

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 683 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLEBK, 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 Depot. Single copies 3d.
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, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription from that date.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 4, 1870.

ECCLÉSIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1870.

Friday, 4—St. Andrew Corsini, B. O.
Saturday, 5—St. Agatha, V. M.
Sunday, 6—Fifth after Epiphany.
Monday, 7—St. Romuald, A. B.
Tuesday, 8—St. John of Matha, C.
Wednesday, 9—St. Raymond of Penafort, O.
Thursday, 10—St. Scholastic V.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Mr. Bright, as we long ago foretold would be the case, is getting into bad odor in Ireland. John Bright the Minister is necessarily a very different sort of man from John Bright the demagogue, and popular agitator; and for John Bright the Free Trader to adopt, or advocate the extreme views of the Dublin *Irishman* and other Irish popular organs, which are simply a protest against Free Trade in land, is morally impossible. So it has come to pass that his utterances on the Land Question are no longer received with shouts of applause; and Mr. Bright, now that he is called upon to act as well as speak, is beginning to realize the difficulties which lie before him, and the Cabinet of which he is a member. Hitherto, so he tells us, difficulties have vanished as he approached them; the mountain which at a distance appeared insurmountable, as he got close to it resolved itself into a very slight obstacle indeed; but the nearer he approaches the Land Question, the more its difficulties assert themselves; and he now recognizes that, of all the questions that have ever presented themselves to a British Legislature for solution, this of the Irish Land tenure is incomparably the most difficult.

And how will the Cabinet of which he forms a part face it? for face it, it must. A few more weeks, and the long looked for Bill for Ireland will be before the country; and though we know as yet nothing of its provisions, its principle or its details, we are confident that it will be received by the extreme party in Ireland "with a bowl of execration, as a mockery and a snare." No measure that Mr. Gladstone, or that any British Ministry would dare to lay upon the table of the House of Commons will meet the demands of a numerous party in Ireland, who though certainly not the majority, are the noisiest and the most powerful, because the most active. It does not require the gift of prophecy to foretell that before Easter, Gladstone and Bright will be the best abused men in Ireland—abused because they have raised hopes which it is impossible for them to realize.

On the Continent of Europe, during the past week, things have passed off pretty quietly. The Pierre Bonaparte shooting case is still discussed, but popular excitement has subsided. M. Emile Olivier, the head of the French Ministry, appears to be firmly seated. In Spain all is confusion, which seems to be the normal state of the country. At Rome the Fathers are going on steadily with their work, but the results have not as yet been given to the world. Of course our own Correspondents continue to put in circulation the most ridiculous stories, but they are not worthy of serious notice from Catholics. As a rule, it may be set down that all that is published in the *Times* respecting the Council, and the discord amongst its members, is false.

Prince Arthur is still in the United States. The remains of the late Mr. Peabody have been landed at Portland with imposing ceremonies from Red River we hear that conferences between the insurgent leaders, and the Catholic dignitaries from Quebec, promise a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the foolish imbroglio; and it is added that by Easter all will be over, and the district will again be under the regime of the Hudson Bay Company.

THE CIVIL AND THE SPIRITUAL.—A pamphlet recently published in England, and which is attracting much notice, is strikingly illustrative of the progress of the Protestant movement, considered as a Protest against sacerdotalism. The writer insists that the great evil of the Establishment, as it stands at present, is the power and influence of the clergy; that they possess too much independence in the administration of their parish, and the performance of

divine service. The remedy needed in this case, and recommended, is the increase and extension of the power of the laity.

This idea, as much as any protest against dogma, lies at the root of what is called Protestantism; and this spirit is at work even in the Catholic Church: those who are possessed by it being known as "Liberal Catholics." Unconsciously perhaps, but still at heart, these men are possessed by the same evil spirit as that which led to the deplorable religious apostasy of the XVI. century.

In its inception that great religious revolution, known as the English reformation, had for its object the substitution of lay power for clerical power; its design was to put the parishioners in the place of the priest, the civil magistrate in the place of the bishop, the King in the place of the Pope. Its originators fondly hoped that they might effect this change without touching or impairing dogma; but they soon made the discovery that their position as non-Papal Catholics was untenable, and so the reformation went its way till its supporters had substituted the private judgment of the individual for the authority of the Church. Here too they hoped to be able to make a stand by appealing to the Bible; but the more logical of the reformers would not stop here; nor were they content until they had displaced revelation to make room for reason or rationalism, and had enthroned man in the place of God.

All Protestantism is in its first stage Erastianism. Amongst those who still call themselves Catholics, it is known as Gallicanism; and there are—so strangely inconsistent are men, and so blind are they as to what lies straight before them if they will but follow out their principles—who indignantly declare themselves free from all taint of Gallicanism or Protestantism, who nevertheless cherish in their hearts the fatal germ from which, when the opportune moment shall arrive, will burst forth into luxuriant growth these noxious weeds in the Lord's vineyard. Wherever, for instance, we see a tendency amongst so-called Catholics to tolerate the encroachments of the civil magistrate upon the domain of the Church, there we may be sure that the mystery of iniquity is already at work. What then shall we say of those who not only tolerate those encroachments, and strive to palliate them, but who actually invite them? That men who openly avow themselves Protestants should thus act is but natural; it is but the honest legitimate development of Protestant principles. But that professing Catholics should be willing to degrade her whom with lying lips they profess to love and honor as their spiritual mother, by subjecting her, in matters spiritual, to the control of the civil magistrate, is amongst the most inexplicable and painful phenomena exhibited by fallen man. Why do not these men, so every honest and intelligent Catholic naturally asks—why do not these men openly avow themselves Protestants, and leave the Church whose precepts they set at naught, whose most sacred interests they betray, and whose menaces they defy?

We insist that the Church is an autonomy: she is therefore the sole judge of the extent of her own powers; she alone can determine the conditions of membership, and the limits of her kingdom; and though she seeks not to curtail the sphere in which the civil ruler may rightfully exert his influence, she will not permit the latter to encroach upon any pretext, upon her sphere or legitimate domain. Nor is this the language of Catholics alone. The adherents of the body known as the Free Church of Scotland, and which seceded about a quarter of a century ago from the Scotch established church, justified their secession upon these very grounds. Claiming to be members of a branch of the Church Catholic, founded by Christ, they felt that they could not consistently with those claims allow the civil magistrate to meddle with their ecclesiastical affairs, as by so doing they would be failing in their allegiance to Christ. Though Protestants, in this instance the Free Church party in Scotland reasoned, spoke, and acted as Catholics: for to their credit be it said, they made their practice to agree with their theory.

But we shall be told that the object of the Liberal party is to set up a "Free Church in a Free State." This is the Liberal formula; but what is the Liberal practice? Let Spain answer; let Italy answer—and we shall soon learn what manner, what extent, of freedom a "Free State" free in the Liberal sense, leaves to the Church. Freedom indeed! Yes such freedom as Henry VIII. allowed to the miserable, servile wretches who, false to their Ordination vows, acknowledged his usurped Supremacy, and consented, like Cranmer and others, to become the tools of his tyranny, the facile instruments of his filthy lusts. This is the Freedom which your Liberal Catholics, who exalt the privileges of the secular magistrate at the expense of those of the spiritual magistrate, are preparing for the Church. Enemies are they more to be feared than any Protestants.

The Jesuit Fathers at Guelph are preparing to erect a new Catholic Church there. It is to be commenced in the spring of this year, and to be finished in the spring of 1872, at a cost of \$15,000.

The *Minerve* has a long and laboured article on the *Guibord* affair, in which it puts these two questions, and answers them both in the affirmative:—

(1) "Have the members of the *Institut Canadien* incurred canonical censures which deprive them of certain spiritual advantages, and notably of ecclesiastical sepulture?"
(2) "In our social condition, does this privation carry with it the loss of any civil right which a parishioner may have over that portion of the cemetery reserved to Catholics dying in peace with the Church?"—*Minerve*, 29th ult.

The question, so it seems to us, lies in a nutshell as the saying is. Is the right to ecclesiastical burial, or sepulture in a piece of ground set apart for Catholic burial, an accident of a man's ecclesiastical or spiritual status, or of his civil or political status? If of the former, and as the Church alone can determine the ecclesiastical or spiritual status of any man, then to the Church, or ecclesiastical tribunals alone belongs the cognizance of the affair *Guibord*. If on the contrary, the right to sepulture in a Catholic cemetery be a secular, civil, or political right accruing from a man's civil status, then of course every British subject, be he a Catholic or Protestant, Christian or Jew—since the civil rights of all are alike—has the right to claim that after death he be buried in the Catholic cemetery, and in that part of it hitherto specially devoted for the reception of those who have died in peace with the Church. Nay, we see not—if the civil magistrate may rightfully command that the body of one not so dying be interred in the Catholic cemetery—why he should not enjoin that there also be buried the bodies of the many defunct dead dogs, cats, and pigs whose remains infest our streets in the warm weather.

The questions then at issue in the *Guibord* case are these:—

(1) "Is the right to sepulture in the portion of the cemetery reserved for Catholics, dependent upon the religious or ecclesiastical status, or upon the civil or political status, of the deceased?"
(2) "Has the civil power any better right to determine a man's religious or ecclesiastical status, than has the Church to determine his civil or political status? To prescribe for instance the conditions of eligibility for a place in the City Council, or the Dominion Parliament?"

This last, especially, is the more important question at issue.

A GUSHING THING.—Like the younger Miss Pecksniff, the Rev. Mr. Beecher is a gushing thing: he pleads guilty to the soft impeachment, and therein he finds an excuse for his conduct in that dirty piece of business, "the Richardson McFarland case" in which, as it will be remembered he acted a prominent part.

The way Mr. Beecher expresses it is that he "slopped over;" that being full to the brim—full indeed with lechery and all uncleanses—he could not help slopping over. His feelings, to use a familiar form of speech, were too many for him; and so again, as he could not contain them, the natural filthiness of the nasty old man ran over. Here are the terms, in which, as reported by the Press, this worthy pillar of the Protestant church, and most reverend minister of the pure Gospel, accounts for his having been mixed up in the "blood and lust" line of business:—

I suppose I do slop over sometimes. Well, I never saw a pan just full of milk that did not slop over. If you do not want any slopping over, take a pail of milk and put it in a big bucket. There will be no slopping over then. And a man who has only a pail of feeling, in an enormous bucket, never slops over. But if a man is full of feeling up to the very brim, how is he going to carry himself without spilling over? He cannot help it. There will be dripping over the edge all the time.

If no excuse for the above is no doubt an explanation of the reverend gentleman's conduct. His heart is as full as an unclean cess pool; and like it, full of most abominable stuff, which at the least disturbance runs over, and discharging its contents, poisons the neighborhood. But good God! if such be the preacher what must be his Gospel? If "he who drives fat bullocks should himself be fat" what must be the moral condition of the sheep who obey the voice, and follow to their pastures the lead of so scabby a shepherd as the Rev. Ward Beecher?

The Landlord and Tenant question is rising to practical importance in France, and threatens to become as troublesome to deal with as is the kindred question in Ireland. No political changes, no concessions, no extension of the franchise, no form of government, not even extreme republicanism, will, so we are told by the leading organs of the popular party, give satisfaction, or allay discontent, until the working classes are by law released from the burden of paying rents to the landlords, whose premises they occupy. This is the French Landlord and Tenant question as defined by the *Times*' correspondent:—

"The *Marseillais* has amusingly distinguished itself by declaring that all modifications of government, and even the revival of the Republic are immaterial as long as the proprietors have the shameful audacity to ask for any rent for their houses when tenanted by workmen. Such is in Paris the tone of our so-called Republican press; and do not fancy that the *Reveil* and the *Rappel* are far behind the *Marseillais* in this strange conception of what a Republic must be. Unfortunately, there is no doubt that those papers are by far the most largely bought and read in Paris, and that our working classes are

more and more infected with the stupid and lamentable confusion between Republicanism and Socialist follies."—*Times* Paris Correspondent Jan. 31st.

The French are more logical, and more consistent than are democrats in other countries; and the conclusions of the *Reveil*, of the *Rappel*, and the *Marseillais* are but the legitimate and necessary deductions from the principles of the democratic party every where. The fundamental principle of that democracy is simply this:—That the individual has no rights which the State, or Society, is bound to respect. From this proposition flow as its logical corollary State-Schoolism, Compulsory Education, and last of all, No Rents.

ORDINATIONS.—The following Orders were conferred by His Lordship Bishop Piussonneault, on Sunday morning last, 30th ult., in the Chapel of the Grand Seminary of St. Sulpice, of this city.

Minor Orders—Mr. Francis Xavier Darragh, Diocese of Montreal.
Subdeaconship—Rev. Joseph Brien, Diocese of Montreal.

Deaconship—Revs. Daniel J. Gillis, and James Brondrick, Diocese of Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Rev. Thomas Carroll, Diocese of Hartford, U.S.

Priesthood—Revs. Jean Baptiste Morisseau and Francis Xavier Chagnon, Diocese of Montreal; Owen McKeena, Archdiocese of New York; and William Kelly, Diocese of Boston, U.S.

At the end of the imposing ceremony, His Lordship delivered one of his usual, effective and pathetic discourses—reminding the ordained of the new obligations by them on that day contracted, the grandeur and excellence of the sacerdotal function to which they were called, and the necessity of grace for the due and constant discharge thereof.

Of the excellent Seminary of St. Sulpice, the numerous ordinations of which it is our pleasant task to record from time to time in this journal, it is unnecessary here to say one word. Still it would be difficult for us to over-rate the immense services which the excellent institution, and the pious congregation of St. Sulpice since its foundation have rendered, and are still rendering to the sacred cause of religion, both in the Old and in the New World. We have been told that from the Grand Seminary of Montreal alone, within the last ten or twelve years, upwards of eight hundred priests have been turned out—all of them having studied, and most of them having been ordained, within its sacred walls. Their holy mission has been, of course, to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel, and to plant the sacred standard of the cross of Jesus Christ throughout the different parts of this large Continent.

Comment on this is superfluous. The shortest and truest comment is in the words of the Psalmist: *A Domino factum est illud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris.* "This is the Lord's doing, and it is wonderful in our eyes."

May the Lord, the Giver of many excellent gifts, spare it and its pious and self-denying directors—the worthy successors of the holy servant of God, Mr. Olier—many long years yet for the good work. And that having prepared and sowed good sound seed for the large fields of souls anxiously awaiting it, the seed thus sown may bring forth, as it has already done in the past, fruit a hundred fold now, and life eternal hereafter.

The *Trade Review* with legitimate pride points to the condition of our banks for the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and thence concludes to the wealth and material prosperity of the Dominion. On Nov. 30th, 1869, the Bank Statements which the *Trade Review* quotes, showed the sum of \$89,756,706, Assets, against the sum of \$55,326,258 of Liabilities.

But as compared with that of the Australasian Colonies how trifling do these signs of wealth appear! especially when we bear in mind that the population of the Dominion is about double that of the infant colonies last named. From a letter published in a recent number of the *London Times* we learn that for a population of 1,697,339, the Banks of Australasia showed Assets of £46,956,121 stg., or about \$234,000,000 against the sum of £23,100,000, or about \$115,000,000 of Liabilities.

In other words, though the population of the latter is scarce half of that of the Dominion of Canada, the Assets of its Bank are very nearly more than three times as great, in reality as 234 to 90. This will give some idea of the wealth, the resources, and wonderful progress of Colonies of which the oldest was settled not a century ago.

Another test of the relative importance of the British North American, and of the Australasian Colonies is furnished by the tables of Imports and Exports. The Imports of the Dominion are given in the *Year Book* for 1870 as \$57,567,888. Those of Australasia, as copied from the letter in the *Times*, are set down at upwards of \$143,000,000, literally £28,728,968; and whilst of the former, the total Exports are stated as \$57,567,888, those of the latter are given at about \$150,000,000, literally £30,403,545.

On Wednesday of last week, and again on Monday, our talented friend Dr. Rogers gave his lectures on "the Rose, the Shamrock, and the Thistle," in the St. Patrick's Hall, before numerous audiences, who must have been all delighted with the lecturer's eloquence, and the skill with which he handled his subject. Dr. Rogers' reputation as a lecturer, is now so well established that it is unnecessary for us to insist upon his merits. The crowds that flock to hear him is the best testimony that can be offered.

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

Dear Sir,—We Catholics are often reproached most bitterly with having a divided allegiance, that we are Papists before being British subjects; and in short, that in matters of religion we put the Church before the State.

I have not a word to say in mitigation of sentence for our offences. But hardly are Protestants the persons who should cast the first stone at us, for in this matter of divided allegiance they are just as bad as we are; perhaps "more so," as appears from the concluding paragraph of a letter from "A Protestant Englishman," that the *Witness* published a short time ago without a word of reprobation. I suppose therefore the sentiments of the writer find favor in the eyes of the pro-Yankee editor of that journal, whose annexation tendencies, and fulsome flattery of everything Yankee are well known. The provoking cause of this letter was the row kicked up outside a chapel inside of which the notorious Chiniquy was blackguarding Popery, by a lot of loafers. You and I, Sir, and every good man will of course agree so far with "A Protestant Englishman," as to protest against such an outrage, no matter by whom perpetrated; whether by a parcel of blackguards staggering half drunk from one place of debauch to another; or by a few smart friends of Mr. Chiniquy—as many suspect was the case. But because, taken by surprise, the police did not—which is of course to be regretted—make any arrests of the ringleaders in the blackguard business, still I do not think that the disloyal language of your contemporary's correspondent is justified. The man, though he calls himself *Englishman*, is at heart a Yankee:—

"Much as I love my country, I prefer my creed to my allegiance; and if the Catholics and dough-faced Protestants in power will not preserve to us freedom of worship and of speech, I, for one, will change it to that country where they can be secured, and this feeling to be that of many."—*Protestant Englishman*.

The allusion to the U. States as a land where freedom of worship and of speech is protected is rather unhappy. I should like to know what the Catholic priest who a short time ago was seized by a Protestant mob, tarred, feathered, and otherwise indecently and cruelly used, thinks of the matter: or what evidence the charred rafters and blackened walls of Catholic Chapels and Convents wrecked by Protestants in the land which the *Witness* loves so well, give upon the subject. Our police may not be quite up to the mark; that they were not prompt enough to repress the slight disturbance that occurred on Sunday evening may be admitted; but it would be a stretch of mendacity, of which scarce the editor of the *Witness* is capable, to pretend that life and property are not under all circumstances better protected in Lower Canada and in Montreal, than in New York or any part of the U. States. If there be any of a different opinion the sooner they are off to Yankee land the better.

AN ANTI ANNEXATIONIST.

P. S. I send you for insertion a paragraph from a U. States paper, *The Star of Bethlehem*, containing some very pertinent remarks upon Yankee regard for religious freedom and rights of conscience; the truth of the facts therein detailed has never been called in question:—

"At Ellsworth, Maine, a Catholic priest was assaulted, tarred, feathered and ridden upon a rail. He had not violated any law, did not interfere with any matters outside his business, but was ill-used for no reason but that he was a priest. The American press did not denounce the perpetrators of the outrage as bigoted ruffians, and there were no long, whining appeals in behalf of religious toleration. Again, what an example of mildness was the sight of a number of defenceless women and children, ruthlessly driven out into the night, and fleeing in terror from a brutal mob, that instigated by ministers of the gospel, howled around the flames of the convent, or like ghoul, dug up the graves of the cemetery. This in Protestant Boston / Plymouth Rock, and toleration! A stone from the ruins of the Ursuline Convent should crown the monument on Bunker Hill. One of the ministers most prominent in causing the outrage was Lyman Beecher. But that should not excite surprise, as it is a family failing with the Beechers, male and female, to be involved in disgraceful acts, whether inciting a riot, originating calumny, or giving sanction to lust and marital infidelity. In the city of Newark, a Catholic Church was sacked, and to the sacrilege was added the crime of murder. There was an organized attack upon the Catholic Churches in Philadelphia. It was not the sudden outbreak of a mob, but a premeditated assault. As the Catholics fled for their lives in that carnival of murder and riot, or beheld their burning churches, they no doubt had exalted ideas of American toleration. We might mention the outrages at Kensington and Louisville, but we have no space. From the record that Protestantism has in this country, we can have no faith in its sense of truth or justice."

(To the Editor of the True Witness.)

Mr. Editor,—It was predicted in the *Almanac* for 1869, that, on the seventh day of August, there would occur an eclipse of the sun—total in some localities—partial in others. I read the prediction months before the event took place,