

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 210, St. James Street, by
J. GILLES,
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.
The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.
To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.
The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week 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. POTTENGL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1873.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.
OCTOBER—1873.
Friday, 24—St. Raphael, Arch.
Saturday, 25—Of the Immaculate Conception.
Sunday, 26—Twenty-first after Pentecost.
Monday, 27—Vigil of St. Simon and Jude.
Tuesday, 28—St. Simon and Jude, Aps.
Wednesday, 29—Of the Feria.
Thursday, 30—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

ST. PATRICK'S ORPHAN BAZAAR.
The Annual bazaar in behalf of St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum opens on Thursday 23rd inst., in the Mechanic's Hall, St. James St. The bare announcement of this fact will suffice to procure for it a numerous attendance, and hearty support from our Irish friends; whilst men of all creeds and nationalities will heartily unite in contributing towards the support of such an excellent work of charity.

A new feature of the bazaar this year will consist in the voting for the MacMahon Flag which will be presented to the Irish Society that shall poll a majority of votes; each vote will cost twenty-five cents. During the evening a splendid band will be in attendance.

Entrance tickets will be sold at the door at ten cents each, season tickets for twenty-five cents. The articles exposed to the public at the bazaar will be found to be numerous and very beautiful.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

If the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in the person of Henry V. could be effected by a vote of the Assembly, we might look upon the thing as done; but behind the Assembly there is all France, and it may be questioned whether the former is a full and fair representative of the other. The Army has not spoken out, and under a democratic form of government if there be a large standing army it is the government. What it wills is law. The trial of Marshal Bazaine is proceeding, and everything would seem to indicate that he will find it no easy matter to clear himself of the heavy charges under which he labors.

The telegrams are very reticent upon the movements of the Carlists in Spain. That there has been a serious fight we know; both sides claim to have been victorious; from the fact that the general commanding the troops in the service of the Madrid revolutionary party, has made no forward movement, and has no trophies to show, the presumption is that he must have had the worst of the fight. The naval victory over the insurgent flotilla at Carthagena was not much to boast of after all.—Admiral Lobos was obliged to retire—as he pretends, in order to take in coal—thus raising the blockade of Carthagena. For this he is about to be brought before a Court Martial. One of the insurgent ironclads has come to grief; she was run into by her consort, and cut down; one half of her crew were drowned. Mgr. Mermillod has issued his interdict against the *Cures* elected in Geneva and sacrilegiously performing sacred functions. M. Loysou has a little boy and we wish him joy of it.

Before we again address our readers, our Colonial Parliament at Ottawa will have met, and taken into consideration the subject of the so-called "*Pacific Scandal*." The report of the Royal Commission will, of course be laid before both Houses; but what action, if any, the House of Commons will take thereon is unknown at time of writing. It may accept it, or if it so pleases it may ignore it altogether, and act as if no investigation had ever taken place. The appointment of the Royal Commission in no wise affects its privileges or right to deal with the matter as it sees fit; it neither adds to, nor in any way detracts from its powers; it is to-day what it was six months ago. We may look forward to some very exciting scenes, and expect to hear much bitter language.

To add to our complications, and still more to muddy the already very turbid waters of Colonial politics, M. Riel who has lately been returned to Parliament by acclamation by his Manitoba friends, will appear in Ottawa at the opening of the session to claim his seat. His

appearance will be the signal for a violent clamor. If the Ministry do not cause him to be arrested for the killing of Scott they will be denounced by one party for condoning the murder of a British subject; and if they attempt to bring him to trial the other side will be down upon them for breach of faith. The Ministerial benches can not be pleasant places to sit upon.

The intrusive government at Rome is enforcing the rights of conquest to the utmost. It has ordered the General of the Jesuits to vacate the buildings belonging to the Order, and has taken forcible possession of six convents. The United States and Portuguese Consuls have entered a protest against this act of robbery, on the grounds that the Franciscan convents were owned by their citizens. Valencia is menaced with a bombardment by the insurgent fleet.

PROTESTANT MARRIAGES, AND PROTESTANT TACTICS.—We respectfully submit to the notice, and careful consideration of the *British Whig*, the subjoined extract from the subject of Protestant Marriages from the Pastoral lately issued by His Grace the Archbishop, and the Bishops of the Province of Westminster at the close of their Synodal deliberations;—

"The Catholic Church recognises as perfect and valid, the marriages of the people of England contracted before the law of the land, if there be no impediment which in itself annuls the contract. The Catholic Church does not re-marry those of the English people who are received into its unity. It regards them as already man and wife, and their children as legitimate. Therefore, if any Catholic solemnize a mixed marriage before the Registrar, or before the Protestant Minister, the Catholic Church refuses to re-marry them. For two obvious reasons: first, they are already married; and, secondly, the Catholic party has committed a sacrilegious act."

Thus in such a case, even though the Catholic party has committed a sacrilege, still he is looked upon by the Church as validly married. *Fieri non debuit sed factum valet*. Perhaps the *British Whig*, whom we have always looked upon as honest, even if mistaken, will see fit to reconsider his statement to the effect, that, in Germany, the Catholic priest preaches that the marriages of Protestants are but concubinage. This system of tactics, even against Papists, is unworthy of an honest man.

There is another system of tactics very common both on this Continent and in England.—Not only do such papers as the *Montreal Witness* habitually employ it, but even journals like the *London Times* are not ashamed to resort to it. This system consists in publishing letters on questions of Catholic faith or morals over the pseudonym of *Catholic* or *Catholicus*, or some feigned name, designed to produce the impression that the writer is actually a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and to give additional weight to the untruths which the letter contains. "Oh!"—exclaims the Protestant public—"these statements so damaging to Popery must be true, for they come from Papists themselves." The writers are, in fact, not Catholics at all, and very often apostates, who, therefore, from prudential motives conceal their real names.

We have an instance of this mode of carrying on the war, before our eyes. It is taken from the *London Times*, and consists in a letter to the editor of that paper on the subject of the double-teaching—*esoteric and exoteric*—which the writer falsely pretends is habitually given to Papists; the one to the educated and persons of intellectual culture; the other to the ignorant and unenquiring dupes.

As an instance of this double teaching the writer in the *Times*, who, as usual, professes to be a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and who signs himself *Oscotian*, cites the difference betwixt the teachings given to educated Catholics on the subject of the damnation of heretics, or persons outside of the visible Church; and that on the same subject imparted to the vulgar. He puts it in this way. The children of an Irish Catholic school, he says, if asked what will be the fate of heretics, will reply, "that every Protestant will be damned;" whilst in reply to the same question addressed to another class of Catholics—the educated gentleman, and the refined Oxford convert, will "fall back on the doctrine of invincible ignorance, or some other quibble, which is never taught to any one out of a theological seminary." The impression sought to be produced on Protestant readers of the *Times* by this pseudo-Catholic, probably an apostate, is that the Church teaches the many, that which in the case of a few she explains away, by quibbles never taught out of a seminary. Here then, fortunately, we have a positive statement—for our anti-Catholic writers are generally cautious not to commit themselves to anything positive; and we propose to show how false is that statement; and how identical with the teaching given to the "refined Oxford convert," is that on the same subject given by the Church to the humblest of her children. The question of fact at issue is:—Does the Church teach the latter to believe that Protestants will all be damned? whilst explaining away this apparently harsh doctrine so as to suit the more educated classes of her children? Let us test this by the examination of the

Catechisms that she uses for the instruction of the young in the humbler sort of schools.

Amongst these catechisms there is one by the Rev. Mr. Keenan very generally in use amongst English speaking Catholics, whose teachings are therefore essentially *esoteric*, but as the reader will see identical with those pretended *esoteric* teachings on the same subject given to the refined Oxford convert, "and which according to *Oscotian* are never taught to any one out of a theological seminary."

Q. Do Catholics charge all that are apparently out of their communion with the crimes of heresy and schism, and consequently exclude them from salvation?

A. No: all baptized children who die before they sin *mortally*, and before they embrace and believe error are members of the True Church. Again: all those sincere people belong to the soul of the Church, who, being baptized, and believing the great fundamental truths of Christianity, and who are prevented from believing it in all its details, not by carelessness, nor temporal interest, nor human respect, nor the spirit of obstinacy, nor by malice—but simply because they never doubted, and never had sufficient means of knowing the truth which they would embrace at once and with gladness could they only discover it—all there, we say, belong to the soul of the Church, and will be saved if they lead good lives, and do not violate God's laws." *Doctrinal Catechism, by the Rev. Stephen Keenan, approved of by the Most Rev. John Hughes, D.D., Archbishop of New York, p. p. 322 and 323.*

With the orthodoxy of the teaching above given we have nothing to do; the question at issue is one of fact:—Does the Church confine her qualification of the doctrine of exclusive salvation to refined Oxford converts—and the students of her theological seminaries? or does she in public as in private, to rich and poor, to young and old, to simple and learned, teach openly one and the same doctrine?

Perhaps we attach more importance to the trick of apostates and non-Catholics generally writing in Protestant journals over a pseudonym intended to convey the impression that they are *bona fide* members of the Roman Catholic Church, than it deserves; but the trick is so common—the artifice is so often resorted to, that it is no wonder if the unwary allow themselves to be sometimes deceived by it. It is, therefore, well to caution them against being taken in.

A DISGRACEFUL AFFAIR.—We have already had occasion to report in our columns, and comment upon the conduct of some of the Protestant ministers of Montreal, in the matter of aiding minors to contract marriage against the wishes of their parents, their legal and natural guardians. Lest we should be misunderstood, we, at the outset, repudiate any intention of casting a slur upon the Protestant clergy in general, for the great majority of them are, we believe, honorable gentlemen, who would scorn to be parties to any violation of God's great law—"Honor father and mother."

But though this scrupulosity may be predicated of our Anglican clergy, of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, and of those of many other denominations, all are not alike; and we must cite as an instance of this the conduct of the Rev. (!) J. A. Vernon, minister of the French Canadian Protestant church, and if we are not mistaken one of the agents of the F. C. M. Society. We will tell the story which we find published in the columns of the *Montreal Witness* of the 16th inst., under the caption of *A Strange Case*, but without one word of censure on the chief actor therein.

It seems that an attachment had existed for some time betwixt a young man George Cawthorne, Protestant, and a Madlle. Loiseau an infant of only 15 years of age, residing with her parents in Visitation Street. The parents of this child in the exercise of their legal rights, and of their rights derived from God Himself, strongly discouraged the intimacy of their daughter, a Catholic, with young Cawthorne, and absolutely prohibited their marriage.—Hereupon with the connivance of some friends, all of whom have rendered themselves amenable to the law, Cawthorne persuaded the young girl to abscond, and took her before this Rev. Vernon by whom an illegal and sacrilegious marriage betwixt Cawthorne and the minor Loiseau was at once celebrated.

When the parents missed their daughter they were almost distracted. The wretched mother applied to the law for redress, and on Wednesday morning of last week, the high constable; Bissonette, armed with a warrant, succeeded in arresting all the guilty parties, with the exception of the Rev. J. A. Vernon; he, however, was got hold of later in the day—and the whole gang were brought before the Magistrate on Thursday and were held to bail in the sum of \$120 each.

Comment on this disgraceful affair is surely unnecessary, and at the present stage might perhaps be out of place. We will only ask our Protestant readers to supply those comments

for themselves, and this they can easily do, by asking themselves; how they would judge the conduct of a Catholic priest who should be guilty of the conduct attributed in the *Witness* to this Rev. J. A. Vernon? who should virtually connive at the abduction of a young Protestant infant of only 15 years of age from the home of her parents; and without enquiries, without publication, without any communication with the girl's Protestant parents should at once proceed to the celebration of a marriage betwixt the Protestant child so abducted, and her Catholic abductor.

We know not what the law says upon the matter; but as this is by no means the first time that this dirty trick has been played by the lower class of Protestant ministers in this City, we hope that in this instance the full measure of law in its utmost severity may be meted out to all the parties to this most infamous outrage upon law, natural morality, and the sanctity of marriage. It is full time that a stop were put to these proceedings.

Our friends of the Evangelical Alliance enlivened their proceedings by comic anecdotes. The subjoined is one of the best by a Rev. M. Lorriaux of Paris. According to this truthful narrator, the late martyred Archbishop of Paris was "*prepared for death*" by a Protestant minister which his name it was Forbes—Professor Forbes—an Episcopalian. Beat this who can. Some of our Protestant contemporaries speak in a very irreverent manner of the entire proceedings. So the *Montreal Herald* of the 13th admits that "the slight attention which we have been able to give to these reports has made us conclude that though probably adorned and animated by well chosen language and happy delivery, they have rarely diverged far as to substance from the limits of common place, and from a somewhat monotonous declaration of religious affection entertained by each member for all the rest. In general we should say that if the platitudes—*yes that is the word the Herald uses; where does the man expect to go?*—the platitudes and repetitions of an ordinary Missionary Meeting were extended to interminable length and pronounced by men chosen in a great measure for their oratorical talents, we should have as the product something like the sum total of the discourses which have gratified the Protestant religious world of New York, during some days past." The *Liberal Christian*, a Protestant religious paper of first-class standing says that in so far as it can make out the object of the *Evangelical Alliance* "it is to emphasize anew certain characteristic dogmas of the Trinitarian branch of the Christian Church which have become inarticulate or blurred in popular acceptance;" and in one of our exchanges, the *Acadian Recorder*, we find it asserted that the *Alliance* has behaved very badly to the negroes, in spite of their "*platitudes*" as the *Herald* calls them about love to all men—

"A-top of all this pyramid of good fellowship and love to all men sits a grinning skeleton; which close inspection discovers to be that of a negro and a clergyman. Designating himself thus, he writes to the *New York Herald* stating that he asked for admission to the Evangelical Conference, and could not be admitted because his skin was black."—*Recorder*, Oct. 8th.

In spite, however, of the precautions to keep out all subjects of unpleasantness, it was hard to prevent the speakers at this great Evangelical pow-wow from flying at one another's throats.—The *Witness*, who of course won't make things appear worse than they are, gives an account of one of these passages at arms. It occurred on Thursday, 9th inst., and thus arose. A Mr. Curry, of Richmond, was insisting upon separation of Church and State, and using tall language against a national or State Church, when the President's bell, ringing wildly, called him to order. From the audience arose oris for the speaker to go on; the President thought "it would be discourteous and unchristian to continue." We copy from the *Witness*:—

"Mr. Curry arose and said that he abided by the rules of limitation most readily, yet he would most emphatically protest against being deemed by the chairman 'discourteous or unchristian'—(Here ensued terrific loud calls 'Curry, Curry,' accompanied with stamping of feet, &c. In the din the voice of the chairman struggled to be heard.) Finally comparative order was restored."—*Witness*, 11th inst.

The conclusion of the matter was that Mr. Curry, finding that he would not be allowed to express his opinions on the question of State-Churchism, put on his hat, and accompanied by his friends "marched down from the platform, out of the house."—*Witness*.

It was well for the Alliance that it brought its session to a speedy conclusion, or there would have been more scenes like the above to record. One thing only was made manifest by the meeting; that in their hatred of the Church all the sects agree, but that there is no other bond of union betwixt them.

Under the caption, *Prussian Tyranny*, the *Toronto Globe* refers to a recent order from the Ministers of Commerce and the Interior, forwarded by telegram from Berlin, under date 13th inst., for the expulsion of all emigration agents who are domiciled in Germany. "This" remarks the *Globe* "is on the same principle as everything rests on in Prussia; the State is

everything, the individual nothing, and liberty an impossibility.

How quickly and loudly men can sing out when the shoe pinches them! how indifferent are they to their neighbors' corns! The expulsion, without form of trial, without legal process of any kind, of the Jesuits and members of Catholic religious orders by the Prussian government never provoked a groan from the *Globe*; without wincing, our contemporary, and indeed the organs of Protestant opinion generally throughout the world, looked on, and most of them approved of the arbitrary proceeding. Now, however, when the same process of expulsion is applied to a body of men who are avowedly and openly engaged in a business which by depriving Germany of male adults, diminishes her means of filling up the ranks of her army—they cry out against the *Tyranny* which when Catholics only were the sufferers by it, they rather applauded than condemned.

The *Globe* is right however in denouncing the political regime of Prussia as a tyranny, as incompatible with liberty. Whosoever the State—no matter in what form it be organised, monarchical or republican—whosoever "the State is everything, the individual nothing," there we have Caesarism, or in another word tyranny.

But the direct tendency of Liberalism is to make of the State everything; to merge in the State, the Church, the Family and the Individual. The Liberals of Switzerland by their late ecclesiastical laws are attempting to substitute State for Church; Protestant communities wherever they enjoy unlimited power, as in the United States, as in New Brunswick, have set at naught the rights of the Family and the Individual by their infamous School laws. With all Liberals, and this is the secret of the Catholic's hostility to Liberalism, "the State is everything the individual nothing," and were their principles to triumph "liberty would be an impossibility."

It is in short only by taking the tyrant's ground that the State—it matters not whether its power be exercised by Caesar in person, or by majorities—"is everything;" that as against the State, neither the Church, nor the Family, nor the Individual, has any rights, that the ecclesiastical laws of Germany, of Switzerland, of Spain, and Italy can be defended; or that the School systems of the United States, and of New Brunswick can be justified. It is on this plea, that in some countries the State undertakes to determine by whom, and under what conditions the Sacraments shall be administered; that in others, the State deprives the Catholic parent of the right of determining for himself how his children shall be educated; it is on this plea, that the State "is everything" that "the Individual, father or mother, is nothing," that Liberals speak of all children, as "*our children*;" a phrase which in itself is the summing up of all conceivable tyranny, and on which the entire superstructure of "State-Schoolism" depends. In a word, both State-Churchism and State-Schoolism, find their reason of being in the assumption that "the State is everything the individual nothing;" which again is the fundamental and vivifying principle of modern Liberalism, and which again is, as the *Globe* truly says "incompatible with liberty."

Some indignant comments are made in a letter from a Protestant bishop, Dr. Tozer, addressed to another Protestant bishop, a Dr. Potter, and to the Protestant Dean of Canterbury. The occasion for this remonstrance was furnished by the latter, in that he went through the ceremony of participating in the communion of bread and wine given at a Presbyterian church in New York. If such conduct be approved of by the low church party of the Anglican denomination, argues Dr. Tozer, the high church party of the same sect may justify their attendance at Catholic worship, and thus encourage the Romanising tendencies which they are reproached. Dr. Tozer's remonstrance seems a little out of place, seeing that the head of the said Anglican denomination herself communicates in things sacred with Presbyterians; and that therefore, in fact, all the body of which Her Majesty is head, is also in communion with them, and with all with whom they are in communion; for things or sects which are in communion with the same must be in communion with one another.

Another Protestant minister who signs himself George David Cummins, Assistant Bishop of the Diocese of Kentucky, takes up the cudgels in defence of the Protestant Dean of Canterbury, denounced by Bishop Tozer for inconsistency in that he, the Dean, partook of bread and wine in company with Presbyterians, and in a Presbyterian meeting house. Dr. Cummins argues that there is nothing in the formularies of the Anglican denomination that forbids its ministers from communicating with members of other sects; and he argues that Episcopal ordination is not, and never has been considered by the Church of England, neces-