

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE. PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 195, Fortification Lane, by J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week show the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. 71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. PATTENSON & Co., 27 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 1874.

ECCLIESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

AUGUST—1874.

Friday, 14—Vigil of the Assumption. Saturday, 15—Fast. Assumption of the B. V. M. Sunday, 16—Twelfth after Pentecost. Monday, 17—Octave of St. Lawrence. Tuesday, 18—St. Hyacinth, O. Wednesday, 19—St. Roch, C. (16th Aug.) Thursday, 20—St. Bernard, O. D.

OUR NEW STORY.—With the first issue of our new volume next week, we will begin the publication of a very interesting story, entitled "Lord Daere of Gilsland; or, the rising in the North." The scene is laid in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and the story abounds in adventures of a most extraordinary character, and hair-breadth escapes without number.—The persecutions visited upon English Catholics during the reign of the "Virgin Queen" are graphically described in the trials of the noble Lord Daere, and the beautiful and heroic Gertrude Harding.

This story will well repay perusal, and those wishing to get the opening chapters would do well to send on their orders at once, accompanied with the subscription price—only \$2.

We will also commence the new volume by printing in smaller type the first, or story page, and as far as possible the other pages of the paper, having procured for that purpose a new font of type. This will enable us to give our patrons more reading matter than in the past. We also promise, as opportunity offers, to use all exertions in our power to make the TRUE WITNESS a first class family paper. This we can do only by the assistance of our friends; and the many who are in arrears to us we once more request from them a prompt settlement, and thereby give us the means to make the desired improvement, so as to enable us to give our friends a paper worthy of them, and of the cause we espouse.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Imperial Parliament was prorogued on Friday by the usual message from the Queen, which was read by Royal Commission. The New Free Press of Vienna reports that the Duke De Cases, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, has complained to the British Government that Germany is seeking a quarrel with France; the complaint is based on a conversation of July 30th between the Duke and Prince Hohenlohe, the German Ambassador at Paris, when the latter stated that Germany, irrespective of the action of the other powers, would take what steps it thought proper against the discrimination made by the French with regard to the Carlists in violation of the obligations of neutrality.—General Dorregaray, commanding the Carlist army, has resumed the offensive in Navarroz. He has captured Lagardia. The Republican General Blanco, with eight battalions and twelve pieces of artillery is advancing to retake Lagardia. A circular note was received at Vienna from the German Government on Saturday in regard to Spanish affairs. It merely proposes that the powers should take under consideration the expediency of recognizing the Spanish Government. The Carlists are advancing on Barcelona, and there is not a sufficient body of Republican troops in the vicinity to oppose them. The Daily Telegraph's Paris correspondent says he has reliable authority for stating that a secret convention was concluded three months ago between the Emperor of Germany and Marshal Serrano, by which Germany agreed if necessary to aid in the suppression of the Carlist insurrection either with money or by means of an armed intervention, and undertake to secure the recognition of the Spanish republic by the allies. Serrano in return pledged Spain to an alliance, offensive and defensive with Germany in the event of war with France. Italy was to form a third party to the alliance. News comes from Bombay of terrible floods in Upper Soinde, by which several towns have been swept away. Sioux Indians report that the Arapahoes and Cheyennes are preparing for war. Telegraphic communication between Uruguay and the United States has been completed.

"IS THERE A GOD?"—To this issue the controversy betwixt Protestantism and the Catholic Church must come at last. Protestants who can reason logically see clearly that it will never do to admit the being of God, and above all of a God who has revealed His will to man, to which will He demands that all men should unreservedly submit themselves. To admit this they see is tantamount to admitting a medium of revelation or infallible Church, and all the adjuncts of Popery.

So they raise the question, "Is there a God?" and it is upon this ground that the battle betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism, betwixt Church and State, will have to be fought; indeed we may say on which it is being fought in the greater part of the world at the present moment.

His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster, in his recent publication stated the question in a few simple words. "The Church of Jesus Christ within the sphere of revelation, of faith, and morals is supreme, or it is nothing, or worse than nothing—an imposture and an usurpation." Now in this thesis the Archbishop quite repudiates the pretensions of the State to be the supreme authority in the moral as well as in the material order, and asserts a God or supreme ruler.

But to refute the Archbishop, a Protestant writer of some note, Mr. Stephens, takes up the cudgels, and in an article in the Contemporary Review proceeds to demolish the thesis of his opponent. Now to do this Mr. Stephens, who is a clear headed man, saw at once that it was necessary for him to throw doubts as to there being a God; for if there be a God Creator, it is to be presumed that He has made some revelation of His Will to His creature man; and if He has so revealed Himself it is certain that He must have established some means or medium of communication whereby man can ascertain with infallible certainty wherein that revelation consists; but this leads us at once to the conclusion that there is an infallible Church, supreme therefore in all questions of faith and morals, and therefore in these matters owing no allegiance to the State.—Q. E. N.

So Mr. Stephens begins his attempted refutation of the Archbishop of Westminster by challenging him to prove that there is a God. Mr. Stephens does not deny that there may be a God; but he contends that the arguments that can be adduced in support of the thesis that there is such a Being, are too weak to support the superstructure that His Grace builds thereon. There may be a God, Mr. Stephens is willing to admit; perhaps—for he is candid—the balance of probabilities is in favor of there being a God; but at best it can only be a probable opinion: an "I Think," not an "I Believe," and the shadowy claims of such a doubtful Being cannot be put in competition with those of such a substantial entity as the State.

But, continues Mr. Stephens, granting for the sake of argument that there is a God, has God ever revealed Himself to man? Is the story that we read in the Bible true? are the proofs of the credibility of the historical and biographical notices of the person called Christ which we find in the New Testament so conclusive as to authorize the building thereon of the superstructure called the Church? Here again as in the matter of God, Mr. Stephens does not absolutely deny the truth of the facts on which the Christian religion is based, but he denies that they have been proved, or that they can be proved. At best they must remain in the hazy region of opinion, and never under any circumstances can they be appealed to as against the fact of the State. That there is a God; the Falk Laws are facts; the Incarnation, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ may be but myths; a life to come of a heaven and a hell, men may be permitted to doubt, for these can never be fully proved; but who can call in question the existence of the jails wherein recalcitrant Catholic Bishops who pretend to exercise spiritual functions without leave of the district magistrates are locked up by orders of the Prussian Government? God and the Church are matters of opinion; the State is a fact.

Having thus to his own content, and to that of his Protestant readers, undermined the ground whereon the Archbishop of Westminster erects his Church. Mr. Stephens concludes that he has demolished his antagonist, and so sings his song of triumph. Not so fast, Mr. Stephens! You have proved this, and this only. Not that the thesis of the Archbishop is unfounded; but that Christianity and Protestantism are logically incompatible. You have shown that the truth of the conclusion of the Archbishop that there is an infallible Church can be logically impugned only by calling in question the truth of the premises on which that conclusion is based: to wit—That there is a God; and that God, through Christ, has revealed His will to man, binding man under heavy penalties to submit himself unreservedly to that revelation.

And it is only upon these principles that Protestantism can logically be defended, for unless God has given us some means of knowing His will with infallible certainty, in so far as that will has been by Him revealed, He might just as well never have revealed Himself; He might just as well not be; for an un-revealed or unknown God, in so far as man is concerned, is no God at all. And so by closest logical process or claim in which no flaw from the first link to the last can be found, we may conclude with infallible certainty from the non-being of an infallible church or teacher, to the non-being of revelation, thence to the non-being of a personal God; and so starting as Protestants, we find our terminus in the quagmire of Pantheism, or in the dark abyss of Atheism. And so Mr. Stephens acts in strict accordance with Protestant principles, when he begins his attack upon the fundamental Catholic doctrine that there is an infallible teacher of God's revealed will in matters of faith and morals, by calling in question the being of God; as a matter that at best can only be said to be very probable, though incapable of proof.

"It is singular that the advent of the German squadron on the Spanish coast for the purpose of intimidating the Carlists should be deemed at Madrid likely to cause the Spanish navy to declare for the Pretender."—N. Y. Tribune.

If the Spanish navy prefers Home Rule to the sway of a German Prince, or a tool of the German court, it will most certainly declare for Charles VII., who is no Pretender, but Spain's lawful king. At the beginning of the present century, when Napoleon I. had obtained *par vim et arma* the abdication of Charles IV. and his son Ferdinand, and placed on their throne his own brother Joseph, did Spain allow the latter to repose on a bed of roses? No; the whole nation arose in its might against him, though supported by the powerful army of the Emperor. History tells us that persons of all classes, of every age and condition, became soldiers for the defence of their liberties and their country. Although Spanish territory was for the moment occupied, Spanish chivalry was not subdued, and under such leaders as Castanos and Palafox, the people dealt many a hard blow to the usurper, and succeeded in rendering his government impossible. Napoleon was beaten in Spain by Spanish arms even before the Duke of Wellington, at the head of the allies, drove him from the Peninsula. There was nothing singular in the resistance of the Spaniards of that day to foreign rule, and if their descendants of the present day inherit any of their chivalry and pride, they will to the death resist the interference of Germany, which has for real object the extinction of their religion and their nationality.—The Republicans, who have invited this intervention, may have a different object in view,—to crush the Carlists who are rapidly gaining ground in the North. But Bismarck's object is twofold: 1st., to place a German Prince on the throne; and he thinks he can accomplish this with ease, since France, who resisted the attempt before, is now powerless, Italy is bankrupt, England impotent, Austria under his thumb, and Russia his partner in the game; and, in the second place, it is his wish to extend the persecution of the Catholic Church, as the N. Y. Times plainly puts it:—

"Prince Bismarck's desire to interfere against the Carlists is, as we may conjecture, principally dictated by the low he hopes to deal through the Carlists at the Roman Catholic party."

But Bismarck's ostensible object differs widely from the above *real* twofold one. He desires, forsooth, to punish the Carlists for their atrocities,—the murderous shooting of prisoners, women and children, and German correspondents.—The cable has shocked this Continent by its recital of the barbarous doings of the Don's followers, doings which never had existence outside the brains of the traitors who rule at Madrid. The truth, however, is at last beginning to leak out. The New York World, a journal not partial to the Carlists, says in its issue of July 31st:—

"Truth is more precious than rubies, and it is hoarded more carefully at Madrid than diamonds.—All the despatches from Madrid represented that the Carlists, after their great victory at Estella, had been guilty of unprovoked barbarity in the execution of the prisoners who had fallen into their hands. The first report was that General Dorregaray had shot 300 prisoners in the back; then the number was reduced to 180; finally to 18. The letters of our own correspondent at Estella have given us the other version of this affair, and shows that the men then executed, thirteen in number, were guilty of crimes which would have caused their death had they been taken in warfare in any civilized country."

What were these crimes? Let the World say:—

"The Carlist troops, pursuing the retreating Republicans, captured 180 of them amid the smoking ruins of this village. They were engaged in acts of wanton cruelty—setting fire to the houses, throwing the wounded into the flames, and outraging the women. The whole of these 180 rascals were tried by Court Martial, and sentenced to death. Dorregaray mitigated the sentence by sparing the lives of all but thirteen of the most guilty. These were shot, and they richly deserved their fate."

So, after all, the thirteen *martyrs* deserved death by the rope, and not by the more honorable instrument, the rifle. It will be found out by and by that the German correspondent, about whom such a fuss has been raised, if really shot, also received his just deserts. The bottom is then about knocked clean out of

Prince Bismarck's flimsy pretext for interference in Spain. The rascals who rule at Madrid may justly fear that the honest sea-men have discovered Germany's *real* intent, and that they will, in order to frustrate it, espouse the cause of Don Carlos, by whom alone the country can be saved from the awful peril that threatens it. It is not at all surprising that they should declare for their King in this crisis; it is what the voice of God and country calls upon them to do. M. J. W.

AS OTHERS SEE US.—We know that the Guibord party in Montreal is always anxious to hear what the enlightened people on the other side of the lines say of the famous Guibord case, now receiving the attention of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We have, then, much pleasure in assisting to circulate the opinion of a leading paper, the N. Y. World which reviewed the case on July 31st, in this wise:—

"There is a singular inconsistency in the demand that a person who had braved the displeasure of the Church during his life, should receive the honors of the Church after he was dead. In most countries a man who had once got to the point of defying excommunication would not care—nor would any one in his behalf care—what the Church could do to him after that."

The above, if nicely translated into French, would read well in the *Colonne Francaise* of the *Witness*. M. J. W.

CONVERSION.—We had the pleasure of being present on Sunday last at the parish church of Hemmingford, where a most interesting ceremony was performed by the respected Pastor, the Rev. F. Geoffroy—that of receiving Miss Mary Ann Breinard into the Catholic Church.

Mr. MICHAEL McALEER, of Allerton, has kindly consented to act as Agent for the TRUE WITNESS for Hemmingford and vicinity. We hope our friends in the locality will give Mr. McAleer a kindly reception when he visits them in our behalf.

Mr. CHARLES O'REILLY, of Chembly, has kindly consented to act as Agent for the TRUE WITNESS. He is now prepared to receive orders and subscriptions and grant receipts therefor. We hope our friends in the neighborhood will call on Mr. O'Reilly and pay him their indebtedness to this Office.

THE POPE AND FREE MASONRY.

To the Editor of the Daily News.

Sir,—So many paragraphs, have appeared in the newspapers of late on the subject which is the heading of this communication that I have to ask you to publish the following article, clipped from the paper called the *Voice of Masonry*, together with the remarks which I consider necessary and proper to make thereon.

"THE POPE EXPELLED FROM THE MASONS.—At the semi-annual meeting of the Grand Lodge of Masons, Scottish Rite of the Orient of Palermo, Italy, on the 27th of March last, Pope Pius IX. was expelled from the order. The decree of expulsion was published in the official Masonic paper at Cologne, Germany, and is preceded by the minutes of the Lodge in which he was initiated, and is as follows: 'A man named Mastai Ferretti, who received the baptism of Freemasonry, and solemnly pledged his love and fellowship, and who afterward was crowned Pope and King, under the title of Pio Nono, has now cursed his former brethren and excommunicated all members of the order of Free Masons; therefore, said Mastai Ferretti, is herewith by decree of the Grand Lodge of the Orient, Palermo, expelled from the Order for perjury.' The charges against him were first preferred in his Lodge at Palermo, in 1865, and notification and a copy thereof sent to him, with a request to attend the Lodge for the purpose of answering the same. To this he made no reply and, for divers reasons, the charges were not pressed until he urged the Bishops of Brazil to act aggressively toward the Free Masons. Then they were pressed, and after a regular trial, a decree of expulsion was entered and published, the same being signed by Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy."

This is one of the most circumstantial fabrications I have met; but it has some internal marks of its imposture. The decree of expulsion was published in Cologne. Why not in Palermo where it is said to have been made? Why send it to Germany for publication when there are so many journals in Italy thirsting for such items? Again, Pius IX. assumed the Pontificate in June, 1846. His very first Bull was directed against the Free Masons; yet according to the above clipping charges were not preferred against him until 1865 nearly twenty years afterwards. But I am not limited to internal evidence of fraud in the account. Well-known facts show its falsehood. Giovanni Mastai Ferretti was sent to the College of Volterra at the age of twelve, and remained there an object of love and esteem for professors and students until his eighteenth year. Of course he was not a Free Mason during that time. On leaving college he entered the Pontifical Guard, and remained in it until he determined to become a priest. Certainly the officers of the Pontifical Guard were not Free Masons. His health while in the army was bad, but I believe it was restored in consequence of a Novena made for that purpose by the Pope of the time, Pius VII. and himself. He thereupon left the army to make his studies for the priesthood. It will not be pretended that during those studies and his subsequent active life in South America and elsewhere as a priest he could have attached himself to an order regarded throughout Italy as antagonistic to the Church. The fact is that the Venerable Pontiff came of a very religious family, and was remarkable at all times for his personal piety, so far as any data to which I can now refer to throw light upon his life. I therefore deny that His Holiness was ever a Free Mason, and it is only a fabrication of his enemies to insult him. Why any man should invent the story of his Free Masonry is hard to imagine; but that he should at the same time deliberately manufacture all the plausible circumstantial details of the above statement, including Victor Emmanuel's signature, passes all ordinary conceptions of impudence.

Your obedient servant, CATHOLICS.

Kingston, Aug. 1st, 1874.

Bishop Horan, whose arrival at Quebec from Rome has been announced, reached Kingston yesterday, and is once more at home with a people who are endeared to him and who feel joy at his safe return.—*British Week.*

The crops in this locality are looking splendid and will be above the average with the exception of hay and fall wheat which will be about an average crop, the latter perhaps rather over than under.—*J.*

WITNESS FOR THE TRUE WITNESS.

SHORT SERMONS, FOR SINCERE SOULS.

No. 63.

"THOU SHALT NOT STRAY."—7th Com.

In order to make restitution are we bound to reduce ourselves to a state of absolute poverty?

If your riches or position in society, Christian soul, have been acquired by dishonest means; if by extortion, fraud, or any other injustice you have raised yourself from a state of poverty to one of affluence you are undoubtedly bound to make restitution even though you be reduced thereby to that state of want and poverty whence you raised yourself. The reason of this is evident. You have no right to this higher station of life, since you acquired it by fraud and dishonesty; and it will be depriving yourself of nothing to which you have a just right in reducing yourself again to the station of life which you held previous to your dishonesty. But if you raised yourself to your present station of life through honest means—or found yourself in it, through the exertions of your forefathers, then you are not bound to restitution, if that restitution will reduce you to poverty and want. A workman is not obliged to sell his tools—a farmer is not obliged to sell his working horses or his agricultural implements—a person born in easy circumstances or brought up to a profession is not obliged to reduce himself to poverty so as to have to work in the fields or at laborer's work in order to make restitution. This principle is acknowledged in our homestead law whereby certain articles of furniture and certain animals and implements are exempted from seizure for debt. You are bound however to curtail every expense of dress—to retrench every superfluous and luxury of eating and drinking and to content yourself with a station of honest mediocrity in order to enable you to fulfil the important and grave duty of restitution.

To whom ought we to make restitution? This question is so simple and so easy of solution and there is about it so little room to doubt, that it appears almost absurd to ask it.

Restitution can only be made to the rightful owner, where the owner can be found. This is the plain and simple principle. And yet simple and evident though it be, there appears in all ages of the church to have been those, who, either prompted by self-love or ignorance have sought to make restitution in other ways. As early as St. John Chrysostome's time there were those who thought that in order to avoid detection they were allowed to endow altars, to give alms or have masses said for the soul of the injured man. This, Christian soul, is a grave error. St. John Chrysostome calls these alms "Judaical if not diabolical alms." Yes! assuredly it is in *van* that you persuade yourself that these alms and good works will pass for restitution. Whenever the owner is known to him only can restitution be made, for remember "the thing owned always cries out for its owner;" he alone has the power to dispose of it; and if you dispose of it for him even by alms, you are guilty of fresh robbery; you give alms not out of your own means, but out of his means, whom you have injured. It was thus that Judas acted, when in despair at having betrayed our divine Lord, he went back to the priests and scribes and threw at their feet, the money they had given him as the price of his perfidy. It was Jesus Christ you had injured, O wicked traitor! not the treasury of the temple; it was OUR DIVINE LORD you betrayed, not the Priests and Scribes, and if you wished to make restitution of thy so ill gotten silver, it was at the feet of Jesus the betrayed, you should have cast it, not on the floor of the Temple. And you, Christian souls, shame! oh shame! even the Jewish priests—even those bad men who had trafficked in the blood of your Saviour—even those dishonest stewards who had taken from the treasury of the temple that money which ought alone to have been spent in the service of the temple; even these bad men knew better, than you, that it belonged to Jesus and not to them; and hence they rejected it as "the price of blood." You would endow altars, beautify churches, or feed the poor forsooth with money which belongs to others and not to you. This indeed would be all very well, if you did not know the proper owner, or even if he could not be found, but to give to the poor or to altars, what belongs to others, who are known and can be found, this is Judaical if not diabolical alms. St. Austin reproving you centuries ago speaks thus—"This is the man you have injured; and do you expect to repair this injury by paying a stranger? The poor man whom you have aided or whom you have clothed may rejoice at the alms you have given; but the whom you have injured will sigh and lament the damage you have done; the one may bless and praise you; but the other will vomit out against your maledictions and curses; the poor man whom you have relieved may ask God to cover you with blessings; but he from whom you have stolen will demand from that same God justice and the punishment of the robbery."

And which, Christian soul, do you suppose Almighty God will hear? whose petition will He prefer? Undoubtedly he will prefer the petition of the injured man. The obligations of justice are long prior to and far stronger than those of charity; hence your God will hear the prayer of Justice before that of Charity, the prayer of the injured before that of the benefited. Charity, alms deeds, adorning altars, building churches, are great and glorious acts in the sight of God, for "charity covereth a multitude of sins;" but charity cannot cover injustice. Alms deeds, adorning altars, building churches, are great and glorious deeds, but an act of restitution in those to whom restitution is necessary, is a greater act still. It is a beautiful thing beyond doubt in the sight of angels and saints to see a man giving alms to his fellow men who is in need, but if in order to give that alms, he has first stolen that which he gives, what beauty in the sight of those pure spirits can there be in the