctor must have found himself amongst a very queer set of associates.

Not that we have any prejudices against Abolitionists, or Abolitionism *per se*. Were the former honest men, and disposed to go the right way to work to procure the freedom of the Southern slave, we should highly respect them; but the only honest, the only right way in which the Northern Abolitionists can agitate for the liberation of the negro is the very mode which these gentry will not adopt, because it implies or requires a little personal sacrifice, and an expenditure of something more than mere stinking breath. The only proper way for the Northerners to procure the emancipation of the slaves is—1st, to subscribe the requisite sum amongst themselves; and, 2nd, with the money so collected, to pay the Southern masters the full market price of their slaves. It was thus, and upon this principle, that the British Legislature effected the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies.

This is a process which, simple and honest though it be, will never meet with favorable acceptance from the Maworms and Tartuffes of Boston. They may love freedom, in the abstract, but for dollars and cents they entertain a far stronger attachment. Like Joseph Surface they can utter the most beautiful sentiments; they can sympathise with the slave, wish the hungry man a belly-full, and the naked where-withal to be clothed. But with this their charity stops, for it can go no further. Ask them to put their hands in their pockets, and they will stand aghast at such a monstrous proposition. Generous they are no doubt; but generous only so long, and in so far, as they can be generous at the expense of others. We regret that one whom we have long esteemed so highly as Dr. Brownson, should have consented to appear amongst such a set of buffoons, and to strut his hour on the stage for the detection of the Boston Abolitionists.

In the learned gentleman's lecture, as reported by the *Bowen Traveller*, we find nothing very remarkable. At its outset he seemed conscious of his anomalous position, and betrayed that consciousness by some remarks about its "*novelty*." On the question of the Union he was more outspoken, and frankly admitted that "the Union was gone for ever" and could, therefore, neither be restored nor preserved.—

This to any but a blind man was apparent from the out-break of the civil war. The success of the Northerners over the "*rebels*," and the subjugation of the latter, may lead indeed to a Union, but it will not, cannot, be the Union which has heretofore subsisted betwixt the several Sovereign and Independent States of which the American Republic was composed.—What then are the Northerners fighting for?—since by the confession of their ablest champion, the "Union is gone—gone for ever. Not for the Union are they fighting; but for territory, but for dominion, and for the same objects as those which Cromwell had in view when he advanced to the conquest of Ireland. By such means, but by such means only, as those which the great Puritan leader employed to subdue the Catholics of Ireland, may the people of the South be crushed and subdued by the Yankees; by the same means as those by which Ireland has, since the days of Cromwell, been annexed to great Britain, and held in subjection, but by none other, can the South when crushed and subdued, be kept in permanent Union with the detested North. Whatever such a Union is worth fighting for, and worth praying for, is in our opinion more than doubtful.

HOUSES OF REFUGE.—The arrest of a gang of burglars—of young lads, most of them the sons of respectable parents, and apprenticed to lucrative trades—has naturally directed attention to the question of "*Houses of Refuge*," as a means for preventing the spread of juvenile criminality. We say preventing; for the object of a House of Refuge, as we understand it, is not "*correction*," but "*prevention*."

The question is most important, its solution highly desirable, but in a community composed of such heterogeneous elements as ours, is we fear exceedingly difficult, if not impracticable.—It is however for the supporters of the scheme to lay their plan in all its details, before the public; the latter will then be able to judge how far it be feasible, and how far it is compatible with our peculiar social circumstances.

In connection with this subject our attention has been drawn to a communication over the signature "*R.*" in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 11th instant, of which our contemporary seems to approve, but which to us seems to indicate a sad confusion of ideas, both as to the necessity for, and objects of, such an asylum as that which the writer recommends. The latter broaches the subject with the following remarks:—

"Sir—On reading your humane and appropriate article on the state of juvenile offenders in the Montreal jail, one feels ashamed that in a city of nearly 100,000 inhabitants, there is no place of refuge for the helpless and unfortunate."

This is not correct. In proportion to the number of its inhabitants, there is perhaps no community in the world that has more places of "*refuge for the helpless and unfortunate*" than we have; and were crime the consequence of want and poverty, little would be required to make Montreal the most exemplary city on this Continent. But the fact is, that crime in general, and those crimes against property in particular, which have of late so much excited public attention, are not the product of want and of misfortune, but of idleness, dissipation, and an inordinate love for vicious sensual gratifications. The perpetrators were all lads in easy circumstances; far above the pressure of want; well fed, clothed and housed, and who certainly stood in no need of a House of Refuge "*for the helpless and unfortunate*." This is the moral phenomenon with which we have to deal; and the problem to be solved is, not how to find a place of refuge for the destitute, but how to check youth in comparatively easy circumstances, from engaging in a career of vice and profligacy. The enemy with whom we have to deal is vice, not poverty; and the weapons with which we must combat him must be spiritual, not material weapons. It is not by putting clothes on a boy's back, and victuals in his belly, that you will establish the grace of God in his heart; and yet unless this can be effected, nothing will have been done towards accomplishing that, which should be the chief object of the civil magistrate, as it is his first and highest duty—the security of person and property.

The "*House of Refuge*" of which we stand mostly in need is a "*House of Refuge*" for the morally indigent, for the morally depraved, and morally helpless; a moral hospital in short, in which the victims of their vicious passions may be received, and from whence they may be discharged some day to fulfill their duties towards society. Such an institution must needs also be a place of detention, or moral lazaretto; a place in which the patients shall be compelled to undergo a sort of moral quarantine; and it is at this point that the aid and intervention of the civil magistrate must be invoked; and it is also precisely at this point that we come in contact with the great difficulty arising out of our peculiar social circumstances. We are a mixed population, composed of Catholics and Protestants; and the moral treatment which one class of our population insists upon as indispensable for the restoration of moral health, would not be tolerated by the other. Even in our schools, we find by bitter experience that the mixed, or "*common*"