

FOR SALE,
DRAFTS at THREE DAYS' SIGHT, on Messrs. OVER-
END, GURNEY & Co., LONDON, from
ONE POUND UPWARDS,
Negotiable at any Town in Great Britain or Ireland.
HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacramento Street,
Montreal, Oct. 1852.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 25, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The political news is *nil*. Recruiting is going briskly on, and with the exception of the old women of the "General Peace, and All Manner Of Humbug, Society," who have lately held a meeting at Manchester, all parties seem to agree in the propriety of immediately putting the national defences in a state of efficiency. It is stated that the government have in contemplation the establishment of a defensive coast militia; the martello towers, off the coast of Sussex, are to receive an armament forthwith.

The great event of the week has been the closing scene in the famous drama of Achilli v. Newman. The defendant was called up for sentence on Monday, the 31st ult., and received, amidst the murmurs of some, the plaudits of others, and to the surprise of all, the purely nominal sentence "that he—Dr. Newman—do pay to Her Majesty the fine of £100, and that he be imprisoned in the first class of misdemeanants in the Queen's prison, until that fine be paid." Of course the fine was paid at once; the last part of the sentence especially, excited much tittering on the part of the audience. Monstrous as have been the proceedings throughout the whole trial, and well calculated as they have been to bring—trial by jury, at least, by Protestant juries—English judges—English Courts of Law—and English administration of justice—into odium and contempt, perhaps the sentence itself is the most absurd part of the whole. Either Dr. Newman was guilty of one of the most atrocious and abominable libels on record, or he was an innocent man—either he deserved to suffer the severest penalty that the law could inflict, or he merited no punishment at all. If Achilli be not the monster of bestiality that Dr. Newman accused him of being, he has been foully wronged by the sentence of the Court of Queen's Bench; and if he be (what every body, from the judge who pronounced sentence, to the door opener of Achilli's own conventicle, knows him to be) then has gross injustice been done to the Rev. Dr. Newman. In either case, the sentence is indefensible; and whilst by Catholics throughout the world it will be hailed, as, to all intents and purposes, a triumph for the illustrious defendant, its glaring inconsistency, and manifest iniquity, will have the effect of inspiring them with a thorough contempt for the logic and integrity of English judges, and Protestant tribunals. "Thank God," will be the exclamation of every honorable minded foreigner—"Thank God, I am neither a Protestant, nor an Englishman." We abridge the report of this extraordinary scene from the English papers:—

The avenues of the court were at an early hour thronged by a large crowd of persons, who appeared most anxious to obtain admission to hear the sentence pronounced; and as soon as the doors were opened there was a general rush, and within one or two minutes every seat and standing place was occupied. The galleries, also, were thronged during the day with a crowd of gentlemen, who appeared to take great interest in the proceedings. Considerable confusion was occasioned throughout the day by the vast numbers who were anxious to get into the court, but who were unable to do so; and this increased rather than diminished towards the close of the day, when the sentence was about to be pronounced.

When the judges had taken their seats,
"Sir F. Thesiger rose, and prayed the judgment of the Court upon Dr. Newman.

"Several affidavits were put in, and read by counsel for the defendant, after which the Attorney-General, who was followed on the same side by Mr. Sergeant Wilkins, Mr. Bramwell, and Mr. Budeley, rose, and addressed the Court in mitigation of punishment. Sir F. Thesiger, for the plaintiff, contended that the punishment should not be merely nominal; he applied himself to examine the effect of the verdict, which he contended to be conclusive on all issues on which the jury had found.

Lord Campbell said, the Court was of a different opinion. The finding of the jury was conclusive while it stood; but a finding on a particular fact was not binding one way or the other.

"Mr. Justice Coleridge, as senior puisne judge, pronounced sentence. Addressing the defendant, he said—"It now becomes my duty to pronounce the judgment of the Court. I believe I speak the sentiments of every member of the Court, when I say that, in the first place, they are satisfied that you honestly believed in the truth of the allegations which you made against Dr. Achilli. They see no reason to doubt that you are a man incapable of having avowed or published, that which you believed to be false. The Court are further of opinion that this was not a reckless or unthinking belief, but that it was formed, and entertained, after having made due inquiries. Passing to the question of the actual truth or falsehood of the facts asserted in your plea of justification, I cannot adopt the strong and unqualified language your advocates have used; great allowances must be made for the difficulties under which Dr. Achilli labored; but after making all these allowances, and taking all the circumstances into consideration, the Court is not entirely satisfied with the finding of the jury, on these facts, in all particulars. If the question of the granting a new trial had turned solely on the finding of the jury, the Court would have had no difficulty in saying that there was so much to question in them, that, in their opinion, there ought to be a new trial."

The learned judge proceeded to exonerate the Church of England from the imputation of being interested in the personal character of Achilli.

"She might have said, that, though he had left the Church of Rome, yet, under whatever circumstances he had done so, he had not been honored or trusted by her."

Justice Coleridge is an Anglican, and felt a natural and excusable anxiety to disclaim, on the part of his sect, any connexion with such an infamous, and degraded profligate as he, and his brother judges on the Bench, knew this Achilli to be. Continuing his address, the judge complained of the "triumphant and ferocious merriment" of the language in which the defendant had exposed the vices of Achilli to the world, and of the exultation he displayed "over the unhappy man, whose soul offences were produced before the public." The task, added the senior puisne judge, should have been performed "even upon a man so foul and wretched," with feelings of sorrow and sadness, and not in a spirit of exultation. He concluded by complimenting the defendant upon the purity and integrity of his motives, and by exhorting him in future to conduct the controversy "in a spirit worthy of his great abilities—his ardent piety—his holy life—and our common Christianity!" Singular, that even on the Bench, Protestant judges cannot abstain from twaddle: "Our common Christianity!" as if between Catholics and Non-Catholics there were any Christianity "in common"—as if the co-religionist of Achilli had any religious community with a Dr. Newman! When will Protestants realise the truth—that, between them and us there is, in the matter of religion, "nothing in common?"—that Catholics disclaim all community of Christianity with Non-Catholics? and that there is just as much Christianity "in common" betwixt the Catholic and the Devil Worshiper of Central Asia, or Mumbo-Jumbo on the coast of Africa, as there is betwixt the Catholic, and the Non-Catholic, or Protestant? "Common Christianity" of Catholics and Protestants indeed! God forbid that, in our Christianity, we should be suspected even of having anything "in common" with them.—"Que conventio Christi et Belial?"

The Protestant press, generally, admit their conviction, of the innocence of Dr. Newman, and the guilt of Achilli, by the tone which they adopt when commenting upon the sentence.

"Dr. Newman"—says the *Times*—"has received the very lenient sentence of one hundred pounds, and the nominal addition of imprisonment;" and adds "that the sentence was quite as severe as the case warranted." He admits that the sentence of the Court "nullities, and sets aside" the finding of the jury; but remembering that "all" that the most ardent admirer of Achilli can say is—"that he has not been proved guilty of the most heinous offences, while against Dr. Newman's moral character, not a whisper of suspicion was ever breathed"—he concludes:—

"We rejoice in the sentence, because we do not concur with the jury, and because we are convinced that, phrase it as they will, the judges would have awarded a very different sentence had they been really convinced of the falsehood of the plea of justification."

We must do the Anglicans the justice to admit that they are very eager to disclaim all connection with Achilli. We believe them; whatever we may think of their Parliamentary Articles of Faith, and their Creeds—by "Order in Council"—we must admit that their clergymen are generally gentlemen, men of education, and refined manners; and, in that respect at least, very different from, and far superior to, the ordinary frequenters of Exeter Hall, and the Little Belial. The *Morning Chronicle*,—the organ of the High Church party—comes out strong against the "unhappy man," as Mr. Justice Coleridge calls him:

"Achilli has not joined the Church of England; he has never been permitted to administer at our altars; he belongs to Protestantism unattached. In the ranks of the English clergy, thanks to the vigilance of the Bishops of the Metropolitan See, he has found no entrance."

Really, the "unhappy man" must be a bad bargain—very "foul" indeed, when we find the more respectable of the Non-Catholic sects so forward to disclaim him. Too filthily for the Anglicans, the precious convert has been handed over to Sir Culling Smith, and the evangelical conventicle; convert, man, conventicle, are well worthy of one another, but into the ranks of the English clergy, says the *Morning Chronicle*, "he could find no entrance."

The Continental news is made up of the Emperor's nuptial festivities. The ceremony called the "Civil Marriage" came off on the evening of Saturday, the 29th ult. On Sunday, the 30th, the marriage of the Emperor Napoleon III, to Eugenie de Montijo, was solemnised by the Archbishop of Paris in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. The beauty, and winning demeanor, of the new Empress have made a favorable impression upon all who have had the happiness of being admitted to her presence; and there is no doubt but that she will soon be exceedingly popular throughout the Empire, as, indeed, she deserves to be. Louis Napoleon has done many things well, but in his choice of a wife, he has done best; and many a discontented republican, to whom the name of "Empereur" was as distasteful as that of "Roi," will be won over to the new order of things by the graces and virtues of the Empress Eugenie. The Spaniards are delighted at seeing their lovely countrywoman elevated to the throne of Imperial France, and it is said that the Queen has ordered a magnificent crown as a wedding present to Her Imperial Majesty. A general amnesty for political offenders has been proclaimed, and it is generally understood that a decision has been come to, to restore a considerable portion of the Orleans property to the members of that family, and, also, to admit the exiled Generals to return, unconditionally, to France. The credit of these gracious measures is due entirely to the Empress, "whose good sense, and charitable actions"—say the public journals—"are hourly gaining for her the esteem of the public."

The steamer *Pacific* arrived at New York on Monday evening. Russia and Belgium are said to be contracting an alliance. The troops of Austria and Russia were concentrating on the Turkish frontier; but as yet no acts of hostility had been committed.

The *Arabia* arrived at New York on the 23rd, with news up to the 12th inst. The following are amongst the most important items by telegraph:—

"A rebellion had broken out in Milan, but the insurgents had been put down. Mazzini, Kossuth, and the other ent-throats of Europe seem to be busy again. Parliament re-opened on the 10th inst.; no business, of any importance, transacted; Ministers would introduce a bill to enable the Canadian Legislature to dispose of the Clergy Reserves."

CHURCH AUTHORITY.

"We have been informed, and the information was not a little surprising, that there are Protestants who are troubled with the argument put forth by the *True Witness* in favor of Church authority. To us the argument appears so utterly inconclusive and circular, that it is scarcely worthy of the attention or space required for a reply. It is as destitute of foundation as the Hindoo system of the world, which made the earth rest on the back of an elephant, and the elephant on the back of a tortoise, but could not tell what the tortoise stood upon.—Thus the *True Witness* makes the inspired Church the evidence of the inspiration of Scripture, and the inspired Scriptures the evidence of the inspiration of the Church, an argument which has neither beginning nor end."—*Montreal Witness*.

We will take the word of our cotemporary for the fact, that the minds of some of his Protestant readers have been "troubled with the arguments put forth by the *True Witness* in favor of Church authority;" and we may be allowed to give utterance to a sincere hope, that these "troubled" minds may seek for peace, by continuing earnestly their investigations after truth, as we are certain, that by far the greatest obstacle the Catholic controversialist has to contend with, proceeds, not from the strength of his opponent's logic, but from that apathy, that stolid indifference to the truth, and dread of "freedom of inquiry," which are so universally characteristic of orthodox Protestantism; when a Protestant of this class once begins, in good earnest, to inquire, it is all up with him; he will, if capable of reasoning logically, soon expand into a Papist, or subside into an infidel. We may be permitted, also, to remark that, in our humble opinion, the manner in which the *Montreal Witness* meets the "arguments put forth by the *True Witness* in favor of Church authority," is not calculated to restore calm to the spirits which the said arguments have "troubled;" we think that if any of the Protestants, to whom our cotemporary alludes as having been troubled by the "arguments of the *True Witness* in favor of Church authority," will but dispassionately compare those arguments, with the rejoinder of the other *Witness*, they will admit that the latter has not even so much as attempted to refute, or reply to, them.

Instead of attempting to refute us—instead of fulfilling his promise of opposing to our arguments "a positive, and contrary, thesis," our cotemporary thinks to settle the matter, in an off-handed manner, by pronouncing our arguments "utterly inconclusive and circular;" and then, with that contempt for truth, which is with him a substitute for reasoning, he taxes us with making—"the inspired Church the evidence of the inspiration of Scripture, and the inspired Scriptures the evidence of the inspiration of the Church." Charity would bid us put this falsehood down to the account of the "invincible stupidity" of our opponent, were it not that, in reply to a question from him, at an early period of the discussion, we had distinctly stated—[*True Witness*, Jan. 7th]—"that, in arguing with Non-Catholics, or Protestants, we did not recognise the inspiration, or superhuman authority, of the New Testament"—that, in short, until their "inspiration" shall have been proved, we can not admit that any writings are "inspired."—With what face then, can our cotemporary accuse us of appealing to "inspired" writings as the evidence of the "inspiration" of the Church? Again we repeat, that, in our controversy with Non-Catholics, we do not recognise the existence of any "inspired" writings; neither do we assert the "inspiration" of the Church.

The *Montreal Witness* called upon us to state our arguments in favor of Church authority, promising that he would, thereunto, reply—demolishing said arguments, and "chewing us up most catapanously" as a warning to all fool-hardy Papists. To this we made answer by stating our thesis, and the arguments in its support, calling upon our opponent to produce his "positive and contrary thesis." Our thesis was—that the only means appointed by Christ Himself for the promulgation, and perpetuation, of His doctrines, amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things," was the teaching of a body of men, by Him expressly commissioned "to teach." From the miracles, and above all, from the Resurrection of Christ—facts which are authenticated as easily, and in the same way, as are any other facts recorded in history, viz., the death of Mary Queen of Scots—the banishment of Napoleon to St. Helena—or the siege of Jerusalem by the Roman legions—we concluded that Christ's mission was divine: from the divinity of His mission, we concluded to the divinity of the commission, given by Him to a select body of His disciples, "to teach;" and from that commission "to teach," we concluded to the infallibility of the teaching of the body so commissioned. For, reason assures us, that where a divine commission is given, everything indispensably requisite for the due fulfillment of that commission is therewith given; but to a teacher, infallibility, or a certain knowledge of what he is to teach, is indispensably requisite; therefore we concluded that, to the divinely commissioned body of teachers, infallibility, as indispensably requisite for the due fulfillment of its divine commission, was also given.

That such a body of teachers must be in existence

at the present day we deduced from the fact of the necessity for such a teacher, and also from the fact that the divine commission "to teach" has never been repealed, or superseded by some other commission emanating from competent authority. Man, we argued, is not endowed with an infallible, and intuitive apprehension of the dogmas taught by Christ, for in that case a Revelation would have been unnecessary. But a firm belief in, and therefore a certain knowledge of, these dogmas is necessary to man for his salvation; but God has given to man everything that is necessary for his salvation: therefore God has given to man some certain means of knowing the substance of the Revelation made through Christ.

The controversy then resolves itself into the simple historical question—"What means has Christ Himself appointed for the promulgation, and perpetuation, of His doctrines, amongst 'all nations,' and 'until the consummation of all things?'" and this is the sole question that Catholics can discuss with Non-Catholics, for upon it every thing else depends; he who makes use of the means appointed by Christ Himself for promulgating and perpetuating the knowledge of His doctrines amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things," shall never err; he, who makes use of any other means, may search after, but has no right to expect that he shall ever attain unto, the knowledge of the truth. Now, our thesis is—that the means appointed by Christ Himself, for promulgating and perpetuating the knowledge of His doctrines, amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things"—was the teaching of a divinely commissioned, and because divinely commissioned, therefore an infallible, body of teachers, or Church—to which, for the sake of distinction, we give the name of "*Ecclesia Docens*"—to this thesis our opponent promised to oppose "a positive and contrary thesis;" hitherto he has not fulfilled his promise.

Our opponent might upset our thesis, by showing—either that no commission to teach was ever given, or that Christ had neither the right, nor the power, to give such a commission. Or, by proving—that if given, it was given only for a definite, and limited period; or that, if given for an indefinite, or unlimited period, it has subsequently lapsed, or died out—been repealed, or superseded, by some other commission, emanating from the same authority. Or, by showing that Christ has appointed some other means, besides the teaching of a select body of men, for the promulgation, and perpetuation, of the knowledge of His doctrines, amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things." Or, by proving that all men have an intuitive, and infallible apprehension of the doctrines by Christ revealed; or, by proving that it is not necessary to man, for his salvation, that he should believe in, and therefore know with certainty, the truth of, these revealed doctrines; or finally, by clearly establishing the fact that, God has not given to man, all that is necessary to him, for his salvation; and that therefore, Christ has appointed no means for the promulgation, and perpetuation, of the knowledge of His doctrines amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things." But, only by asserting, and successfully supporting, as his thesis, some one of the above propositions, can our opponent hope to destroy the "argument of the *True Witness* in favor of Church authority."

For, most certainly, if the teaching of an infallible, because divinely commissioned, body of teachers be not the means appointed by Christ Himself for the promulgation and perpetuation of the knowledge of His doctrines, amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things"—then, of two things, one,

1. Either Christ Himself has appointed some other means.
2. Or, He Himself has appointed no means.

If Christ Himself has appointed some other means for promulgating, and perpetuating, the knowledge of His doctrines, we call upon our opponent to state what means, and when, and how, appointed; reminding him, that, upon pain of approving himself false to his own principle—"that in matters of religion nothing is to be believed, but what can be proved from the Bible"—he is bound to prove, from the Bible, and the Bible alone, that Christ Himself has appointed some other means, besides the teaching of a divinely commissioned, and therefore infallible, body of teachers, for the promulgation and perpetuation of the knowledge of His doctrines amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things."

If, on the other hand, Christ Himself has appointed no means for the promulgation, and perpetuation, of the doctrines of Christianity, there is but one conclusion that we can logically come to—that is,—that, in the opinion of Christ Himself, the doctrines of Christianity were not worth promulgating, or perpetuating; and to that conclusion every logical Protestant must come, who denies—the authority of an infallible Church, or "*Ecclesia Docens*," and who is unable to prove, from the Bible, that Christ Himself has appointed some other means for promulgating, and perpetuating, the knowledge of His doctrines amongst "all nations," and "until the consummation of all things."

Old maids and bachelors are notorious for the lively interest that they take in the domestic arrangements of young married couples, and for the excellent advice that, unasked, they are in the habit of giving to inexperienced Paps and Mamas, as to the bringing up, the feeding and physicking, of the expected little ones. Alas! for the ingratitude of human nature—that such excellent and disinterested advice should so often be so badly received by those to whom it is addressed. Much the same kind of interest, and attended with very much the same results, do our Non-Catholic friends of Upper Canada take in the affairs and internal arrangements of the Catholic Church. They are so fond of us that we are in a