

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
 At No. 369, Notre Dame Street, by
 J. GILLIES,
 G. E. CLERE, 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, no subscription shall be Three Dollars.
 The True Witness can be had at the News Depot, Single copy 3d.
 We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 18.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.
 AUGUST—1865.
 Friday, 19—St. Hyacinthe, O.
 Saturday, 19—East, of the Octave.
 Sunday, 20—Eleventh after Pentecost—St. Joachim, O.
 Monday, 21—St. Jeanne F. F. de Chantal, V.
 Tuesday, 22—Of the Octave.
 Wednesday, 23—Vig. of St. Philippe de Benit O.
 Thursday, 24—St. Bartholomew, Ap.
 The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—
 Saturday, 19—Providence Convent, Montreal.
 Monday, 21—St. Romain, Hemmingford.
 Wednesday, 23—St. Callixte.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.
 By the arrival of the *Moravian*, we have further news from the *Great Eastern*. We learn that on the 1st inst., 1,200 miles of the cable had been paid out. On the 2nd, the signals from the great ship became unintelligible, but the fault was soon corrected. As the apparatus which the *Great Eastern* had on board for taking up the portion paid out, in case of accident, has been prepared with the utmost care and by the best mechanical skill of the age, this good news is not unexpected. We believe that she has now performed the most difficult portion of her undertaking, having passed the deepest parts of the ocean, and complete success seems now more probable than ever. From England we learn that an alarming cattle disease had broken out in the vicinity of London, and caused serious ravages. Sir R. McDonnell, Governor of Nova Scotia, had accepted the Governorship of Hong Kong. From Spain we learn that thirty cases of cholera are reported at Valencia. This alarming disease had also appeared in camp at Gibraltar. The *London Times* advocates the recommendation to the Detroit Convention for a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, and ridicules the idea that Canada can be starved into annexation.

Although the Canadian Parliament has now been in session for upwards of a week, yet it has done nothing of importance up to the present moment. Several papers have been laid on the table, referring to the Delegation to England, the Defence of the Province, Reciprocity, &c., and it is probable that these subjects will shortly be taken up. Besides a number of bills in various stages which were left over from last session of Parliament, and which will, of course, be introduced and voted upon first in order, notices have been given of eight or nine new private bills; there is, consequently, a considerable amount of work before the Legislature.

Her Majesty's ship *Styx*, 6' guns, belonging to the North American squadron, arrived here a few days ago, having Admiral Hope on board. We understand that it is the intention of the Admiral to pay a visit to the Lakes. It will be remembered that the *Styx* was one of the vessels that accompanied the Prince of Wales when he visited Montreal. From what we learn, her stay on this occasion, will be more prolonged, for we understand that she intends to remain here till about the first of September.

The examination of the witnesses in the Sanders's Kidnapping case has, we understand, been concluded, but the case will not, probably, come on for trial till the opening of the Court of Queen's Bench on the 24th September. The defence is entrusted to B. Devlin, Esquire.

We are sincerely obliged to our enterprising agent in Kingston, Mr. P. Purcell, for his exertion in our behalf, as well as to our subscribers in that city for their promptness in paying their subscriptions to the TRUE WITNESS. Did all our subscribers imitate the good example set by our friends of Kingston, we would be very seldom troubled with writing "Notices to Delinquents."

We beg to remind our readers that the Grand Pic-Nic in aid of St. Ann's Church and School, is to be held on Wednesday next. We hope to see a large muster of our friends in the Victoria Gardens on that occasion, to forward the good cause of religion and education.

LAVEL UNIVERSITY.—We acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of the Calendar of this excellent Institution for the scholastic year of 1865-66.

The results of the late general election suggest a most important consideration to the Catholics of the British Empire. For whom, on whose side, should their votes have been cast? On the side of the Liberals, or on that of the Conservatives, or the so-called Tory party? For Palmerston and Russell, or for Derby and Disraeli? Most important, upon the foreign as well as upon the domestic policy of the Empire, will be the result of the determination which, on these points, the Catholic electoral body has taken; for, although only a minority, yet parties are so evenly balanced that the side on which they have thrown the weight of their influence, has won the day.

And yet, at first sight, it would seem as if the Catholic, called upon to vote either for the Liberal or for the Conservative, had before him but a choice of evils. To a certain extent this is actually the case. Neither to the one party, nor to the other, as these two parties actually exist in the British Empire, can the Catholic give his entire confidence, or his unreserved allegiance; and it remains for him, therefore, after a careful summing up of the several advantages and disadvantages which present themselves to him, to vote for that political party whose advent to, and retention of, power, presents the smaller amount of evil to the Catholic cause; for we suppose, of course, that the true Catholic will always be guided in his political course by the interests of his Church. The question then which, in this case, he has to discuss, and to which he has to furnish a practical answer, is simply this: "Is the avowed, and probable policy of the Liberal, or that of the Conservative party, the policy which, upon the whole, abroad as well as at home, will approve itself the more favorable, or at all events the less unfavorable, to the Catholic cause?" By the answer to this question should the vote of the Catholic elector be determined, and not by paltry local and personal considerations; such, for instance, as—Whether will a Liberal or a Conservative Ministry approve itself the more in favor of such or such a particular job, or the more willing to distribute its patronage and emoluments amongst the Catholic laity?"

For many years it has been the generally received tradition amongst Catholics, that the Liberal party was the party which they should support; and on the other hand, that the Conservative, or Tory party, was their natural and irreconcilable enemy, with whom alliance was impossible, against whom all their political influence at the hustings should be cast. Thus we have seen Catholics, men who profess to believe all that their Church believes and teaches, consorting with the Protestant Dissenters, keeping company with all the tag-rag and bobtail of the conventicle, and indeed, in so far as it was in their power to do so, identifying the cause of their Church with that of modern Liberalism and European Democracy. It may well be asked, was the tradition which dictated this line of action to Catholics well founded on facts? Were the political associates whom they had in consequence accepted, the class of men likely, in the long run, to promote the honor and the interests of the Catholic Church? Is the political alliance of Catholics and Liberals in harmony with the religious professions of the former, or a logical consequence of the religious, political, and social traditions of the latter? To answer these questions it is necessary to attempt some definition of the words Conservative and Liberal, respectively.

We would define, then, a British Conservative, or Tory, even if a Protestant, as one who, on the most prominent politico-religious and social questions of the day, holds *formally* sound and true principles, principles very nearly, if not quite identical with, those enunciated, for instance, by the Sovereign Pontiff in his last Encyclical—but who applies those principles erroneously. Thus he will assert the principle of "authority" against the "right of revolution," but predicating of the Protestant Church of England and Ireland, that which can be predicated truly only of the Catholic Church, he, by a false application of a sound principle, often appears to Catholics in the light of an active enemy.

The Liberal, on the contrary, is one who, formally, agrees with the Revolutionary and anti-Catholic party throughout the world; and that party which numbers Mazzini, and Garibaldi, and Garibaldi amongst its most active and most honored members; which aims at the overthrow of the Papacy, and the complete subjection of the spiritual to the temporal order. Hence it sometimes happens that, through his hatred of the principles of the Tory or Conservative, the Liberal may accidentally, and for a season, be found supporting measures favorable to Catholics: not however because those measures are so favorable, but simply out of opposition to the principles, social and politico-religious, which the conscientious Catholic, and the consistent Protestant Tory hold in common, though they give to them a different application.

The difference between the Catholic and the Protestant Conservative is, in short, "material," not "formal." The difference between

the Catholic and the Liberal is "formal," although sometimes it may chance that there is a "material" agreement between them; and thus the question which we are discussing resolves itself into this: Whether is it the more for our honor and the interests of our Church, that we should give our support to those with whom we agree "formally," but from whom we often differ "materially;" or to those from whom we differ "formally," even though we may sometimes agree with them "materially?"

And after, all points of domestic policy, on which the Liberals agree with British Catholics, are, with one exception, of very secondary importance, and are very few in number. The most important is, of course, the "Irish Church Establishment," which Liberals are willing enough to subvert, from opposition to the principle of Ecclesiastical Establishments, to State endowments of religion, and because, according to their social and politico-religious system, all Church property is national property, and should be secularized, or confiscated by the State. On the Education question, Liberals in Great Britain as everywhere else, are the upholders of the principle of "State-Schoolism;" whilst, on the contrary, the true Conservative maintains the principle that the rights of the Family over the child are anterior to, and more sacred than, those of the State. On what may be called the "patronage question," which after all is, we fear, with many who call themselves Catholics, the political question *par excellence*, or the question of paramount importance, the Liberals, as they are called, may, perhaps, be the better disposed to buy up the votes and political support of venal Catholics, by a more plentiful distribution of the public plunder amongst members of that denomination; but we cannot call to mind any one point of domestic policy besides these which we have enumerated, whereupon there is likely to be any agreement, even "material," between Liberals and conscientious Catholics, that is to say, Catholics who take their political principles from the teachings of the Church.

On all questions of foreign policy, however, the Liberals hold principles inimical to Catholics, and never fail to give to those principles the most ample practical application in their power. The Liberal party are the natural allies of the democratic revolutionary and anti-Catholic party on the Continent; they have been and are the abettors of the designs of Cavour, of Garibaldi, and of Mazzini upon the Pope and the Holy See; it is to them that, in a great measure, are due the success of the Italian Revolution, and the cruel straits to which the Holy Father is reduced; and it is now plain, from the confessions of Garibaldi himself, that, but for the treacherous, though efficacious co-operation of the British fleet, acting under instructions from the Liberal British Ministry, his attempted invasion of the Continental dominion of the King of Naples, would have resulted in disaster to him and to the cause which he represented.

Why then should Catholics support the Liberal party? or why should their political influence be given to men who will but avail themselves of it to stir up rebellion against the Holy Father, and to foment treason in the Pontifical territory? The only reason we can perceive is the tradition to which we have made allusion—to the effect that, at home, the Liberals are the natural allies, the Conservatives the natural enemies, of Catholics—though abroad no one will deny that it is from the former alone that the cause of Catholicity and of the Pope has anything to dread.

Unfortunately, it is true that English Conservatives, by their wicked and foolish diatribes against Catholics, have done much to confirm this false impression; but have the latter been altogether blameless in the matter? and have they not, sometimes, by their incautious language and their too hasty adoption of Liberal political formulas, done their part to foster and propagate the belief amongst Protestant Conservatives that in the British Isles, "Catholic" and "Democratic" are terms synonymous, and that the sincere Papist is necessarily the enemy of the British Crown and the British Constitution? We fear that such is the case; we confess that, if misunderstood, and often misrepresented to our disadvantage, we are but reaping the bitter fruits of our political *mesalliances* with democracy, under the specious designation of Liberalism. We believe that could we once convince our opponents amongst British Conservatives that we are, and must be, if true to our Church and the great principles which she lays down for the guidance of her children, as thoroughly Conservative, in the best sense of the word, as they are; that we hold rebellion and revolution in abhorrence; that, in our eyes, the rights of property and the authority of our legitimate Sovereign are sacred; that we entertain no designs to destroy the existing Constitution, or to upset the throne—one chief cause of the hostility which we encounter at the hands of Protestant Conservatives, or Tories, would be effectually removed. But so long as we continue to consort with the very scum of democracy, to repeat their stock phrases, to re-echo their revolutionary formulas, and to give them our political support, so long must we

pay the usual penalty of keeping bad company, and must consent to be ranked amongst the factors of rebellion, and tools of the revolution; so long shall we furnish a cogent argument in the mouths of the Whalleys and the Spooners and the Newdegates, against Popish loyalty; and so long shall we give to the Orangemen a pretext for keeping up their odious and dangerous secret organization. So long, too, shall we continue to scandalize numbers amongst our Protestant brethren, who, attracted towards the Church by the workings of God's Holy Spirit, are often repelled by the revolutionary and democratic principles that men, calling themselves Catholics, feel themselves bound to profess and practise, because of their monstrous political alliance with democracy and modern Liberalism.

Amongst the many phases which Protestantism on this Continent has assumed of late years, there is one which, not often alluded to in the public journals, is beginning to assume some importance—we mean the Protestant sect of "Perfectionists," or, as they are sometimes called, "The Free Love Communists." In their peculiar doctrines there is nothing very original; nothing but what manifested itself at the first outbreak of the Reformation or Great Apostasy of the sixteenth century; nothing but what follows as a natural and logical deduction from the principles laid down by Luther, Carlstadt, and other leaders of the revolt against the authority of the Catholic Church. But, as with the exception of the Mormons, no other modern Protestant sect carries out the principles of Protestantism, with regard to the relative position of the sexes, and the rights of individual man and woman, so consistently as does this sect of "Perfectionists," it finds itself exposed to the taunts, and unfriendly criticisms of the other and less advanced Protestant sects by which it is surrounded. These "Perfectionists" have, so it appears, lately published a pamphlet wherein is given their "Confession of Faith;" hereupon the *N. Y. Observer* breaks out in the following strain of invective:—

THE FREE LOVE COMMUNISTS.
 We have a pamphlet recently published by the Onieda Community. It is a conversational exposition of the principles and practice of the men and women who have for some years past been living in a distinct community. They were formerly called Perfectionists. A man by the name of Noyes was the leader and prophet of the new sect, and is still at its head, standing in the same relation to it that Joe Smith did to the Mormons. It is certainly remarkable that this community, established in 1848, and numbering now only 200 members, yet has a flourishing existence in the midst of an enlightened and a religious part of the country. Its cash receipts and disbursements last year were \$433 88,82, and the taxes they paid amounted to more than \$8,000. The social principles of this community, are revolting to all ordinary ideas of decency, as they are opposed to the laws of God and man. They do not believe in or regard marriage. They live in one house, and each one follows his own inclination in regard to social and domestic arrangements. The children are cared for in a common department, with no recognized relationship to parents. This is as clear an intimation as it is proper, perhaps, to make of the 'free love' development in this establishment, which claims special holiness in its members, and an organization designed to introduce its members into intimate fellowship with the spiritual world. And it is, therefore, only another of the many schemes which men and women, who cannot bear the restraints of God's law, invent to gratify their own wills under the guise of superior holiness. —N. Y. Observer.

Taking for granted that the *N. Y. Observer* fairly represents the tenets, and the practices of this sect, with regard to the relations subsisting between the sexes, we can see nothing in these tenets to which any logical Protestant can take exception; nothing in these practices which a citizen of the Northern States of the American Republic has the right to criticize or censure.—"The social principles of this community," says the *N. Y. Observer*, "are revolting to all ordinary ideas of decency;" but certainly it is not in the ordinary ideas of decency that obtain in the Northern States that we should look for a test of what is morally right and what is morally wrong; nor is there in the 'social principles' of the "Free-Love Communists" anything more revolting to the ideas of decency which obtain amongst all Catholics, than there is in the 'social principles' of any other Protestant community, which for any reason whatsoever tolerates divorce.

But, adds the Protestant critic of the "Free-Love Communists," with the grace of the kettle reproaching its neighbor the pot with the blackness of its sitting parts—your social principles.—"Are opposed to the laws of God and man. You do not believe in, or regard marriage. Each one of you follows his own inclination in regard to social and domestic arrangements." Very shocking no doubt; but nevertheless only a logical and practical, even if somewhat extreme, application of the right of private judgment: merely a reducing to practise of the Protestant principle that marriage is a "civil contract" and nothing more. Unless marriage be what the Catholic Church asserts it to be, i.e., a Sacrament, whose nature, condition, and effects are absolutely determined and unalterably fixed by the law of God, then indeed marriage is but a civil contract, of which, as with every other civil contract, the terms are to be arranged at pleasure between the contracting parties themselves. If God has not determined those terms, once for all; if He has left His creatures free to arrange the term of their sexual union amongst themselves,

no State, no human tribunal has the right to interfere with or curtail the liberty in which God has left man in this respect; and if, on the other hand, God has clearly determined the terms and conditions of the sexual unions of His creatures, then is marriage much more than a civil contract: then all that we, His creatures, here to do, is to learn what those terms are, and implicitly to submit to them. In neither case can man have any conceivable right to legislate upon the subject: and we certainly respect the "Free-Love Communists" for their contempt of, and the open defiance which they give to, human legislation upon a matter which, if not determined by God, every man is morally at liberty to determine for himself. Under all conceivable circumstances a human Marriage Law is a sheer impertinence. For if God has legislated on the subject, then has not man the right by his puny Acts of Parliament to override God's law; and if God has not legislated on the subject—the State has no more right to prescribe the terms of the sexual unions of its subjects, than it has to dictate the terms of any other mere civil contract—as for instance a contract for the delivery of a certain quantity of Mess Pork. It is the duty of the State to enforce the terms of a civil contract upon both contracting parties, until they mutually and voluntarily release one another from the obligations contracted: but here the legitimate functions of the State cease; and it has no right to interfere between the two contracting parties, or to dictate to them the terms of, the contract. As well might it establish a law of the *maximum* at once, and determine the price at which beef should be retailed in the market.

But the "Free-Love Communists," urges the *N. Y. Observer*, do not believe in marriage: they live in a state of concubinage. Well! So be it: but, and here is a question to which we defy any one who denies that Marriage is a Sacrament to give an answer. "What is the moral—mind we do not say legal, but moral—difference between Marriage and Concubinage?" To say that one is in accordance with man's laws on the subject of sexual unions, and that the other is not, is merely to indicate a legal difference; and what we defy Protestants to assign is a moral difference between the two. Now if they cannot do this, what can it be for them to reproach the "Free-Love Communists" with disbelieving in marriage, and living in a state of Concubinage!

Marriage, says the Protestant, is a mere civil contract. Good! Then it belongs morally to the individuals contracting, to determine for themselves the terms of that contract; to contract to cohabit for life, during mutual good behavior, or for a term of years, at their pleasure. This is the inalienable moral right of every man of every woman, if God has not once for all determined absolutely the conditions on which alone the sexual unions of His creatures are lawful; and no human legislation can deprive him or her of this moral right which both hold from God. The State may make the exercise of that right illegal, but it cannot make it immoral; just as he who neglects to clean the snow from off the side walks in front of his premises is *legally* though not *morally*, guilty of an offence.

In so far then as the practice of the "Free-Love Communists" is a protest against the tyranny and impertinent interference of the State or *Juch in-Office*, in matters on which God—if Marriage be not a Sacrament—has left every man and woman morally free to act as he or she pleases, we rejoice in, and approve of, it; as a practical commentary upon the Protestant doctrine of Marriage, as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the proposition that Marriage is merely a civil contract. Nor let it be thought that, amongst Protestants, the *Free Love Communists* stand alone in this matter, or apart from all their fellow sectaries. On the contrary, they have, on their side, not only most of the Patriarchs of the Reformation, and the fathers after the flesh of Protestantism, such as Luther and Carlstadt, and the Anabaptists; but in our own times we find their views skillfully and perseveringly advocated by the most able and illustrious exponents of Protestantism. In the October number, 1864, of the *Westminster Review*, the organ of the advanced Protestant party in England, the reader will find an article on "The Laws of Marriage and Divorce," wherein the principle on which the "Free-Love Communists" conduct their sexual unions, is laid down and defended by arguments unanswerable by any one, who admits the Protestant premise, that Marriage is not a Sacrament, not a *status* whose conditions have been irrevocably fixed by the Law of God; but merely a civil contract. The *Westminster Review* concludes a very remarkable article on the above indicated subject, with the following words, wherein he vindicates the right of the individual to determine for himself, without let or hindrance from the State, the terms, conditions, and duration of such sexual unions as he or she may see fit to contract:—

"[I]—Marriage—"May indeed be considered merely as partnership entered into for certain purposes by two persons of the opposite sexes; and although the stipulations which they may make with each other might properly be enforced by society, it does not appear to us to be so obvious distinguishable from every other species of partnership, that its