

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS,

GEORGE E. CLERK and JOHN GILLIES, At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, G. E. CLERK.

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 carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3c, can be had at this Office; Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 3, 1860.

PERSONAL.—In consequence of the absence of the Editor of this journal, it is requested that all communications intended for his private perusal, may be marked "Private."

We have said that there is nothing perhaps that more perfectly proves the utter falsehood of the charges brought against the Papal Government, than the nature of those charges themselves.—There are assertions without end or measure; but assertions, without proofs, especially when made by a hired assassin, as in the case of the Roman correspondent of a certain influential English newspaper, are certainly not the most reliable materials for history. That must in very sooth be a desperate narrative which requires the shining stiletto dipped in the blood of Prime Ministers for its pen. Now it is extremely difficult to meet broad general assertions, which it is in the very nature of things impossible to disprove; but we may reasonably call for the proofs of their truth; and when they are not forthcoming, we may be allowed to doubt and dispute them. We are treated by the English journals to a whole string of accusations, as to an alphabet, which we must receive on their authority—oppression, priestcraft, tyranny;—but when we ask for proofs, we are met with Falstaff's subtlety: "Give you a reason on compulsion! If reasons were as plenty as blackberries, I would give no man a reason on compulsion." The worst of all this is, that John Bull, in the fullness of his faith in the newspapers, according to his old song—"It must be true, because it's in the papers"—swallows the most enormous lies without the slightest remorse, and goes to bed at night with a clear conscience, little dreaming that he is the victim of a conspiracy to rob his pocket by the tickling process of what our Yankee neighbors would call "moral suasion." Another feature in these reports from the seat of war, which should at least throw some slight shade of doubt on somebody's veracity, is the fact of their utter disagreement—"the different versions each manage to dish up: "The newspapers, too, make no little ado, though a different version each manage to dish up; Some say the Prince Bishop has run a man through; Others say an assassin has killed a Prince Bishop."

The telegrams from Sicily are certainly most amusing specimens of contradictions—as opposite as their own electric polarity, and might very well be described by the old song— "There's some say that we ran, Some say that they ran, Some say that none was ran at a man; Put one thing I'm sure, That at Sierra Muir, A battle there was that I saw, man; And we ran and they ran, And they ran and we ran; But Florence ran fastest of a' man.

Whether we ran or they ran, Or they ran or we ran, Or if there was running at a man, There's no man can tell, Save one brave general, Who first began running of a' man."

Amid such discordant accounts, prudent men will calmly await the issue. Another thing that will cause unprejudiced minds at least to suspend their judgment, and will serve to throw discredit upon the accounts of such papers even as the London Times, is that paper's unjust and ungentlemanly conduct towards the author of the "Question Irlandaise."

The writer of that able pamphlet having been abused in true Times' Correspondent style, with any amount of abuse and invective, and the smallest amount of logic, addressed a letter to the Times, asking that paper to answer either affirmatively or negatively, five simple questions of fact with regard to Ireland, on which facts the whole of the arguments of the pamphlet were founded. This surely was a reasonable request, and one with which every lover of fair play, let alone an Englishman, would gladly have complied. It was in fact the only course left open to a gentleman and a man of honor; and it was only natural therefore to suppose that the mighty Thunderer would gladly have availed himself of it, especially as it afforded him only too good an opportunity of supporting the reputation of his "Correspondent" and of hurling an especially manufactured thunderbolt of proofs at the head of the audacious little Frenchman, and thereby annihilating him in his shoes. But did the Times do so? No. As the questions were rather inconvenient ones to answer, and would have necessitated the Thunderer's eating his own words to an extent that was likely to decidedly disagree with his stomach, he very prudently smirked the nasty dose, and refused insertion to the Frenchman's queries. We must confess that we would willingly discredit the fact, for the sake of human nature, if it were not substantiated beyond all reasonable doubt on the authority of another paper, and uncontradicted by the Times. However, such conduct is perhaps the strongest proof of the strength and irrefragability of the worthy Frenchman's arguments, and will serve, amongst unprejudiced minds, to throw discredit upon the statements of per-

sons so utterly lost to all feelings of common honesty and decency as those who are guilty of it.

The English nation appears to be besotted in its admiration of the brigand Garibaldi. In its eyes he is the liberator of Italy—the vindicator of "oppressed nationalities"—in fact he is deified in the eyes of an hero-idolrous nation, and will doubtless obtain a niche with Kossuth near a Sayers and the Dei minores of the ring.—That Garibaldi has courage and daring, no one will deny; this he shares alike with Dick Turpin, Jack Shepherd, and the brigands of the Abruzzi; but whether he deserves a thousandth part of the encomiums heaped upon him by English hero-worshippers, is extremely doubtful; in fact, it would be a curious speculation to determine what would be England's own estimation of him, were he, after the conquest of Sicily and its annexation to Sardinia, to set about, in his character of liberating angel to the world at large, the conquest of Ireland; and from being an ill-governed dependency of Victor (2a), to make that island a fief of Victor. Of course that would be quite another thing. There cannot possibly be any Garibaldiis wanted for Ireland; and should they be so foolish as to arise, they would then, from "liberating angels," become meddlesome devils, rebels, aliens, and a host of other things, all equally complimentary. Whatever may be Garibaldi's virtues as a hero and a liberator, he certainly has very few as an honest and charitable man, and one who loves the people, and especially the poor. That funds must be found to supply the insatiable appetites of his comarant squad, is very true; but whether the charities left for the support of the poor are the proper funds with which to satisfy them—whether liberty, supposing it were gained and granted by this brigand, bought with the money that should give bread to the starving, be not bought at too great a price, is at least very doubtful. Are there no other funds, but the bread of the poor, wherewith to support these liberators? Is England so bad a pay-master, and are English sympathisers with "oppressed nationalities," so lukewarm as to necessitate this robbing of the poor? It is not surely these liberators themselves, who, overrating the boon they are about to grant, are insatiable in their demands. But be it as it may, King Log or King Stark, either is bad enough, but King Stark by far the worse.

"The cry against Camp-Meetings"—exclaims the Montreal Witness—"savours very much of the opposition from certain quarters to everything that is good." We differ with our evangelical cotemporary; it is the natural and indeed healthy reaction against the cant and humbug of Puritanism; it is the indignant utterance of morality against the obscenities of the "Love-Fest," and the lubricity of the "Revival."

We do not undertake to account for the phenomenon—for this would be out of place in our columns; but there is no fact better established than that of the constant connection betwixt impurity of the grossest kind, and that peculiar form of religious extravagance which by the Calvinistic world is dignified by the name of evangelicalism. Two features have invariably characterised and still characterise its professors; the one is their steady, constant worship of Mammon, or pursuit of wealth, in which they are not to be arrested by any considerations of honor or honesty; the other is their hatred of asceticism in all its forms, and their disregard of what, according to Protestant arrangement of the Decalogue, ranks as the Seventh Commandment. The first feature has been noticed by an illustrious Protestant writer, who speaks of the greed and unscrupulousness with which your evangelical stoops, to pick up the most dirty gain, and who "pursue the getting of money with a pace as steady as time, and an appetite as keen as death;" the other, or the sensuality of evangelicalism, has attracted the notice of the Protestant historian, and provoked the wondering comments of the moralists. It was in the XVII. century that Calvinistic evangelicalism culminated, and it was in the Northern section of the British Isles that this foul travesty of religion attained its highest form of development. Let us glance at the moral condition of the people during this epoch of triumphant Calvinism, premising that the picture we are about to lay before our readers, is from no unfriendly hand to Scotland or to Calvinism, but is taken from Chambers' "Domestic Annals of Scotland"—a well-known, and carefully compiled work. The period is that intervening betwixt the death of Charles I., and the Restoration:

"The number of cases of uncommon turpitude in a time of extraordinary religious purism forces itself upon attention. One Foyer who was under notice of the English judges at Glasgow in the spring of 1659, is described by Robert Baillie as 'a most wicked hypocrite, who, under the color of piety and prayer, has acted sundry adulteries.' Being labelled for one only 'he was so scourged.'"

"Offences of a horrible and unnatural kind continued to abound to a degree which makes the daylight profligacy of the subsequent reign—(that of Charles II.)—shine white in comparison. 'More,' says Nicoll 'within these six or seven years nor within these fifty years preceding and more.' Guilt of all ages, from boys to old men, are heard of every few months as burnt on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh; sometimes together. Young women, who had murdered their own infants—on one occasion it was 'a nee pretty young gentillwoman'—were frequently brought to the same scene of punishment. John Nicoll states that on one day, the 15th Oct., 1656, five persons, two men and three women, were burnt at the Castle Hill, for offences of the several kinds here glanced at; while two others were scourged through the city for minor degrees of the same offences.—Vol. II., p. 243.

This was the epoch when Puritanism reigned supreme over Church and State; when in the words of our author, Calvinism "was in the highest power;" when "every vestige of episcopacy was banished;" when Catholics were hunted down like wild beasts, and the Presbyterian clergy exercised "unlimited authority over the external practise and professions of the community." This too was the epoch distinguished above all others in Scotch Annals for its incredible filthiness, and dishonesty, for an immorality so hideous as to make the era of the Restoration "shine white

in comparison." We continue our quotations:—

"At the same time," says your author, "gross offences connected with the affections never abounded more, if we can believe Nicoll, than they did at this time. Some of an indescribable kind appeared in an unnumbered frequency, and continued indeed to do so all through the time of the Interregnum. In Lamoritis Diary, the number of gentlemen in Fife who are stated as having broken the seventh commandment during the time of the Commonwealth, is surprisingly great. Even the sanctimonious Chancellor London himself had to give satisfaction to the kirk in 1651. The writer of the Statistical Account of Melrose remarks the surprising number of penitents which he finds in the Session-books during the seventeenth century,—far exceeding the average of the present day, when the population is nearly trebled! The churchmen of that period themselves, not merely admit but loudly proclaim the extreme immorality of their people, the following being cited, for example, among the causes for a solemn fast in 1655; the growth of sin of all sorts, particularly pride, uncleanness, contempt of ordinances, oppression, violence, fraudulent dealing,—most part of the people growing worse and worse." We might set this down in great measure as the effect of entertaining a high view of human duty,—adds the Annalist,— "were it not for the many facts which have been reported by diarists and others. In short it fully appears that human nature was not effectually restrained by the rigorous discipline now temporarily reigning, but only shewed a tendency to go into moral aberrations of an abnormal and horrible kind."—Domestic Annals, vol. 2, p. 198.

Much more evidence to the same purport, and from Protestant sources, might we adduce to establish our thesis of the connection betwixt evangelicalism and immorality, especially "uncleanliness" and "fraudulent dealings;" to show the regular sequences betwixt an out-break of religion of the evangelical type and an out-break of the "grossest offences connected with the affections" or rather the animal passions.—But we have surely done enough to convince the Montreal Witness that the outcry against Camp-Meetings, does not necessarily proceed from an opposition to everything, or to anything that is good.

THE TROUBLES OF ANGLICANISM.—The condition of the Anglican Church, and the squabbles of the adverse factions therein, must always be of interest to Catholics. If on the one hand from its connection with the State, it has always assumed a prominent attitude of hostility towards us, yet the tendencies of a large party within its bosom have always been Rome-ward, and the logical application of the principles laid down in its formularies has brought many of its most illustrious children to the portals of the true Church. Anglicanism is indeed rather a form of diluted Popery, than a phase of Protestantism; and hence it is that since its origin so many strenuous efforts have been made to eliminate therefrom the strong Catholic elements which it still retains, or which it still holds in suspension.

Its Liturgy is for the most part Popish; and indeed therein many of the most obnoxious tenets of Popery—Baptismal Regeneration, to wit, and the efficacy of Sacerdotal Absolution—are expressly taught. Its Thirty-Nine Articles, though for the most part Calvinistic, are often purposely ambiguous, and susceptible of a Catholic interpretation. With the Prayer Book in their hands, the Puseyites, or Romanising party in the Establishment have on many a hard-fought field, approved themselves more than a match for their Low-Church opponents. The cry of the latter therefore has hitherto been strongly raised of late for a Liturgical Revision, and for expunging all such passages as teach, or imply, Catholic doctrine; now however it would appear that the Low-Churchmen will be satisfied with nothing less than an entirely new Prayer Book, new articles of faith, and a new Creed.—For this purpose they have published an Address to the Protestants of England, wherein their views are set forth, and which reads as follows:—

"THE ARTICLES AND PUSEYISM. "Protestants of England! There are men trying to delude you by saying that Puseyism can be crushed by altering a few passages in the Prayer Book. This is not true. It is not merely a word here and there which is Romish, but the whole book from beginning to end is leavened with Popery. "No less than sixty Collects are taken, word for word, from Popish Mass Books! "To put down Puseyism you must have an entirely new Prayer Book, and what is more,— "NEW ARTICLES OF RELIGION!"

The Address then proceeds to point out wherein the present Creed of the Anglican Church is in need of a thorough Reform:—

"The Thirty-nine Articles are not sufficiently Protestant. Look here and judge for yourselves: "Article viii. defends the Athanasian Creed, which says that none but Catholics can be saved! "Article xx. attacks the glorious Right of Private Judgment, for it asserts that the Church has Authority in controversies of Faith! "Article xxix. is to be found, word for word, in the Office for Corpus Christi Day in the Popish Breviary. "Article xxxiii. advises excommunication, and speaks of reconciling men to the Church by penance. "Article xxxv. says that whoever breaks the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church (bowings, kneelings, vestments, and such like,) is to be openly rebuked! "Article xxxv. says that the Homilies contain godly and wholesome doctrine, and yet the Homilies speak of the 'Sacrament' (!) of Marriage, and call the Apocrypha 'Holy Scripture'! "Article xxxvii. says that the Ordination Service has nothing superstitious or ungodly in it; and yet in it the Bishop professes to give to all who are ordained priests, the power of forgiving sins!!! "Until all this has been purged out, the Articles must continue a stumbling block to every earnest Protestant, and a stronghold for the Puseyites and their friends.

"Let your Cry then be— "REFORM FOR THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES! —AND NO POPERY!"

The Lower Churchmen are here undoubtedly in the right. If "the Church has authority in controversy of faith," as the XX. Article asserts, the Church must have received that authority immediately from God, and in that case her authority must be infallible. To predicate infallibility of authority holding immediately from God, is to impugn, either the Divine wisdom, or the Divine veracity; and the Anglican who really believes that "the Church has authority in controversies of faith," must, if capable of

arguing logically, admit in controversies of faith the Church is infallible. The reason why Anglicans remain Anglicans is simply because they do not believe their own articles of faith! because they do not recognise the existence of "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," in which they profess to believe when they recite the Nicene Creed; and because they do not really believe that "the Church has authority in controversies of faith." The agitation now raging however in the bosom of Anglicanism will have one good effect. It will have the effect of separating the chaff from the wheat, and of compelling both the friends and the enemies of Catholicity to declare themselves under their true colors.

STATE-SCHOOLISM.—Amongst the crying evils of the existing Common School system of Upper Canada we have repeatedly noticed the indecent admixture of the sexes, as a sin against common decency. Boys and girls—of the age of puberty—and under the superintendence of male teachers, are huddled together in these Common Schools, and the results upon the morals of both pupils and of teachers may easily be imagined.

Nor does the evil stop here. It appears that the male teachers of these Common—decency forbids us applying to them the epithet they richly merit—of these Common Schools then claim and exercise the privilege of flagellating, or inflicting corporal chastisement upon, their female pupils—as may be seen from the following report of a case lately tried at the Quarter Sessions lately held in Hamilton, C. W., and which we take from the Journal of Education for U. Canada.

The case, as it appeared before the Court, came in the form of an appeal from Archibald J. Campbell of Carlisle, East Flamboro', a School Teacher, against the decision of the Magistrates of his district, who fined him for flogging a young lady between 17 and 18 years of age, who attended his School. It was proved that the said young lady had spoken her mind pretty freely as to the cruelty of a flogging inflicted the previous day by the same teacher upon one of the boys attending the same school, and indignant at this act of insubordination, Mr. Campbell flogged the young lady with a "hickory whip stalk," with the end of which he also beat her about the breasts. The young lady's father brought his complaint before the Magistrates, who fined the girl-flogger; the latter, however, appealed to the Court of Quarter Sessions, which, we are happy to say, sustained the decision of the inferior Court.

Comments would be superfluous; and we are sure that every Protestant parent who desires that his sons and daughters should grow up pure, modest and virtuous, will agree with us in denouncing the admixture of the sexes, in the school-room, and the public flagellation of young ladies from 17 to 18 years of age as a disgrace to the community which tolerates such abominations.

DR. RYERSON'S "DARK AGES."

As we quoted Robertson, for the Methodist Doctor's edification, in the case of the laity, we must be excused, if we again quote that particularly accurate and logical authority, for the Doctor's further edification, in the matter of the clergy. Having in his own peculiar way accused the greater part of the clergy of ignorance, in order to establish his thesis, he says—"One of the questions appointed by the Canons to be put to persons who are candidates for orders was this—'Whether they could read the Gospels and Epistles, and explain the sense of them, at least literally.'" For this he quotes Brucker; and it is fortunate for the cause of truth that he does so, as, with his usual inaccuracy, he leaves out a word which, although small in alphabetical proportions, is certainly not unimportant for our case, though its omission is of the greatest importance to one trying to prove the ignorance of the Middle Ages. But of this anon. Meanwhile let us observe that the case, even if all that Robertson would wish us to infer from it were true, is not so very bad after all, since, on his own showing, there is evidently a disposition towards amendment, and that moralists tell us, is two-thirds of the battle. Granting that up to the time of Regino, from whom Brucker quotes, the greater part of the clergy (as Robertson tells us) were unable to read or write; and that these very Canons were written by clergymen who could not write for clergymen, who could not read; still they prove at least that there was some little desire on the part of the authorities to amend so lamentable a state of things.—Again, taking Robertson's authority in the sense in which he wishes it to be understood, does it follow that because candidates for holy orders are questioned as to whether they can read, that therefore it is evident that reading must be an unusual accomplishment. Take a case of our own times. When a Catholic Bishop is consecrated, he is interrogated, separately and singly, as to his belief in the different articles of the Nicene Creed. Are we from this to conclude therefore that belief in the different articles of the Nicene Creed is an unusual thing in the Catholic Church, and one pertaining to a Bishop only? Again, a Catholic child, when interrogated in its Catechism, is asked—Of what religion are you? He answers—By the grace of God I am a Christian. Are we therefore to conclude, that because the child is questioned as to his Christianity, therefore Christianity is an unusual thing in the nineteenth century? It is true, that since the decision of the Anglican Bishops, with regard to the non-necessity of baptismal regeneration, Christianity, pure et simple, is becoming more and more rare every day amongst our Protestant populations; but still no one can legitimately conclude from the question of the Catechism, that Christianity is a rare accomplishment in the XIX. century. Again let it be remembered that the question in the Canons bears reference to Latin—whether the candidate can read Latin. Now surely an inability to read Latin, is no very great proof of inability to read one's mother tongue; else may our Common Schools be shut to-morrow, and Ca-

nada be declared a province of ignorant boors.

Come we now to the accuracy of Robertson's quotation. And here, we have said, is observable a curious omission—be it by inadvertence—be it through ignorance—or be it through design. From Brucker, whom Robertson fortunately quotes, (he should have been content with the plain assertion, and bigotry would have accepted it as truth), we find that the question is not—Whether the candidate had learned to read?—nor even—Whether he could read Latin?—but—Whether he could read Latin well? Robertson has failed, either through inadvertence, ignorance, or design, to translate the little word bene—well. The omission is singular, as coming from a man professedly well informed, and who has undertaken to point out the ignorance of others. But this is not Robertson's only sin of omission. Had he given the very next question of the Canons, it would have thrown considerable light (and surely Robertson wished to enlighten his readers) upon the subject. The candidate is next to be asked—If he knows the Creed of St. Athanasius by heart (memoriter)—whether he understands its meaning, and can translate it into the vernacular? Surely this does not look like not being able to read.—Nay, we doubt whether the Methodist Doctor himself, Chief Superintendent of the Educational Department of Upper Canada though he be—if he were told to "truss up his points" to-morrow and go through the Athanasius Creed—would be able to get past the first sentence, much less explain it to the satisfaction of a Catholic Board of Examiners, with His Lordship of Toronto at their head. And yet these are surely not Dark Ages, however some future Robertson, or huer descendant of the Methodist Doctor from his professorial chair may endeavor to prove so from the present Chief Superintendent's ignorance, of his Athanasius Creed. Be that as it may, the omission of this little word well (bene) "is strange, yea! passing strange!" and can be accounted for in a man of Robertson's education, upon none other than a very ugly looking hypothesis. Could bigotry have anything to do with it? The great Protestant tradition?

It is fortunate however that we have different writers of those ages (bless me! were there any books written by men who could not read and write?) from whom we can learn, what was meant by the little word "well" (bene) that slipped so opportunely through Robertson's fingers. Although we have, we fear, made these papers far too long for our readers' patience, and are consequently anxious to bring them to a close, we cannot conclude without giving a few examples from which to judge of the import of this little word. But we will be brief, in mercy to our suffering readers.

St. Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, who lived until 636, was not at least one of those "many dignitaries of the Church" who, as Robertson tells us were unable to subscribe the Canons of the Councils in which they sat as members, since we have whole books, and learned ones too, written by him; nor does he appear to think that the clergy under him ought to be ignorant—much less to be unable to read, since in his rules for the clergy, he requires of them, that they should be "continually occupied in teaching;" (what! when they themselves could not read?)—"in reading, in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs." Surely Robertson will admit that all this presupposes an ability at least to read. The eighth Council of Toledo, held in 653, requires even more. That no one should be admitted to any degree (not even to serving the priests at the altar) of ecclesiastical dignity, unless he knew the whole Psalter—the hymns of the Church—and the Office for Baptism; and that any who had been admitted without that knowledge, should forthwith set about acquiring it. [We fear the Methodist Doctor would hardly pass this examination.] As we may at some future time recur in a different form to this subject, we will conclude with these two examples. Henceforth we have done with the Methodist Doctor, and the equally learned, (?) Robertson, but in conclusion would beg of the worthy Chief Superintendent, for the sake of greater accuracy, and to save himself from the contempt of all educated men, that when for the future he has occasion to speak of the ages that intervened between the VII. and the XI. centuries to eschew the word Dark, and substitute the equally convenient and certainly more appropriate expression—Middle Ages.

SACERDOTS.

In a progressive country like Canada, where everything is necessarily only developing itself from its infantine proportions, it may not perhaps be altogether out of place to say a few words on Christian Architecture, especially as we don't wish our words to be considered dogmatic, but rather as suggestions to minds more comprehensive than ours to develop to their true proportions and symmetry. In a country where our churches are for the most part, but the first germs of what they have hereafter to become—bearing reference to their successors but as the acorn to the lordly oak—it becomes a matter of the utmost importance to determine the style in which our future ecclesiastical edifices are to be constructed. Now the Christian architect has but one principle to guide him in the determination; his researches and studies become only the pedantic wanderings of the antiquarian, if he lose sight of the true needle that has to direct him, "Omnia et in omnibus Christus," can be the only motto of the Christian architect. Our unit of admeasurement must be "in all things Christ." This therefore leads immediately over the ruins of Pagan architecture to Christian art. However grand and imposing, however sublime may be the proportions of the Greek and Roman styles, the Christian motto precludes their use for Christian churches. They have never been initiated into the Christian mysteries, and therefore, cannot be adopted by the Christian architect. It is true that the ancient Roman Basilica has a certain claim to our reverence, inasmuch as it was used by the early Christians for the purposes of worship, but still the Roman Basilican style can hardly be said to have assumed, in the hands of the Christians, the proportions necessarily for a