

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 663 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLERE, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country subscribers Two Dollars. If the
subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the
year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms
shall be Two Dollars and a half.
The True Witness can be had at the News
Depots. Single copies 3d.
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by
carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if
not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we con-
tinue sending the paper, the subscription shall be
Three Dollars.
The figures after each Subscriber's Address
every week shows the date to which he has paid up.
Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has
paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription
FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 20, 1870.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1870.

Friday, 20—St. Bernardine of Siena, O.
Saturday, 21—St. Hermegild, M.
Sunday, 22—Fifth after Easter.
Monday, 23—Rogation. St. Fidelis of Samsrin-
gen, M.
Tuesday, 24—Rogation. Our Lady of Good Sac-
rifice.
Wednesday, 25—Rogation. St. Gregory, VII, P. O.
Thursday, 26—Ascension, Obl.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Irish Land Bill is dragging its slow way through the House of Commons, and there will be but little time for the Lords to make changes therein, if it is to become law this season. From Ireland there are fewer agrarian outrages to report. A board has been picked up, or is said to have been picked up, off the coast of Wales, on which is cut the date of February 11th with the words "The City of Boston is sinking." This may be only a hoax.

The High Court of Justice for the trial of political prisoners charged with the crime of conspiring against the life of the Emperor has been convened. The feeling that the said conspiracy is a sham, got up by the Government for political purposes, is pretty general. There is nothing of importance to report from Rome.

The Red River expedition is now en route. Again we are told that the Fenians in force are on the war path, and intend to show fight in the North West. We expect that the natural difficulties of the route, and the want of discipline, will be the most dangerous obstacles that the expedition will have to encounter.

The news that Sir John McDonald is to all appearance out of danger, will be received with general satisfaction even by his political opponents, scurrilous as have been many of their attacks upon him; and we are sure that the Catholics of U. Canada to whom Sir John has ever been a good friend, will return thanks to God for sparing the life of one of our foremost Canadian statesmen. We hope that his recovery may be perfect and speedy: for we doubt if the Ministry could survive the loss of his services, and without approving of all its acts, we should consider a break up of the actual Cabinet as a serious misfortune for the country. It would be difficult, perhaps impossible in the state of parties, to get as good a Ministry, and the chances are that we should have a much worse.

It is rumored that the Lieutenant-Governorship of Nova Scotia has been offered to the Hon. Mr. Keany.

THE COUNCIL.

(From the Vatican.)

"After holding ten Sessions in a fortnight the ceremonies of Holy Week and of Easter relieved the Fathers for a moment from the Conciliar assemblies. The last had been held on the 12th, when the forty-fifth General-Congregation met. An immense number of the pilgrims now gathered together in Rome from all parts of the world thronged the Basilica, and eagerly scrutinized the faces of the venerable men, many of whose names have now become household words. The Bishop of Pontiers represented on this occasion the Commission *de fide*, and after he had addressed the Council, Cardinal de Angelis announced that the votes were about to be taken on the whole of the first four chapters of the *schema* on dogma collectively. The Bishop of St. Polten, Secretary of the Council, then ascended the pulpit, and called upon the Fathers one by one, beginning with the Cardinals and Patriarchs, to record their vote. Each stood up in his place when his name was pronounced, and his vote was immediately written by the Secretaries. Owing to the absence of several Italian and French Bishops, who had obtained leave to visit their dioceses at Easter, the whole number who voted was only 595. Of these 515 said *Placet*, without any condition, and 80 *Placet juxta modum*, handing to the Secretary at the same time in writing the modifications which they would have desired the Council to adopt. With this restriction the vote was unanimous.

"It is remarked that while the deplorable intrigues of certain persons, who wished to persuade

the Civil Power to exert a pressure on the Council, have been signally defeated, the European statesmen who have been chiefly conspicuous for the violence of their language and the indiscretion of their acts have all been ejected from office. Menabrea first set the example in Italy, and Menabrea has fallen from power. The Giskra section of the Cabinet of Vienna has encountered the same fate. Prince Hohenlohe, in spite of the imprudent support of the King of Bavaria, has been forced to resign his office by the religious and patriotic majority of the Munich Parliament. Lastly, in France, where M. Buffet and M. Daru thought it creditable to insult the Holy Father and the Council, public opinion has condemned both, and these ephemeral celebrities, who could only contrive to reign for a few weeks, have returned to obscurity. It seems that decidedly Providence is on the side of the Council.

"It is reported that the Bavarian Bishops intend to do collectively what the Bishop of Ratisbon has already done in his own diocese, and to prohibit all the theological students of Bavaria from attending henceforth the lectures of Dr. Dollinger.

"We read in the *Bien Public* of the 15th instant that sixteen Bishops of the Dominican Order, headed by Cardinal Guidi and the Pere Jandel, General of the Order, have forwarded to the Commission *de fide* a collective vote on the subject of the *schema* on infallibility. They declare that this doctrine has always been held by their Order and by St. Thomas Aquinas, and that they are ready, like St. Alphonsus, 'to lay down their lives for it.'

We cannot understand, perhaps because we are Papists, and therefore the slaves of logic and consistency, how men can abhor a religion which they profess, or profess a religion which they abhor. The members of the *Institut Canadien* profess to be Catholics, members of the Catholic Church, and yet, without ceasing, they revile her doctrines, repudiate her discipline, and insult her ministers. Why then do they continue to call themselves children of such a Church? why seek after death to be interred amongst those whose society whilst living they repudiated, and whose belief they scouted as a vulgar superstition? Why ask for services for a corpse from a priest, whose ministrations, the living man spurned with contumely? If we held the opinions of a member of *L'Institut Canadien* we should deem it an outrage to be buried with Romanists, and an insult to our remains, to have the mummeries of Popery performed over them.

And yet we see this same *Institut*, whose prophet is Voltaire, the avowed enemy of Christianity, setting the machinery of the law in motion to obtain for one of their members deceased, who whilst living, deliberately and obstinately abstained from participation in her Sacraments, and who therefore was not in Communion with her—certain purely religious ministrations from the Catholic priest, whose ministrations whilst living he had deliberately and to the last moment of his existence, rejected! And this is done in the name of civil and religious liberty! We contend that the action of the *Institut* is a direct attack upon all liberty, and should, as such, be opposed by men of all denominations.

Let us be logical and consistent. If the individual have rights which the civil magistrate may enforce, to the *spiritual* services of the ministers of religion, it follows as a logical consequence that the latter, or minister of religion, must have spiritual rights over the individual which the civil courts are also bound to enforce. But here in Montreal, neither priest nor Bishop has any spiritual rights over any individual which the civil courts can enforce. Neither priest nor Bishop can compel any man against his will to take part in any manner in any act of Catholic worship, in any ceremony of the Catholic religion. The individual, though baptized by a Catholic priest, though admitted to the participation of the Sacraments, is free at any moment, and for any reason that seems good to him, without formal notice or warning of any kind given, to repudiate all connection with the Church; nor has the Church or her ministers any claim of any kind over him of which the civil courts can take cognisance. By parity of reason therefore, the Church should be equally free to repudiate, or reject from her bosom any individual, without thereby being responsible for her conduct to any civil tribunal. If, however, the latter be invoked to enforce the performance of purely religious, or spiritual functions in behalf of the individual whom she has repudiated, why should not the same tribunal undertake to compel the spiritual allegiance which every baptized person owes to the Church? Rights and duties are always reciprocal terms. Where the one cannot be predicated, so neither can the other. But the Church in Montreal, as represented by the Bishop and the clergy has no spiritual rights, that the civil courts can take cognisance of, over the individual; so therefore neither has the latter any claims to the spiritual or religious services of the said Bishop and clergy which the civil courts are competent to enforce. Now the action of the *Institut Can-*

dien to compel by law the parochial clergy of Montreal to perform certain religious services, and to recite certain prayers to God over the mortal remains of Guibord, implies that the latter had rights which the civil courts can enforce, to certain spiritual ministrations: it implies therefore, as the corollary of this proposition—that the deceased owed certain spiritual *devoirs* to the ecclesiastical authorities, which the same courts were in like manner competent and bound to enforce. Yet there is not a member of the anti-Catholic society whose course of action we are criticising, but would repudiate this logical and necessary consequence of his own premises. Again therefore that society stands self convicted of grossest inconsistency. Here in short is their thesis. The Catholic Church in Montreal has no rights that can be pleaded in a civil court to compel any man to accept her spiritual services, or to submit to her disciplinary rules; but the individual has civil rights to the spiritual services of the Catholic priest which the civil magistrate is bound to maintain. This is absurd.

And this brings us to the great question at issue. Whence can any man acquire a *civil* right to the *spiritual* functions of the priest? Does a man because he receives the Sacrament of Orders contract any peculiar civil obligations either as towards the State, or as towards the individual members of the State. The latter, it is true, imposes some peculiar obligations, or burdens on the priest,—such as the keeping of Registers of the Births and Baptisms, Marriages, Deaths and Burials he celebrates: but this is not to confer a privilege, or to exempt from duties to which all other citizens are naturally liable. It is a special duty or peculiar burden imposed on the priest, which he, for the good of society, and for the sake of its material interests, cheerfully condescends to accept. It does not confer on him the right, or power to perform any of his priestly or spiritual functions, for these he receives from the Bishop who ordained him, and who gives to him spiritual jurisdiction in the diocese: nor is it in any manner essential, or necessary to the valid performance of his sacerdotal and sacred functions. An unregistered birth is to all intents and purposes a valid birth: an unregistered baptism, if regular in other respects, makes its recipient a child of God, and heir to the Kingdom of Heaven; the parties to unregistered marriages are, if the requirements of Christ's laws be complied with, validly married, just as a man whose death is unregistered, remains nevertheless to all intents and purposes validly dead, till the day when the great Judge of heaven and earth shall appear with His angels: but as the material interests of society are subserved by a registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages, the priest willingly accepts the burden or obligation of keeping the Registry, or record of certain spiritual functions by him performed in virtue, not of license from the State, but of the authority given him by the Church. Again then we fall back upon the unanswered, unanswerable question—Whence can any man acquire a *civil* right to the *spiritual* services of a priest?

We can understand how, in virtue of the law, a man can have a "civil" right to a seat in his parochial church, where the parochial system obtains, and is upheld by the civil tribunals; we can understand how a man can have a "civil" right to be interred in a particular enclosure set apart for burial purposes—for these rights lie purely in the material order, in which the civil power lives, moves, and has its being. But what we cannot understand, what no "feller" as Lord Dundreary would say, "can understand" or explain, is how a man's "civil" rights can confer upon him any "spiritual" rights, or rights to prayers and religious services; we cannot understand how the civil magistrate whose functions lie purely in the material and temporal order, can have any jurisdiction in the spiritual order.

Even the *Montreal Witness* repudiates, as a monstrous absurdity the proposition that the individual has a civil right to the Sacraments of the Church. What have our Courts of Law, he asks, to do with the Sacraments? Well, carry out and apply this principle! What have our Courts of Law to do with any religious services or spiritual functions of any kind? On what grounds can you pretend that though the civil courts cannot issue a *Mandamus* to the priest to give sacramental absolution to this man, or administer the Eucharist to that man, they are competent to compel him to bless a grave, or to recite certain prayers prescribed by the Ritual, over the remains of another man? Do you not see, we say to our opponents, that you are committing the impossible, and decreeing blasphemy? You cannot, even with your jails, nay not even if to incarceration you add the thumbscrew and the rack, compel a man to bless, or pray from his heart! and every uttered blessing, every proffered prayer which is not accompanied, or rather preceded and dictated by the requisite interior or spiritual intentions, is a sacrilege and a blasphemy—a mockery of God!

By this simple fact, the limits of the civil

power are sharply defined. It cannot—and no one is bound to the impossible—it cannot in the nature of things, make a priest bless, or pray from his heart, *ex animo*, or with the requisite dispositions: and in the nature of things it has no right to compel any man to mock God with prayers which do not proceed from the heart—for this is sin.

PROTECTION AND A NATIONAL POLICY.—The *New York Freeman* puts the question of Protection in a very clear light. He says:—

"Protection must either be equal or unequal: if equal it does no good: if unequal it does harm to all save the protected class."

This is just what is the matter. The lately imposed taxes upon food and fuel may enrich a few capitalists, and coal-mine proprietors in Nova Scotia; but they will cause loss and sorrow, and cruel suffering to thousands of poor persons, especially in the large cities of Canada.

Every man will, in his own interest, be at one and the same time a Free Trader, and a Protectionist. He will always seek to buy in the cheapest, and to sell in the dearest, market; and if he have any particular commodity to dispose of, he will always be willing to make the market to which he carries it artificially dear by protection, or the legislative exclusion of competition. But if the tailor be thus protected, why not the shoemaker? If the agriculturists, why not the manufacturer and the merchant? And if these, why not the laborer—who has nothing to offer for sale, but his muscle, and his daily toil?

As our political and social systems are at present constructed, we draw the majority of our legislators from the wealthy agricultural, mercantile, and manufacturing classes of society: these, therefore, governed by the principle of self-interest, so legislate as to keep the labor market cheap, because they are consumers of labor; and so as to make the market for the commodities which they have to dispose of, as dear as possible.

But the time may come, probably will come soon, when the working classes, in the vulgar acceptance of the term "working classes" that is to say those whom Louis Blanc and French socialists speak of as in a peculiar manner the "people," as distinguished from the "aristocracy" and the "bourgeoisie"—shall form a power in the Legislature; and when that day comes, they too will legislate in the same spirit, that is to say just as selfishly as do those who today enjoy a monopoly of legislative or law making power. A "working man's" Parliament will be protective as towards what he has to sell—that is to say labor, and will strive to make labor as dear as possible; just as our Nova Scotian coal mine owners do their best to make their coal artificially dear; and on the other hand, the "working-man's" Parliament will be a Free Trade Parliament in respect of those commodities, food, clothes, fuel, &c., which the laborer has to buy. He will do his best by means of legislative interference to prevent competition in the labor market; and instead of a tariff imposing duties upon coal and food, he will give us one, imposing a tax upon immigrants, and all who keep wages, or the price of labor low. There is no reason why we should not legislatively discourage the importation of labor as well of coal; or why the artisan should not be as well protected against competition, as the wealthy manufacturer, and large coal mine proprietor: and so long as the latter are, and the former is not, protected by law, a gross injustice is perpetrated upon the working man. Our tariff like the elder Mr. Weller's grog, is "unequal and that's the fault on it."

But the policy of Protection for Canada is sometimes defended, not upon its intrinsic merits, but as a "National policy" forced upon us by the fiscal system of the U. States, and their refusal to concede to us reciprocity. To this it may well be replied, that for Canada, Protection is not a "National policy," but a silly servile copying of the worst feature of the policy of the U. States. A truly "National policy," were we plucky enough to adopt it, and strong enough to maintain it, would be the direct opposite of the U. States' policy. Instead of falling back upon the system of Protection, we should adopt that of unlimited Free Trade; and trusting to direct taxation only for our revenue, we should burn all our Custom houses, discharge all our Custom house Officers, and throw our ports open to the introduction duty free of all the products of all the world. This indeed would be a distinctive "National policy."

Again Protection is sometimes defended as a "retaliatory policy," as a just retaliation against the exclusive policy of the States. To this it is enough to reply, that even if we would, we cannot, and dare not, attempt a really retaliatory policy against the U. States—that is to say a fiscal policy which should really inflict loss upon them. By simply refusing to allow the transit through their territory, and duty free, of merchandise for the Canadian market, the U. States government would cut us off during the greater part of the year from all access with the world beyond the seas, and would at once cause such distress and suffering to us, as to provoke from all the mercantile classes one loud and

overpowering cry for Annexation. The truth is that the theory of Canada with its limited market, composed of some three or four millions of purchasers, being able to retaliate effectively upon the U. States with its home market of from thirty to forty millions, is sheer buncombe; it reminds one painfully, but forcibly, of the old fable about the ill advised frog who would blow himself up to the size of the ox. We all know how that speculation turned out for the frog, and how that unhappy animal after a short period of violent inflation, "burst," collapsed, and came to grief.

The best, the only way to make a market for our products is to be found in the increasing of the numbers who attend that market, that is to say in the increase of our population. This will be best brought about by making Canada as attractive as possible to the intending emigrant from the Old World; and as unfortunately, neither in its climate, nor in the fertility of its soil, does Canada possess any natural attractions greater than those of the United States, we should strive to render it attractive by making it a cheap country to live in. This done, emigrants in thousands, and from all classes of the Old World's society, would flock to us, would become consumers of our products, furnish a market for our producers, and both as laborers, and employers of labor, would develop the natural resources of the country. It will not, however, tend to encourage emigration from England to Canada from amongst the working classes of the former, to tell them, that the Canadian Government taxes their food and fuel, but leaves the one commodity which they have to offer, that is to say their labor, unprotected.

The battle betwixt the respective advocates of purely secular education, and of religious education, is raging fiercely in England, and certainly the religious education party does not shine. They are right of course when they insist that education to be valuable should include religious as well as secular instruction; but they fall into all manner of inconsistencies when they attempt to conclude from this premise, that in a State established system of education for the common use of the people of England, provision should be made for religious as well as for secular teaching. It is not the function of the State to teach religion; and it cannot devolve upon others functions, which it does not itself possess, and which it is itself incompetent to perform. In other words, you cannot put a quart of beer into a pint bottle.

This does not on the other hand strengthen the logical position of the secularists. The premises of their opponents, that in any system of education that is to be of general use to society, religious, must be blended with secular teaching, remains a true premise. At the same time it is equally true that the State cannot of itself, and therefore cannot through others by it appointed, give religious teaching. What then is the logical consequence of the combining of these two undeniable premises? This—that the State is incompetent to establish any system of education that shall be generally useful to society. From the arguments of the two contending parties we simply come to a conclusion against State-Schoolism.

Some of our Canadian contemporaries have joined in the controversy, but we trust to be excused if we say that they also have made a mess of it. Nor is this to be wondered at, for they really do not know what they themselves mean, when they talk about a "common" and at the same time a "distinctively" Christian education, and object to what they call "denominational" teaching. All distinctively Christian teaching must needs be "denominational" or, as others call it, "sectarian;" for it is only when they get beyond the charmed border of the supernatural, only when they abandon all that is peculiarly or distinctively Christian in their several systems, and meet on the common ground of natural religion, ground common to all men, whether Christians or Jews, that the different denominations, or bodies into which the Christian world is split up, can agree as to what is true and what is false, what is to be taught, and what is to be denounced as error.

The Convocation of the Anglican Church has asked the Government for a revision of the printed Word of God. To the Catholic this mode of procedure is unintelligible. If the Protestant Word of God need revision, the body which in England calls itself the Church, should set to work at once, and make the needed revision—if competent to do so. If incompetent to do so now, that defect cannot be remedied by any act of the Crown, or by powers conferred on it by Act of Parliament.

This is to us the great mystery of Protestantism, considered not merely as a protest against the Catholic Church, but as a phase of Christianity.—That Protestants should accept as the "Word of God" that which to them can be at best nothing more than the "Word of Man." We will suppose their bible revised, and that by the best scholars of the Empire—what then? Unless these pretend, that in their revision of the