

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 696, Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a 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 Depots. Single copy 3d.
We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.
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, SEPT. 28.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

SEPTEMBER—1866.
Friday, 20—St. Wenceslaus, M.
Saturday, 21—St. Michael, Arch.
Sunday, 22—Nineteenth after Pentecost. St. Jerome, D.
OCTOBER—1866.
Monday, 1—St. Romi, B. O.
Tuesday, 2—Holy Guardian Angels.
Wednesday, 3—Of the Feria.
Thursday, 4—St. Francis d'Assise, C.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Nothing of importance in European politics has occurred during the past week. We hear no more of the dispute reported as having broken out between Austria and Piedmont, with reference to the Venetian debt. We may suppose, therefore that the difficulty, if it ever existed, has been got over; and the Venetians will now be called upon, under the strong influence of Piedmontese bayonets, to vote for the final degradation of their country to the rank of a Piedmontese Province. A really free vote of the people would probably have a very different issue. In the South of Italy, and amongst the Neapolitans, the hatred of Piedmontese rule is spreading and becoming stronger. The people are crushed with new taxes; and the cruel conscription which carries off their young men to swell the ranks of the army of their conqueror, is driving them to acts of almost open revolt. Rome is still tranquil. What will become of the Pope? what he will do? and where he will seek shelter from his foes? when the French shall have finally left Rome are questions in everybody's mouth, but to which as yet no answer can be given.

Lamirande the notorious swindler, for whom so much very natural sympathy was felt and expressed by a certain class in Canada, has been handed over to the French authorities, at whose hands we trust he may receive the due reward of his many villainies.

Rumors of a Fenian raid are again rife; but although it becomes our authorities to be on their guard, we can hardly believe that, unless the U. States' Government has made up its mind for war with Great Britain, it will again allow its own citizens, to engage in hostilities with a Province of the British Empire. For electioneering purposes, it may indeed for a time coquet with Fenianism, and wink at the violation of its own municipal laws: but when the alternative of either enforcing these laws, or of war, is fairly presented to it, we can scarce believe that it will elect in favor of the latter.

There have been two or three days without rain, and these we hope may be enable the farmers of Lower Canada to save some portion of their crops.

From the Montreal Witness of the 20th inst., we clip the following paragraph:—

We understand that the interest excited by Prof. Tachella, both in lecturing before the Institut Canadien and at Nordheimer's Hall, on Tuesday evening, has suggested the idea to many of a mass meeting to hear the professor's account of a country in which we are all so deeply interested, and to convey through him our good wishes to his nation. Should this idea be matured, we will announce the time and place.

The person alluded to in the above as Prof. Tachella is an itinerant anti-Catholic lecturer; who, under the pretence of treating of Italy, abuses the Pope, the Italian clergy, and the Religious Orders, after the style of Gavazzi. Now so long as he does this in chambers hired by himself for the purpose, no one has any right to complain, or interfere; no one has any right to attend the man's lecture with the intention of obstructing, contradicting, or manifesting disapproval of, the lecturer. In a Hall by him paid for, he is at home, and has a perfect right to demand the protection of the law.

But the case would be very different were he to address a public meeting in the open air, or were any of the public buildings of the City placed at his disposal. This to us, we may be mistaken however, seems to be the drift of the paragraph in the Witness, and if so, all lovers of peace and order will protest before hand against the carrying out of the design. A lecture upon

Italy at the present moment, must necessarily be to a considerable extent controversial, or to use a vulgar phrase "sectarian" in character. It would necessarily be to a considerable extent, either a Catholic or an anti-Catholic, either a pro-Popery or a no-Popery lecture; and neither the one nor the other should be given before a "mass-meeting," that is to say a public meeting of the citizens generally held upon public property. At such a meeting the Catholic, and the non-Catholic would have an equal right to attend, and to manifest their sentiments of approbation or disapprobation, as the case might be. Such manifestations in a mixed community like ours would inevitably lead to a collision, and probable serious breach of the peace; and we repeat therefore, that every friend to peace, order, and harmony should protest against any occasion being given for them.

From all public meetings, in a word, all political, or politico-religious questions should be carefully eliminated; above all such delicate, and irritating politico-questions as a lecture upon Italy, whether delivered by a partizan, or by an opponent of the Revolution would inevitably give rise to. For the Italian question, now that Austrian dominion is at an end, is as much, as is far more, an ecclesiastical question than it is a secular question; and without expressing any opinion whatsoever, good, bad, or indifferent, about Professor Tachella or his mode of treating his subjects, we protest against its being treated at all at a "mass-meeting" of the citizens of Montreal—interpreting these words "mass-meeting" in their ordinary and most obvious sense.

No! Let Prof. Tachella lecture as often and as loudly as he will; let him denounce to his heart's content the vices of the Catholic clergy of Italy, and the abuses of ecclesiastical Government, provided only that he do so in places hired by him, or his friends for that purpose. Under such circumstances, if any one dislike the lecturer's sentiments or style, he has but to keep out of hearing; and if any one interfere with, or in any manner obstruct the lecturer, then at his own risk he does it, and exposes himself to well merited punishment; no good citizen can sympathize with the disturber of a private meeting. But if by "mass-meeting" the Witness means a public meeting, or a meeting held either in the open air, or in a building the property of the Corporation, then indeed, every citizen, no matter what his opinions, would have a legal and a moral right to attend, and to express his sentiments, whether favorable or unfavorable to the lecturer. Who can doubt what would be the result in a mixed community as is ours, and where party spirit runs so strong?

THE PRESBYTERIAN.—Sept. 1866.—A friend has sent us a copy of this publication, directing our attention to its leading article on "Confederation," under which caption it treats of the School Question, apparently in a very untruthful, and uncandid spirit. But as this may be the effect of pure ignorance, rather than of malice, we will, without taxing the Presbyterian with the latter, do our best to make him see the School Question as it presents itself to us; and as alone it can be dealt with by a State, or Government such as ours, which makes open profession and boast, that it has no semblance even of connexion with the Church.

A State so constituted is evidently incompetent to deal with the School Question as a religious question; it must, if it entertain it at all, entertain it without any reference to any religious considerations whatsoever. Before its tribunal Catholics and Protestants, Christians and heathen stand upon an equal footing. To it they are all alike; and if it has no right to subject any to civil disqualification or disadvantages because of his religious belief or unbelief, so neither can it recognise in the suitors before its bar, any religious distinctions, or titles whatsoever. It cannot allow any one to plead before it, either as a Catholic or as a Protestant. It knows only citizens; all having as before it, no matter what their religion, equal rights and equal duties. Whether this be a desirable state of affairs as between State and Church; whether these mutual relations of the two orders—the temporal and the spiritual—are the best conceivable, are questions with which we have now nothing to do. We simply state a fact; to wit, that by its own deliberate act, officially embodied in its Statute Book or public archives, the State in Canada has declared that it has no connexion, not even the semblance of any connexion, with the Church. Though in this declaration many prominent Catholic legislators concurred, we do not profess to admire it; and our business is simply to state, or as the French would say, "constater" the fact.

Such being the case, the State, or Canadian Legislature cannot pretend even to take cognisance of religious or conscientious scruples of any kind, so as to adjudicate upon their validity or invalidity. All that it can do is to take cognisance of their existence, and to respect and recognise them as a barrier which it has no right to overleap. It, the State, has, and can have, no jurisdiction as a Court of Conscience.

So when the Lower Canadian Protestant comes before it, and pleads that he entertains conscientious

scruples against sending his children to the Catholic Schools of the Lower Canadian majority, the Legislature cannot so much as entertain the question—"Are these scruples well or ill-founded?"—It has no jurisdiction in the domain of conscience. And so in like manner when the Catholic of Upper Canada comes before its bar, with the plea that he has conscientious scruples about sending his children to the non-Catholic Schools of the Upper Canadian majority, the Legislature is utterly incompetent to entertain the question as to the validity or the invalidity of the so urged scruples.

If a purely secular tribunal, such as is our Canadian Legislature, so much as allow that question to be raised in its presence, it violates logic, natural justice, and the fundamental principles of religious liberty, for it arrogates to itself the functions of a Court of Conscience, or spiritual tribunal. Permit it upon any pretext whatsoever to discuss and adjudicate upon the validity of conscientious scruples, and you have established the most dangerous of precedents. It was—we would fain remind the Presbyterian—upon the pretext that the alleged conscientious scruples of the Covenanters against taking the oath of allegiance, were frivolous, and that it was competent to decide upon the validity or frivolity of conscientious scruples, that the Scotch Privy Council in the seventeenth century took such vigorous measures against the refractory sect; and the sin of Lauderdale and his colleagues consisted, in the eyes of the Scotch Presbyterians, in this—not they adjudicated erroneously upon a question of conscience, but in that they presumed to adjudicate thereon at all.

This premised, and we defy the Presbyterian to impugn the validity of our premises without contradicting principles always asserted in its own behalf by the sect that it represents—it follows that the Catholic parent of U. Canada pleading his conscientious scruples against sending his child to the "mixed" or "non-Catholic school" which his religion teaches him is "altogether dangerous to faith and morals," is as much entitled to the respectful consideration of the State or Legislature, as is the Protestant parent of L. Canada, who before the same tribunal pleads his conscientious scruples against sending his child to a Catholic school. In neither case has the State the right to entertain even the question as to the validity or invalidity of the conscientious scruples urged by the several suitors at its bar. It may, in the plenitude of arbitrary power, refuse to entertain either as a plea for exemption from taxation for obnoxious school purposes—and this would be even handed tyranny; but it cannot accept the plea in one case, and ignore or disallow it in the other, without inconsistency, and a gross violation of the fundamental principles of religious liberty as laid down by Presbyterians themselves when, in the last days of the Stuart dynasty, they themselves were the victims of State tyranny and persecution.

If then the conscientious scruples of the Lower Canadian Protestant afford a valid reason why he should be exempt from all taxation for the support of a Catholic school; so also, as before a tribunal incompetent to adjudicate upon the validity or invalidity of such scruples, or to sit as a Court of Conscience, do the alleged conscientious scruples of the Upper Canadian Catholic against non-Catholic schools—which he believes to be altogether dangerous to faith and morals—afford an equally valid reason why the latter should be exempt from all taxation for the support of such schools. Whether his belief be erroneous or well founded, is a question we repeat, which the State cannot so much as rightfully entertain: for having no semblance even of connexion with the Church or spiritual Order, the State has no means by which it can determine what is, or what is not, dangerous to the faith and morals of the Catholic child.

To this line of argument, which is conclusive against the sophisms of the Presbyterian there is no reply possible save this—That the State, or civil magistrate has the right to sit in judgment upon conscientious scruples, and to adjudicate upon their validity. Will the Presbyterian assert this principle broadly and generally? We think not: for the pages of Presbyterian history in Scotland are open to contradict him. Will he assert it in a limited and particular sense, so as to mean that the State or civil magistrate has the right to adjudicate upon the conscientious scruples of Catholics? Yes: we think he will adopt this line of defence, because it is but too common for Protestants in their dealings with Catholics, to have two different sets of weights and measures, two essentially different standards of right and wrong. Our contemporary will therefore very probably argue that, though under Confederation, a Lower Canadian Legislature would be morally incompetent to sit in judgment upon the validity of the alleged conscientious scruples of the Protestant minority, an Upper Canadian Legislature would be perfectly competent to sit in judgment upon, and return a verdict against, the alleged conscientious scruples of the Catholic minority of their Province. In short, Protestants generally assume, in all controversies, that there is one law for themselves—another, and a contradictory law for their op-

ponents: and this it is that has hitherto so embarrassed the discussion of the School Question. As a preliminary therefore, essential to the profitable ventilation of the said question, we respectfully invite the Presbyterian to define its principles, as to the competency, or incompetency of a purely secular tribunal, to adjudicate upon the validity of conscientious scruples. We pause for a reply.

From a highly respected correspondent we have received a copy of certain statements made before an assembly of Orangemen on the 12th of July last, by a Mr. Bredin, a Methodist preacher, near Richmond Hill, U. C.; and we have been requested by our aforesaid correspondent to make some remarks thereon—a request with which we will do our best to comply.

It seems that this Rev. Mr. Bredin publicly assured his Orange audience on the occasion above alluded to, that "the Pope annually repeated the curse of Pius V. against England;" and being remonstrated with, the said Mr. Bredin pledged himself to adduce Catholic authority for the truth of his assertion. The result was the publication by Mr. Bredin of a paper, from which our correspondent makes, and sends us, the following extracts:—

(Ours.)

1. "Rev. Joseph Reeve—a Romish Church Historian—on page 541 of his history (Third Edition, 1851) says that 'Pius the V., in 1569 published a Bull of Excommunication and deposition against Elizabeth, and declared her subjects absolved, by his authority, from their oath of allegiance.'"

"The following are the closing sentences of the Bull, taken from Dowling's History of Romanism, page 564—and the original will be found in Burnett's History of the Reformation, vol. 4, page 99. (Dr. Reeve admits, and frequently quotes, the authority of Burnett.)"

2. "We do therefore, out of the fullness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic and a favourer of heretics, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended Title to the Kingdom aforesaid; and also the nobility, people and subjects of the said Kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, and of allegiance and obedience. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen subjects, people and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her admonitions, mandates and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we anathematize with the like sentence of anathema."

(J. Bredin notes—Neither the Blessed Saviour nor his apostles ever outraged humanity as did Pius the V.)

3. "Part of the oath sworn by every Archbishop and Bishop of the Romish Church. 'The original Latin of this oath is copied into Dr. Isaac Barrow's works, folio edition, vol. 1, page 563 from the Roman Pontificate, Clement VIII., Antwerp 1826—'Heretics, Schismatics and Rebels to our said Lord (the Pope) or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost, persecute and oppose.' See Dowling, page 616."

The following curse is pronounced by the Pope at Rome, on the Thursday before Good Friday, every year:—

4. "In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, we excommunicate and anathematize all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and other apostates from the faith; and all other heretics, by whatsoever name they are called, or of whatever sect they be." This is called the Bull in *Omnia Domini*, or at the supper of the Lord. The curse is accompanied with Bull, Book and Candle. Quoted by Dowling, page 617. (It surely cannot be the Christian religion that thus curses millions of men.)

To the first two paragraphs it is sufficient to reply, that as Pius V. never pronounced a curse against England, so it is impossible that that curse can annually be repeated by the Popes of later times. Pius V. excommunicated Elizabeth; and, in accordance with the laws both of the Christian Church, and of England, he judicially affirmed her illegitimacy, and therefore the worthlessness of her claims to the Crown of the last named realm, and to the allegiance of the English people. The first it was his right and his duty to do, since every religious denomination asserts its right to excommunicate, or cut off from spiritual communion all its professing members who violate its laws. Now up to her accession to the throne Elizabeth was, or pretended to be a Catholic, bearing Mass, and outwardly, at all events, conforming with the old religion. Even after her accession to the throne it was long doubtful what steps she would take in matters of religion; and so far was she from having even then made up her mind to a rupture with Rome, that she officially notified her accession to the reigning Pontiff, thus compelling him to acknowledge or to deny the validity of her claims. In his spiritual capacity the Pope pronounced against the validity of the pretended marriage of Henry VIII. with Anne Boleyn, and so far merely ratified the finding of the Parliament which had previously pronounced sentence of bastardy upon her.

But an excommunication, even of the major sort, is not a curse in the ordinary sense of the latter word, which implies the imprecation of evil upon the person cursed. It—excommunication—is a judicial sentence of the Church declaring that the person excommunicated is, because of his or her conduct, cut off from all communion with the excommunicating Church, forbidden access to her sacraments, and deprived of all participation in her prayers, and the spiritual benefits of which she is the dispenser: and surely even Mr. Bredin will scarce deny to the Catholic Church the right which even his sect claims to have the power of exercising—to wit, the right of cutting off from her Communion those whom she deems unfit, either because of their heretical doctrines, or their immoral conduct to participate

in her sacraments, or to hold spiritual intercourse with the faithful of her members.

The 3rd paragraph contains an ingenious perversion of truth. The Latin word *persequor* means simply to "pursue, search after or drive out," and by no means implies that which the modern English verb "persecute" implies. Of this every tyro in Latin must be aware: yet the misrepresentation has often—and often again no doubt will do, good service to controversialists of the Bredin stamp. So also with equal justice and intelligence might it be argued that the Anglican, who uses the prayer at the end of his communion service—"Prevent us O Lord in all our doings"—prays the Lord to throw obstacles in his way, since the word which still in Latin means, and in English once meant to go "before" or "assist" has now in the lapse of time come to signify "hinder" or "oppose." Such artifices, such verbal quibblings are worthy of a Methodist minister.

A Catholic Bishop at his Consecration undertakes, towards heretics, and all promoters or factors of false doctrine, the same obligations that the Protestant candidate for Anglican Episcopal Orders professes to undertake upon his consecration; the same and no more. To wit:—

That he will use all diligence to banish and drive away all strange doctrine contrary to God's word; and both privately and openly call upon and encourage others to do the same, i.e., *persequor et oppugnare*, &c. &c.

One word as to the Bull once, but now no longer, read at Rome on Holy Thursday in *Omnia Domini*. Therein it is true that not only all heretics, but all pirates, pillagers of ships at sea, tyrannical princes levying illegal and cruel imposts upon their subjects, together with other heinous offenders against justice and God's law are declared excommunicate, cut off from the Church and her blessings. But so far is the Catholic Church from invoking evil upon these heretics and sinners, or in other words from "cursing" them in the ordinary acceptance of the word "curse," that she always, and on Good Friday especially, and in her public office, prays for their conversion and restoration to her fold. This simple fact which Mr. Bredin may easily verify by looking into the Roman Missal, is conclusive as to the fact that there is an essential difference between excommunication with anathema, that is to say betwixt even the major excommunication or heaviest censure of the Church, and that act which Mr. Bredin implies by the word "curse." We do not, for instance style the Anglican Church a "cursing church," because in its Liturgy it says: "Cursed are the unmerciful, fornicators, and adulterers, covetous, persons, slanderers, (a hard hit this at some of our evangelical friends) drunkards and extortioners."

To resume. There is nothing to apologize for, or explain away in the excommunications and anathemas pronounced by the Church, and by the mouths of the Popes against heretics of all brands and grades. If there be a Church, divinely led, and instructed by the Holy Ghost, with authority to teach the truth, and to condemn its opposite, such a Church must necessarily speak as the Roman Catholic Church speaks to-day; even as the Apostle spoke, who said "let him be accursed, who preaches any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you." *Galatians*, 1, 8, 9; and again, let him be Anathema, Maranatha, who loves not our Lord. There is a specimen of Apostolic "cursing" which Mr. Bredin would do well to study, before he presumes to criticise the cursing of the Romish Church.

* Only in living languages do words thus change; when dead, corruption has no more dominion over them.

TREACHERY IN THE FENIAN COUNCILS.—The British Government need never be at a loss for want of information as to the designs of the Fenian leaders. Scarcely is it necessary for it to employ spies, so numerous are the volunteer traitors who press their services upon it; all that is said, all that is plotted in the Fenian Councils, in spite of the affectation of secrecy, and in spite of oaths, is communicated in a short space of time to the authorities in London, who are thus enabled at a moment's notice to lay their hands upon the unsuspecting victims of the Fenian delusion.

In the *Irish People* of the 22nd inst., the Fenian organ at New York, we find this fact strikingly confirmed. Therein we learn that a Mr. David A. Sutton, a member of the Committee appointed to search into, and report upon the affairs of Fenianism in general, has absconded from America, carrying with him in his flight "the secret correspondence of H. C. F. B., John O'Mahony, for the purpose of selling them to the British Government."

The papers thus carried off, and which will soon be in the hands of the authorities in England, contain, so the *Irish People* assures us the more important correspondence and acts of the Fenian administration for over eight years; and the New York paper then proceeds to speculate in the following terms, on the probable consequences of this act of treachery:—

"They"—the papers carried off—"contain information calculated to convict many of our friends and associates at present in prison in Ireland, against whom there is merely a suspicion of complicity in the Fenian movement. They also contain such information as may lead to the arrest and conviction of many of our friends in Ireland and Great Britain who have not been even suspected up to this. The *Rightly and Address Book* of the Fenian circles of America is also among the documents missing from Headquarters, and is said to have been taken off by the absconder, Sutton. The latter may be of great use to our enemy in enabling him to estimate our numbers and resources. The whole plot is, no doubt well worth a handsome sum of blood-money.—*Irish People*.

When will men learn to profit by the lessons of experience? Have we not in the above a signal instance of the futility of "secret soci-