

THE TRUE WITNESS

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. OILLIES
FOR GEORGE E. CLARKE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

Town Subscribers.....\$3 per annum.
Country do.....21 "
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.
Single Copies, 3d.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 30, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Baltic* and *Persia* have both arrived since our last with Indian dates up to the 10th Sept. from Calcutta, and the 17th from Bombay. The news is a shade less gloomy. Lucknow still held out, and its garrison were in good spirits, and well supplied with provisions, and it was expected that the place would be relieved by the middle of September. General Havelock was still at Cawnpore, in daily expectation of reinforcements under General Outram, who was at Allahabad with a strong force. Before Delhi, the position of the besiegers was still improving, and the assault was spoken of for the 3rd September. In several sorties the Sepoys had been repulsed, leaving large numbers of dead behind them, and several guns; and the tide was everywhere turning in favor of the British troops, who were, at last dates, already beginning to arrive at Calcutta in considerable numbers.

There is nothing of any importance from Great Britain, or the Continent of Europe.

THANKS.

The Ladies directing the St. Patrick's Bazaar have the pleasure to acknowledge their deep gratitude for the generous support they have received from the inhabitants of Montreal generally; by which they have been enabled to realize, in a time of unusual pressure, the large sum of £900, expenses paid. The Ladies beg to tender their warmest thanks to all the friends of the Orphans' Bazaar;—to the rich who, out of their abundance, gave largely;—to the poor who, in their poverty, gave their mite so cheerfully. To the St. Patrick's congregation the Ladies beg to express their unbounded gratitude for having borne, as might be expected, the heaviest portion of the burden. The Ladies feel a particular pleasure in acknowledging their obligations to their Protestant patrons, who on this, as on every former occasion, have responded to the orphans' appeal in a spirit of generous and enlightened charity. The St. Patrick's Society is requested to accept the best thanks of the Ladies for the kind assistance rendered by its Sub-Committee in the preliminary arrangements. The Ladies, in conclusion, pray that the Father of the orphans may reward the patrons of His helpless children.

PROTESTANTISM AND ITS FOUNDERS.—There have been, are, and no doubt ever will be, bad Catholics—that is, men who professing the Catholic faith, set all its precepts at defiance by their lives. Such men are a scandal to the Church; but no argument against the divine origin of the religion that they profess can be logically based upon the immorality of their conduct.

It is very different however with the founders of a religion. These men profess to be inspired, or urged by the Spirit of God, to reform the Church, and to inaugurate a holier era upon earth. In the ordinary language of the Protestant world, Luther and his cotemporaries were such men, especially raised up by God to perform the work of the Lord. Now the work which they did was certainly either the Lord's work, or the Devil's, according as they were the servants of the first, or the last of these two masters.

But the Bible gives us one infallible test whereby to ascertain whether a man be the follower of Christ, or of Satan. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me," is the test given by Our Lord Himself; and we have but to apply that test to Luther and his fellow-laborers, to ascertain whether they were the followers of Christ, or of Satan. Were they self-denying men, or sensual, and self-indulgent men? If the former, then possibly of God; if the latter, then certainly of the Devil.

These simple considerations have been suggested by a series of articles in the *N. Y. Church Journal* (Protestant) copied from the Protestant *Guardian*, on the life and doctrines of Luther. To such testimony, no Protestant can reasonably object; for whatever their defects as witnesses when testifying against Popery, all Protestants are good witnesses against themselves. Now, what says the witness in this case as to the "self-denial" of Luther?

Luther's notions were certainly lax on certain departments of morals. He was deficient in the spirit of self-denial, and seemed all "carnality," he said and did what he liked; he unhesitatingly attributed to the immediate agency of the devil all that

thwarted his plans and wishes—the swelling of a stream when he wanted to cross it, a giddiness in the head when he desired to write. He made himself and his own views the infallible standard of truth, theological and practical, for all men.

Rather strange characteristics these of a "Man of God" and of one raised up by the Lord to reform His Church! and yet the Protestant *Guardian* comes to the conclusion respecting this man—whose morals on certain departments—(chastity and sobriety)—"were lax"—who was notorious amongst his cotemporaries as a gross sensualist, a regular theological Falstaff, and a right merrie fellow over a bowl of punch—who could not brook the slightest contradiction in any form, and who invariably said and did, not according to God's will, but, "what he liked"—that, "we cannot doubt that he strove to serve God with all his heart, and that his life was a conscientious, and with certain exceptions, a holy one." As a qualification however of Luther's "holy life"—with of course "certain exceptions" to which decency prevents us more particularly to allude—the *Guardian* adds that "that man must be undiscerning indeed, or hoodwinked by his prejudices, who cannot see in Luther's character, conduct, and writings the germs of that which distinguishes his nation to this day—the warm heart, and somewhat loose moral notions—the worship of nature; and the vagueness and carelessness of creed—the poetry hand in hand with Pantheism, or Fatalism, or Epicureanism." This Protestant apology for Luther's laxity of morals, strongly reminds us of the indignant old lady who—"barring that she was a thief and a w— and given to drink"—defied any one to say "that black was the white of her eye."

According to the same writer, Luther not only resembled honest Jack Falstaff in his love of wine and women, but in other points—such as courage and love of truth. In other words, according to the *Guardian*, this man of God was not only a sensualist, but a coward at heart, a bully and braggadocio, and a most unscrupulous liar. *Non noster hic sermo.*

"Luther," says the Protestant *Guardian*, "was perhaps as resolute and fearless as any man, but he had a large infusion of the better part of valor. He was daring upon calculation. He would go the Diet of Worms, though there were as many devils there as there are roof tiles; yet he took good care both at Worms and at Augsburg afterwards, to have the Emperor's safe conduct before he went."

Now this is honest "Jack" to a title. "Jack" was full of valor—"as valiant as Hercules"—but beware instinct; and "Jack" occasionally was "a coward on instinct," just as Luther was on "calculation." That Luther was an unscrupulous liar, the *Guardian* fully admits; for after quoting some of our Protestant "man of God's" letters to the Pope, full of professions of submission and obedience, the *Guardian* significantly adds:—

"Whether this specimen of diplomacy—not a whit stronger, be it observed, than several others which might be quoted—quite bears out the encomium of Luther, for 'truthfulness and the simplicity of a child,' &c., our readers can judge for themselves."

And again:—

"He—Luther—"gave himself full license for dissimulation and deceit of every kind when he thought it necessary, and not a little relished his own success."

This, be it remembered, is the testimony of one who has "no doubt" that Luther "strove to serve God with all his heart, and that his life was a conscientious, and with certain exceptions, a holy one." Perhaps so; but measured by the same moral standard as that which the Protestant *Guardian* here applies to the "author of the Holy Protestant Faith," Falstaff must be esteemed a saint, and Doll-Tear-Sheet, his well beloved, should be classed amongst the Virgins and Martyrs of the first ages of the Catholic Church.

Of Luther, as the theologian, and expounder of the Scripture, the *Guardian* speaks in the following terms:—

"Luther denied the canonicity of the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as the Book of Revelations. When Scripture indeed went against his opponents, there was no more thorough-going stickler for the letter than Luther. . . . But when the obvious literal sense of Scripture went against himself, no one more unscrupulously tampered with it than Luther. His dogma of justification, without works, infringes in various evident points far more sharply upon the teaching of the New Testament than does that of Zuingli; and is certainly in direct verbal contradiction to the teaching of St. James."

Such, according to Protestant testimony, was the great Apostle of the Reformation, "morally and theologically." Lax in his morals, the sensual, self-indulgent enemy of all asceticism, headstrong and irritable, doing in all things his own will, "a perfect master of the art of dissimulation," and the unscrupulous perverter of God's Holy Word. And yet are to believe that this man was ordained by God to reform His Church; that this man so impure in his habits, and whose language was so filthy, so disgustingly obscene that at the present day no one would dare to translate it into the vulgar tongue—so brutal in his manners, and so overbearing to his neighbors that even Melancthon speaks of his connection with Luther as "servitium prene deformem"—so regardless of truth, that he "gave himself full license for dissimulation, and deceit of every kind," and who unscrupulously tampered with Holy Writ—was selected by the Holy One, the God of all truth—to preach His Holy Word

unto all nations! This is the task that Protestants impose upon us, these the demands they make upon our credulity, when they ask us to recognise the hand of God in the great religious apostasy of the XIX century. No, we reply; we cannot believe that that Reformation was from God, unless He be the God of lust, falsehood and all impurity.

ORANGEISM IN IRELAND.—On our second page will be found a notice of the decided action against Orangeism, at last taken by the British Government. The late outbreaks in Ireland are now officially attributed to the Orange Societies; and in consequence, the Lord Chancellor, after laying down the sound constitutional principle that such societies should not be allowed to "receive countenance from any in authority who are responsible for the preservation of the public peace"—has issued positive instructions that henceforward no member of any Orange Society be appointed a Magistrate—and that from every person placed on the Commission of the Peace a distinct pledge be exacted that he is not an Orangeman, and does not intend to become one, during the time he "owns the commission of the Peace." His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has expressed his entire approval of this arrangement.

Were we inclined to indulge in self-laudation we might indeed point with a feeling akin to pride to the fact, that the Imperial Government has laid down for its guidance the identical principles which the TRUE WITNESS has, from the beginning, and single-handed amongst the Canadian press, advocated; and that the Lord Chancellor has adopted the very policy towards Orangeism, the advocacy of which by the TRUE WITNESS has exposed us to many ungenerous reflections from our cotemporaries. Long ago we pointed out the evils with which we were menaced by the official countenance given to Orangeism by "those in authority who are most deeply responsible for the preservation of the public peace," and indicated the constitutional remedy which it was alike our duty and our interest to adopt.—Single handed, we say, we fought the battle; for alas! such was the servility of too many of our Catholic cotemporaries, such was their dread of offending their patrons, the dispensers of official good things, that even Catholics seemed willing to put up tamely with the gross, unpardonable insult offered to them by the Governor-General, and his Ministerial advisers on the 12th of July, 1856. We can now however boast that the truth of the principles laid down, and that the justice and prudence of the policy advocated, by the TRUE WITNESS, have been formally recognised by the Imperial authorities.—It remains then only that the same principles, the same policy, be applied to, and followed out in British North America; and that henceforward no "countenance from any in authority," be given to Orangeism, and that no person, not willing to take the pledge that he is not, and has no design of becoming, a member of an Orange Society, be appointed to the "Commission of the Peace."

How are these objects to be attained? We answer, by union, and honesty of purpose, amongst Catholics of all origins. "Place-hunting," and the old system of truckling to "Jack-in-Office" must be abandoned; the "Government-hack" must be held up to well merited contempt, and our rulers and our representatives made to feel that the only terms upon which they need expect the support of the Catholic vote, are these—1st—that they abstain from encouraging or giving any official countenance to Orangeism; 2nd—that they exclude from the Magistracy, not only every known Orangeman, but every one who will not pledge himself to abstain from all connection with any secret political society during the time "he owns the commission of the peace."

For unless such measures be promptly taken, the same outrages that have lately disgraced Belfast, and the North of Ireland will we fear be renewed in Canada. It was only owing to the great forbearance of our Catholic population under wanton insult from the Orangemen, and the influence of our Catholic clergy, that the streets of Montreal on the 12th of July last, were not the theatre of a bloody conflict. If unfortunately no steps be taken betwixt this and next July, if in the interval the same policy towards Orangeism that has been adopted in Ireland, be not adopted in Canada, we have, from the daily increasing influence of Orangeism, and the violent boasts of its supporters, only too good reason to dread that the 12th of July 1858 will be signalised by fatal collisions betwixt Orangemen, and those whom they insult by their processions, and that many valuable lives will be lost in consequence. Should such be the case—then on the head of Sir Edmund Head—on the heads of his Ministerial advisers—on the heads of all persons who, "responsible for the preservation of the public peace," have "countenanced" Orangeism, or not done their utmost to discountenance it—be the blood of the slain. They, and they only, will be responsible for it to God and man.

In the meantime shall we, Catholics, still be idle? Should we not avail ourselves of our con-

stitutional right to petition the Imperial Parliament, and thus to bring before the notice of that august tribunal the unconstitutional, ungentlemanly conduct of the man who still, unfortunately for us, misrepresents our gracious Sovereign?—and at the coming election, should we not by our votes, inflict a well deserved punishment upon those who as the Governor General's responsible advisers, must be looked upon by us as responsible for the gross insult offered to us last year?—and who, in defiance of the well known principles of the British Constitution have given official "countenance" to an infamous, because secret political society? These hints would we throw out to our readers, reminding them that if they wish God to help them, they must first help themselves.

Our talented cotemporary, the *New Era*, has some valuable remarks upon this same subject, and recommends to his readers the following course of action, which we likewise submit to the consideration of our friends:—

"Form without loss of time an anti-Orange Association throughout Canada, substituting publicity for secrecy, branches for lodges, free to all men, open and above board in all its operations, with a few simple rules, a small fee for membership, and periodical public meetings. Let this Society, by diffusing information as to the true nature of the Order, preserve new dupes from joining it; let them at all elections strengthen the hands of that man, whoever he may be, who boldly comes out against patronizing Orangemen; let them by petitions to Parliament, and other constitutional means, keep Ministers informed of their duty, and inspired with a lively sense of their responsibility. In one sentence, let them meet conspiracy by association, darkness by light, intolerance by liberality, secrecy by publicity, hatred by reason, and numbers by numbers."

CONVERSIONS.—From extracts from the London press which we have given in another column, it will be seen that a serious defection from the Parliamentary church of England is about to take place, even if it has not already occurred; and that several eminent clergymen of the Anglican sect are about to join the Catholic Church. In this we see the result of causes which have long been, and still are, in operation in the bosom of the Establishment; and from which we may confidently expect results more decisive, as the consequences of the late decisions of the legal tribunals, contradicting the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, become more patent to, and more fully appreciated by, those well meaning, but mistaken men who have hitherto refrained from becoming Catholics, because they still labored under the extraordinary delusion that the Parliamentary Church of England, "As by Law Established," was part and parcel of the Church of Christ. This delusion has been for ever dissipated by the late decisions of the Courts of Law—to which, in spite of their previous loud boasts, the far greater part of the office-bearers of the said Establishment have tamely submitted. Indeed, how any truly conscientious person, calling himself a Christian, can for a moment remain in communion with a Church whose bishops, in their legislative capacity, have sanctioned, and whose "only Supreme Head upon earth," has formally ratified, the violation of Christ's laws against Adultery—is to the Catholic an inexplicable mystery; or at all events, one which he can account for only upon the hypothesis of Satanic agency, and diabolical possession.

The passing of the "Adultery Bill" of last session by the Legislature, must give a death blow to the Anglo-Catholic system. One by one have its unhappy members, the Tractarians, seen their fine-spun theories ruthlessly swept away by the besom of the law. In the consecration of an avowed Sabellian bishop, they witnessed the formal renunciation, by the Establishment, of the doctrine of the Trinity; the decision pronounced by the Privy-Council against "Baptismal Regeneration," was followed by the surrender of the last relic of the Sacramentarian system. They still cling fondly to their lights and altars, but the one are extinguished, and the others must be removed; for in them no power of offering sacrifice—the characteristic office of the Christian priesthood—is recognised, and the doctrines of Calvin, and of Zuinglius, respecting the Blessed Eucharist, are now alone tolerated within the walls of the Parliamentary Zion. All these things have tended to disabuse the minds of Anglicans of the absurd notion, that the Anglican, is a Branch of that Catholic Church, which teaches the doctrines of the Trinity, and of Baptismal Regeneration—and the office of whose priests it has ever been, since the first day of Christianity, to offer the true and proper sacrifice of the real body and blood of Christ; but the law of last session, formally legalising adultery and polygamy, passed by a Legislature of which Anglican Bishops are an integral part, and assented to by the "Supreme Head of the Anglican Church"—has given that notion its "coup de grace," and rendered the position of the "Tractarians" henceforward untenable.

Meanwhile poor dear Dr. Sumner in an address to his clergy "deplores the spread of Romish principles, and of latitudinarian speculation, together with the indifference, and demoralisation of the working classes, &c." Alas! good man; he sees not that the indifference to religion, of the "working classes" is but the natural and direct result of the open contempt for the laws of Christianity manifested by the upper classes in

their scandalous disregard of Christ's positive precepts respecting the inviolability of the marriage union; and that the "demoralisation" which he deplores, is but the consequence of that depravity of morals which prevails in the halls of the Legislature, and even on the Bench of Bishops. What right have the Bishops of the Church of England to expect that the "working classes" shall respect the laws of Christ or of morality, when they themselves set the example of a violation of those laws, by sanctioning adultery, and legalising polygamy?

The "spread of Romish principles" is also but the reaction caused amongst the honest and devout members of the Establishment, by the scandalous disregard of truth, and the vile truckling to the civil power, of the Anglican ecclesiastical authorities. A lie, even a Protestant lie, cannot live for ever. A sham must be seen through at last; and Anglicanism the most transparent of shams, cannot expect to be for ever impenetrable to mortal eyes, nor can Bishops and ecclesiastical dignitaries whose official lives are one continuous lie from beginning to end, hope to be believed because of their wigs. Romanism, or Latitudinarianism, Catholicity, or Infidelity, these are the only issues that present themselves to the earnest inquirer after truth; and those of the Anglican clergy who are susceptible of logic, and who are at the same time honest, must inevitably accept one or the other, for no middle ground is logically tenable, as Dr. Sumner himself in substance admits. "Questions" he says in his address quoted above—"had been raised in influential quarters concerning the Divine inspiration of that authority"—King James' Bible—"which for so many years had been unquestioned." To such questions it is clear that neither Dr. Sumner, nor any other Protestant, can give a satisfactory answer; all that he, or any other Protestant can do when such "questions are raised" is to raise a counter cry of "Infidelity" or "Romanism" as the case may be; thus showing that, in their opinion, either one or the other of these must be the fate of the earnest mind which once presumes to do its own thinking, and to raise questions concerning the Divine inspiration of the authority upon which it rests its hopes of eternal life. To this one issue must all controversies between Catholics and Protestants come at last.

The *Montreal Witness* institutes the following comparison betwixt the clearly proved fraudulent bankruptcy of the "Montreal Provident and Savings Bank," and the very suspicious failure of the St. Roch's Bank at Quebec:—

"The St. Roch's Bank had had an officially religious character. It was instituted by the Roman Catholic Association of St. Vincent de Paul, and indeed, was, as stated by the officers of the community, its special 'work,' which in the Romish sense means a religious meritorious practice. The Montreal Savings Bank was never a religious institution, or connected with any church or religious society. The St. Roch's Savings Bank, if we are to credit the *National*, is bankrupt because of the dishonesty of its directors who have still the property in their hands; the other bank failed only through the dishonesty of a paid agent, and not by that of any of its directors. The Provident and Savings Bank of Montreal paid eventually almost in full its depositors, the real losers being those who foolishly, and against the advice of the directors, parted with their deposit-books at a heavy discount; but in Quebec it appears depositors get nothing at all."

There is scarce a word of truth in the above extract. The St. Roch's Bank had not "an officially religious character" because—although originally connected with, though not instituted by, a society of laymen, called the Society of St. Vincent de Paul—from its refusal to comply with the terms upon which alone that connection could be maintained, it had for many years before its failure, entirely separated itself from the said Society.

As no official "Report" has been issued by Government upon the affairs of the said Bank, we do not feel ourselves justified in expressing our private opinion of its management. We may however be permitted to indulge in the hope, that the conduct of its Directors will yet be subjected to the most searching scrutiny, and that if any, or all of them be proved guilty of dishonest practices, they may be punished without mercy, and with the extreme rigor of the law, and that they may be hooted out of society. Already, as we have observed once before, one person suspected only of improper conduct, has been summarily expelled from the Society of St. Vincent de Paul of which he was a member; thus showing how little disposed Catholics are to screen from punishment any of their peccant brethren, and how very little sympathy the Society of St. Vincent de Paul has with those who, in the words of the *Courier du Canada*, "unmindful of the dictates of prudence, and ignoring the teachings of the Church, misapplied a trust that had been reposed in them."

We know not how far the *Witness* is correct in stating that "in Quebec depositors get nothing at all"; but his assertion that "the Provident and Savings Bank of Montreal paid eventually almost in full all its depositors"—and that those who parted with their deposit books at a heavy discount did so "against the advice of the directors"—we pronounce, and upon the authority of the *Official Report*, to be a monstrous untruth. In that *Report* it is proved—in the first place, that