

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED, EVERY FRIDAY, BY THE PROPRIETORS.

GEORGE E. OLBERG AND JOHN GILLIES,
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.All communications to be addressed to the Editor,
G. E. OLBERG.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
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;
but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 4, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The relations betwixt the Catholic Clergy of France and Louis Napoleon are becoming more complicated every day, and would almost seem to indicate an approaching rupture. The French Prelates in their Pastoral letters, and Mandements to their flocks exhorting the latter to pray for the Sovereign Pontiff, menaced as he is by the revolutionary spirit now dominant in Italy, have expressed themselves pretty plainly as to the policy which has encouraged and fostered the growth of that spirit; in retaliation, the Emperor has prohibited the publication in the journals of any of the Bishops' Pastoral letters, and, if rumour may be believed, is prepared to go a step farther should the Church not prove herself sufficiently obsequious. For the sake of Louis Napoleon, whose government has done so much to restore order in France, we regret these proceedings on his part; but for the Church we have no uneasiness. She will still thrive, no matter how the princes of the earth may rage against her, and every device of her enemies will ultimately be brought to naught.

The *Monitor* announces officially the signature of the Treaty of Peace. It is now positively asserted that a Congress, at which all the Great Powers will be represented, is about to be held at Brussels. With respect to the restoration of the Grand Duke nothing has as yet been allowed to transpire.

THE PROTESTANT PRESS ON THE IRISH REVIVALS.—We have been severely taken to task by several of our Protestant contemporaries in Canada, for venturing to express our opinion as to the origin of, and causes at work in, the "Revivals" still progressing in the North of Ireland. We have expressed our opinion that this strange outbreak of indecency and fanaticism was not from God; and that the Holy Spirit was not the efficient cause of the howlings, convulsions, and violent muscular phenomena, by which its progress has been marked. This has been attributed to Popish prejudice, to our anti-Protestantism, and hostility to evangelical religion; therefore the best vindication against these uncharitable aspersions—that we can offer is, the testimony of the Protestant press itself as to the matter in dispute. For if that press takes the same, or nearly the same view of the Revivals as that taken by the Papist, it may be presumed that the latter is as little biased by Popish prejudices as is the other. We therefore have much pleasure in showing to our critics how fully the views of the Catholic *True Witness*, as to the "Revivals" and their origin, are corroborated by the highest Protestant testimony.

The London *Athenaeum*, a journal of the highest standing in the Protestant literary world, has, in its issue of the 1st of October last, a long article on the subject of "Revivals" in general; from which we purpose to lay some extracts before our readers, and to which we respectfully invite the attention of the *Montreal Witness*, the *British Whig*, the *Toronto Christian Guardian*, and our other traducers.

The *Athenaeum* prefaces its remarks with a slight sketch of the history of the "Irish Revival," and of the reasons which no doubt induced its promoters to pitch upon the North of Ireland as the scene of their labors. There has been, we learn from our informant, a very general desire for some time past to get up a "Revival" somewhere in the British Islands, in imitation of that which recently occurred in the U. States. For a successful "Revival" several conditions are requisite. That it should occur at a season of the year when the minds of men are unoccupied by business, mercantile, or political; and that a convenient place should be selected for its inauguration. "A bad season," says our authority, "is a favorable condition for a Revival—a financial crisis—and generally speaking the season of the fall." The vicinity of Belfast offered also many advantages for the purpose:—

"The North of Ireland has been selected as the scene of the awakening. There is a sufficient area, the locality is easy of access, the air is refreshing, and farmers and landlords are not so likely to interpose proprietary or legal objections to a Revival, as they would, without doubt, in this country."

The people also of Ireland are more excitable, says the *Athenaeum*, than the people of England; hence another reason for the selection of place:—

"The Celtic race also is more emotional than the Saxon, more prone to secular as well as religious freaks. We are not therefore surprised that revival phenomena have been exhibited at Ballymena and Coleraine, or that they resemble what has taken place on the other side of the Atlantic."

But hideous, and ludicrous at the same time, as are the phenomena of an American Revival, they have been surpassed in absurdity, and in all their revolting details, by the phenomena that have lately transpired in the North of Ireland. Even in their extravagances the people of the United States have never gone to such excesses as those we read of, as of nightly occurrence amongst the "regenerated" of Belfast. The Yankees take things coolly, looking upon a "Revival" as a matter of course; as natural in its season as frost at Christmas, or flowers at Midsummer.

"Oalm, sensible Americans," says the *Athenaeum*, "think no more of a Revival than they do of a Good in

the Methodist, or Baptist, or Congregational, or Presbyterian, or any other denomination, or 'wallow' in a couple of months in the usual duration of a Revival. 'It never survives the winter.' In fact the Revivals work themselves out. How is it possible for Revivalists, who have the strongest frames and the most desirable feelings, to be continually exerting them? The patients cannot be always writhing, or howling, or psalm-singing, or forever groaning under the burden of sin; as a matter of course, they must have lucid intervals of taciturnity and rest. The operators also cease to be striking after a time, and flag, or at any rate lose their lubricity in preaching, soliloquy and exclamatory prayers."

Hence Revivals are usually short-lived, though that of Ireland has already exceeded the usual limits; and this, more even than the extravagances attending it, distinguishes it from the Revivals of this Continent. The muscular contortions, the convulsions requiring four strong men to subdue, and the howlings are the invariable concomitants of an outbreak of the epidemic; whilst the results are constantly the same, and equally deplorable everywhere.

"Revivals certainly leave behind them some reminders—considerable reminders of hymn-books, and pamphlets, and sermons; also some not inconsiderable reminders in the mad-house and the grave."

The *Athenaeum* then notices some of the most striking features of the Irish Revival; the violent physical contortions of the "stricken;" the convulsions of the regenerate, and the wild throes attendant upon the "new birth." The scene in some of the chapels after a meeting, we are told, is not unlike a battle-field; "hundreds of people lying on the ground, groaning moaning, screaming, with hands clenched and eyes gleaming; some are speechless for as long as twelve hours; some of them—the regenerate—are fearfully wrought in their bodies; some of them would even have dashed out their brains." These are what are styled "convulsing symptoms" of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Even little children are not exempt, but "take the Revivals" as badly as grown up people. "Little children"—we are assured—"of five, six, seven, and eight years old talk powerfully, wonderfully, and experimentally, of the things of God."

The Cis-Atlantic Revival is evidently modelled, even in its most minute particulars, after those which have several times answered in the States; though, as yet, neither Ireland nor England offers so fine a field for the work as America, with its disciples of the Democratic Gospel, Ebenezer Socialists, New Lights, Trunkers, Superstitions, Cosmopolites, Free Inquirers, Children of Peace, Inspired Church, Pathologists, Believers in Gm, Perfectionists, Spiritualists, and many equally remarkable denominations."

After this enumeration of Protestant sects, and a sketch of the humors of an American Revival meeting—together with an interesting account of an Irish Catholic, who took the Revivals; and becoming converted believed it to be his duty to baptise himself, and for that purpose filled a large stone trough with water, and immersed himself therein—our Protestant informant continues:—

"In some respects the Irish revivalists have improved upon the American prototype. The phenomena are not perhaps so grotesque, but it must be owned they are curious. The physical crisis in general consists in a gymnastic, or kinepathic exercise—wringing of the hands, raising the arms, moving the limbs, or holding the stomach in the hands in a state of violent despair, or at least great excitement, under a sense of sin."

Again we would respectfully invite the attention of the *Montreal Witness* to the passage in the above marked by Italics. That peculiar action of the converts during the agonies of the "new birth"—that "holding their stomachs in their hands," is strongly indicative that that very valuable organ is, in some mysterious manner, the seat of the disease; and is strongly confirmative of our hypothesis that the Revival epidemic is attended, if not caused, by a morbid state of the bowels, and a disordered condition of the digestive organs. It is evident, we say, that the "pressure," or "weight," of which the converts almost invariably complain, is upon the "stomach," rather than upon the "heart;" for why, were it otherwise, should they "hold" the former "in their hands?"

The *Athenaeum* notices also some of the other phenomena of this sad epidemic.

"Physical 'marks of the Spirit' have been exhibited on the bosoms and arms of the females"—(who have fallen victims to the Revival)—"photographs of the Saviour, and the word 'Gesus'—from which it would appear that 'the Spirit' has used blue-bag, and is favorable to Hibernian orthography."

Finally, the *Athenaeum* notices the statistics of the Northern Whig, an Irish Protestant paper, which we produced in our issue of the 21st ult.; and which show conclusively, that the chief moral effect of the "Revival" has as yet been to send greater numbers than usual to the jails, and the Police office. "This," concludes our Protestant contemporary, "is a sad commentary on the effect of Revivals."

The above evidence we offer as a complete vindication of the *True Witness*; as an ample, and indeed, irrefutable justification of all that we have ever said respecting Protestant "Revivals." It is the testimony of a staunch Protestant; it is the deliberate judgment of a journal which occupies the highest position in the field of British literature; and which, by its bold and forcible condemnation of an outbreak of religious fanaticism, and its unflinching exposure of evangelical frauds and hypocrisy, has rendered valuable service to the cause of religion and morality; and has well earned the respect of every honest man—or what amounts to much the same thing—the hostility and abuse of the *Montreal Witness*, and its evangelical confederates.

Amongst the latter we may be permitted to notice the *Christian Guardian*; whose wrath breaks forth against the *Toronto Leader*, and the *True Witness*, because we have refused to recognise in the disgusting physical phenomena of the "Revival," and the subsequent moral depravity, and mental aberrations of its victims, signs of the presence of God's Holy Spirit.—Our Methodist contemporary above named, refers us to the "great revival which commenced in the city of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost," as a precedent for the Belfast Revival; but the *Christian Guardian* forgets that the former was not marked by any of those extravagances which, in the Protestant press, are cited as the characteristics of the latter. We read,

"In the Acts of the Apostles we do not read of cases of 'hysteria'—we find no mention made of persons having fallen into strong convulsions, which it required the united strength of several powerful persons to subdue or control. Herein lies the essential difference betwixt the phenomena of the Pentecostal, and those of the Belfast Revival. The former were manifestly supernatural, i.e., inexplicable upon any hypothesis of natural agency, and were totally distinct from the manifestations of that mysterious power under which the victims of demoniacal possession are represented to us, both in sacred and in profane history, as suffering. Whilst, on the contrary, the manifestations, or phenomena, of modern Protestant Revivals, present features strikingly analogous to those attributed in Scripture to the 'possessed of devils'; and, if this hypothesis as to their origin be rejected, are all easily accounted for by the agency of well known natural causes. We retort therefore the charge of 'blasphemy' upon the *Christian Guardian*, in that he has irreverently presumed to institute a comparison betwixt the divine manifestations on the day of Pentecost, and the wild extravagances of the Belfast 'convulsionnaires.'"

THE 'THREE TAILORS' OF TOOLEY STREET.—We are not certain as to the number of those worthies who, from their calm retreat in Tooley Street, addressed the world in the name of "The People of England;" but we have been forcibly reminded of them, and of their never-to-be-forgotten Allocution, by a document going the rounds of the press, under the title of the "Report" of a Committee of the Parliamentary Opposition of Lower Canada. The tailors of Tooley street have been surpassed in absurdity by the illustrious four, whose names are appended to the Report above alluded to.

The "profound consciousness" with which the latter approach their task; the mock-heroic dignity with which they prescribe the remedies in their opinion best suited for the "grave constitutional crisis;" and, the cool impertinence which they display in assuming to themselves the right to shape, or cut out the future destinies of this country, are all perfect of their kind; whilst equally admirable is their simplicity when they avow themselves unable "to conceive on what reasonable grounds the demand for Representation according to Population can be resisted?" by the people of Lower Canada. They cannot conceive how the French Canadians can reasonably insist that the terms of an arrangement, from which hitherto their enemies of U. Canada have reaped the advantages, should still be adhered to, now that, owing to an alteration, or assumed alteration in the respective populations of Upper and Lower Canada, the advantages thereof are on the side of the latter. This would seem to indicate that the signers of the Report are as ignorant of the precepts of natural justice, as from their eager hankering after Government situations, they are indifferent to the best interests of the country which they misrepresent in Parliament. A child could tell them that the "reasonable grounds," of which they find it "difficult to conceive," on which the friends of Lower Canada resist the demands of their Upper Canadian adversaries for "Representation according to Population" are these: That, at the time of the Union, when the population of Lower Canada was far larger than was that of the other section of the Province, and when of course "Representation according to Population" would have been advantageous to the interests of Lower Canada, that system of Representation was, for the sake of Upper Canada, purposely repudiated; and the principle of Equality of Representation, as the basis of the Legislative Union, was adopted in lieu thereof. It is but just and reasonable therefore, that Upper Canada, having enjoyed all the advantages of this arrangement, should submit also to its disadvantages, now that the relative positions of the two sections of the Province with respect to population have, or are said to have, altered. This is the "reason" which the wisacres of the Committee profess themselves unable to conceive, and this reason is indeed unanswerable.

But as the affairs of the political world are regulated not by "right," but by "might;" as it is but rarely that considerations of truth, honor, or justice are allowed to obtrude themselves into the deliberations of our modern law-makers; so it is not impossible, but what after all, the policy of Federation recommended by the illustrious "Four" is, that from which, if adopted, Lower Canada would derive the greatest benefit. On this point we do not deem ourselves at liberty, or indeed competent, to hazard an opinion; for it is one which does not fall within our province as a Catholic journalist, and upon which there is great difference of opinion amongst the best of our Canadian publicists. Federation however implies as its essential preliminary, the repeal of the existing Legislative Union. As in physics it is an axiom that two bodies cannot occupy the same place at the same time, so in politics, the change from a Legislative to a Federal Union, implies the repeal of the former; and the Legislative Union once repealed, the question of Representation by Population would cease to exist.

All that we are directly interested in as Catholics is, that our Church, our religious, charitable, and educational institutions of all kinds, should be altogether beyond the reach of hostile hands. This security it would be absurd to look for from any conceivable system of "checks and guarantees," if the power to assail them were in the hands of the enemies of our religion. No Act of Parliament, whether pompously designated "fundamental," no provision of a "written constitution" can be conceived of, which it would not be in the power of another Act of Parliament to amend or repeal. No authority can be higher than that from whence it proceeds; God Himself, though Omnipotent, cannot make any thing greater than Himself; and so, no authority or law emanating from a United Canadian Parliament, would suffice to control, or impose obli-

gations upon any subsequent Parliament which might feel disposed to set aside that authority, or to evade any fundamental law enacted by its predecessors. What one Act of Parliament can make or give, that any subsequent Act of Parliament can annul or take away, at the pleasure of the majority for the time being; of those of whom that body is composed.

Only in the autonomy therefore of Lower Canada; in its having, either a separate and independent Legislature of its own; or else in a Legislature in which, by its representatives, it shall have an equal voice with those whose hostility to its peculiar religious institutions is a matter of notoriety—can any security for those institutions be found. That security we possess at present under our actual system of Representation; and might possess no doubt, if the Legislative Union were repealed, and a Federal Union of all the British North American Provinces, securing to each, sole and absolute control over its domestic and internal affairs, were to be substituted in lieu thereof. But so long as the Legislative Union exists, so long as in one common Legislature are laws passed affecting both sections of the Province—Protestant or anti-Catholic Upper Canada, and Catholic Lower Canada—so long will it be the duty of the representatives of the latter to resist to the death every effort that may be made to alter the existing arrangement. Still, until that Legislative Union be repealed, must the "Constitution be maintained as it is;" for in that alone consists any security for our Schools, Colleges, Churches, Convents, for our educational and charitable institutions of all kinds.

STATE-SCHOOLISM.—Our objections to "common" Schools, our repugnance as Catholics to allow our children to attend those institutions, and our complaints that therein the faith of our little ones is tampered with, and corrupted, are generally treated with ridicule by Protestants; and we are taunted with seeking to create strife betwixt Catholics and Protestants because we insist upon the necessity of separate education for their children. That "Common" Schools are employed as a means of proselytism and for the perversion of the children of Catholic parents—that the tendency of mixed education is to beget an indifference to religion amongst those subject to its influences—and that it is chiefly because of those tendencies that the "Common" School system is valued by Protestants—are facts often by us advanced; and as the following extract will show are facts whose truth is occasionally admitted by Protestants.

The *Christian Register* is the title of a Protestant journal published at Boston; and is, as may be supposed, a staunch advocate of "common" schools, and of "State-Schoolism." In its issue of the 22d ult., it deplores the folly, and too precipitate zeal of the Protestant school authorities of Boston; who by their extreme measures lately adopted, and by recognising the right of Protestant school teachers to compel Catholic children by means of torture, to commit acts of apostasy, have provoked Catholic parents into the withdrawal of their children from the Protestant State-Schools into schools of their own; supported by Catholic charity, and in which Catholic truth is imparted to the pupils. This is a great misfortune, says the *Christian Register*; for "absurdly punctilious as seem the scruples of Catholic sticklers on such matters as the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, and the Commandments in the schools, the effect is the establishment of separate schools under the entire control of their priests. These schools are multiplying wherever they have the means;" and thus argues the *Christian Register*, "vaulting sectarianism, like vaulting ambition, often overleaps itself and falls on the other side."

But why does the *Christian Register* regret the secession of the Catholics from the common schools?—why, seeing that no Protestants are requested to support Catholic schools, and that in addition to their support of these schools, Papists are burdened with the support of the Protestant State-Schools, why does the *Christian Register* grudge his Catholic fellow-citizens such an exercise of their rights as parents? The reason is plain; he himself tells us. Because the "common" schools, under the old system of management, and when there was as yet no talk of flogging Catholic boys into apostasy, were admirable institutions for corrupting the faith of Papists; and because fewer Catholics will be Protestantized under the new arrangement, which has stimulated them to the establishment of separate schools:—

"We desire to have Protestant truth taught to all the young, but there will be fewer young Catholics Protestantized among us by having distinct schools for the two religions than by imparting secular instruction alone to all together. Only let the children mingle together and the effect is well known."—*Christian Register*, 22nd ult.

Read the above carefully Catholic parents; especially you who from fear of the expense, from desire of some worldly advantage to your children, or from an unwillingness to give offence to your Protestant neighbors, have hitherto been indifferent to the dangers of common schools; and have allowed your little ones to attend those seminaries of infidelity and immorality. Read and see, to what imminent danger—Nay! to what almost inevitable perdition, you, by Protestant shewing, have been exposing the souls of your children, of those for whom at the last great day, the Judge will hold you responsible. "Oh! there is no danger," you will urge, eager to find an excuse for your dereliction of duty. "Oh! there is no danger that the faith of our children shall be corrupted; or that their religion shall be in any wise interfered with." This you know to be a lie; this excuse for your infamous conduct towards your children cannot avail you. You know—because your Protestant neighbors boastfully proclaim it—you know that the common school is the last and cleverest device of Satan to ruin souls; that it is the almost infallible receipt for "Protestantising young Catholics," and making them tenfold more the children of hell than are those who Protestantised them. You know that it is sufficient to endanger the faith of your Catholic children to let them associate in school with Non-Catholics. "Only let the chil-

dren mingle together and the effect is well known," says the *Christian Register*; how then can you flatter yourselves that your children shall escape apostasy? or that you shall escape well merited damnation, if through negligence, through your culpable indifference, or a grovelling dread of giving offence to your Protestant neighbors, you persist in allowing your children to attend the Protestant common schools?

No Protestant doubts for one moment the consequence of mixed schools. It is as a powerful engine of proselytism, that those schools are valued; it is just because of their effects upon the faith of "young Catholics" that they are prized by Protestants, and cherished by anti-Catholic governments. Catholic parents therefore, if true to themselves, to their children, and to their God, will hold those schools in abhorrence, will shrink from them as from the greatest of evils.—The Catholic parent who really loved his child would rather follow him to the grave, and lay his body beneath the sod in the hopes of a joyful resurrection, than allow him to attend a Protestant "common" school; with the certainty almost, that that child would be Protestantised, and that its immortal soul would therein be exposed to the most imminent danger of being lost forever. This is no charge of our making against non-sectarian or mixed schools. If we speak of them as institutions admirably calculated to Protestantise their Catholic pupils, we do but repeat the words of our Protestant cotemporary the *Christian Register*; and if we assert that the Protestantised Catholic is in imminent danger of hell-fire, we do but repeat a truth which the Church teaches, and which reason approves. Better for the child that it had never been born, or that a mill stone had been tied round its neck and that it had been cast into the deep—than, that having been born of Catholic parents, and baptised into the Church, it had been allowed to attend one of the State or "common" schools. We shudder when we read of the unnatural parents who often extinguish the vital spark in their offspring, and with unnatural hands deprive it of the natural life which through them it had received; but what is their crime, what their brutality, to that of the Catholic parent, who, warned of the danger, exposes the soul of his son to the almost certain death that awaits it in the "common" schools of Upper Canada, and the United States!

The editor of the *Montreal Herald* acts wisely in declining to enter into a controversy on "religious or quasi-religious subjects," with the *True Witness*. A slight acquaintance with the subject matter of controversy, and a little regard for truth, are qualifications indispensable to him who would engage in such a controversy, and neither of these qualifications does the *Herald* possess.

Of his disregard for truth we may cite as a conclusive proof, his argument that every man should adhere to what he calls the "distinctive Faith" of his fathers—without any proviso that that "Faith," as he calls it, be the truth; and though that "Faith" be distinguishable from Catholicity only in that it in some respects agrees with the "Distinctive Faith" of infidels. Of his ignorance of the subject matter in dispute, we gave an instance in our last; showing that the *Herald* is so ignorant of the rudiments of Catholicity as to doubt whether, by the Catholic Church, baptism administered by heretics is deemed valid.

But though the *Herald* will not "argue" with, yet, having made a charge against us, he is bound, either to substantiate it, or to "withdraw it. He accuses us, by implication at least, of having abandoned the Protestant Faith, the faith of our "immediate ancestors;" and we call upon him, therefore, to specify one single article of that Faith which we have abandoned, and which, therefore, we must once have held. To deal in vague generalities is light work; but to descend to particulars is not so easy, and the *Herald* will, we think, find it no easy matter to accept our challenge.

It is true that we once did not believe what the Catholic Church believes and teaches, and were, therefore, at one time justly obnoxious to the charge of being a Protestant or baptised Non-Catholic. It is true that we now believe all that the Catholic Church believes and teaches, and simply because she so believes and teaches; but we are not, therefore, conscious of having abandoned anything which we did once hold or believe. We believe now, it is true, that the formulas known as the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, are exponents of revealed truth, though we once rejected them as old women's fables; but we are not aware that we have rejected, since being a Catholic, any Creed or Symbol that we held whilst Protestant. The reproach, therefore, of the *Herald* of having "abandoned the Faith" of our ancestors, is to us quite innocuous, because we know ourselves to be unworthy of it.

But what have these paltry personalities to do with the subject matter of the controversy? or why should the *Herald* persist in treating it as if it were in any manner connected with the merits or demerits of the writer? Our thesis, that it is the duty of every man to embrace the truth, and cleave thereto, irrespective of the opinions of his ancestors or his contemporaries.—The doctrine of the *Herald*, if consistently obeyed, would compel the son of a heathen father to worship Mumbo Jumbo because his fathers worshipped it; the son of a Calvinist to worship, under the name of God, a monster tenfold more hateful than Mumbo-Jumbo, because his Calvinistic ancestors delighted to represent God as an omnipotent fiend; and would condemn the son of infidel parents to remain an infidel, because his immediate ancestors believed nothing. The common sense of mankind must revolt against such doctrine; and yet it is implied in the reproach that the editor of the *Montreal Herald* addresses to us as an "Ex-Protestant."

No! the editor of the *Herald* acts wisely not to "argue." His forte lies not in argument, but in invective, in calling names, and in making false charges which he well knows to be false, and which, therefore, he will not attempt to substantiate. If our opponent deems we are unjust