

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE. PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY. At No. 195, Fortification Lane, by J. GILLIES, to whom all Business Letters should be addressed.

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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1874.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

Friday, 11—Of the Octave. Saturday, 12—Of the Octave. Sunday, 13—Sixteenth after Pentecost. Monday, 14—Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Tuesday, 15—Octave of the Nativity. Wednesday, 16—Ember Day. SS. Cornelius and Cyprian, MM. Thursday, 17—Stigmata of St. Francis.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The escape of Bazaine, and the manner in which it was accomplished continues to form the chief topic of conversation in France? The Cologne Gazette publishes the following accounts said to be from the escaped prisoner himself:—

"From his sitting room the prisoner was obliged, in order to arrive at the terrace, (his promenade), to pass a bridge, and to descend some steps at the end of it. The bridge was enclosed by walls on both sides on one of which stood the guard. A tent roof was spread over the bridge to keep off the rays of the sun, which also concealed from those standing at the foot of the steps the persons on the bridge. On the South-eastern point of the island, which has a deep descent into the sea, Bazaine had arranged a little kitchen-garden, in which he worked much and watered his beans. There his flight was to be effected. On a fair projecting part of this garden Bazaine discovered one day that an old gutter for carrying off the rain water which poured through the rock was filled up by fragments of wall and rubble. Every day Bazaine worked to open it gradually, and had to conceal with stones and grass what he was doing from the eyes of spies. At last the opening was completed. If inside the gutter two strong iron bars were placed across the rock, and if to the bars a strong rope, ending with an iron ring and penetrating through the other side of the gutter, was attached, a rope ladder could be fastened to it strong enough to carry even so corpulent a man as Bazaine. In the gutter there was room enough to hide the rope ladder and ropes till the decisive day. The most difficult part was to arrive unnoticed at the gutter. Every evening, Marchi (the jailor) accompanied the prisoner on his return from the terrace across the bridge to his rooms. Then the door was closed by the warders, and escape rendered impossible. Bazaine resolved to trust to a happy chance, and to expect the day agreed on with his wife for the daring act. The night from last Sunday to Monday was chosen. When at 10 o'clock Bazaine arrived with Marchi at the flight of steps, he asked him not to take any more trouble, as the way to his rooms was now very short. Marchi let himself be persuaded. Bazaine mounted alone, crossed the bridge, the tent-roof of which concealed him for a moment from those outside, feigned to open and shut the door, which was closed later by the unsuspecting warders, leaped across the wall at the left of the bridge, went softly along the outer wall, and reached the gutter, having now passed the first danger. A thick rope, provided with many knots, and at the end with a strong iron hook, was fastened to the ring, and the descent, eighty feet deep, began, with the danger of being smashed against the projecting cliffs or of falling into the sea, lashed by a furious mistral. Bazaine who had gained much strength during his captivity, had also put on a strong, tightly fitting belt, with an iron hook, in front, so that he could fasten himself to a knot of the rope whenever he required a short rest. Arrived at the middle of the rope, he perceived a fog-like light beneath him. He knew now that his wife was there. He replied by the signal agreed on, lighting a match, showing him thus suspended. His hands swelled and bled, the cliffs hid him everywhere—thick cloth trousers, still damp from the sea water, are covered all over with holes, and show what the daring man must have suffered. Having reached the end of the rope, but not of the strand, he let himself drop into the sea, and swam toward the boat in which were his faithful wife and her courageous cousin. Before reaching it his strength left him, and Alvarez De Rull, his youthful deliverer, had to lift the heavy man into the rolling boat. After one hour's rowing they reached the peninsula of Croisette. At some distance the barge of the steamer Baron Riccaoli, hired by Mme. Bazaine for a pretended pleasure trip, waited for them, and brought them toward 1 in the morning on board the steamer. The Captain did not know the name of his guest. Mme. Bazaine, when going on land with the barge, had announced she would engage a valet and perhaps a chambermaid for her voyage. Bazaine was introduced as the newly engaged valet, and went at once to his cabin, which he did not leave again before the landing at Genoa. Bazaine and Mme. Bazaine state most explicitly that they have had no accomplices, and began and executed their work alone."

On the other hand it is confidently asserted that the rope story is all an invention to put the authorities on a wrong scent, and that the escape was effected by the simplest means imaginable, Bazaine quietly walking through the gates, and getting on board the boat waiting for him, with the connivance of the guards. Thus the Union Republicaine du Midi publishes the following version of the escape, which is less romantic, is more truthful than that in the Cologne Gazette:—

"Bazaine, according to this account, issued from the inner gate of the fort at 9 p.m., accompanied by the Sergeant-de-Garde, as if intending to take a walk, the sentry taking no notice. They descended the most made round of the fort, and reached the gate looking out on a small wood, a second sentry posted there allowing them to pass. They then went down the walk of the Grand Jardin, at the extremity of which a boat was in waiting, while the Italian steamer was only 80 yards from the shore. Everything was quiet meanwhile on the island, and

Colonel Villetta, on leaving at 6 the next morning, gave directions that the prisoner should not be disturbed, as he had passed a sleepless night. This is partially confirmed by the *Droit*, which says Bazaine undoubtedly left the prison by the gate, and that the complicity of some of the officials is conclusively established."

The trial of Col. Villetta and other alleged accomplices in Bazaine's escape will begin on September 14.

Paris, Sept. 2.—The English pilgrims arrived at Pontigny to-day. The party numbers 313, and includes Archbishop Manning, the Earl of Gainsborough, and other members of the nobility.

The *Times* Paris correspondent pretends that the peasantry are firmly convinced that Louis Napoleon is still alive and at the head of the Government. In this they are confirmed by the tour that the Marshal President is making. The writer in the *Times* says:—

"Now, the peasants have for some time become very suspicious. They have been told so many things, so much evil of this party and of that, that they no longer believe anything that is said to them; they will no longer believe anything but what they see. They do not see the President of the Republic except on horseback at a certain distance, and in Marshal's uniform. Well, what do you think has happened? A friend of mine has conversed in the environs of Mans with peasants who told him there had been an attempt to deceive them, that the Empire existed in Paris, and that as a proof of it they had with their own eyes seen the Emperor in the very costume which he formerly wore, with the same large red riband, with moustaches and short hair, but a little grayer than formerly. They had been told it was the Marshal-President, but this was an attempt to trifle with them. A Marshal would not have been dressed exactly like an Emperor; it was really the Emperor who was making this journey and the peasants were kept at a distance to prevent their recognizing him. All that my friend could say was fruitless; and they added that the soldiers at the Mans Review had been forbidden to cheer, because they would naturally have exclaimed 'Vive l'Empereur,' being near enough to recognize him. My friend returned this morning perfectly astounded at such a phenomenon. As to the first object, therefore, of the Marshal's journey, the result is assuredly strange, for his Marshal's uniform and large red ribbon will give rise in these districts to the legend of an Emperor who is not dead but has returned, and is going through the Provinces to prepare them for the accession of his son."

The 2nd Inst., anniversary of the overthrow of the Empire and the declaration of the republic, did not pass off without some disturbances. In some instances the regular troops had to be called out to quell the mob, and at Lyons, and other places, arrests were made.

The French Government has suspended *L'Univers* for two months because of some severe attacks against Serrano, chief of the revolutionary Government at Madrid. The Carlists are blockading Pampluna.

The revolutionary party in Spain boast of several successes over the royalists. The Carlists have, it is said, raised the siege of Puycedra, before which place their losses are said to have been heavy. Little reliance can be placed however on statements which reach us through the telegrams made up by the revolutionists. A despatch from Bayonne, under date 6th inst., reports heavy fighting as going on in Catalonia, and severe punishment inflicted on the revolutionists by the royal army.

As a proof of the intensity of the persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany, it is stated that in the course of one week, 5 priests were arrested; 11 were expelled from their respective churches; 4 Catholic societies were dissolved, and 20 cases of confiscation of Catholic property had taken place. This is not bad for one week. A German publishing house in Leipzig which was engaged to issue a translation of Becher's "Life of Christ," has discontinued the work, owing to the recent disclosures of the immoral life of that notorious Protestant minister.

The long fight betwixt the farmers, and the agricultural laborers in England is now over, the latter having had to give in. This result will very likely give a great stimulus to emigration, and Canada will in that case be a gainer.

The conversion to the Catholic faith of the Marquis of Ripon is reported. This nobleman was Grand Master of the Masons in England; but a short time ago he withdrew from the situation, which has been taken by H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.

The resignation of the Quebec Ministry is announced. The names of their successors are not yet given to the world.

The Sovereign Pontiff has been pleased to appoint as Bishop of Sherbrooke, the Rev. M. Antoine Racine of the Church of St. John the Baptist, of Quebec. The Consecration of the new Prelate will take place on the 18th of the present month.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of the first number of the *Ontario Tribune*, a new weekly paper published at Toronto, professedly in the interests of the Catholics of the Dominion. We regret that the editor should deem it his duty to inaugurate his career with an unprovoked attack upon the *TRUE WITNESS* which he couches in the following words:—

"An organ which would place the interests of the Catholic people of Canada above the interests of any political party has been a want long felt, as there has not been for years (and perhaps never has been in this country) a journal which, uncontrolled by political considerations, gave this body its first attention."

Or in plain English: the *Ontario Tribune* accuses the *TRUE WITNESS* of subordinating the interests of Catholicity and the Church to those of some political party—said party of course not indicated; and of being controlled, or guided in its advocacy of, or opposition to, measures, not by considerations of Catholic interests, but by political party considerations.

We respect ourselves too much to dream even of offering a denial to these very insulting accusations. The *TRUE WITNESS* has now been before the Catholic public of Canada for nearly a quarter of a century; and its readers amongst clergy and laity must know what of truth, what of falsity, the language of the *Ontario Tribune* contains. Our ecclesiastical superiors too, the Prelates of the Church in Canada, are fully competent to answer in our behalf; and were it necessary, we could appeal

to them whether it be true in any degree, that during our long career, in any one single instance, we have failed to make the promotion of what we honestly believed to be the true interests of the Catholic community, our sole object, regardless of the obloquy and the hostility of the politically influential, which we have often incurred by so doing.

But we soon, we say, to answer to the charges which the *Tribune* brings against us. The character of the *TRUE WITNESS*, whether for good or evil, is made by this time, and can not be affected injuriously by what the *Tribune* may think fit to say against it, or beneficially by anything that its editor can say in its favor. That the sacred cause of Catholicity might have found many thousands of champions, far more learned, far more able than our humble selves, we fully admit; but whether we have even for a moment, on any matter involving Catholic interests, lacked zeal or integrity of purpose, is a question which we respectfully leave for decision to the Catholic public who have honored the *TRUE WITNESS* with perusal; and above all to the Clergy and Chief Pastors of the Church who for many years have honored us with marks of their good will. If these condemn us we bow our heads, and say no more; if these absolve us, we are indifferent to what the *Tribune* may say either for or against us.

INDISSOLUBILITY OF MARRIAGE.—The disregard for the sanctity of the marriage tie; which contempt, conspicuous in all Protestant communities, is perhaps more openly displayed in the United States than in any other country—as evidenced by the recent controversies betwixt a precious pair of Protestant ministers at New York, the obscene details of which are, for the delectation of its readers, carefully published by the *Witness*—is provoking a strong impression amongst honest and intelligent Protestants that there must be something dangerous to society, and to the well being, even in the material order, of those communities amongst whom respect for the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage tie is becoming weakened. In the indissolubility of marriage lies the safety of the family, and therefore of society. Thus we find the *Star* in an excellent article of the 26th ult., giving utterance to the following truths, which under the spiritual leadership of such fellows as Tilton, Beecher, et hoc geno omnia, have been long lost sight of in the model republic. *The italics are our own.*

"It is the existence of the family which gives the spur to earnest labor, and willing self-sacrifice. For the wife of one's bosom, and the children that appertain to father and mother alike, whom an indissoluble tie has bound together, a man is willing to labor and strive, to plant and build, for they are the links which unite him with his fellowmen. Destroy the sanctity of the family, and the nation perishes." —*Evening Star, Aug. 26th.*

But this is just what for generations the Catholic Church has been endeavoring to impress upon the hearts of a protesting world, and for proclaiming which the Pope is denounced as the enemy of nineteenth century civilisation, as the opponent of progress, as in antagonism with the spirit of the age. Now the life of society is dependent upon the sanctity of the family; and the sanctity of the family in turn depends upon the indissolubility of the bond or tie, which binds together man and wife, father and mother. Declare that tie to be dissoluble, and the sanctity of the family is destroyed, which destroyed, the nation perishes. Not he then who defends, but he who attacks the sanctity of marriage, is the enemy of social progress.

But by whom is the "tie" by which, as the *Star* expresses it, father and mother are bound together, declared to be not indissoluble, but dissoluble? By all Protestant communities. By whom is the marriage tie asserted to be indissoluble? By the Catholic Church, and by her alone, and that in the teeth of the Protestant and liberal world. Who then, if the premisses of the *Star* be correctly laid down, who is the enemy, who the guardian of society, and civilisation? The Protestant State which legalises divorce, which proclaims the competency of its tribunals to dissolve the indissoluble tie which binds together man and wife, father and mother? or the Catholic Church which denies the competency of the State and of any earthly tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical, to dissolve the indissoluble, or to put asunder those whom, in Christian matrimony, God has joined together?

We discuss not with the *Star* the evils in the supernatural order of which Protestantism may be the cause; but here in the natural order, in the order of social well being, of civilisation as the *Star* understands the word, of domestic happiness, and national prosperity, we may well ask our contemporary if Protestantism has not approved itself inimical to man's temporal interests? Is not divorce part and parcel of the social system of every Protestant community? an essentially Protestant institution in short? Is not the indissolubility of the marriage tie openly denied by every Protestant State upon earth? From its inception, did not Protestantism sanction polygamy, and

declare war against the fundamental doctrine, on which, the sanctity of the family is based, "one with one, and for ever?" If in the spiritual order, Protestantism be considered as the negation of authority, and the assertion of the right of private judgment; so in the material order, Protestantism is a revolt against the restraints which the law of Christianity as interpreted by the Catholic Church, places upon man's animal lusts; in that she asserts, ever has asserted, and will to the end of time—in spite of Acts of Parliament, of Bismarckian laws, and the hostility of liberals—persist in asserting the indissolubility of the tie which binds together man and wife, father and mother, and which no State, no law enacted by man can sever.

The hideous revelations as to the condition of society in the U. States, the exposure of the gross contempt that there prevails, even amongst the professed preachers of righteousness and the pastors of the people, for the sanctity of marriage, have opened the eyes we hope of many Protestants and displayed to them the yawning abyss which threatens soon to swallow up what remains of Christian civilisation; we pray to God that it may have the effect of causing them to ask themselves this question. Can Protestantism, which has everywhere, by sanctioning divorce, weakened the tie which binds together man and wife, have God for its author?

A very pretty quarrel betwixt the Methodists and the Anglicans has been set a going by a controversy as to the right of ministers of the first named sect to use the prefix of Reverend to their names. A Methodist minister named Keet who had buried a child in the parochial burying ground was desirous of putting a tombstone over her body in which the deceased was spoken of as the daughter of the Reverend Mr. Keet, Wesleyan minister. To this the Anglican minister objected, and an angry controversy ensued the question at issue being whether Wesleyan ministers had a right to be dubbed reverends, a title which courtesy invariably accords to ministers of all Protestant denominations, as well as to priests of the Catholic Church.

In itself the matter is of little consequence; but every little thing helps to intensify the ill will and jealousy with which the members of the non-conforming Protestant sects regard their more wealthy, and by the State more highly favored Protestant sister of the Establishment. In this case differences of dogma are not causes of strife, but it is the social superiority over their non-conforming Protestant brethren, which the ministers of the Establishment affect, that irritates the first named, and intensifies their jealousy of the Established Church. Social equality rather than religious purification is what the non-conformists have in view in their agitation for disestablishment, and the silly attitude adopted by an Anglican minister towards a brother Protestant minister in withholding from him the ordinary prefix of reverend, will give additional stimulus to the movement in favor of religious equality in England.

PROCESSION IN HONOR OF THE B. VIRGIN.—On Sunday next, 13th inst., immediately after Vespers will take place a Solemn Procession from the Church of Notre Dame de Bonsecours to that of the Parish of Notre Dame. All the religious Societies and Confraternities are invited to assist in this public demonstration of love and respect for the ever Blessed Mother of God, and to implore her intercession for the Church in these stormy days when all the fury of hell seems to be about to burst upon her.

We see by the Correspondent of the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* that His Lordship Mgr. Cricanor, Bishop of Hamilton, has procured the services of fourteen young ecclesiastics for his diocese. These sailed about the middle of last month in the *SS. Phenician*, of the Allan Line, under the care of the Reverend Father Brennan.

On Sunday afternoon last, at 1.30 p.m., took place the solemn benediction of the stone of the Chapel now in course of erection on Dorchester Street by the Grey Nuns. His Lordship Mgr. Fabre officiated; and there were present besides the Clergy a large number of our most respected citizens, amongst whom we noticed M. P. Ryan, Esq., M.P., our City member, J. W. McGauvran, Esq., M.P.P., and His Honor the Mayor. A handsome collection was taken up.

We have received the first number of the *Chicago Pilot*, a very handsome eight page weekly paper, published in the interests of the Catholic religion. From its appearance we should say that the *Chicago Pilot* well deserves success, and we trust that it may obtain it.

The Annual Report for the current year of the Montreal Hospital in Dorchester Street is before us, and we regret to see that there is an excess of expenditure over income.

Riol has again been returned from Provencher, by acclamation. What action the Federal Parliament will take thereupon remains to be seen.

We are indebted to the *Montreal Witness* for the following item, which furnishes us with data to determine the much vexed question—Which is the most drunken, and therefore immoral part of the United Kingdom?

"The number of gallons of proof British spirits consumed in the United Kingdom for the year ending December last, was 28,908,501; the proportion being, England nearly 10,000,000 gallons; Scotland nearly 7,000,000 and Ireland not quite six and a Scotch." —*Montreal Witness.*

If to this the *Witness* would append the returns of illegitimacy in the several parts of the United Kingdom, as furnished by the Reports of the Registrar-General, the "record" would be a good deal worse for the land of Calvinism, and of a very widely open bible.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS. SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS. No. 65.

"THOU SHALT NOT STEAL"—7th Com.

Theologians enumerate six different ways in which we may participate in our neighbor's sin. By commanding it, as a master to his servant, a parent to his child, a superior to a subordinate; by advising it as a friend to a friend, or a lawyer to his client; by consenting to it or approving to it outwardly; by praising the person so as to encourage him to the sin; by concealing the thief or the thing stolen; by being silent, when your disapprobation would have hindered the evil, or by not denouncing it to the proper authorities. In all these ways we participate in our neighbor's sin, and thereby bring upon ourselves the duty of restitution, for not only are all those who do the act guilty of the sin, but all those also who participate in the doing of it. This is put beyond all doubt by these words of the Apostle (I. Rom.) "Who having known the justice of God did not understand, that they who do such things are worthy of death, and not only they that do them but they also that consent to them that do them."

All then, Christian soul, having sinned; actors as well as participants, and participants as well as actors, all have brought upon themselves the duty of restitution; though not all in the same order.

1st. First and foremost, he who holds in his possession the thing stolen is undoubtedly first bound to restitution, because as holder of it, he is always and continually the unjust detainer of it; (in holding it, in fact as we have so often said, he is continually stealing it) and because the thing always cries out for its owner. And let the holder bear this also in mind—If, through his not having made restitution, any other either of the actors or participants should at any time have made restitution, he, the holder of the thing stolen, is bound to make restitution to him, who has made the restitution.

2nd. After the actual holder, should he not make restitution, he who commanded the theft or unjust act is next bound. It might at first sight appear to you, Christian soul, that after the actual holder the actual thief or perpetrator of the injustice should be next bound; and this is so, when there was no one to command the deed; but when the deed was done under a command or threat, then the commander of the deed, or the threatener, becomes the actual thief, and the perpetrator or actual doer of the deed, is only the instrument or executioner of the deed.

3rd. Should neither the holder nor commander make restitution the actual doer then becomes bound, because next to the commander the doer is the efficient cause of the act. Should there be more doers than one (and the same is true of the commanders and holders in their own order) each is bound to his own share of the restitution; and should not the rest perform their part of the restitution, each becomes liable to that share of the restitution which has not been made by the others.

4th. After the efficient causers or agents of the act, those who have been the positive cause, that is those who have advised, consented to, favored or aided the deed in any other way than by the actual theft, are bound.

And lastly, those who have been the negative cause, that is those who might have prevented it and did not, are bound to restitution.

Such is the order to be observed, Christian soul, in making restitution whenever many have cooperated either in theft or any unjust act.

But you say I have received no part of the profit. I took no part in the act, I merely was silent when I might have prevented it. How can I be held to restitution? Alas, Christian soul, if you did not prevent the evil when you were able to do so, you undoubtedly consented to it, and the Apostle tells you, that he who consents to an evil is equally deserving of death as he who did it, hence you are bound to restitution. I acknowledge that there are particular cases, where you may be excused, but they are few, and the general rule is, that he who does not prevent an evil when it is in his power is bound to restitution. Should the danger to yourself in preventing the evil, be so great that it would be greater than the injury inflicted on the injured man, you might be excused from restitution since the injured man could not rationally wish you to defend him under such circumstances; but unless in some such case as this, you are bound to defend him, and should you fail, you will be held as a participator.

But three of us committed the theft, and each of us got only our share of the spoil; how can I be held responsible for the whole? If each restore his share, you are not bound to the whole, because the owner will get his own; but if the others do not, restore their share, you are bound to the whole. For beware, Christian soul, your self-interest is blinding your judgment; let, therefore, self-interest resolve the doubt. Answer me. A company of three merchants owes you a debt; from whom will you collect it? Is not each merchant's property liable for the whole debt, and is it not by the liquidation of the debt that this liability can alone be cancelled?—Would you have any scruple, think you, in making one pay the whole, if the others either could not or would not? Undoubtedly you would not. And why? Because in all partnerships the goods of each are vested in all, and the liabilities of each are held by all. So also in the partnership of stealing. When you stole in company, you assumed the liabilities of the company, and if others cannot or will not make restitution, you are liable for the whole.

And there is another consideration, Christian soul, which, above all others, should make you fear the sin of theft; and that is: the almost utter impossibility in most cases of making full and proper restitution; for it is not only necessary to repair the injury itself, but the injury also which the injury has caused.—We read in Zozomen that Ladislaus, King of Poland, had levied an unjust impost upon the lands belonging to the Church, and upon the farmers who rented them. His Queen, Edwige, remonstrated with him upon the injustice, and obtained a promise that he would restore all that he had received. Alas! answered the pious Queen—(and it is astonishing, Christian soul, what a correct theology piety inspires)—Alas! she exclaimed, that is well; you can return these poor families their grain, bushel for bushel; but who shall make amends for their tears? Yes, Christian soul, you may restore ill-gotten goods; you may repair injuries inflicted; but how will you be able to estimate the injury which the injury has done? These poor farmers lost their grain, but that was restored to them; but meanwhile their creditors were upon them for the debts they owed;