

The True Witness

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

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. PETERGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 3, 1872.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1872.

Friday, 3—Finding of the Holy Cross.

Saturday, 4—St. Monica, W.

Sunday, 5—Fifth after Easter.

Monday, 6—Rogation Day. St. John before the Latin Gate.

Tuesday, 7—Rogation Day. St. Stanislaus, B. M.

Wednesday, 8—Rogation Day. Vigil of the Ascension. Apparition of St. Michael, Arch.

Thursday, 9—Ascension, Obl.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The report that reached us last week to the effect that the Gladstone Ministry had actually resigned, has not been confirmed; but its position is so weak, its hold of life so fragile, that at any moment we may expect to hear of its dissolution. The Tichborne claimant has at last found bail, and is at large again; there are still it would appear from this, some silly enough to believe in his monstrous and absurd story, thoroughly refuted though it has been.

The Carlist uprising in Spain is assuming more serious proportions; and even should it fail of restoring the Crown of Spain to the rightful owner, it may have the good effect of driving Amadeus away from Madrid, and of heaping shame, and trouble on the House of Savoy—far which all sincere Catholics will feel truly thankful. The details that reach us are so meagre and confused that we can as yet, however, only speak with much hesitation. We know not how far the brave Biscayans are mindful of those ancient liberties, of which they were robbed, and of the gallant stand made by their fathers, in defence of Don Carlos, their legitimate sovereign, and against the foreign mercenaries, and hireling cut-throats from England, who at last succeeded in forcing upon them the daughter of Ferdinand's wife, under the title of Isabella Segunda; but if the men of to-day be the worthy sons of the men of 1836 and '37, and animated by the same noble spirit, they will in their native mountains be well able to resist all the troops that the Spanish Liberals can muster against them. Their country is strong by nature, and defended by strong hands, is almost impregnable. What damps our hopes is the report, we trust unfounded, that the Carlists are making common cause with the Republican party. If this be true they do not deserve to succeed; and they will for ever have disgraced a righteous cause by allying themselves with an impure democracy. We trust however that the report is false, and that the flag of legitimacy, unsustained by the filth of Liberalism, may yet float triumphant over both a regenerated Spain, and a regenerated France. But there must be no compromise with the Revolution; and it is because he feels that it is so, and because he acts accordingly, that Henri Cinq, in refusing to accept the tricolor, the emblem of '89, has approved himself to be a thorough French gentleman, and worthy therefore to sit, by the Grace of God, and not in virtue of a plebiscite, on the throne of France and of Navarre.

Although no solution of the question of consequential damages has yet been obtained, every body seems to be quite easy on the matter, and confident that an amicable solution will be arrived at. The tone of the press of the U. States on the matter is calm and far from hostile; indeed many of their most able writers seem to think that their Government has taken up a false position, from which it should retreat as soon as possible.

It turns out that the proceedings which have lately been taken by the U. States Government against the Mormon branch of the Protestant Church, must be quashed as illegal. The Mormons are therefore jubilant, and it is said are likely to retaliate upon their brother Protestants.

The annexed paragraph is from the *Daily News*, and refers to an abandoned woman who, we believe, was once for a short time an inmate of a Religious House, from which, however, she was expelled for immoral conduct. As to being puzzled to know "who's who" now-a-days, we can give our contemporary an infallible rule, by the application of which he will never fail to solve the problem. He may for instance, set it down as certain, that the "brands snatched from the burning," who, in the guise of "converted priests" and "escaped nuns," challenge the sympathies of the Protestant public, are not what they profess themselves to be, and are what the *St. Louis Republican* evidently suspects Edith O'Gorman to be. They are all tarred with one brush, and that none of the cleanest. *Ex uno, vel una, disce omnes*—

"It appears that the success of Edith O'Gorman as an escaped nun, is about 'played out,' consequent of her conduct previous to giving a lecture at St. Paul. The *St. Louis Republican* goes even so far as to say that 'when she returned to that city her actions were such as to start the rumor that the gentle martyr was drunk.' It is really a puzzle to know 'who's who now-a-days.' Apropos of this interesting brand we find some amusing details in a letter from *Griswold*, to the *Times*. It seems that the "escaped nun" is being "run" to use a Yankee expression, by a speculator of the name of Phillips, and who has made a very good thing out of her, in some of the States, where she has been exhibited. Wherever he goes, his first step is to get up a persecution against her, and to have her mobbed—a dodge we have seen resorted to in Canada, and which has been found to answer well. For this purpose it seems that Mr. Phillips keeps always on hand a large assortment of imitation brick-bats, made of red flannel, and stuffed with cotton which he, before the persecution and mobbing begins, distributes to the Romish persecutors who are to pelt her. The effect, as Mr. Dickens would say, is very striking indeed. We will, however, let the contributor to the *Times* tell his story in his own words:—

"I met Phillips here, the famous lecture impresario of Cincinnati. He has the 'Escaped Nun' on his hands at present.—With the O'Gorman he has swept through New England and the Middle States, and is now on his way to California. The 'Escaped Nun' is a big card, and there are few carding machines equal to Phillips. And of all the nuns who have escaped from nunneries, none have escaped as this nun has.

"On a fortunate day for her, Phillips, who was looking for some novelty in the lecture line, came across her. He saw at once what the business was capable of, and he was not slow to make a bargain with her. The first thing he did was to get her mobbed. (An escaped nun is of no account until she is mobbed.) It was a little severe on Edith, and the boss mobber, whom Phillips had hired for the occasion, getting a little drunk, nearly broke Phillips head with a dray pin in the mole, in a confused yet conscious zeal to earn his money.

"Phillips has a rude wood-cut on his small bills representing the mob, which he cut out himself with a jack knife while recovering from the effects of the escaped dray pin. The cut—allude to the picture, not the cut in the scalp—shows the mob pouring a perfect volley of shot directly into the escaped nun's face, while a shower of brickbats is flying towards her over the top of a distant scaple. The nun smiles sweetly at her assailants, while Phillips is seen in the background, egging on the mob. I may remark incidentally that it is the first time Phillips ever allowed himself to be kept in the background, but this, you see, was business!

"Whenever business lags, Phillips has her mobbed again. He carries a quantity of assorted brickbats about with him, so as to be able to get up a mob on the shortest notice. He had some imitation brickbats, made of red flannel stuffed with cotton batting, which he hurled at her himself with well simulated rage, regardless of consequences to her chignon.

"At one place where he had arranged to have her mobbed the mob he had hired disappointed him. Not one of them came. So he had to mob her all alone. He says she must be mobbed regularly, if she has to mob herself.

"His small bills are a curiosity in show literature. 'She was stoned in Erie, Pennsylvania!' 'Tickets for sale at the bookstall!' 'Nearly assassinated by a pistol shot in New Jersey!' 'Get your seats early, and avoid the crowd!' 'The carriage was considerably damaged!' 'Copies of her photograph for sale at the hall!'

"Phillips considers that he has struck the right trail at last, and is on the high road to fortune.—The Escaped Nun business knocks every other show he has had anything to do with."

This will no doubt remind our readers of, and will also account for, a story that appeared some time ago in some of our City papers about a savage attack upon a "brand" who was preaching somewhere in Craig Street, and who was furiously pelted with stones by a Popish mob; the ground at the time being deeply covered with snow, and no stones in consequence accessible. We all know however how these bogus persecutions are got up; and the red flannel brickbats stuffed with cotton are but one of the many devices by which the No-Popery steam is kept up.

DR. MARSHALL'S FIRST LECTURE. — On the evening of Wednesday, 24th ult., Dr. Marshall, as announced, delivered his lecture in the St. Patrick's Hall. Amongst the audience were to be seen a large number of the Catholic Clergy, and of our most distinguished citizens. The subject chosen was, "Progress in the Nineteenth Century," and we will endeavor to lay before our readers a brief analysis of as interesting and instructive a lecture as we ever had the good fortune to listen to.

Having been introduced to the audience by Dr. Hingston, the lecturer came forward and explained how he proposed to treat his subject, "Progress," and to examine how far the vaunts as to the unrivalled excellence of this nineteenth century, were justified by facts. He would

consider its artistic, its intellectual, and its moral conditions; and comparing them with the same conditions of past centuries, of the so-called Dark Ages for instance, and of heathendom, he did not think that it would appear that the men of the present generation had any sufficient reasons for their self-glorification.

In the mechanical sciences, it is true, the present age had made great progress as compared with past ages; it had carried out and applied to manufactures and other material purposes, and in many ways utilized the inventions of great thinkers, who had suggested that which we moderns have tested by actual experiment. We travelled from place to place more rapidly, more comfortably, and more cheaply than did our grandfathers. This much the lecturer conceded to the nineteenth century; but in other matters, in the more exalted domain of art for instance, how did this age compare with those that had gone before? Has it in its poets excelled Homer and Virgil, Shakespeare and Dante? In painting, has it so far surpassed the age of Appelles, of Michael Angelo, of Raphael, and Titian, that it should boast itself? Might not even the name of Phidias bear comparison with that of the greatest sculptor—the lecturer did not know who he was—of the nineteenth century? In architecture had we done anything to prove our superiority to the ignorant builders of the mediæval cathedrals and monasteries, beautiful in their ruins, which cover Europe, and which neither the hand of time, nor the still more ruthless hand of the modern Reformer had been able to utterly destroy? In Art, which is the infallible index of the intellectual condition of a people, the nineteenth century had certainly as yet done nothing to win for itself a name above all other names.

Intellectually, how fared the boasted progress? There were the names of many men before the world—men of whom it was customary to speak as philosophers, and as the exponents of advanced modern thought—but what great thing had these accomplished? There was a Darwin, there was a Huxley, there were a Stuart Mills, and many others, all able men no doubt; but what truth had they established? what one good thing had they brought about? It might no doubt to some be a source of intense satisfaction to reflect that they were descended from the apes, and were only highly developed oysters; others might console themselves with meditations upon protoplasm; but for the great mass of mankind, for the toiling millions, ever toiling, ever sinking lower and lower in the scale of existence, what availed these discoveries of the nineteenth century intellect? At best they were theories; whilst the constant deterioration in all Protestant countries of the condition of the great masses of the working classes; the rapidly increasing numbers of the pauper classes! their abject misery, ever becoming more abject; their hideous moral degradation and corruption; their filthiness unutterable, at sight of which even the pauper classes of Rome in the days of the Emperors would have stood aghast—these, the lecturer added, are facts, stern facts, admitted, and commented upon by the best Protestant writers of the present day on Sociology and kindred subjects. Here the lecturer read extracts from Mr. Mathew Arnold, and other Protestant writers of note, to show how, even in the days of heathenism, the condition of the poor was immeasurably superior, physically and morally, to the condition of the great masses of the people in all Protestant countries in the nineteenth century, and under the reign of Queen Victoria.

On the moral progress of the age, the lecturer would be brief; the moral aspects of the age are too revolting to be long dwelt upon. Its consummate flower, its greatest product was the Protestant Divorce Court with its unmentionable obscenities, and impure details which, published in the journals, formed the delight of an intellectual and progressive public, the readers of those journals.

We regret that we have not space to enter more largely into the details of this brilliant lecture; and of course it is impossible to convey to the reader an idea however faint of its style, its pungency, its sometimes humorous, always forcible and felicitous illustrations.—Progress of course the lecturer recognised—but whither? What the terminus towards which the non-Catholic world was progressing? Towards heathenism; for as a witty Frenchman had well observed. "Protestantism was but heathenism without its Gods. And even these, the Gods of Paganism, some modern writers would have us rehabilitate. One writer spoke of the cultus of Minerva as ennobling; and another enthusiast would fain restore the worship of Adonis as edifying, as full of consolation, and a most desirable substitute for the gloomy austerities, and false morality of the Christian Gospel.

The allegations of the lecturer as to the terrible condition of Protestant countries, the misery and destitution of their peoples, their licentiousness, and disregard of the rules of decency which even savages observe—were all

sustained by quotations from Protestant writers, such as Emerson, Arnold, Mills, Ranke, Alex. Von Humboldt, Bunsen, and others, from whose works Dr. Marshall read copious extracts during the course of the evening.

The lecturer was greeted throughout with loud applause; and the announcement that on Friday night he would in the same Hall deliver a second lecture on the subject of "Liberty in the Catholic Church" was received with great delight by an audience, whose solo regret was that the stay of the learned and eloquent lecturer amongst them was to be so short.

In consequence of indisposition Dr. Marshall's lecture on Friday evening, was postponed to Sunday, to be given in the Hall beneath the Church of the Gesu.

On Sunday evening, at 8 P.M., Dr. Marshall again delivered a discourse to a crowded and delighted audience, in the Academic Hall, beneath the Church of the Jesu. The subject was "Liberty and the Catholic Church," and the argument that not only liberty could and did exist within her pale, but that without it, there was no true liberty. The eloquent, and logical manner in which the lecturer treated his subject elicited loud and frequent bursts of applause, assuring us that our illustrious visitor was well appreciated by a Montreal audience. We regret that our limited space prevents us from giving the lecture in full; and we should but do it injustice were we to attempt to analyze it.

The London *Times*, April 1st, in an article discussing the actual condition of the English agricultural laborer brings out a fact strikingly illustrative of that "modern progress" on which we of the nineteenth century so much pride ourselves. That fact is that the modern agricultural Englishmen, the descendants of the men of Agincourt, of the terrible bowmen of Flodden, are in a progress of rapid deterioration, owing to the deterioration of their material condition.

"It is not so long since" says the *Times* "that a medical officer attached to the Privy Council Office made a Report in which he described the physical power of the Country Laborer as in progress of rapid deterioration, through an insufficiency of food to sustain his strength. The Report attracted much attention, and no little anxiety, for though its conclusions may be described, in the phrase of the day, as sensational, its language was sober in expression, and the writer appeared to be at once painstaking and accurate."

The fact that, physically, the laboring man of the nineteenth century is worse off than was the laboring man of the fifteenth; that the latter was better fed, and could more easily procure, by his labor, the necessities of life, has long ago been recognized by all who have taken the pains to make serious enquiries on the subject. In the middle ages the ploughman, the laborer in the field, was in every material respect far better off, than are his representatives in the present century. This is one striking feature of modern progress.

Thus Hallam, whom no one can reproach as *laudator temporis acti*, or suspect of a tendency to depreciate the present age, expressly tells us, that "there is one very unpleasant remark which every one who attends to the subject of prices will be induced to make—that the laboring classes, especially those engaged in agriculture, were better provided with the means of subsistence in the reign of Edward III. or of Henry VI. than they are at present."—*Middle Ages*, c. ix. The same writer quotes Sir John Gailham to show that in 1784, the material condition of the working classes had greatly deteriorated; and since 1784 their condition has steadily been becoming worse and worse. "A laborer at present" says Hallam "can by his week's wages purchase only about half a bushel of wheat, and twelve pounds of meat; in the reign of Henry VI. by the same amount of labor the working man could procure a bushel of wheat, and twenty-four pounds of meat." To-day as we learn from the reports of the strike in Warwickshire, the Agricultural Laborer, hardly ever tastes animal food, except a little bacon rind, from the 1st of January to the 31st of December; but in the Middle Ages, and in England especially as we learn from Sir James Fortescue, animal food formed a great part of the Englishman's diet; and on the whole concludes Hallam,—"after every allowance" made "I should find it difficult to resist the conclusion, that however the laborer has derived benefit from the cheapness of manufactured commodities, and from many inventions of common utility, he is much inferior in ability to support a family to his ancestors three or four centuries ago." This is to what modern progress, and the unexampled commercial prosperity, the enterprise, and intelligence of our age have reduced a considerable portion of our fellow Christians, and fellow subjects.

And the deteriorating process is going on, and will be continued, until some terrible and bloody cataclysm be the result. Year by year it becomes harder for the poor man by ever increasing toil, to obtain a bare sufficiency of the coarsest and cheapest food. Half starved, his physical condition is deteriorating; his bones and sinews are shrivelling up; and we thank God that we are not as were our ignorant unprogressive ancestors of the Dark Ages.

WAS ST. PETER EVER IN ROME? Obj. 7. If he (Peter) had previously been there and had been established as Bishop of the city; it is utterly incredible 1^o that St. Paul should have assumed such authority over St. Peter's flock as he does assume over the Romans; and 2^o that the Jews the Gospel.

When Bishop Brown urged these objections, he knew as a biblicist scholar that they were dishonest, and relied upon the ignorance of his readers for their acceptance. As an Apostle St. Paul's authority was equal to St. Peter's; it would only be when a question of jurisdiction arose, that St. Paul would have to give way. Bishop Brown as a Christian Bishop knew well (though in this case it was convenient to suppress the fact) that in the early ages of the Christian Church there were often as many as three Bishops in one city at a time, each equal to the other in orders and dignity and episcopal authority, until such time as any question should arise that involved jurisdiction or the settling of disputes, in which case the senior Bishop would immediately assert his position. This Bishop Brown doubtless knew, but wished to ignore since it at once puts his objection out of court. It would have been better moreover, because more explicit and satisfactory, had the good Bishop, whilst he was attacking the Catholic Church, pointed out to the world those instances of authority exercised by St. Paul on which he relies, since they would doubtless, did we but know them, be explicable in various ways.

The second part of the objection—which we would warn our readers is a gratuitous and barefaced assertion—has been already answered in our last. That men "convinced against their will are of the same opinion still" is true of Jew and Gentile. That in *consenting to hear*—twas Paul who asked them to listen—they were all willing to learn, is not quite certain. The probability is, that some among them sought only to find something to favour their previous refusal to believe. Be that as it may, to ask for *further* information is no proof, good Bishop, that they were "utterly uninstructed" since a man of the deepest study if an impartial judge is always willing to hear fresh evidence. Our good Bishop of Ely's weak point is too much conclusion from too little proof. Too much bread to such an unconscious little sack.

Obj. 8. "Of the fathers, the first who speaks to the purpose is Irenæus."

In this assertion Bishop Brown quietly ignores the testimonies of St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, Papias Bishop of Hierapolis, and St. Dionysius of Corinth. This is bold. "Faint heart never won fair lady." But the good Bishop is courageous, as far as assertions and denials are concerned, and appears utterly reckless of all scholarly ridicule. We have already seen his vain attempt to dispose of the overwhelming testimony of Papias, and the question of Rome and Babylon. Until he can adduce some stronger proofs, than the authority of "some learned men" (there have been "some learned men" who have maintained, that his Lordship is great * * * great grandson to a monkey) Papias of Hierapolis will have to remain as an undoubted witness to Peter's Roman Episcopate. Granting however for the sake of argument, and in order to beat the good Bishop (of Ely not Hierapolis) on his own ground, granting that Irenæus is the first of the Fathers, who speaks to the purpose—What then? Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons in the year 178, and was a disciple of a disciple (Polycarp) of St. John the Apostle. This is not a very long distance for a tradition to travel. St. Mark's gospel is no further removed from Jesus Christ, in point of transmission, than is this testimony of St. Irenæus from the fict of Peter's Episcopate. Each has only travelled three stages.

JESUS.	JOHN.
PETER.	POLYCARP.
MARK.	IRENÆUS.

But we cannot consent to give up our previous testimonies. Papias is irrefragable, and as such, is, as the Bishop of Ely remarks "doubtless a very early authority (A. D. circ. 110.)" Certainly! seeing, that he comes according to the Bishop's own calculation within forty-three years after the death of Peter? Clement speaks of his martyrdom during the persecution of the Roman church under Nero. Ignatius speaks of Peter and Paul as having taught them (the Romans) with apostolic authority. "Oux os Petros sui Paulos diatassomai umin. Ekeinai apostoloi &c." (Your classical readers will notice the strength of diatassomai make decrees). St. Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Roman Church (written between the years 161 and 170) endorses the previous testimony of Clement, as to St. Peter having gone to Rome. These are testimonies which the worthy Bishop has no right to ignore, especially as elucidated by later writers. It is confusing however to know that he grants us St. Irenæus, and that he adds the acknowledgement that he "speaks to the purpose."

SACERDOS.
The river in front of the city is now clear of ice.