

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT No. 210, St. James Street, by J. GILLIES.

G. E. OLERK, 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 shows 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. FITZGERALD & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTEAL, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1873.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1873.

Friday, 16—St. Urbanus, B. C. Saturday, 17—St. John Nepomucen, M. Sunday, 18—Fifth after Easter. Monday, 19—Rogation. St. Peter Ccl., P. C. Tuesday, 20—Rogation. St. Bernard of Sienna, C. Wednesday, 21—Rogation. St. Paschal, B. C. Thursday, 22—Ascension, Obl.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Another week having elapsed without any reports of the Pope's death, we may conclude that the health of the Sovereign Pontiff is as good as can be expected in one of his advanced years, and exposed to so many persecutions from his enemies in possession of his Dominions. The Carlist war continues in Spain, but as yet no decisive results have been obtained by either side; the great want of the Carlists is arms. The latest telegrams report a victory won by them over the troops of the revolution government, killing some 200 of the enemy, and capturing many prisoners, several stands of arms, and one field piece. The government army is said to be in a very demoralised condition. The elections in France have gone in favor of the radical and republican candidates.

From Great Britain there is not much of interest to report. The death of the well known John Stuart Mills is reported as having occurred at Avignon. In him the British literary world loses an eminent writer on Political Economy, and the Protestant Church one of its most advanced champions, and faithful representatives. In his articles in the Westminster Review, Mr. Mills, better than any man living, illustrated the tendencies of the Protestant movement in the XIX. century. By some he was not considered perfectly orthodox; but then where in the Protestant world can we find a test or standard of orthodoxy? Every man's private judgment is, and must be that standard; and if, as we believe he did, by that standard the deceased faithfully meted out his religious opinions he was as orthodox as the most illiterate of evangelical preachers.

The celebrated, but now almost threadbare, Tichborne case was brought again before the public on Wednesday, the 23rd ult., the Claimant—now the Defendant—having on that day been arraigned on the charge of perjury. His position is now very different from what it was on the previous trial. Then the onus probandi was with him; he had to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that he was the person he represented himself to be. To-day the burden of proof rests with the prosecution, and by the terms of the indictment it has undertaken to prove two things; first that the defendant is not Roger Tichborne; second, that he is Arthur Orton the son of the Wapping butcher. The opening address for the prosecution by Mr. Hawkins was very powerful, and occupied several days in the delivery. Considering however the magnitude of the task the prosecution has undertaken; to wit—that of proving that the defendant is Arthur Orton we think it is not likely that it will get a verdict.

Great Britain is menaced with another "little war," one of the most un lucrative pieces of business in which a great country can be engaged. It seems that the King of the Ashantes, a tribe of very brutal negroes on the West Coast of Africa, had taken offence at something done, or not done by the British authorities—and was marching at the head of a large body of his savage followers to attack a small British fort.

The United States troops have had no fresh encounters with the Modocs, but the authorities seem determined to carry out their original design of exterminating the offending Red Men.

A motion for giving some substantial reward to the Rev. Mr. Ancient, the Protestant clergyman who so distinguished himself by his heroic efforts to save the lives of the ill fated crew of the Atlantic, was brought before the Dominion House of Commons by Mr. Joly on the 10th inst., and was well received by the House. Any testimony that the Government

may be pleased to award to the brave man will, we are sure, be approved of by the community. The N. Y. Herald publishes a report, not confirmed, that when at St. Petersburg the Emperor of Germany was shot at, the ball passing through his helmet and wounding his Adjutant. It is said that the shot was fired by a priest, but we have no particulars that can be relied upon.

Tidings reach us of a fresh riot at Rome. A body of Liberals marched on the Quirinal palace insisting on the immediate suppression of the religious corporations. The police made a stand against them.

THE "WITNESS" AND ST. BERNARD.—Whilst yet in the flesh, the saints, now reigning in heaven with Christ, suffered many things; through many tribulations they passed to their eternal rest.

This is in the order of grace, and so has the Lord appointed it to be. But it is too bad, it is not of divine appointment, that the saints should still be doomed to suffer from the misrepresentations of dishonest or ignorant Protestant journalists. We protest therefore, in the name of outraged sanctity, against the indignities offered to the memory of the great St. Bernard by the Montreal Witness of the 8th inst., who claims that holy man, that through going Papist, and out and out Mariolator, as one of his own; as a Dollingerite, or to use the cant phrase, as "an old Catholic."

Here are the words of which we complain:—"Bernard of Clairvaux was another 'Old Catholic,' and his hymns are sung in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, in whose hymn book some will be found. Luther said of him, 'If ever there lived on earth a God-fearing, holy monk it was St. Bernard of Clairvaux.'"—Witness, 8th May.

Perhaps the editor of the Witness is not aware that the Memorare, the most fervent prayer that the Catholic Church addresses to the Blessed Virgin, and in which the prerogatives of the Mother of God are asserted in the most emphatic language, was composed by this "God-fearing" monk, whose hymns are sung in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and must therefore, in the views of that august body, be thoroughly orthodox in all that relates to the mediatorial office of Mary's Son, and His work as the Redeemer. But no Catholic ever used, or uses stronger language to express the dignity of the B. Virgin; no one ever addressed or addresses to her prayers more fervent for her intercession; no one ever attributed or attributes to her more power over her Son, than did this same orthodox St. Bernard; who, therefore, if the stock charges of the conventicle against Papists be true, must have been an idolater, in that he gave divine honor to a creature, and robbed Christ of the glory due to Him as Our Redeemer, by putting the Virgin Mary in His place. If Catholics of the present are in their cultus of the B. Virgin idolatrous, and robbers of Christ, so also, and to the same degree was St. Bernard, whose hymns are sung in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland; but if the views of St. Bernard with respect to the office and dignity of Christ be orthodox—as the said Presbyterian church by implication admits them to be—how comes it that Catholics of the present day are taxed with idolatry, with ignoring Christ and His work, because they address Mary in the very words and spirit of the orthodox St. Bernard? If this question cannot be answered, it must be admitted that the most exalted views of the peculiar prerogatives of Mary held by Catholics, are perfectly compatible with the most rigidly orthodox views as to the Person and Office of Christ as Our Redeemer. This is the reply that Catholic apologists of the XIX. century tender to those who accuse them of putting Mary in the place of Christ. We do no more, no less, than did St. Bernard in his day.

But this is not all that we have to urge against the article in the Witness. Our contemporary claims St. Bernard as a Dollingerite, in other words as "an old Catholic;" that is to say as one who refuses to accept in the Pope, the divinely appointed teacher of teachers, and pastor of pastors; to whom directly, by Christ Himself, has been given the charge over the Universal Church; and who therefore, so it must be supposed have been by Christ endowed with all that is essentially necessary to enable him to discharge the duties of his divine commission as teacher of teachers, as the one "pastor of pastors." To this cruel wrong done by the Witness to the memory of St. Bernard as an ultramontane Papist, we must let St. Bernard reply in his own forcible words, as they are to be found in the 2nd Book, De Consideratione, c. 8, addressed to Pope Eugenius III.

"Who art thou," Quis es? asks St. Bernard by way of impressing on his readers the unapproachable dignity, the supreme authority, the peculiar duties and responsibilities attached by Christ Himself to the office of Pope. "Who art thou, Quis es? Here is the answer.

"Sacerdos insignis, summus Pontifex. "Tu princeps episcoporum: "Tu princeps apostolorum: "Tu primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedech, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moyses, iudicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctioe Christus."

"Who art thou? The great priest, the supreme Pontiff. Thou art prince of the Bishops; thou art the heir of the Apostles; thou in primacy art Abel, in government Noah, in patriarchate Abraham, in order Melchisedech, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in the judicial office Samuel, in power Peter, in unction Christ."

Rather strong language this, good Mr. Witness, for one of your "old Catholics" who lately met at Cologne, to have used towards the Pope, is it not? But this is not all. St. Bernard continues his enumeration of the particular privileges of the Pope—still replying to his question "Quis es?"

"Thou art he to whom the keys have been committed, to whom the sheep have been entrusted."

"Tu es cui claves tradite, cui oves creditæ sunt." Nor is this a privilege, or trust which in the opinion of St. Bernard the Pope shares in common with others; for as Luther's "God-fearing and holy monk" continues:—"Though there be other heavenly door keepers, and other shepherds of flocks, the Pope is far above all these, in that to each of them is assigned only a particular portion of the fold, or flock; whilst to the Pope alone is committed the entire charge over all. Nor is this all; for the Pope is, according to St. Bernard, the pastor not only of the sheep, but the one pastor of all the pastors, the shepherd of all the shepherds, whose call therefore those shepherds are in duty bound to follow, even as the sheep are in like manner bound to follow and obey their particular pastors.

"Sunt quidem et alii coli janitores, et gregum pastores; sed tu tanto gloriosus, quanto et differentius a trumque proletrici nomen hereditasti. Habent illi sibi assignatos greges, singuli singulos; tibi universi crediti, uni unus. Nec modo ovium, sed et pastorum tu unus omnium pastor."

Here again we pause in our quotations, to ask the editor of the Witness who claims St. Bernard as one of the "old Catholics" of the XIX. century, as one holding views as to the duties and prerogatives of the Pope identical with those put forth by Dr. Dollinger, and the clique who lately assembled at Cologne—if he in his heart believes that there is one of that clique who would subscribe to the views enunciated in the above passages by the holy monk of Clairvaux writing in the twelfth century? Whether is the language of St. Bernard that of those whom the Witness calls Ultramontanes, or that of Dollinger and his disciples?

But we have not done yet with St. Bernard. Not only does he insist that the Pope is the pastor of pastors: Moses in authority; Peter in power; Christ in unction; to whom alone the rule over the entire Church has been committed—but he goes on to argue—as if in anticipation of the 'pleas' by which your modern "old Catholics" try to shuffle out of the scrape in which they find themselves when they appeal to antiquity—that these sublime attributes of the Papacy are held, not from the Church, or through the Bishops, or by consent of Councils as a sort of disciplinary arrangement which it is in the power of the Church to modify—but immediately from Christ Himself.—

"Whence do I prove this?" (the unapproachable dignity of the See of Peter) "you will ask. From the words of the Lord. To whom indeed, I do not say of the Bishops, but even of the Apostles, have all the sheep been so absolutely and indiscriminately committed? If thou lovest me Peter, feed my sheep." Which? The people of this or that State, or region, or particular Kingdom? My Sheep, he says."

All, all without exception, are by Christ Himself, and in a special manner, or in a manner quite distinct from that in which they were committed to the other Apostles, committed to St. Peter, whose singular prerogative it is feed all Christ's sheep.

"Unde id probem quæris? Ex verbo Domini. Cui enim non dico Episcoporum, sed etiam Apostolorum, eis absolute et indiscrète totæ commisse sunt oves? Si me amas, Petre, pascue oves meas. Quis? Illius populus civitatis, aut regionis, aut curi regis? Oves meas inquit. Cui non planum non designasse aliquas, sed assignasse omnes? Nihil excipitur, ubi distinguitur nihil."

The question raised betwixt us and the Witness is not at all as to the correctness of St. Bernard's views as to the peculiar attributes and prerogatives of the Papacy and their immediate divine origin—but as to the fact whether, holding and openly expressing such views of those attributes and prerogatives, St. Bernard can by any honest and intelligent man be classed amongst those who lately assembled at Cologne to protest against the encroachments of the Papacy, and who are styled "old Catholics?" Amongst all the Bishops assembled at the Vatican, was there one who applied to Pius IX. terms stronger or more expressive of admiration for his exalted and unapproachable or peculiar dignity, than those employed by St. Bernard towards a predecessor of Pius IX. in the Holy See? Tu princeps episcoporum, * * * auctoritate Moyses * * * iudicatu Samuel * * * potestate Petrus—tu barces Apostolorum—unctioe Christus * * * pastorum tu unus omnium pastor! Who can doubt what would have been the answer given, had the question been propounded to St. Bernard—"Do you believe that the Pope who holds this place in the Church; who in authority is as Moses; in unction as Christ; who by particular divine commission is the sole pastor of all the pastors of Christ's flock; the teacher of all the teachers—do you believe that he, when exercising his teaching functions is fallible or infallible?" We pause for a reply.

Nay! Have we not St. Bernard's reply in

the title that he applies to the Pope. "Hæres Apostolorum" heir of the Apostles. Not their successor merely, but their heir; the inheritor, and actual possessor therefore, of their authority, their prerogatives, their entire magisterium, of all that which was the peculiar property of the Apostles, and distinguished them from all other men. Heir, not of an Apostle, but of the Apostles; of the collective body; of the Apostolic College. Was that body infallible when pronouncing dogmatically on questions of faith and morals, directly or indirectly the subject matter of the Christian revelation? If so, then also must its heir be infallible.

There are we believe many so-called orthodox Protestants who, in spite of the old woman's twaddle in which they indulge about the blasphemy of attributing, under certain circumstances, and within a certain sphere, the gift of infallibility to a man, as thereby putting man on an equality with God—who will admit that the Apostles were by God endowed with that gift of infallibility, without which indeed, it would have been utterly impossible for them to have discharged the commission of teaching all nations in His name, given to them by their divine Master. In the case of the Apostles—probably because they lived near two thousand years ago—they see no blasphemous raising of man to a level with God in attributing to them the infallibility as teachers; neither, in their case, do they confound infallibility with omniscience and impeccability. It is only when they have to deal with the Pope, with the circumstances amongst which they actually live, that they seem to be suddenly smitten with moral and intellectual blindness; that they take to twaddle, and speak as the knave or fool speaketh.

In conclusion, we would again remind the writer in the Witness who claims St. Bernard as a modern "old Catholic," that the question at issue is not as to the soundness of that holy man's views as to the office and dignity of the Pope? but simply as to the fact, whether those views are identical, or even compatible, with those enunciated on the same subject by the party of whom the Witness speaks as "old Catholics?"

PARTIES IN SPAIN.—In Spain as elsewhere political parties may be defined in terms of religion. There are but two parties in Europe, the Catholic, and the anti-Catholic.

There are degrees of course. Amongst the first named some are more bitterly or consistently anti-Catholic than are others of their colleagues; and some who—perhaps these are to the Catholic cause the most dangerous of any—style themselves Liberal Catholics; nevertheless they are to all intent and purpose, anti-Catholics. In the great struggle now impending there can be no neutrals; he who is not heart and soul for, is against us; whose sword not with us, scattereth.

In Spain we note these two parties distinctly; for here in a remarkable manner the lines of political demarcations coincide with those of religious demarcation. Carlist and Catholic, Republican and anti-Catholic, indeed anti-Christian, mean pretty nearly one and the same thing.

So a correspondent in the London Times tells us, whose long residence in the country, and intimate acquaintance with its people authorize him to speak with authority. He says:—

"The Republic finds favor with but a small portion of the better educated classes in Arragon. To explain this it is necessary to state that there is, perhaps, no part of Spain where religious fervour exists to a greater degree, and where the influence of the priest is more powerfully exercised over the minds of the people. Well, every priest in the land is a Carlist—every man, woman and child whose consciences are in the keeping of the priests are Carlists, without any exception; hence the R-public only finds favor with those who have sufficient independence of mind to have thrown off priestly thraldom, or who have never allowed themselves to be subjected to it. In this category are a large number of the working classes, and a smaller proportion of the better educated members of society. This was clearly evidenced in a monster procession which was formed in this city two weeks ago, as a demonstration in favor of the Republic, and in which scarcely a dozen men of any social position took part."—Times Cor.

To what class belong those who in Spain "have thrown off priestly thraldom or who have never been subjected to it"—there can be no doubt; these are simply anti-Christians; and what it is that they propose to themselves may be guessed at from the following extract from their programme which the same correspondent of the Times quotes, as having been lately published in Madrid, by their organ of the press the Descamisados or Shirtless, a title which Spanish Liberals have adopted, as did French Liberals that of sans-culottes or "breeches-less" in the last century. Of the aims and aspirations of these Liberals who have thrown off the yoke of priestly thraldom, judge from the following extract given by the Times' correspondent:—

"Our aspiration is absolute and complete social levelling. Anarchy is our war-cry! Everything for everybody, from power, down to women! The black flag is unfurled! War to the family! War to property! War to God!"

And as the one obstacle to the realisation of these Liberal aspirations is the Church, personified in Christ's Vicar on earth, the first

item of course in the programme is, war to the Pope. All who are at war with the last named, are consciously, or unconsciously, doing their little best to carry out the programme of the Spanish Liberals.

On the other side are arrayed the Carlists whose war-cry is "God and Our King;" and therefore it is that instinctively all Catholics extend to them their sympathies, all Liberals vent upon them their execrations. What may be the issue of the contest now raging; what trials God may yet have in store for His Church; whether the hour of triumph and deliverance be at hand; or whether what we have already seen be but the prelude to further and greater afflictions—it would be presumptuous on the part of any one to predict. But this we know, and knowing this we are not dismayed, that when the storm rages most fiercely, when all the winds of heaven seem to be let loose upon the barque of Peter, then the Eternal Pilot is still seated at the helm, and bids us still to be of good cheer.

The Carlist war is therefore more, much more than a dynastic war. It is the reply to the challenge of the Revolution:—"War to property; war to the family; war to God!" It is for these that the Carlists are in arms, and may God protect the right.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MAY 5th.—The Speaker submitted to the House a Message from his Excellency the Governor General, dated 10th ult., from the Secretary of State for the Colonies enclosing a further report from the Law Officers of the Crown on the N. B. School Law business.

We would here correct an error of which we were guilty some days ago, in giving as the opinion, or final decision, of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that which was the opinion of the Attorney General on the actual meaning of the British North America Act. This opinion is of much weight of course, but still it is not final; and we believe that the Catholics of New Brunswick are not discouraged, but intend to carry out their design of Appeal to the Privy Council against the law of their local legislature. We wish them every success, and trust that the generosity of the Catholics of the Dominion will not allow their project to miscarry through want of funds.

Should all legal means of obtaining redress fail, recourse may be had to political action. The Imperial Legislature may be appealed to, not indeed to amend or alter the law as it now stands, for we would deprecate such an appeal; but to explain or define its own law, so as to give effect to what was no doubt the spirit of the legislators. Their intent was as we conceive it, to set at rest the long vexed Education Question, by securing to the minorities of the several Provinces the continual enjoyment of all privileges which, at the time of the Union, they actually enjoyed, whether by long established custom, or by express Statute.

We have received, but too late for publication this week, a communication with extracts from letters from authorities at Rome, and Mgr. Strossmayer himself, explicitly repudiating the speech attributed to that Prelate in a pamphlet published and circulated in L. Canada by the Montreal Witness. That this pamphlet was a vile slander, that its statements were lies, any one might see; the internal evidence that it was a forgery, and a clumsy forgery to boot, was so strong and clear that none but a very ignorant person could be deceived by it. Still as there are many very stupid and ignorant persons in the world, it is well that they should know that Mgr. Strossmayer himself explicitly denies having ever uttered the speech attributed to him in the pamphlet from the Witness office. We will publish the documents in our next.

M. Loyson, not satisfied with cohabiting, in spite of his solemn vows of chastity, with the widow of the late Mr. Merryman of New York, seems determined to give further scandal to the Christian world. On Sunday, the 4th inst., so we are told in the papers, he enacted the blasphemous farce of celebrating Mass; thus adding sacrilege to his other iniquities.—A number of miserable creatures, 1,200 in all, it is said, assembled to witness the infamous travesty of the most solemn rites of the Christian religion, and joined with the apostate priest in his fearful mockery of God.

The following paragraph which we find in one of our exchanges is very gratifying, as it shows that the Catholics of Lindsay can appreciate gratefully, and are worthy of the good pastor, whom Providence has placed over them. The munificence of the people is as honorable to them as it is to their priest. The following is the paragraph alluded to:—

"RESURRECTION SOLD.—LINDSAY, Ont., May 5.—The residence of Judge Smith has been sold for \$12,275; the purchasers being the Roman Catholics of the town, who propose to fit it up for their priest, the Rev. Mr. Stafford."

Proposals for the entry of Prince Edward Island to the Canadian Confederacy are expected to come up before the present Session of Parliament is brought to a close.