

# The True Witness

AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 210, St. James Street, by  
J. GILLIES.  
G. E. OLIER, 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. '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription from THAT DATE.

S. M. PITTENGL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1871.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

SEPTEMBER—1871.

Friday, 1—St. Egidius, Ab.  
Saturday, 2—St. Stephen, C.  
Sunday, 3—Fourthcentia after Pentecost.  
Monday, 4—Of the Faith.  
Tuesday, 5—St. Laurence Justinian, B. C.  
Wednesday, 6—Of the Faith.  
Thursday, 7—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Another desecration of the Papal City has occurred. The revolutionists intending to celebrate their temporary success in Rome, forced the people to hang out flags while they set up effigies of the infidel trio—Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini. The situation of the Holy Father can be better imagined than described, thus living, amidst a gang of the worst desperadoes almost the world ever saw. Calm and confident still in the protection of God, the Pope asks his children to continue their prayers for the rescue of the Holy City.

Affairs in France as reported by telegraphic despatches present strange features of contradiction. From the mass we gather that Gambetta's influence is declining, and that the power of the Right is daily increasing. In order to create confusion Gambetta is seeking the immediate dissolution of the Assembly, in view of the fact that the refusal to prolong the powers of M. Thiers shows the determination of the Deputies to hasten the inauguration of order. The newly-fledged army of Gambetta is also doomed to its merited destruction. The old troops of France justly estimating its cowardice show their dislike to affiliation, and as M. Gambetta's efforts so far have had no permanent success, so we may suspect that the French people, recovering from their fit of madness, will soon send him to that obscurity so eminently suited to him, and from whence he should never have been allowed to emerge. On the 24th ult. an excited debate took place in the Assembly on a motion to disband the National Guard. Viscount Meaux in a speech loudly cheered by the Right demanded its immediate disbandment. M. Thiers spoke in opposition, but finding that his objections were of little avail he again made one of his threats to resign. Gen. Ducrot, to prevent a collision proposed a gradual disbandment, which proposition being well received by the Right was carried by a majority of 333 votes.

Relations between Russia and Prussia do not seem to be of the most peaceable character; people talk of an alliance or understanding between Russia and France, and the former as if to confirm the report, by an Imperial ukase permanently abolishes the privileges which have been heretofore given by the Russian Government to German colonists in Russia. An alliance between the Sub-Alpine Government, Austria and Prussia is also spoken of. The future of Europe is pregnant with great events but their development and result it would be difficult to foretell.

The French deputation to Ireland which has met with such an enthusiastic reception since its advent there, were again honored by a grand demonstration in Dublin and Kingstown at their departure for England. Speeches were made expressing deep felt sympathy with France; bands played and processions headed by French and Irish flags paraded the streets. The telegram asserts that it may be looked upon as an extraordinary Fenian demonstration. From time immemorial good feeling has existed between the peoples of France and Ireland. During the late war Ireland generously aided France and it is ridiculous to name Fenianism in connection with the reception of the deputation. The demonstrations of welcome to the French deputation were National and not of any party. Let writers therefore abstain from applying nicknames or party-names to national movements.

CAN A ROMAN CATHOLIC DOUBT PAPAL INFALLIBILITY?—What is it to be a Roman Catholic? It is to believe 1st. *all that the Roman Church believes and teaches*; and 2nd, simply *because she so believes and teaches*. He who rejects, or even doubts the truth of, any one article of her teaching is no longer a Roman Catholic: neither is he a Roman Catholic who accepting all her teachings, accepts them on any other grounds than those of the Roman Catholic Church's infallibility on all matters of faith and morals, and connected with the Christian revelation.

But the Roman Catholic Church teaches that the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, when speaking *ex cathedra*, he defines—in virtue of the authority specially given by Our Lord Jesus Christ to St. Peter, to "confirm his brethren," and to "feed His sheep"—any matter of faith or morals, is infallible, or by the grace of God, preserved from error.

He, therefore, who now that the Church so teaches, rejects, or calls in question, her teachings upon that point is not—no matter what he may style himself—a Roman Catholic at all.

If it be replied that, because Dr. Dollinger, and some other German ecclesiastics, more intent upon gaining favor with their respective governments than upon serving God, refuse to accept it, therefore the doctrine of Papal infallibility, under the conditions above defined, is not taught by the Church,—we come to a simple question of fact, which every one calling himself a Roman Catholic can easily and promptly determine for himself; he has but to consult his confessor. Alas! we fear that they seldom go to confession who reject the definition of the Council of the Vatican on Papal Infallibility—to his parish priest, or to his bishop; and, as Dr. Milner, *Ep. xii.*, observes, in replying to the objection raised by Dr. Porteus against the Catholic *Rule of Faith* to the effect that the majority of Catholics have no other rule to follow but what a few priests and private writers tell them,"—every Catholic, "knows that the doctrine of their priest must be conformable to that of his bishop \* \* \* also that the doctrine of the bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other bishops and the Pope." He then who persists in determining what the Church believes and teaches, not from his confessor, his parish priest, and his bishop in communion with the Holy Apostolic See, but by his private judgment, is not a Roman Catholic, but a Protestant, and a self-deceiver if he deem himself anything else.

It is argued that, according to the well known rule of St. Vincent de Lerins, that only is to be held to be Catholic doctrine, which has been held always, everywhere, and by all—*quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*. But there is no one doctrine of the Catholic Church which has not been denied, at some time or another, in some place or another; and by some persons or another. The Divinity of our Lord, the Trinity and all the mysteries of Christianity have been at times called in question by those professing to be members of the true Church, and to hold true Catholic doctrine. If then nothing but what has always, everywhere and by all been held to be Catholic doctrine is to be held as Catholic doctrine to-day, if we are not to believe anything which has ever, anywhere, or by any one been impugned we shall have to give up every article of the Creed.\*

No. St. Vincent de Lerins teaches no such absurdity as that imputed to him. His rule indeed is, that that must be held to be Catholic doctrine which has always, everywhere, and by all been so held; but the converse of this proposition—that nothing is to be so held, but what has been always, everywhere and by all been so held, is simply an absurdity which the learned Saint never dreamt of enunciating.

But in fact or practically, has not the doctrine of Papal infallibility been always recognized by the Catholic Church even if not defined in set form of words? Is there an instance on record during the many centuries of her existence, in which the decision of the Pope on a contested question of faith and morals, given *ex cathedra*, and addressed to the universal Church, has not been accepted? When, under such circumstances and conditions, the Pope has declared himself, has it not always been the motto of the Church, *Rome has spoken: the cause is finished?* and have not those who may have refused to abide by the Papal utterance, been thrust forth from her communion, and ceased to be numbered amongst her children? In practice, and in spite of the theories and the subtle, or scholastic objections of some theologians, the Church has always acted as if she believed that the Pope, under the conditions prescribed by the General Council of the Vatican, were infallible; and from her acts we judge of, or may determine her faith—or belief in the matter. On this subject we cannot do better than to quote the words of the learned Bishop of Philadelphia,

\* The doctrine of the double Procession of the Holy Ghost, has not been always, everywhere and by all been held—as witness the Oriental schismatics; and yet that doctrine is to-day, a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

the Rt. Rev. Francis Kenrick, in his work on the Primacy published in part in 1837, therefore much more than twenty-five years ago, long before the Council of the Vatican was dreamt of. Thus speaks the learned Bishop, certainly an approved Roman Catholic writer:—(The Italics are our own.)

It is the undoubted right of the Pope to pronounce judgment on controversies of faith. All doctrinal definitions already made by General Councils, or by former Pontiffs, are landmarks which no man can remove; but as the human mind may assail revelation in endless variety of form, there must be always in the Church an authority by which error, under every new aspect, may be effectually condemned. Nothing can be added to the faith originally delivered to the saints; but points contained in the deposit of revelation may be expressly declared and defined, when the obscurity which may have existed as to the fact of their revelation has been dissipated. The assembling of a General Council is always attended with immense difficulty, and is oftentimes utterly impracticable. The chief Bishop is the 'natural organ of the Church' as Peter is styled by St. Chrysostom the mouth of the Apostles. In pronouncing judgment, he does not give expression to a private opinion, or follow his own conjectures; but he takes for his rule the public and general faith, and tradition of the Church, as gathered from Scripture, the Fathers, the liturgies and other documents; imploring the guidance of the Divine Spirit, and using all human means for ascertaining the fact of revelation. It has been warmly discussed whether a solemn judgment thus pronounced, wherein a doctrine is proposed to the Church generally, as necessary to be believed under pain of anathema, or an error is proscribed as contrary to faith, with the same sanction, may possibly be erroneous. The personal infallibility of the Pope in his private capacity, writing or speaking is freely conceded by the most ardent advocates of Papal prerogatives; but his official infallibility, *ex cathedra* is strongly affirmed by St. Alphonsus de Liguori and a host of divines, in accordance I believe with ancient tradition, and the general sentiment of the Church. The assembly of the French clergy in 1682 contended that his judgment may admit of amendment, as long as it is not sustained by the assent and adhesion of the great body of bishops. Practically there is no room for difficulty, since all solemn judgments *hitherto pronounced by the Pontiff have received the assent of his colleagues*; and in the contingency of a new definition, it should be presumed by the faithful at large that it is correct as long as the body of bishops do not remonstrate and oppose it. The Pontiff never has been isolated from his brethren. The harmony of faith has always been exhibited in the teaching of the episcopal body united with their head. The authority of the Pope in matters of faith, appeared most conspicuously in the fourth and fifth centuries. The decrees of Damasus, and Innocent, and the doctrinal Letters of Celestine, and Leo, were lauded by bishops, severally, and in solemn Councils, as the correct expositions of the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation."—pp. 270, 271.

We heartily endorse every word in the annexed extract from an editorial article in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 23rd of last month on the notorious Camin, and the disgraceful riots occasioned by the fellow's attempt to deliver a No-Popery lecture. Why will Catholics be so wicked and so foolish as to try and put down fellows like this Camin, and others of his stamp with whom we are sometimes troubled in Montreal, by brute force, as if moral force would not suffice against them. Protestants know as well as we do of what sort of stuff all these "converted priests," these "brands snatched from the burning," are made; they in their hearts despise them as thoroughly as we do: and if our people would but avoid placing them in a false position with regard to the degraded creatures, by resorting to rioting, stone throwing, and acts of violence, the "converted priest's" nuisance would quickly be abated by honest and intelligent Protestants themselves.

The following is the extract from the *Gazette* which has prompted these remarks, and which Catholics would do well to ponder:—

"The second and more recent case is that of the attempt of a person calling himself Baron de Camin to address an audience in Ogdensburg on the subject of Popery. This Baron de Camin has for some years inflicted his filthy presence upon the people of Canada. In the west he has made several attempts to deliver lectures; but in all cases he has failed in attracting audiences, the only result of this mission being unpaid printers' bills and hall rents. He pretends to have been at one time an inquisitor of the Grand Inquisition, and in his lectures to give full and harrowing details of the infamy of the system. He is a Communist of the Communists, and regards revolution as the very acme of glory. In Ontario he had become so well known as to have become perfectly harmless; and people simply regarded him as a dishonest knave, whose chief ambition it was to gather a few cents by appeals to the negative Protestantism of the people. On his first appearance, at a few places the "Young Britons" took him up, in virtue of his character as a converted priest (Heaven save the mark); but even they have recently found him out, and he has for many months been enjoying a severe letting alone.

"It is this man who was the cause of the recent riotous proceedings in Ogdensburg. He announced a lecture there, and some Roman Catholics, forgetting that he was perfectly harmless, but annoyed by his abuse of what they regarded as the sanctities of holy religion, resolved to prevent him speaking. They made a fatal blunder in doing this for two reasons. First they elevated a common low fellow into the character of a martyr, and next they proclaimed their belief that their religious system could not stand the light of discussion. The authorities resolved to protect the Baron, and a hundred special constables were sworn in to assist the Police in doing so. The authorities acted wisely. The law could not stop to enquire into the character of the man who thus invoked its interference. The right of speech was at stake, and at all hazards that must be maintained. It was maintained—let us be thankful for that. And if in the assertion of it undue importance has been given to a bad man, the fact is due simply to the folly of those who attempted to interfere with him. No one is obliged to listen to such fellows as this Baron de Camin, and the best treatment that can be bestowed upon them is to pass them by without the slightest notice."

TO THE PROTESTANTS OF TRENTON, ONTARIO, GREETING: GENTLEMEN (AND LADIES)

The conversion to Catholicism of the Rev. W. Bond, one time Anglican clergyman, has exercised you greatly. Allow me to sympathize with you on the occasion. You have deep reason to deplore the event and your loss,

That a gentleman of high literary attainments should have dared to "go over" to Rome—that in the exercise of his protestant right of private judgment a British subject should dare to choose for himself a religion according to the dictates of his own convictions—that leaving the pleasant pastures of Anglicanism, where he could for ever have roved unrestrainedly from Atheism to Ritualism—from High to Low or Broad Churchism—from Colensoism to Puseyism—from Mormonism to Spiritism—he should put on the yoke of Catholicism and swear obedience to the Church of God founded upon the Rock, against which by divine promise the Gates of Hell shall never prevail—is an offence of so shocking a nature that it is not to be wondered at that you should grieve thereat, and should endeavour prayerfully within yourselves to soften the blow to your tender susceptibilities by inventing the wildest theories imaginable in explanation of the rash act.

Poor man! he is insane, or he never would have taken such a step: exclaimed an ancient and a pious lady. Well! yes. In the eyes of worldly wisdom it is insane for any man to care for "conscientious convictions," especially when those convictions are liable as in Mr. Bond's case to interfere materially with his worldly prospects. To subject himself for conscience sake to a persecution from his Protestant brethren, worse, because more bigoted and unreasonable than that of the early Christians, is certainly an act of insanity as times go in the Protestant church, where religion is held as secondary to the world according to that aphorism of the Revd. Dr. Bellows, protestant clergyman in New York—"The State first, then God." First I am an American and then a Christian.

Yes, Gentlemen, it is an insanity—but an insanity shared in by 200 millions of people spread over the whole world—it is an insanity handed down to us by Christ himself when he said "Go teach (it to) all nations"—it is the insanity of Peter and Paul and the whole Apostolic college—"leave all and follow me"—it is the insanity of the Cyrills, the Cyprians, the Chrysostoms, the Irenoi, the Jeroms, the Leos, the Athanasii, the Austins, the Bossuets, the Wisemens, the Mannings, the Newman, the Stones, and the great and good of all nations. It is an insanity that has civilized the whole world, and without which the world would be steeped in ignorance and paganism at the present moment. It is an insanity to which the Protestant church is indebted for whatever of "religious consciousness" is left smouldering in its now deserted camp fires—it is that insanity concerning which the Psalmist so early as the Davidical days inquired "These are they whom we held in derision, and whom we considered as insane"—it is an insanity which will exist in the world, if Christ's words be true, even to the last syllable of recorded time.

That people who hold religion as only an every-seventh-day affair—who worship the God Mammon under the multitudinous forms of cotton bobbins, muslins, jackettes and hairpins, should deem Mr. Bond's step as an act of insanity, we can well understand. So would they judge also Paul of Tarsus. These men are altogether too worldly—of the earth earthly to see in it aught of the workings of the spirit. In their minds the voice that spake "Why persecutest thou me Saul?" was only a delusion and a snare. The beam in their eye is so large—it is so much made up of dollars and cents and dividends and little deeds and worldly prosperity, that nothing of spiritual can hope to penetrate to their aching retina. Like the eyeless fishes of Colorado, they have lost by disuse their power of spiritual sight.

It is strange, Gentlemen, passing strange to behold how completely a conversion to the Catholic Church changes the Protestant estimate of a man. Up to nine of the clock Montreal time on Saturday Aug. 5th., in the year of grace one thousand eight hundred and seventy one Mr. Bond was the best of teachers. The village had confidence in him. The School examination, according to the report of the Trenton Courier, "was thorough and searching, and the ready answers of the pupils evinced a good training and confidence in and respect for the teacher" (Courier, July 6th.) But immediately all this is changed—presto! more suddenly than a pantomimic transformation—in one tick of the clock all this is changed. "Do you still persevere in your desire to join the Catholic Church?" "I do." That moment a change comes over the spirit of your dream:—Mr. Bond is henceforth entirely another character—his teachings are suddenly discovered to be injurious to the school—in hot and indecent haste a childless lawyer in whose veins courses Papist blood is dispatched to collect signatures praying his dismissal. He has now become the worst of men and no longer fit for protestant recognition. There has been wrong doing somewhere, Gentlemen. Either parents and trustees of Protestant children have been very remiss in not checking this alleged injurious teaching sooner, or Mr. Bond's conversion to the Catholic Church has wonderfully quickened

their power of perception or their appreciation of duty.

But tell me, Gentlemen, supposing the charges which you bring against Mr. Bond as your Grammar School teacher are the real front of his offending, and not his having dared to become a Catholic—tell me I pray you—what do they amount to? We will pass over with your permission the first charge "of partiality to Catholic children," as I feel certain that even Trenton bigotry is long ago heartily ashamed of that. What then does the second charge amount to? Remember you refused to make your charges in writing as in duty bound, but preferred to allow Mr. Austin's religious zeal to be your "charta scripta." What then does the charge amount to? Has he ever tampered with your children's faith? He could not. When the offence occurred he was still a Protestant—as much so as any of you, Gentlemen, who now seek to hound him down. One thing alone he had not—your bigotry and intolerance—your hatred for the Catholic Church. But that surely does not make him less a Protestant. He could not then have tampered with their faith. Nor do you even attempt to bring the charge. What then had he done? He taught them what you have yet to learn: charity to all men, even to Catholics. Is this a crime? He taught them to be just to all men—to love fair play. Is this to tamper with their faith? Not unless Protestantism be the mere negation some would make it—not unless it be simply the protest against Catholicity its name implies. But I cannot believe that this is Protestantism. Where then his offence? Again I ask you where?

I fear, Gentlemen, you are not able to discuss with Mr. Bond these questions of history. There be educations and educations. There is an education that makes the shop-keeper and the lawyer, and one that makes clergymen and men of letters. You may be very learned in your way. Subpoenas and bills of lading—distress warrants and coal oil invoices are one branch of secular learning, but the refinement and discrimination that go to make the historian, the man of letters and the Anglican clergyman are quite another thing. Do not venture on the discussion, Gentlemen, lest you be worsted in the unequal contest. The frog burst o'er it inflated itself into a Bull.

Return, Gentlemen, I pray you to a more amiable frame of mind. Grant to Mr. Bond the Englishman's right of choosing a religion according to the dictates of his convictions, without let or hindrance from you or yours. Taboo him not because he has become a Catholic. He has joined the Church of Ages—and if you yourselves lack the courage to follow him, call not after him across the fearful leap, upbraiding him for his courage and success.

Ever yours, Gentlemen,  
H. BRETTARGH.

Senor Castelar in the Spanish Cortes has been airing his opinions about men and manners in a somewhat free-lance style. He slashes at everything to destroy, whilst nothing does he try to reconstruct. Poor King Amadeus and his forefathers to the sixth and seventh generation suffer most damagingly from his jaunty periods. "Poor feudal senors! unquiet and warlike! for a few pieces of gold and six hunt ing dogs they bought from the Emperor Sigismund the feudal title of Duke of Savoy. Their geography obliged them to be perturbators. In this guise only did they leave their eagles' nests and their bears' caves."

Nor is he content with a mere regal target—he aims his impious blows equally against revelation itself and God's Church.

"The Minister of Grace and Justice listens to the aggravations the Church has received from the State. But the aggravations of the Church to the State who shall satisfy them? They are very many and very old. The expulsion of the great industrialists which was the extirpation of our riches." (The worthy Senor is oratorical remember) "the expulsion of the great agriculturalists which left the country's field a waste—the burning of free thought by the Inquisition, which extinguished our learning; the asphyxia of all religious protest which ended at last in destroying the spontaneity of our national conscience" (Continental orators have not got beyond the Johnsonian period yet) "the delivery of our Universities to perpetual commentary on another Commentary of Aristotle adulterated by the Arabian schools and by the Christian monasteries with which thought was reduced to a cabal and a plaything of the past" &c., &c.

This is rhetoric rather than truth—*ratio civilis non philosophica*. The worthy Senor attributes to the Church the expulsion of what his translator calls "the great industrialists." This is short sighted and superficial if it be not malignant. If the Church has expelled from Spain the great industrialists (though we do not altogether see the connection between dogma and silk weaving—acts of faith and Toledo blades) she has certainly been a long time over it. For centuries Spain was the foremost na-