

## The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE

GEORGE E. OLERK AND JOHN GILLIES,  
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.All communications to be addressed to the Editor,  
G. E. OLERK.

## 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 car-  
riers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance  
out if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.Single copies, price 3d, can be had at this Office;  
Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and  
at W. Dutton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1861.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE effects of the Sardinian bombardment of Gaeta have been much exaggerated by the Protestant press, but there can be no doubt that the heavy fire of Chialini's batteries is beginning to tell upon the Neapolitan defences. Some magazines have exploded within the fortress, and many lives have been lost in consequence, and great injury has been inflicted upon parts of the masonry. But still Gaeta holds out, and if the moral of the troops be good, the material damage done by the besiegers' fire is as yet of little importance. The Sardinian fleet has been ignominiously driven off, and several vessels have been put hors de combat, by the brisk and well directed fire of the Neapolitan batteries, so that a blockade is all that the place has to apprehend from the naval forces of Victor Emmanuel. In other respects, the Continental news by the last steamer is devoid of general interest.

The official correspondence of the British Government upon the affairs of Italy in general, and of the Kingdom of Naples in particular, has, since the meeting of the Imperial Parliament, been made public. These documents are of great importance, and their contents will certainly not tend to impress the world with a very exalted opinion of the wisdom or honesty of the Russell policy. Indeed we find therein ample confirmation of what the Catholic press has constantly asserted respecting Italy, and the Italian Governments—to wit—that had the principle of non-intervention been strictly adhered to, Garibaldi and the revolutionary party would have been long ere this dispersed, expelled, or captured by the established Government of Naples; and that but for the armed intervention of a foreign power, but for the invasion of the Kingdom of Naples by the "foreign mercenaries" of Victor Emmanuel, Francis II. would be in peaceable and undisputed possession of his throne. Not by his own subjects, but by the armed interference of a foreign power, has the King of Naples been reduced to his present straits. It is now admitted that Garibaldi and his following of cut-throats, escaped bandits and galley slaves, the offscourings of the streets, and the refuse of the jails—would have been unable to endanger the Neapolitan monarchy, if left to their own resources, and that but for the armed interference of Sardinia, Garibaldi would have shared the fate of a far better man, that of the filibuster Walker. These facts were strongly urged against the foreign policy of the Russell Cabinet by Lord Derby in the House of Lords, who in a masterly speech denounced the armed interference of Sardinia with the affairs of Rome and Naples, as a flagrant violation of all known international law. "There could not," said the noble lord, "be a greater violation of international law than that committed by the King of Sardinia when he invaded the Papal and Neapolitan States." This too was the opinion but a few months ago of Lord John Russell himself; for on the 31st of August last, he penned a despatch, warmly deprecating an attack by Victor Emmanuel upon a Sovereign against whom the Sardinian Government had no shadow even of a pretext of quarrel; although to-day he feebly attempts to justify that very invasion of another monarch's dominions which was undertaken by Victor Emmanuel in open defiance, and within a few days after the receipt of the despatch wherein Lord John Russell deprecated that invasion as a violation of all international law. Thus as it suits his convenience does the author of the last Penal Law maintain or discard the principle of "non-intervention"; and thus by the dishonest conduct of its rulers, by their double dealing and paltry subtleties, is the honor of Great Britain tarnished in the eyes of the civilized world. Francis II. alone gains by the revelations made by the diplomatic correspondence above alluded to; and the fact can not now be denied that, if the question had been left to be settled between him and Garibaldi—that if the principle of "non-intervention" had been enforced, he would now be reigning quietly at Naples, instead of being compelled to maintain a desperate struggle for existence, with the superior forces of Victor Emmanuel.

There are as yet no signs of a settlement of the troubles which distract, or rather which have rent asunder, the American Union. Strange rumors are rife of a plot to assassinate President

Lincoln near Baltimore, and, it is said, that several distinguished men were privy to the diabolical scheme. The story is probably a lie, but that such a story should obtain circulation is a strong and painful evidence of the moral condition of the United States.

Sir Edmund Head has resumed the reins of Government; the Provincial Parliament is summoned to meet for despatch of business on Saturday, the 16th inst.

**EVANGELICAL INTELLIGENCE.**—In any given object the eye can only see that which it brings with it the power of seeing therein. If this axiom holds good in the sensible and natural order, much more must it apply to things supersensible and supernatural; if it be true in the material world, more striking must be its truth in the spiritual world, and in the domain of religion. What, for instance, can the Protestant perceive in Catholicity? Not certainly the great objective truths therein contained, but merely a reflection of his own crude prejudices, a confirmation of his subjective fantasies, at best but a discoloured and distorted image of the divine reality.

So when a Protestant goes into a Catholic Church, or assists at some of the offices of the Catholic religion, he is doomed, by an irresistible fatality, to misrepresent what he has witnessed, to utter "cock-and-bull-stories," and to talk an immeasurably silly twaddle. As the Pythones, or seer of old, when the spirit came upon her, rose unconscious, yet majestic, and poured forth her whole soul in one impetuous torrent of inspired and unpremeditated song—so the evangelical spectator of Popish rites, unconsciously perhaps, yet ludicrously, gives invariably a false version of what he has seen, and heard. Yet do we not call the poor creature a liar—because we look upon him as the victim of an inexorable necessity, the victim of invincible prejudice; we smile good-naturedly, perhaps somewhat contemptuously at his folly, and merely "write him down an ass."

What strange sights Protestants see at Rome for instance! what marvels do they not behold in the Vatican and at St. Peter's—things which no Popish eye hath ever seen, which it hath not even entered into the heart of any Papist to conceive! That Protestants believe, or think that they believe, that they have actually witnessed the many wonders and horrors by them related upon their safe return to Exeter Hall, to gaping and indignant audiences, we do not deny, and it is not therefore so much their veracity and candor that we impugn, as their intelligence and capacity for seeing. They went over to the Continent to see the abominations of Popery, with a firm resolve to find "the Mark of the Beast" on every public building at Rome, and to identify the reigning Pontiff with the anti-Christ of the Apocalypse. What they went out to see, what they wandered forth to discover, that of course they discovered, and that they saw.

But Protestants need not go so far as Rome to gratify their taste for marvels, or to pursue their investigations into the nature, and habitat of the mystic "Beast." These marvels are at their very doors, if they will but make good Protestant use of their eyes, if they will but look at things around them through a pair of evangelical spectacles. Behold what an intelligent correspondent of our friend the *Montreal Witness* saw and heard only "a few days since" in the Sacristy of St. Patrick's Church, of this city:—

"Walking down Alexander Street"—writes this intelligent Protestant in the *Witness* of the 7th ult.—"my attention was arrested by a company of four individuals, among whom was a woman carrying an infant. As they walked up the stairs leading to St. Patrick's Church, I surmised a christening was to take place, and asked one of the party if I might witness it. The reply was a kindly-spoken affirmative, and I followed these people into a room back of the church, where we found some time most elapse before the child could be christened, since a young woman was going through the ceremony of abjuring the Protestant faith to become a Roman Catholic. As I entered, the ceremony of christening the young woman was drawing to a close, after which several Latin prayers having been very rapidly read off by the priest, the convert was requested to kneel and read from a book the creed of her new faith. It was very long, and I would not pretend to tell you the one half of its peculiarities. Let me, however, mention two vows made by this poor young woman, showing first how utterly a true Roman Catholic woman is to have the care of children in Protestant families, if she be faithful to her vows, which were made in the most solemn manner, her hands being placed on a large Bible, and her last words being 'So help me, God!' First, after avowing her most implicit faith in the holy traditions of the Mother Church, in saints, in relics, in indulgences, &c., she added, also, in the Holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the church, promising never to attempt to interpret the same for herself at any time. Then she vowed so to teach and influence all under her authority, and by any circumstance in life put under her care. After this followed an unction confession. The whole ceremony lasted quite one hour, I was told. The christening of the child I need not describe. Truly these poor deluded creatures are fettered in very strong chains, and the more we consider the system which they are taught, the more we realize how difficult is the work of the little band of missionaries who labor for them in our beloved Canada to enlighten so much darkness."

All these things, no doubt, the intelligent writer saw, and heard, though the greater part of them had, and could have had no objective existence. He saw and heard a young woman, "abjuring the Protestant Faith"—though there is, and can be, in *verum natura*, no such thing

as the "Protestant Faith," and having listened to the convert's recital of the "creed of her new faith"—i.e., the Nicene Creed, and of whose peculiarities doubtless the correspondent of the *Witness* is, as he admits, profoundly ignorant—he heard her make "two vows," neither of which, as he quotes them, are ever taken by the convert to Catholicity. The latter, of course, as a consequence of becoming a Catholic, submits himself or herself unreservedly to the teachings of the Catholic Church as the sole means by which Christ Himself appointed, for preserving, and promulgating the contents of His revelation; which again as consisting of truths in the supernatural order are utterly beyond the cognizance of human or natural reason, and which, if received at all, must be received solely upon the authority or credibility in the supernatural order, of the witness promulgating them. The convert therefore of course pledges himself, not indeed "never to attempt to interpret the Holy Scriptures," but never to interpret them in a sense contrary to that in which they have been interpreted by the Catholic Church, who is the guardian, interpreter, and witness of the inspiration of the Christian "hagiographa;" because without her testimony to their inspiration, their divine origin and dogmatic authority, and the several books of which they are composed—they might be curious and valuable indeed as ancient historical records, more or less reliable, but in a spiritual and doctrinal point of view would be as worthless as an equal quantity of old lumber, or an equal weight of old rags.

So too with the second vow attributed to the convert by the intelligent Protestant who, a few days since, was engaged in the innocent, yet laudable exercise of "walking down Alexander Street." That he heard the vow taken by the young convert, we do not question, because he, in common with most intelligent Protestants, entered the sacristy with the full assurance that all converts to Catholicity and "servant maid converts" especially, do take oath to use every means in their power to make proselytes from amongst the junior members of the several families in whose service they may be engaged. We are not therefore, surprised at what our intelligent witness did hear; we marvel rather that he did not hear the same "young woman" make a vow to "wade knee deep in here's blood," and to put arsenic into her Protestant mistress' beer—both of which vows were assuredly made by the same "young woman," there and then, when she made the vow recorded in *Italy* by the intelligent correspondent of the *Montreal Witness*.

Certainly the "little band of missionaries" (the Soupers and Swaddlers) "who labour for these poor deluded Papists," are to be pitied, as engaged in a most hopeless task. But then what consolations do they not, on the other hand, enjoy, in being always able to see that which they desire to see, and to hear those things after which their ears do itch. If Catholics, they would be confined to the dull prosaic region of facts, and actual existences; they would be compelled not only to keep their fingers from picking and stealing but—hard task for evangelical missionaries!—their tongues from lying, slandering, and evil speaking. Let them thank God that they have been placed—we need not say by whom—in a situation where such forbearance from their daily avocations is not exacted of them; that they are professors of that Holy Protestant Faith which does not require on the part of its votaries either intelligence or honesty, and whose profession is by no means incompatible with swindling in business, and falsehood in daily life.

We copy from the *Kingston Whig* of the 22d ult.:—

"Some fifty of Mr. McGee's ardent friends entertained him at dinner or rather supper at the British American Hotel. \* \* \* After the usual toasts had been drunk—the Chairman proposed the health of Mr. McGee. \* \* \* In reply to this honor, Mr. McGee dwelt strongly and long upon the wrongs and misgovernment of the Province, and pointed out their remedy. He defended George Brown from the attacks of his enemies, and said that George Brown had been made what he is by the unjust and malicious attacks of fossil Catholic electors and bigoted news-writers. \* \* \* He assailed the *True Witness* and kindred prints with bitterness, and his invective appeared to meet with the approbation of his friends. He did more. \* \* \* He advocated the dangerous scheme of a Federal Union of all the British North American Provinces, and classed it as the chief panacea of our political ills."—*British Whig*.

If the above be true, and we have no reason to doubt that it is so, we must return thanks to Mr. McGee for his attacks upon, and bitter invectives against, the *True Witness*, as the only favor which we, as gentlemen and as Catholics, would condescend to accept at his hands. From the abuse of a person like Mr. McGee, we derive as much gratification, as full an assurance of the propriety of our conduct, as we should from the public approbation of gentlemen and men of honor; and that our policy as a Catholic journalist should be condemned by the friend and champion of Mister George Brown, is a pledge to every Catholic that it is a policy in perfect harmony with the interests of the Church.—Again we thank Mr. McGee for assailing the *True Witness*.

"He defended George Brown!" Singular occupation for one who calls himself an Irishman, and pretends to be a Catholic! "He defended George Brown!" the low, foul-mouthed scurrilous libeller of his race and creed! the

friend of Garazzi, and the panegyrist of Garibaldi! "He defended George Brown," the sworn enemy of Catholic Schools, of our Religious and Charitable institutions, the obscene slanderer of our Clergy, and of our Religious Sisterhoods, and the malignant, but, thank God, impotent calumniator of our Sovereign Pontiff. "He defended George Brown!" truly—as the Turks say—"he must have eaten much dirt."

"He defended George Brown!" whom even the *Toronto Freeman* is in very disgust obliged to disown, with whom the Catholics of Toronto have been obliged to "sever the tie." "He defended George Brown!"—the avowed editor of the *Globe*—and who, in the words of the *Toronto Freeman*, authority which Mr. McGee will hardly repudiate:—

"Every day reveals a fresh disposition to outrage, deliberately, our most sacred feelings, and remorselessly sport with our most delicate feelings."—*Toronto Freeman*, 8th November 1860.

"He defended George Brown!" the enemy of the Catholic Church—who—

"Seeks to open the flood gates of intolerance, and let loose the 'pent up Ulica' of bigotry, to sweep away the very vestiges of every Catholic institution throughout the land."—*Toronto Freeman*.

Who has—

"Again and again declared himself opposed to our Separate Schools, our Colleges, and charitable institutions."—*Toronto Freeman*.

Who—still in the words of the *Toronto Freeman* of November last—

"Again and again has given his ultra-Protestant supporters the assurance that he had not abandoned one iota of his antipathy or opposition to everything Catholic."—*Toronto Freeman*, 8th Nov. 1860.

Is the editor of the *Toronto Freeman* then, in Mr. McGee's estimation, a "bigoted news-writer," for saying of Mr. George Brown exactly what the *True Witness* has often said? Are the Catholics of Toronto who have "severed the tie" with Mr. George Brown, because of the latter's constant and bitter hostility to every thing Catholic, to be set down as "fossil Catholic electors?" Was the *Toronto Freeman* one of the "kindred prints" which, together with the *True Witness*, Mr. McGee "assailed with bitterness?"

"He defended George Brown!"—a fellow who wants only the courage, the ability, and the opportunity, to be the Titus Oates of Canada.—He—George Brown—has all the impudence of Titus Oates, and he has all the malignity of Titus Oates. Fortunately for us in Canada, he lacks the inventive genius and the bull-dog pluck of Titus Oates; so also has he hitherto escaped—though he well deserves them—the crop'd ears, and lacerated back, of that illustrious martyr and Confessor of the Holy Protestant Faith—of whom, could his genealogy be traced, we think it would be found that Mr. George Brown was a lineal descendant.

"He" (Mr. McGee) "defended George Brown!" Well, after all, perhaps that was the very best occupation in which Mr. McGee could possibly be engaged. He is—in so far as we are concerned—at perfect liberty to "defend George Brown" where, when, and as often as he likes. One thing only, as Catholics jealous of the honor of our spiritual mother, would we beg of Mr. McGee—and that is, that he shall never attempt to "defend the Catholic Church," against the assaults of her enemies. *Haud tali auxilio, non defensoribus istis*—can by such a champion, not by such a one as Mr. McGee, can the honor or interests of Catholicity be upheld. He may haply, by his pretended advocacy, bring disgrace and obloquy upon the religion which he, the "defender of George Brown," still fanatically professes; but we assure him that such advocacy will be felt by every true Catholic, by every honorable and high spirited son of the Church, as the worst insult that could be offered to his mother, as the bitterness of invectives, and the most cutting of sarcasms.

In conclusion, we would call the attention of *Le Canadien* to the notable fact, that the friend of George Brown, and *par consequence* the enemy of Catholic Lower Canada, is a warm advocate "of a Federal Union of all the British North American Provinces." Will our Quebec cotemporary lay this fact seriously to heart, and ponder it in the watches of the night.

**IRISH REVIVALS AND IMPURITY.**—We have been repeatedly taken to task for an irreverent treatment of the celebrated "Irish Revivals;" and for having expressed our opinion that the results of that outbreak of fanaticism would ere long manifest themselves in a great increase in the numbers of illegitimate births, we have been denounced as a blasphemer against the Holy Protestant Faith. Facts nevertheless are stubborn things, and upset all theories, however carefully the latter may be compiled, or delicately adjusted. Here for instance, is a fact which we clip from the "selected" matter of the *Montreal Commercial Advertiser*, and one which speaks volumes as to the moral effects of "Revivalism," both upon its victims, and the prime actors in the disgusting drama.

"*Eliza McKee v. the Rev. Samuel McLean.*—This was an action brought in the Court of Queen's Bench for the seduction of the plaintiff's daughter, and consequent loss of services. Damages were laid at \$300. The defendant is a Presbyterian clergyman at Balloo county Down, and the circumstances of the case were that, at the period of the "revivals," the daughter of the plaintiff became "affected;" that she had been a constant attendant at a young lady's class

organized by the defendant for the persons so "affected," and that the defendant made use of the influence thus obtained over the young woman to seduce her.

There was no appearance for the defendant, and the jury, having heard the evidence of these facts, found a verdict for the plaintiff, \$300. damages, the full amount claimed.

We appeal to the above, not as evidence of the general immorality of Presbyterian ministers—for it would be illogical, indeed intensely Protestant, to draw a general conclusion from a particular premiss; whilst no candid person will deny that Presbyterian ministers, as a body, are highly respectable for their general good conduct, and observance of the moral or natural law. We disclaim therefore all intention of insinuating anything against Presbyterian clergymen generally, of whom the great bulk may be considered as estimable, often amiable members of society.

But what we do infer, and logically infer, from the above is—the great and increased power which the abnormal physical or animal conditions generated in the person subject to the "Revival" excitement, give to the viciously disposed. All "hysteria" is accompanied by a disturbance of the entire system, both moral and physical.—That harmony, or balance, which should subsist betwixt the different faculties, which in the normal state does subsist, and upon which the subjection of the animal to the intellectual depends—that harmony is we say destroyed, that balance is overthrown, and the animal, no longer kept in due subjection, asserts its supremacy over the moral and intellectual. All abnormal physical excitement—and we appeal to the medical profession in confirmation of our thesis—all such abnormal excitement, is dangerous, amongst females especially, to chastity—and of this we have a notable example in the case before us.

The spirit of God comes not with convulsions—*non in commotione Dominus*, iii. Reg. 19, 11: is not accompanied with "hysteria" or physical manifestations; it does not incite to howlings, to jerking, to contortions of the limbs, or to violent derangement of eroline. These were the signs which, of old, characterised the ministrations of the prophets of Baal—who in their religious ecstasies gashed themselves with knives, and indulged in other freaks not unlike those which marked the progress of the Belfast, and all other Protestant, Revivals. If not purely natural, and exclusively animal in their origin, the physical phenomena of the "Revival" are as much the work of Satan, as were the "leapings" and frantic yellings of those false prophets who, in the days of Ahab, seduced the people of Israel into acts of Protestantism against the Lord. We know that He who manifested himself to Elias—not in the whirlwind, not in the great and terrible earthquake, nor yet in the fire, but in the "still, small voice—*sibilus auræ tenuis*"—is not the spirit who speaks in those hideous shrieks, and uncouth howlings through which the "affected" at the *Revival* strive to give utterance to the uncouth fury which possesses them. Not He who touched Isaiah's hallowed lips with fire, incites those howlings, but rather that foul spirit which inspired the orgies of the Bacchantes, and presided over the obscure rites of the votaries of Astarte; and we may confidently affirm that that Spirit is not of Christ, whose effects are manifested in the moral weakness of those "affected" by it, and in their greater liability to fall victims to the arts of the seducer. These are the tests by which we have judged the "Protestant Revivals." We have seen, by Protestant testimony, that the persons "affected" are peculiarly liable to be seduced; that the influence—akin to that of mesmerism—exercised by the Revival preacher over his female subjects, is highly dangerous to the chastity of the latter, and renders them easy victims to his arts; and therefore pondering this testimony, and applying the test cited above—we are forced to conclude that the spirit which manifests itself at the Revivals is not of God, but of the Devil.

We alluded in our last to the illustrious Anglican divines of the "Broad Church" party, and to the remarkable work lately published by the leaders of that party, wherein, not the distinctive dogmas of Christianity alone are disavowed, but in which the very idea of a supernatural revelation of God to man is scouted as a vain thing. That men entertaining such views upon religious subjects should still be allowed to remain—not only in the bosom of the religious communion whose dogmas they openly reject, but in the enjoyment of its Benefices and in the occupation of its Professorial Chairs, must have excited the surprise of our readers; what, however, will they think of Anglicanism—its tendencies and consistency—when we tell them that, not only are the authors of the "*Essays and Reviews*" allowed unrebuked to retain their places of trust and emolument, and therefore unmolested to inculcate the youth of England generally, and especially the young Anglican Levites, committed to their charge, with their peculiar form of Protestantism or Denialism, but that they are especially singled out by the Prelates of the Anglican Church as the men worthy of still higher promotion, as the men whom, above all others, Protestant Bishops do delight to honour! This is strange, yet not more strange than true.

Amongst the "*Essayists and Reviewers*" we find the name of the Reverend Mark Pattison