

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 663 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLBERK, 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.
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 True Witness can be had at the News Depot, Single copies 3d.
The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week show 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, JUNE 4, 1869.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.
JUNE—1869.
Friday, 4—Sacred Heart of Jesus.
Saturday, 5—St. John Nepomucene, M.
Sunday, 6—Third after Pentecost.
Monday, 7—St. Venantius, M.
Tuesday, 8—St. Peter Cel., P. C.
Wednesday, 9—St. Paschal of Baylon, C.
Thursday, 10—St. Margaret, W.

REMOVAL
The Office of this paper has removed to No. 663 Craig Street, one door off Bleury.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Irish Church Bill is no longer the great political question of the day. That measure has passed through the House of Commons with such large majorities in its favor, that all fears for its ultimate success in the House of Lords are set at rest, and public attention is now directed to the other, and far more difficult Irish question—that relating to land. The Ministry have pretty plainly given the country to understand that it is not their intention to deal with that great and intricate question, the most intricate question that ever British Legislature has had to deal with—this session: and in the meantime it can hardly be expected that Irish discontent will in any sensible degree subside. It is most probable that, when the Ministry do address themselves seriously to the preparing of a measure for the settlement of the Irish Land question, a split in the Cabinet will occur: for Mr. Bright has already publicly committed himself to certain extreme views, which it is not probable that the majority of his Ministerial colleagues will adopt. As an Irish reformer Mr. Gladstone's real troubles are all to come; for the Irish Church reform is but child's play compared with the formidable work that awaits the Minister who shall attempt to settle the social grievances of Ireland that have their origin in the tenure of land.
The most interesting item of Continental news is the French elections. Though many extreme republicans have been returned, it is pretty certain that the Emperor will have a majority. In Spain matters seem to be going from bad to worse: the finances are in a most dilapidated condition, and no appearance of the establishment of a settled government of any kind for that distracted country present themselves upon the political horizon. No events of any importance have occurred since our last in the Italian Peninsula.

The Alabama claims, and Mr. Sumner's speech still continue to form one of the chief topics discussed in the United States press, and by American correspondents of the English journals. That the relations betwixt the two countries are in a very precarious condition no one can doubt: but unless Great Britain find herself engaged in war with some of the European Powers, it is the general opinion, confirmed by the tone of the more respectable section of the U. States press, that war betwixt them is not imminent. The policy of the U. States seems to be to keep the Alabama question still an open question, as affording a possible *casus belli*, to be urged, and made use of when Great Britain shall have her hands full. We are firmly convinced, moreover, that, no matter what Treaty on the subject might be agreed to by the governments or official rulers of the respective countries, the real rulers of the U. States, that is to say the nobocracy, would not ratify it, but would in case, of a war in which Great Britain was involved, act in all respects as if no such Treaty were in existence, or had received the assent of their ostensible rulers. The manner in which the proposal that Great Britain should, in the settlement of the Alabama claims, hand over her North American Colonies to the U. States, has been received in our legislature, has elicited the warm sympathies of the English press: the people of England see therein the proof of our sincere attachment to our Queen, and our determination to uphold British connection, in which is to be found the sole guarantee for our liberties, and national existence. "Independence" is but a Clear Grit mode of spelling "Annexation;" and thus every one endowed with even a

very moderate allowance of political foresight cannot fail to see.

Some of the Dublin papers publish what purports to be the substance of the contents of the papers in the case of O'Farrell, the half mad, half drunken fellow who tried to shoot H. R. H. the Duke of Edinburgh. We do not know how far the statements of the Dublin papers are to be relied upon, nor do we feel inclined to put implicit confidence therein. No official verification of these statements has been made public: if genuine, which is fairly open to doubt, they connect the act of O'Farrell with the Fenian organisation, and prove that he was the agent of a party who had determined upon avenging the execution of Allen, and others who were hung for the murder of the policeman at the time of the rescue of Kelly.

Some questions have been addressed to us respecting an article that appeared in the *Evening Telegraph* of the 12th ult., reviewing a book published by a Father Felix, an apostate priest, in explanation of his having left the Catholic Church. Of course every one knows the reasons which compel the unhappy man to whose class this Father Felix belongs, to leave the Church: the evidence adduced in the famous case of Belial Achilli is conclusive on this point: and therefore, though we know nothing of this man Father Felix, in particular, we know quite enough of degraded and suspended priests in general, to form our own conclusions as to the reasons why he left the Catholic Church.

But the questions to which we are able to reply are these. Is it true, as it is asserted in the editorial remarks of the *Evening Telegraph*, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mother of God, as defined by the present Pope, and as held by the Catholic Church, "had been condemned by Pope Innocent 5th?" and that it also had been pronounced by St. Bernard "repugnant to reason, and unsupported by ancient tradition?"

To both of these questions we answer—No. Pope Innocent 5th never condemned the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as defined by Pope Pius IX. and as held by the Catholic Church: St. Bernard never pronounced that doctrine, repugnant to reason, and unknown to tradition.

It is, of course, impossible to prove a negative. It is for the *Evening Telegraph* to show, by quoting the words of the document, that Pope Innocent 5th condemned in the 13th century, the doctrine which in the nineteenth century Pope Pius IX. defined, and declared to be the faith of the Catholic Church.

But are not the writings of St. Bernard extant, wherein addressing the Chapter of the Church at Lyons he censures them for that, without authority from Rome, they had introduced the celebration of the Feast of the Conception: and in which also he speaks of the doctrine which that celebration implied, as a novelty and as repugnant to reason?

It is true that St. Bernard did reprove the Chapter of the Church at Lyons for celebrating a Festival without authority from Rome: and it is also true that, speaking in the same letter of the "active," not the "passive," conception of the B. Virgin—he condemned the opinion—which it is to be supposed some entertained, that the conception of the B. Virgin was immaculate and miraculous in the womb of her mother St. Anne, in the same sense as the conception of Our Blessed Lord Himself in the womb of His Virgin Mother was immaculate and miraculous—as erroneous, as repugnant to reason and tradition, and unknown to the Catholic Church. What it was that St. Bernard thus condemned may be judged from the subjoined extracts from the letter in question:—

"Et si licet lequi quod Ecclesia sentit, et verum ipsa sentit: dico gloriosam de Spiritu Sancto conceptionem, non autem et conceptam fuisse: dico peperisse virginem, non tamen et partam a virgine. Alioquin ubi erit prerogativa Matris Domini, qua singulariter creditur exultare et munere prole, at integri tate carnis, si tantumdem dederit et Matri ipsius? Non est hanc Virginem honorare, sed honori detrachere."—St. Bern. Ep. 174.

This passage shows clearly what it was that St. Bernard protested against—to wit, the opinion that the Blessed Virgin was herself born of a pure Virgin; even as she herself, her virginity remaining, conceived in her womb, and gave birth to Our Blessed Lord. This opinion must be false argues the great saint and doctor, zealous for the honor and the peculiar or singular prerogatives of the Virgin Mother of God: for otherwise, wherein he asks, would this special or singular prerogative consist, if her mother shared it with her?

This opinion then which the Church to-day condemns, St. Bernard in the 13th century condemned: but the dogma which Pope Pius IX. defined, which the Catholic Church holds, to wit—that the B. Mother of God was never for one moment the slave of Satan, or stained with sin either actual or original, could never have been condemned by the great Saint who in his sermon *In Nativitate B. V. Mariæ* insists so eloquently upon the excellence of Mary over the Angels, who certainly never were stained by sin, but who from the very first moment of their existence were immaculate. We must judge a

writer's meaning not by an isolated passage, but by its context: and in this case the context and the whole tenor of St. Bernard's argument shows clearly that that which he condemned as contrary to reason, tradition, and the constant belief of the Church, was the opinion that the B. Virgin was conceived in the womb of her mother by the immediate and miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit.

Besides, St. Bernard knew well that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as defined by Pius IX. and now believed by all Catholics, was coeval with Christianity; that in the East it had been held from the first ages, and had been asserted by all the Oriental Fathers. Indeed, so ancient, so universally spread was the belief in the Immaculate Conception of the B. Virgin, that even Mahomet incorporated it into his new creed, though certainly it was not his object, or his policy to glorify Christianity at the expense of Mahomedanism. Thus in the *Koran*—we quote from Lane's translation—we read how the traditions, even at the early date when that book was composed, said that "no child is born but the devil hath touched it at the time of its birth, wherefore it first raises its voice by crying—*repting Mary, and Her Son*." Of course what the *Koran* says is no argument for the truth of any doctrine: but in this case it is conclusive as to the antiquity and universality of the present doctrine of the Catholic Church as to the immunity of the Blessed Virgin from the stain of original sin; since Mahomet found it necessary to borrow it from the Christians, with whom he came in contact, and from whom as well as from the Jews he got the materials for his pretended revelation.

As to the reasonableness of the doctrine in question we need not insist. As it is only from revelation that we know that any of the human race are conceived immaculate: as but for that revelation, the reasonable presumption would be that all were conceived immaculate, there can be nothing contrary to reason in the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin was so conceived.

A REAL REFORM.—We are glad to see that the Legislature at Ottawa has passed a Bill making a certain class of offences, such as garrotte robberies, and personal outrages, punishable with the lash, as they are in England, to the great advantage of the public. Of course a measure of such utility could not expect to escape opposition: and accordingly we are not surprised that it was attacked by M. Dorion, seconded by M. Masson of Terrebonne. These gentlemen argued against the proposed valuable reform in our criminal code, on the ground that corporal punishment was antiquated, cruel and barbarous. Their proposed amendment was, however, we are happy to say rejected by a majority of 76 to 40.

No doubt the infliction of corporal punishment is antiquated; so also are the crimes which it is inflicted to prevent. So are all punishments, whether fines or imprisonment: and if its antiquity be a reason for discarding flogging, by parity of reason the infliction of any punishment whatsoever upon any offenders against social order, should be at once abrogated as antiquated as very antiquated indeed.

But flogging is, we are told "cruel and barbarous." So also are the crimes which it is proposed thereby to repress, and therefore the punishment is admirably in harmony with the antecedents which provoked it. Cruel and barbarous crimes, which often maim and cripple their victims for life, can only be checked by the dread of cruel and barbarous punishments—that is punishments which inflict severe pain upon the offender. The only proper stand point from whence to consider the question of corporal punishment is the stand point of expediency.—Does it, or does it not, tend to check the perpetration of the offences for which it is inflicted? If it fail in this, not a word can be urged in its behalf of its adoption, or of its retention; if it does, it should be adopted, and maintained.

The protection of the lives and properties of its peaceful, and unoffending subjects is the first, the most important duty of every State, and if it fail in this duty, it has no right to their allegiance. It is the bounden duty of the State,—not merely its right, which it may if it so please waive, but its duty—to prevent outrages upon person and property; and for this purpose not only are all means always lawful to it, but it is in duty bound to adopt such means, no matter how severe, how cruel or how barbarous, as shall most effectually subserve that purpose. Experience shows that dread of punishment is, to those who have, in their career of crime, cast aside all moral restraints, and conscientious scruples, the best, the only conceivable deterrent from crime: and of all punishments, that of the lash is, after the gallows, the punishment of which members of the criminal classes stand the most in dread.

We have used the words "cruel and barbarous," but we deny that corporal punishment as applied to the criminal, is either the one or the other. It would we admit be "cruel and barbarous" in certain circumstances to cut a man's leg off: but when the operation, painful though it may be, is performed with the object of saving life, it is not only neither "cruel nor barbarous"

but eminently merciful and humane. So with corporal punishment. Its cruelty and its barbarity are determined by the circumstances which provoke it; and where applied as it is proposed to apply it, for the prevention of the spreading of a moral gangrene, and for the protection of the persons and properties of honest, loyal subjects of the State, it is a merciful measure and a most humane measure. Painful to the criminal who undergoes it, it no doubt is, and so it ought to be: but most considerate and merciful to those whom it preserves from having their bodies maimed for life, by the hands of the rascally garrotte robber. There is therefore nothing "cruel or barbarous" in the punishment, if in any degree it effects its object, the main object of all punishments inflicted by Society, viz. the protection of person and property: and the Christian, who cannot bring himself to believe that God would ever sanction either cruelty or barbarism, will bear in mind that corporal punishment was formally sanctioned by the code of which God Himself was the author. We are not bound indeed to make that code our precedent: but no Christian can assert that corporal punishment is necessarily, and under all circumstances cruel or barbarous. Its application is a mere question of expediency: and its experience, as we contend that it does—shows that thereby certain crimes are best checked, then it is the duty, as well the right, of the human legislator to resort to it.

THE PROCESSION.—On Sunday last, being within the Octave of *Corpus Christi*, the usual Procession in honor of the Blessed Sacrament took place. The weather was all that could be desired, and we are happy to say that every thing went off in the most orderly manner. The streets along which, according to the programme published in our last, the Procession passed was crowded with spectators, to many of whom the sight must have been strange. No obstructions were however offered; and in Montreal we have but to congratulate ourselves upon the *entente cordiale* betwixt Catholics and Protestants that obtains. Long may this continue to be the case.

We have been requested to state that Rev. Father O'Brien of St. Patrick's Church, will place in the hands of the collectors, the list of the annual collections in aid of the St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum, during the course of the present week. It is also requested that the collectors will have the goodness to give in their returns before the end of the present month.
June 1st, 1869.

The editor of the *Witness* is of opinion that the manager of the Catholic Deaf and Dumb School, would have done much better to invite the writer of the false and malicious libel of the *Witness*, 12th April, imputing dishonesty, if not murder, to the said manager, to a conference, than to threaten him with a prosecution.

THE EXODUS.—Our City contemporaries publish a very important letter from Mr. Brydges, showing that the amount of the so called exodus of French Canadians has been much exaggerated. Mr. Brydges has had returns sent to him from all the Railroad stations in Lower Canada, and from these it appears that some 200 or 300 families, have left the country; but that of those who do go to the States, numbers return in the autumn with money in their pockets.

TRINITY ORDINATIONS.—The Trinity Ordinations of the Ecclesiastical Students attending the Grand Seminary of this city, took place in the beautiful Chapel of the Grand Seminary, on Saturday last, 22nd ult. The Right Rev. Dr. LaRocque, Bishop of St. Hyacinthe, was the officiating Prelate on the occasion.

The Ordinations was preceded by a spiritual Retreat of eight days as a preparation thereto, in which the Rev. Messrs. Colin and O'Farrell, two of the gifted and eloquent Preachers of the Order, took an active part.

The Ceremony on Saturday morning was very beautiful and imposing. Several of the friends of the *Ordinations* both cleric, and laic, were present thereat.

The subjoined is a list of the names of those who participated therein.
Priesthood—Rev. Messrs. P. C. Dufresne, and P. N. E. Demers, of the Diocese of Montreal.

Deaconship—Messrs. M. Auclair, J. T. Giroux, G. Paul, of the Diocese of Montreal; J. Smith of the Diocese of Hartford, and E. McKenna, of the Diocese of New York.

Subdeaconship—Messrs. F. T. Racicot, J. B. Proulx, F. Kavanagh, of the Diocese of Montreal; J. Finnegan, and J. Basum, of the Society of Jesus; W. Kelly, of the Diocese of Boston, and L. B. Demers, of the Diocese of Chicago.

Minor Orders—Messrs. T. Caisse, M. A. Deschamps, of the Diocese of Montreal; S. Doucet, F. J. McManus, P. W. Dixon and T. J. Bannon of the Diocese of Chatham, N. B.; J. S. Cullen, of the Diocese of Boston; E. F. Barron, of the Diocese of Vincennes; J. Mc-

Leod, of the Diocese of Arichat; and P. P. Shaban, of the Diocese of Hartford.

Tonsure—Messrs. T. A. Thibault and M. Carroll, of the Diocese of Montreal; A. Brady, D. Desmond, and H. Lynch, of the Diocese of Hartford; A. J. Bernard, of the Diocese of St. Hyacinthe; J. Ansbro and P. Gilmore, of the Diocese of Sandwich; W. Berigan, of the Diocese of Toronto; F. X. Cormier, M. Dolan and R. L. Knox, of the Diocese of St. John, N. B.; M. J. Letellier and C. O'Neill, of the Diocese of Boston; H. McGuire, of the Diocese of Chicago and T. H. Wallace, of the Diocese of Portland; and J. McMahon.

PILGRIMAGE OF THE "BROTHERS BOYS" TO THE CHURCH OF "NOTRE DAME DE BONSECOURS."—Last Friday the Brothers' boys made their annual pilgrimage to Bonsecours Church. Our city dailies estimate the number of children to have been about 4,500. One thing certain, it was an imposing sight to the numerous spectators who stood at the corner of Notre Dame and St. Denis Streets.

From this point down the whole length of St. Denis Street might be seen one uninterrupted line of young boys, each school headed by its banners, flags and pendants. Their juvenile band players kept the youngsters in merry spirits by the numerous fine pieces they discoursed.

Those of our readers that have seen the Bonsecours Church will easily conceive that it was quite too small to receive into its narrow precincts the multitude of boys that were wending their way towards the shrine of "Our Lady of Good Help." Accordingly as the children arrived, their respective teachers formed them into a square before the Church door, which was thrown wide open. An act of consecration to the Blessed Virgin was then read in French and in English.

During the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament which followed this consecration, the vast crowd of children united in one chorus and sang two or three appropriate Hymns.

The grandeur of this symphony was most affecting to the great number of by-standers, very many of whom joined instinctively their voice with those of the pupils. The Church bell had scarcely told the moment of giving Benediction, when every head bowed in humble adoration. At a second signal all arose, and after chanting the "Laudate," filed off to their schools in the greatest possible order.

What a consolation for our Catholic population to have their children confided to the care of those worthy disciples of the Venerable de la Salle, who not only give them an excellent Commercial Education, but likewise inculcate into their youthful minds solid, religious, and moral principles.—Com.

The members of the Committee of the St. Patrick's Society are making preparations for their Grand Annual Pic Nic, which will be held on the 1st of July (Dominion Day.)

MONTREAL DIRECTORY.—Mr. Lovell is about to bring out his Montreal Directory for '69 '70. The price of this valuable work will be \$2, payable on delivery.

STATISTICS OF CANADA—1867 '68.—We have to acknowledge the receipt of two volumes of the Statistics of Canada, for the year above indicated.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD—June, 1869.—D. & J. Sadler, Montreal:

We always hail with pleasure the appearance of this most excellent, and truly Catholic Magazine. The present number is in no whit inferior to any of its predecessors. We give list of contents, reminding our readers that they may procure the work for the trifling sum of \$4 per annum, or 38 cents per monthly number, remitted in advance to the Messrs. Sadler, Montreal who on receipt of the money will forward the copy to the required address:—

1. Spiritism and Spirits.
2. Dyabreak.
3. Good Old Saxon.
4. Waiting.
5. The Supernatural.
6. Two Months in Spain during the life Revolution.
7. The Approaching Council of the Vatican.
8. St. Mary's.
9. A May Carol.
10. St. Peter, First Bishop of Rome.
11. A Rumed Life.
12. The Philosophy of Immigration.
13. Vigil.
14. The Geography of Roses.
15. Spanish Life and Character.
16. Filial Affection, as taught and practised by the Chinese.
17. New Publications.
18. Foreign Literary Notices.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW—April, 1869.—Messrs. Dawson Bros., Montreal:

We have seen better numbers, but the one before us is by no means destitute of interest. It contains articles on the following subjects:—1. South Africa; 2. The Gladstone Government; 3. Liberty and Light; 4. Domestic Fireplaces; 5. Alfred de Musset; 6. Mr. Mill's Speech on Capital Punishment; 7. The Philanthropy of the Age in relation to Social Evils; 8. Primary Education; 9. National Duty; 10. Contemporary Literature.