

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 663 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLBERG, 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.
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 TRUE WITNESS can be had at the News Depot, Single copies 3d.
The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC 3, 1869.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1869.

Friday, 3—Fast: St Francis Xavier, O.
Saturday, 4—St. Peter Obsequies B. D.
Sunday, 5—Second of Advent.
Monday, 6—St. Nicholas, B. D.
Tuesday, 7—St. Ambrose, B. D.
Wednesday, 8—Fast: IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, Obl.
Thursday, 9—Of the Octave.
NEWS OF THE WEEK.

It seems that M. Rochefort, editor of the celebrated *Lanterne*, and *redacteur en chef* of filthy slanders against Louis Napoleon and the Empress Eugenie, has been elected by the free and enlightened of Paris as their representative. The elected and the constituency are no doubt worthy of one another. Like master, like man, says the Book of Proverbs. As to M. Rochefort all that is known about him is that he is very ugly, very scurrilous, and very unprincipled. His admirers insist that Mirabeau was also an ugly man; but in truth M. Rochefort more closely resembles, physically as well as morally, the filthy Marat than Mirabeau; and the obscure *Lanterne* is worthy of a place alongside the bloody *Ami du Peuple*, or the infamous *Pere Duchesne* of the Hebertists.

The situation in Spain does not improve. The election of the young Duke of Genoa is by no means certain: the Carlists though suppressed, are far from being extinct as a party: and again, the extreme republicans in spite of their late defeat are not discouraged. They are bent upon a Federal Republic, and in this are more logical than their opponents. Anything which is not either Carlist, or Republican is but an intrigue. External troubles too, are not wanting to Spain in this, the hour of her trial. She has a good *casus belli* against the U. States, in that the latter have seized upon several gun-boats built in U. States yards to be used against the Cuban insurgents. As the President has not recognised Cuba as a belligerent there is no conceivable excuse for this conduct: but Spain is too weak to resent it, and this no doubt is what prompted Gen. Grant to its adoption.

The London *Times* reads Victor Emmanuel, now rising from a bed of sickness, a sermon upon the old, old text:—

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be; The devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

He, Victor Emmanuel, not his Satanic majesty, is a first rate article as a King, moralises the *Times*, but as a man he is a bad lot, a very bad lot indeed; and so the *Times* exhorts him as a man to live cleanly, to forswear sack, and to amend his ways. "A model king in many respects" says the *Times*, "it is to be hoped that his fever has left him a wiser, and a better man." A model king no doubt, and the virtues of his reign are duly sung by the London bard. He has spoiled his neighbors, and by fraud and force rendered himself master of their domains, and the oppressor of their peoples: he has unchained the demon of persecution, and let slip the blood hounds upon the Catholic Church, cheering them on to acts of outrage against priests and nuns: and in the words of the *Times*—"his encouraged, 'his subjects turned against the priests: they demolished ecclesiastical tribunals, suppressed monks, taxed canons, and laid violent hands on prelates of the highest rank." Unable "to fight the Austrians" as the *Times* admits, because Austrians carried rifles, and swords, and bayonets, and such like unpleasant things, the brave Italian Liberals found it safer and pleasanter to attack the Church, and wage war with women, and with men whose profession forbade them to carry arms: for Liberals are wise in their generation.

But after this glowing eulogy of his merits as a King, the *Times* is forced to admit that Victor Emmanuel is a very bad man: a nasty sort of man, a crowned Falstaff, without Falstaff's wit, one with whom decent people cannot consort, whose presence is an insult to any modest woman, and whose costly licentiousness has to be defrayed out of the taxes wrested by armed soldiers from his starving subjects. "In the worst days of national distress, Victor Emmanuel"—so admits his eulogist in the *Times*—"had again and again to ask for an increase of the Civil List:

his debts had again and again to be wiped off by a Parliamentary vote, and it was from lavishness to unworthy minions that the King had to draw so deeply on the public purse." And this man, whose sole virtue consists in his hostility to the Pope, and whose private character is a libel on humanity, is the Sovereign whom Liberal Protestants delight to honor.

In Ireland moderate men, who seek only justice—and they after all are we trust in the majority, 'though the least noisy—are waiting quietly for Mr. Gladstone's Bill on the Land Question; but there is a party which by the violence of their language, their menacing attitude and the extravagance of their demands seem determined to render the good intentions of the Ministry nugatory, and to make reconciliation between England and Ireland impossible. To keep alive the spirit of hostility they would sacrifice the interests of the Tenant Farmers, and doom the unhappy men under sentence of imprisonment to an eternity of suffering. But we do not believe that the country, that the Catholics of Ireland, are with this party. These stand firmly on their rights, and insist upon justice: but if the first be recognised, and the other done, we believe that they would ask no more. The nominations of O'Donovan Rossa for Tipperary, and of Mr. Luby for Queen's County could serve no good end, and were intended we suspect only to prevent that amicable settlement of the Irish Question on which good men of all classes are bent; but which the "heartless spouters" as they have been aptly styled, who make their daily bread by agitation, and whom noisy professions of patriotism dispense from the hard necessity of earning that bread by the sweat of their brows, dread as a calamity. Their occupation would indeed be gone, if justice were done to Ireland, and to her honest, industrious, but hitherto much wronged rural population.

Latest tidings from Ireland would seem to indicate the increase of agitation, and defiance against the British Government. Telegraphic reports tell us that O'Donovan Rossa has been elected for Tipperary. We doubt the truth of the report; but any how as Rossa is in the eyes of the law a convict, he is civilly and politically dead, and therefore ineligible for a seat in Parliament.

The Red River business looks serious, though accounts from that quarter may probably be exaggerated, especially with regard to the numbers, and designs of the so-called insurgents. It is certain that they have expelled Mr. McDougall the Lieut. Governor appointed to rule over them: and that the latter has had to recross the frontier to Pembina, where it is said he will pass the winter. What our authorities will do we know not. They are in a very difficult position, from which they can scarce retreat without loss of honor: and it seems impossible for them to advance, separated as geographically we are from the Red River, and dependent for our communications with it upon an alien and, whatever some may say to the contrary, a hostile country. The employment of force against the insurgents is out of the question, as the latter well know: and if, which however is doubtful, they form the majority of the population, we must compromise the matter with them, or in other words, humbly withdraw our pretensions. It is said, and perhaps truly, that the Yankee Fenians are getting ready to improve the occasion by siding with the insurgents.

RIGHT TO BE BURIED IN CONSECRATED GROUND.—This is the heading of an article that appeared the other day in the *Montreal Herald*, and which was provoked by the circumstances we are about to narrate.

A few days ago a man named Joseph Guibord died rather suddenly, and without the services of the priest. The deceased at the time of his death was member of a society called *L'Institut Canadien*, now under the ban of the Church; and membership with which virtually excludes from all participation whilst living in the Sacraments, and after death in the offices of the Catholic Church, which, as do all other religious bodies—claims the right of determining her own conditions of Communion.

The friends of the deceased notified the fact of the death to the ecclesiastical authorities, and demanded for him the last offices which the Church renders to her children departed. These, seeing that the said Joseph Guibord by his own deliberate act had knowingly and wilfully refused to submit himself to her when living, were of course refused. His friends were told that they might bury the body of the deceased in the *Cote des Neiges* Cemetery if they so pleased; but not in that particular portion of it which by special religious rites has been consecrated or set apart for the reception of the mortal remains of those who die in peace with the Catholic Church, and in her communion. Upon this the friends of the deceased took his body to the Protestant Cemetery where it now lies; and they have also instituted legal proceedings to compel the ecclesiastical authorities to receive it into the religiously consecrated portion of the Catholic Cemetery.

This raises the question stated by the *Herald*

of the "Right To Be Buried In Consecrated Ground."

Such a right, legally considered, cannot exist unless in virtue of a special contract. For no one can it be claimed as a legal or natural right, that his body be buried in consecrated ground set apart by religious rites for burial purposes. For the sake of decency and of the public health, the civil magistrate very properly insists that the dead shall be buried, and in ground that may not be disturbed or used for other purposes. He can insist therefore that there be cemeteries: but he cannot insist that the land so set apart or secularly consecrated, shall also be spiritually consecrated; for he has no right or power to compel the performance of any purely spiritual act or religious function.

Now in the *Cote des Neiges* cemetery there are two distinct things. The whole thereof has been by law set apart, or secularly consecrated for burial purposes: and over and above this, a portion of the ground so secularly consecrated, has been spiritually consecrated by the performance of certain religious rites. The questions then at issue are simply these:—"Has any one, not dying in communion with the Catholic Church a legal right to be buried after death in that particular portion of the cemetery which by special spiritual acts has been set apart, or consecrated by the Church for the reception of the bodies of those who die in her communion?" And—"Did the deceased Joseph Guibord die in communion with the Catholic Church?"

To the first question we reply—No. No one can claim as a legal right to be buried after death in ground, spiritually consecrated.

Of the second question, the Church alone is the competent judge, for she alone has the power of determining the conditions of communion.

Thus the case of Joseph Guibord is very simple. His friends are at liberty to bury him in ground legally or secularly set apart or consecrated for burial purposes: but they have not the right to bury him in ground spiritually consecrated, for the reception of the bodies of those, and of those alone, who die in communion with the Church.

Dr. Rodger's lecture, of which in another column we offer a brief analysis, has provoked a rejoinder from the Rev. Mr. Woods, a Protestant minister of this City, of the Anglican denomination. Mr. Woods avows himself a Ritualist,—"an extreme man of the extreme, Ritualist Ritualistum if you will;" but he takes exception to a statement of Dr. Rodger's to the effect that, with the exception of the Papal Supremacy, Ritualists hold all the doctrines held by Roman Catholics.

Thus the Rev. Mr. Woods denies, and we give him the benefit of his denial. He repudiates the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as condemned in the 28th article; but at the same time he holds and teaches "that in the Holy Communion there is a mysterious and indefinable presence of Our Lord which is yet 'verily and indeed'—a real presence."

What Mr. Woods means we know not, and we suspect that if called upon to explain his meaning he would be in sore straits himself. His words are studiously ambiguous. He does not say that in the consecrated bread and wine, and in virtue of the consecration, he admits a "real" presence—but in the "Holy Communion," or act of communicating; thus virtually ignoring a real objective presence, and substituting in lieu thereof a purely subjective presence, dependent upon the faith of him who communicates. This seems to be his meaning in so far as we can fathom it: but if we have misunderstood him we will upon explanation, cheerfully retract.

Mr. Woods also repudiates what he calls "the distinctively Roman doctrines or practices—invocation of saints, indulgences, purgatory, veneration of relics, cultus of the Blessed Virgin."

As a scholar, which we believe he is, Mr. Woods must know that the doctrines and practices above enumerated are not "distinctively Roman," because they are held and practised by schismatic Greeks and other religious bodies not in communion with the See of Rome. They are no more distinctively Roman, than they are distinctively Russian. For Mr. Woods' sake, we regret deeply that he repudiates the *cultus* of her whom he cannot deny to be the Mother of God.

We shall say more on this subject in our next.

SHUFFLING OUT OF IT.—A Mr. Satchell, a member if not a minister of the Protestant Established Church, has written to the Protestant Bishop of Oxford to enquire whether auricular confession, and priestly absolution are in accordance with the principles of the Church of England? To this embarrassing question, to which of course a Bishop of that church does not reply with either a straight forward "Yes," or a straight forward "No," the gentleman addressed responded with a slipperiness worthy of the illustrious Soapy Samuel, by quoting the words of the Prayer Book; in which, before the administration of communion, the minister first is instructed to exhort his hearers to examine their lives and conversations by the rules of God's

commandments; to bewail their own sinfulness, and to confess themselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life; and is then at liberty to add the following exhortation:

"Therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but require further comfort or counsel, let him come to me or some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution together with ghostly counsel and advice." S. OXON.

The querist may of course interpret this answer either affirmatively or negatively. "Which is Wellington and which is Napoleon?" asked the inquisitive old lady at the show. "Whichever you please, marm; you pays your money, and you takes your choice." So with the question—"Does the Church of England, or does she not, sanction auricular confession, and recognise the power of the priest to absolve?" put by Mr. Satchell. "Whichever you please, sir;" replies the Soapy prelate; "there are the words of the rubric, dark and ambiguous as the Delphic oracles of old, and you can take your choice." If you are in favor of the practice of confession, and sacerdotal absolution, you will find in the said words something to countenance you; if, on the contrary, you abhor the practice as rags of Popery, you will see that the rubric no where enjoins the necessity of confession as the divinely appointed means of obtaining pardon for post-baptismal sins, or recognises the efficacy of absolution; which is to had "by the ministry of God's word"—whatever that ambiguous or mysterious phrase may signify—"You reads your rubric, and you takes your choice." With this reply Mr. Satchell must be satisfied, and S. Oxon escapes triumphantly from the snare spread for him. He has delivered his soul. We cannot but admire the ingenuity with which Anglican prelates parry troublesome questions, and baffle their tormentors, high church, and low church.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RITUALISM.—According to an announcement Dr. Rodgers, late Protestant minister at Memphis in the United States, delivered a lecture on the above named subject on the evening of Wednesday, 24th ult., in the Academic Hall of St. Mary's College. The lecturer who has the advantages of a fine physique, a clear and powerful voice, and an elegant delivery, was introduced to the large audience by the Rev. Father Merrick.

Mr. Rodgers commenced his discourse by a definition of Ritualism. From an æsthetic point of view it may be considered as an effort to make religion, and religious services, attractive to the multitude; but this was not all, for it had also a didactic side, and was resorted to for the purpose of impressing upon the mind the truths and significance of Christian dogma. The preacher sought to effect through the ear and the sense of hearing, the same object which the Ritualist sought to attain through the medium of the retina, and the sense of sight.

The lecturer next considered the matter from an historical point of view. He showed how, one by one, a large section of the Anglican church, educated at Oxford, had been compelled by the force of inexorable logic to adopt the distinguishing doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church—all of them indeed with the exception of the Supremacy of the Pope. First it was discovered that the canon of the New Testament as accepted by Anglicans, rested wholly on the authority of the Pope as head of the Roman Catholic Church; that for many hundreds of years after the origin of the Christian religion, there was no universally received canon of Scripture: that there were no means of knowing with certainty, what books were to be accepted as the Word of God, and what rejected. This controversy was closed by the authority of the Pope. But if the Church, speaking by the Pope, were competent to decide so great a question, it could only be because she is infallible; for if liable to err, she may have erred in her authoritative definitions as to the Canon of the New Testament; and thus the writings which Anglicans receive as the Word of God, may be spurious. But if competent to settle the question of the Canon of Scripture, the Catholic Church must be infallible, and therefore competent to settle authoritatively all other questions of faith. To be consistent, or logical, we must either accept all, or reject all; and therefore, amenable to the stern laws of logic, the Oxford school of High Churchmen found themselves compelled to adopt all Catholic dogma, with the exception of the Papal Supremacy.

So the belief in a real presence in the Eucharist arose again in the Protestant mind.—With it, of course, sprang up a belief in an Altar, a Priest, and a Sacrifice as the essential, characteristic, and central act of Christian worship; and this belief was naturally and inevitably accompanied by those external acts, or rites by, and through which the High Churchmen sought to confess the faith that was in them, and to impress it upon others. Hence altar decorations, gorgeous vestments, incense, and lowly prostration before the Divine Presence, concealed or veiled from mortal eyes under the appearance of bread and wine.

Of the Ritualists themselves, the lecturer said but little, but what he did say was couched in

terms which could not offend. If he pointed out and insisted upon the logical untenableness of their position, the absurdity of the "three bran's" theory of the Church, and the inefficiency of Anglican Orders—to the good intentions, the earnestness and devotion of the men themselves, he tendered his homage. Only he earnestly would exhort them to consider their consciences seriously, and to examine whether they could logically defend their actual position.

Such is a brief outline of a lecture, which occupying nearly an hour and a half in its delivery, was listened to with close attention, broken only by loud plaudits, by a numerous audience, comprising many of our prominent Catholic clergy. We hope that at some future day we in Montreal may have the pleasure of hearing Dr. Rodgers again; and should he visit any of our other Cities in Canada, we bespeak for him a numerous attendance, and a hearty welcome, as for one who is an eloquent lecturer, and an amiable gentleman.

We hope the *Montreal Gazette* will pardon us if we point out to him an error into which he has fallen with regard to the action of the Catholic Church, and the ecclesiastical authorities of Montreal, towards the body of a man who died excommunicate, that is to say outside the pale of the Church. The *Gazette* speaks of "the refusal of the Roman Catholic authorities in this City to permit the burial in the cemetery of the *Cote des Neiges* of the remains of Joseph Guibord." This is erroneous. The Roman Catholic authorities offered no opposition whatsoever to the burial of the excommunicated man in the *Cote des Neiges* cemetery: what they refused was this—To bury him in that particular part of the said cemetery which, by religious rites, or consecration, has been set apart for the reception of the bodies of those who die in communion with the Church, and of those only. The *Gazette* will see that this is a very different thing indeed from a refusal to allow the body to be buried in the cemetery, and will we hope correct its error.

IS EMIGRATION A SIGN OF BAD GOVERNMENT?—The *Troy Whig*, quoted by the *Montreal Gazette* of the 25th ult., asserts that "the agricultural towns and counties of New England have sent out more emigrants to till the fields of New York and the Western States, than Great Britain and Ireland have sent to the United States." If the facts be as stated, and if as some pretend the emigration of a people be a sure proof of bad laws and misgovernment, New England, from which the *exodus* has been greater than that from Great Britain and Ireland, must be a worse governed country than either of the last named.

ECCLIASTICAL CHANGES.—The following changes have taken place lately in the Diocese of Sandwich:—Rev. J. B. Duprat has been appointed to the Parish of Paincourt, Dover, in lieu of the Rev. Mr. Raynel, who has become a member of the illustrious order of Jesuits. Very Rev. Dean Laurent, late of Amherstburgh, has been changed to the Parish of Sandwich; Rev. Mr. Flannery to Amherstburgh; Rev. Mr. Gauthier to Maidstone, and Rev. Mr. Ouellette to Corunna, in place of Rev. Mr. Gauthier.

L'INSTITUT CANADIEN.—News has been received from Rome, so the *Minerve* informs us, to the effect that the answer of *L'Institut Canadien* has been examined, and been declared to be insufficient and insolent. Instructions have, in consequence been transmitted to Canada that all priests withhold from the members of the said Society, absolution even in *articulo mortis*.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.—In the *Minerve* we read that the Bishops in France have applied to the government!!! for permission to assist at the Council. Thank God that we live under a different regime, and that our Bishops can perform their sacred duties without authority to do so from the civil magistrate.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of the first number of the *People's Journal*, an ably edited, and handsomely printed paper, published at Hamilton, Ont.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD—December, 1869.—Messrs. Sadlers, Montreal.—Like good wine, this periodical improves with age, but we hope that it is now so well known to the Catholic people of this Continent, as to need no other commendation. The contents of the current number are as follows:—1. Father Hecker's Farewell Sermon; 2. Angela, c. vi.; 3. Dr. Harwood's Price Lecture; 4. Haydn's Struggle and Triumph; 5. Prayer; 6. Immutability of the Species; 7. A Hero, or a Heroine? 8. The Sanitary Topography of New York; 9. The Basilica of St. Peter; 10. Beecher's Norwood; 11. Church Music, part 1.; 12. The Early History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York; 13. Matters Relating to the Council; 14. Foreign Literary Notes; 15. New Publications. Price, \$4 per annum.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW—Oct 1869.—Messrs. Dawson Bros., Montreal.—The articles are on the following subjects:—1. Juvenal's Mundi; 2. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew; 3. The Different Schools of Elementary Logic; 4. Mrs. Browning's Latest Poetry; 5. The Pope and the Council; 6. The Constitutional Development of Austria; 6. Literature of the Land Question in Ireland; 8. Contemporary Literature.