

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 686 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES,
G. B. OLBERG, 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 Depots. Single copies 3d.

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, DEC. 11, 1868.

ECOLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1868.

Friday, 11—Fast St. Damasus, P.O.
Saturday, 12—Of the Octave
Sunday, 13—Third of Advent.
Monday, 14—St. Lucy, V.M.
Tuesday, 15—Octave of the Immaculate Conception.
Wednesday, 16—Ember Day. St. Eusebius, B.C.
Thursday, 17—Of the Ferials.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The resignation of Mr. Disraeli, and the summing-up of Mr. Gladstone by the Queen, for the formation of a new Ministry, are the great events of the week in the British Islands. The result of the elections showed conclusively that Mr. Disraeli had no chance of holding his position in the new House of Commons: and he has acted wisely and honorably in thus retiring from a useless contest. His successor will however have no easy task, in framing a policy for Ireland. Still the Irish Question will be his rock-a-head; and when he shall have eradicated the danger on its ecclesiastical side, he will still be in risk of striking on the other, or secular side, on which is engraved "Tenant Right"—and in which after all consists the Irish difficulty *par excellence*.

A successor to Dr. Longley, the late government Archbishop of Canterbury, has been found in the person of Dr. Tait, a gentleman who for some time has been in receipt of the revenues of the Diocese of London. Dr. Tait is a Broad—that is to say he is one who whilst very severe upon Ritualists, or anything savouring of excessive devotion to Our Lord Jesus Christ, is very liberal in other matters, and quite tolerant of Rationalism. He will therefore, it may be expected, assume an attitude of decided hostility towards the Ritualists or Romanizing party within the Establishment, and thus perhaps accelerate the advent of the inevitable schism. His appointment will thus in one sense prove of benefit to the cause of Catholic truth; since his administration, if he be faithful to his antecedents, cannot but have the effect of convincing the most prejudiced, that the Anglican Establishment is essentially Protestant—and that betwixt it, therefore, and the Catholic Church, there can be no semblance even of any connection. Dr. Tait, we may add, was one of the four Oxford authorities who first opened the attack upon the famous Tract 90, wherein it was attempted to be shown that the formularies of Anglicanism were susceptible of a Catholic interpretation.

The French Emperor has won the battle against the editors, in the Courts of Law, which have sentenced several journalists to heavy fines, for their action in the Baudin affair. Before the tribunal of French public opinion it does not fare so well with him; and it cannot be doubtful that the whole business has tended towards increasing a spirit of disaffection with his government. M. Havin, the director of the *Steele* newspaper, a journal which was inspired by the Voltairian philosophy, and as such was exceedingly popular with the lower strata of the bourgeoisie in Paris, sought reconciliation with the Church in his last moments, and we hope that his penitence was sincere. It was M. Havin who some years ago took the initiative in getting up a monument in honor of his spiritual father Voltaire, and in his career as a journalist he was always a consistent Voltairian.

The unfavorable reports as to the health of the Sovereign Pontiff are contradicted, and we may hope that the Lord will still preserve him many years to preside over the destinies of the Church. From the many signs of discontent amongst the people of the Italian Peninsula, it may be inferred that the throne of Victor Emmanuel is in a far more precarious condition than is that of the Holy Father: and that the latter may still be quietly but gloriously seated in the Vatican, when King "honest-man" shall have gone forth on his travels, to add one more to the number of sovereigns retired from business. Florence, not Rome, seems now to be objective point of attack to Italian revolutionists.

The Whelan case was argued before the Judges at Toronto on Friday, and their judgment will be delivered on the 21st inst. Whelan

was sentenced to be hung on the 10th, so that already the sentence of the Court before which he was tried, and found guilty, has been virtually set aside: and the opinion is very common that owing to technical informalties, and legal defects, it may yet be entirely quashed.

On Tuesday, 1st inst., Sir John Young was sworn in as Administrator of the Province. It seems that his Commission as Governor General has not yet been issued.

A startling rumor reached us via New York on Saturday evening to the effect that the Emperor Louis Napoleon had been killed. There may have been political disturbances at Paris, and these may have given rise to the rumor, which we are happy to say is contradicted by a telegram from London, to the effect that the Emperor is alive and well.

The following is given as the list of the new Ministry in England. There are doubts however, as to Mr. Bright. Earl Russell, to have a seat without a portfolio; Earl Clarendon, Secretary for the Foreign Department; Right Hon. Robert Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, Secretary of State for War; John Bright, Secretary of State for India, and President of the Council for India; Hy. Woods, Lord High Chancellor; John Duke Colridge, Solicitor General; H. Fortescue, Chief Secretary for Ireland; Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, First Lord of the Admiralty.

STATE-SCHOOLISM.—The Toronto *Globe's* strong point is certainly not logic: and in his most labored articles it is almost always the fact that his conclusions are refuted by his premisses.

For instance:—He is arguing against government aid to denominational educational institutions; and cites the happy results of the adoption of the "voluntary principle" in the matter of religion:—

"The experience of the churches in this country, so far as they have tried the voluntary principle, has been most satisfactory. . . . When we find the voluntary principle working so well—when we find that under it we have peace among the various creeds—when we find that under it, the religious welfare of the people is better looked after than in order and wealthier countries where Church and State are united—should we not be encouraged to maintain the principle to the fullest extent."—*Globe*, 21st Nov.

Of course the reader will suppose that after this labored exordium, that after such a fervid panegyric on the "voluntary principle," the editor of the *Globe* is about to urge its application to education as well as to religion, to the College as well as to the Church: that he is about to conclude to the adoption, to the fullest extent, and as applied to education, of a principle which has given peace to the various creeds, and under whose benign operation the religious welfare of the people is better looked after in U. Canada, than in older and wealthier countries, where the State lends a helping hand to the Church, and where government contributes to the maintenance of religion.

Not a bit of it. For instead of concluding to the adoption of the "voluntary" principle in education, our contemporary's whole argument is intended to be plea in favor of the "compulsory" principle, and in behalf of State-Schoolism. For the only way that he can discover of settling the vexed question of education, and of doing justice to all—is, not the adoption of the voluntary system which in religion has given peace; but of its very opposite. He is for endowing a State University, but is opposed to endowing the Denominational College. A more ludicrous instance of what is called the "non sequitur," it is impossible to imagine.

For wherein does the School Question differ from the Church Question? It is impossible to assign the slightest shade of a difference in principle betwixt them; and every argument that is of force against the compulsory principle, and in favor of the voluntary principle in religion, is equally valid against the compulsory principle in education, and in favor of voluntarism. It is no more the duty, or the business of the State to establish and support schools, colleges or universities, for its subjects or citizens, than it is its business to establish and endow churches for them. It has no more right to do the one, than it has to do the other: and if, because of the strong differences of opinions amongst its subjects, it cannot establish one common uniform church, and is therefore obliged, in order to avoid injustice, to fall back upon the voluntary principle in religion; so in like manner, and for the same reasons, it is in justice bound in a community like that of U. Canada, to fall back upon the voluntary principle in education. Let us have no Educational endowments of any kind.

The only satisfactory settlement of this vexed question then, as deducible from the *Globe's* own premisses—the only true way of doing justice to all, consists, either in giving aid from State funds to all educational institutions, or in giving it to none. To the first system, which is called the Denominational system, the *Globe* is opposed. Very good! then, we must fall back upon the other alternative, and insist that State aid be given to none: that the State leave Education free in the same sense, and to the same extent that under the religious voluntary system, it leaves religion free: that it meddle not either with college

or with church, since it has no more right to interfere with the one, than it has to interfere with the other.

We are not arguing in favor of the voluntary principle either for Church or School; neither do we at present intend to say one word for, or against, either State-Churchism or State-Schoolism. What we insist upon is simply this—That, if the voluntary system be good in one case, that of religion—it must be good in the other case, to wit, that of education; that the State has no more right to tax the humblest of its subjects, for the support of a school system to which he is opposed, than it has to tax him for the support of a church system to which he objects—reasonably or unreasonably it matters not. For, as it is in the naked fact of the Presbyterian's objections to an Episcopalian Church system, and not in the reasonableness or validity of his objections, that the reason lies why a State whose subjects are, some Episcopalian, and some Presbyterians, should not establish an Episcopalian Church; so by parity of reason, it is in the bare fact of the objections which some of its subjects may entertain towards any particular system of education, not at all in the reasonableness of those objections, that the reason lies why a State which professes to deal impartially with all, should either favor equally, all schools, colleges, or universities, which any of its subjects may set up, and in which nothing contrary to natural morality is inculcated—or else should refrain from in any manner assisting any. Obliquity of moral vision, the result of political prejudices, or of intellectual deficiencies, may prevent the editor of the *Globe* from appreciating these elementary, self-obvious truths: but he may rest assured, that none who love justice, and fair play—though for the time they may be compelled to put up with the tyranny of a brute majority—will ever accept as satisfactory or just, any settlement of the School Question which is not based either upon the Denominational system, or the Voluntary system carried out to "its fullest extent." If aid to Denominational colleges be refused, then let the cry be "Down with the State College and the State University!"

With the highest respect for our contemporary the New York *Tablet*, we take exception to the following assertion that appears in its issue of the 5th:—

"The only country in the world where there is true and full religious liberty is in the United States."

We are open to correction if in error—but it is not the case, we respectfully ask, that in some of the States of the Union, political disabilities, because of their religion, are still imposed upon Catholics by law, as in New Hampshire for instance? Is it not also true that in almost all, if not in all, of the same States, Catholics are by law forced to pay for the support of so-called common schools? and in the very same number of the *Tablet* as that from which we have above quoted, does not the learned editor truly say:—

"The State might as well tax us, Catholics, to support Protestant worship, spiritist circles, or inflated balls of science, as to tax us for the support of the public schools."—*Tablet*, Dec. 5th.

How then can the editor pretend that in the United States there is true and full religious liberty, when its Catholic citizens are taxed for the public schools? how can he pretend above all, that it is "the only country in the world where there is true and full religious liberty?" We do not undervalue the advantages of the actually obtaining system in the United States. We do not deny that there the Catholic Church is more free than she was in France under Louis XIV., or than she is in Napoleonic France, in revolutionized Italy, or in any other so-called Catholic country. But we do deny her claims to "true and full religious liberty," so long as in any one State political disabilities because of their religion are imposed by law upon Catholics; and so long as every where Catholics are taxed for the support of the public schools. But we do assert that in Canada, where no legal disabilities of any kind exist; where every office, from that of Governor to that of a constable, is legally open to all, whether Protestant or Catholic; and where there is legally established a denominational system of education, imperfect indeed, but still one under which the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, can in most cases have their own schools, supported by a proportionate share of public funds—the principles of "true and full religious liberty" are better understood, and more faithfully, even if still imperfectly, applied than they are in the United States.

The large religious liberty which the Catholics of the United States enjoy, is due chiefly to the jealousy which the several Protestant or non-Catholic sects entertain towards one another, and not to the fundamental principles of their Revolution. Indeed one of the chief reasons assigned by the men who built up American independence, in justification of their appeal to arms against the iniquitous British Government, was that the latter had, by its Quebec Act encouraging Popery in Canada, and by its liberal conduct towards its newly acquired Catholic subjects in North America, forfeited its claims to the allegiance of its Protestant subjects. The American War of Independence was therefore

quite as much a protest against "Religious Liberty" for Catholics, as it was a protest against "Taxation without Representation." In the words, however, of the sweet singer of Boston, the founders of the Republic "built better than they knew;" and contrary, not only to their expectations, but to their intentions, a very considerable degree of religious liberty, though still far from complete, grew out of, and was secured to Catholics, by the Constitution which the Revolution established.

For this, however, we repeat it, and the *Tablet* will herein agree with us—no thanks to the Liberal party in the United States. That party is there what it was in France in '92, what it is in Italy, in Austria, and in Spain to-day; and in the words of the *Tablet*, with which we entirely agree, "the whole Liberal movement for the last hundred years"—whether in Europe or America—"has been simply an anti-Catholic movement, directed against the freedom and spiritual independence of the Catholic Church." Now we think that it cannot be denied that the "Liberal movement" has made more progress in the United States than it has in Canada; and that consequently the Catholic Church is in the last named country less exposed, as yet, to assaults upon her freedom and spiritual independence, than in the United States. What Catholics have to rely upon in the latter, is, humanly speaking, not their political system, but their increasing numbers, and their own power to enforce justice from their enemies.

The inevitable quarrel betwixt the Central or Federal Government, and the local or Provincial Governments, is, if we may judge from the tone of our several contemporaries, about to break out. It is but the old question of State Rights, and Federal Rights, applied to our new Canadian Constitution.

On the one hand the *Minerve*, the organ of the French Ministerial party of Lower Canada, and which in this matter has all our sympathies insists strongly and ably upon the duty of the members of the Provincial Legislature of Quebec to assert the dignity of the local government, and to uphold the Federal element in our Constitution. "To that Legislature" says our contemporary "is intrusted the guardianship of the constitution itself, of the Federal principle which is its basis." And again:—

"Lower Canada demanded the application of the Federal principle, and her demands have been listened to. It is for us to keep that which we have obtained."—*Minerve*, 2nd inst.

The *Montreal Gazette*, the organ of the English Ministerial party of Lower Canada, takes a very different view of the position, and consequently of the duties of these who whether in the Central, or in the Provincial, Legislatures have to work the constitutional machine. In the eyes of the *Gazette* and of those whom it represents, the Federal principle is not the basis of the actual Constitution: but, on the contrary, a disturbing element therein, whose influence must be neutralized as much as possible whilst awaiting for the time hopefully looked forward to, when it shall have been entirely eliminated from the system; and the Legislative or Incorporating element therein shall be recognized as the basis of our political regime. Thus the *Gazette* says:—

"If the Dominion is to hold together, mere local prejudices or interests must give way to a general policy devised for the general good."—*Gazette*, 2nd Dec.

Which put into plain English means simply this—That the interests of Lower Canada must give way to that which the Central Government believes to be for the general good. For as the question—What is for the general good? will have to be decided not by any particular or Provincial Legislature, but by the General or Federal Parliament, the principle enunciated by the *Gazette* would, if carried out, transfer all power, even in matters relating to the particular interests of a Province, to the hands of the Federal Government.

This divergence of policy betwixt the two journals which we have quoted, has its origin in the different views which they respectively take of the Constitutional Act. In the eyes of the one, the Federal principle is its basis, the essential ingredient on the maintenance of which its integrity depends. In the eyes of the other, the principle of the complete subordination of the Provincial Governments, to the Central Government, of State Rights to Federal Rights, is the basis, or fundamental principle. One looks on the Act as creating a Federation: the other looks on it as an Act of Union.

And so, sooner or later, a rupture betwixt the two is inevitable; and as there is but little to distinguish the Lower Canadian, English speaking and Protestant minority, from the Upper Canadian majority, the quarrel, when it does come, will be one not so much of States or Provinces, as of Nationalities, and Creeds. It will be, in its main features, a struggle for political ascendancy betwixt French Canadians and Catholics on the one hand, as against English and Protestants throughout the Dominion on the other. To postpone the evil day, if it be impossible altogether to avert it, is obviously then the duty of all Catholics; and the only way by which this can be effected is by following the counsels given in the *Minerve*—by, in short, rallying round our Provincial Authorities, and our Provincial Legislature, and giving to them, and all the support in our power. We must be content, for the furtherance of this great object, to lay aside our little jealousies; and we should all of us, according to our means, labor to obliterate the party lines which too often separate as it were into two hostile camps, men who at heart, *au fond*, as the *Minerve* would say, are sincere in their desire to uphold Lower Canadian autonomy, as the means under God, of maintaining the rights of our French Canadian brethren, and above all the rights and interests of the Catholic Church in this part of the world. Instead of decrying, or belittling the local powers we should do our utmost to magnify them; instead of invidious criticism of their every acts we should tender them our generous and unanimous support.

Remittances in our next.

PROTESTANT PROGRESS IN SPAIN.—It would be untrue were we to pretend that under the Liberal and Revolutionary regime, Protestantism was making no progress in Spain. In the *Diarro Espanol*, an organ of the government, we find the following hopeful facts recorded, which show that the Reformation in Spain in the nineteenth century is conducted upon precisely the same principles, and by precisely the same kind of energy, as were the English and Scotch Reformations of the sixteenth:—

"On the night between the 30th and 31st of the last month all the properties of the cathedral city of Lerida were stolen; the robbers had to break five strong doors, well secured with bars and chains in order to get at the archives and treasury of the Church. It is supposed that they hid themselves in some unobserved corner of the sacred edifice at the time in which the pater noster was being said. The result is that they carried away all the funds laid up for the purpose of public worship, and, beside, 4,000 crowns given by the Government for repairs to the pavement of the church."

"Of similar outrages we (adds the *Times* correspondent) have incessant accounts in the daily papers. In the South, especially in Andalusia, the churches have been frequently plundered, both by thieves breaking in at night, and by disorderly mobs forcing an entrance in the daytime."

In other parts, these acts of sacrilegious vandalism are conducted in a more orderly manner; the Liberal Government itself superintending the process, and pointing out the churches which are to be destroyed. In Madrid the churches of St. Mary of Almaden and of Santa Cruz have already been demolished; and it is said that the decree has gone forth than those of San Millan, El Jesus, El Carmen and 14 others are to share a similar fate.

There are other features indicative of the progress of the Reformation in Spain, well worthy of notice. Here are two which we find in *Our Own Correspondence* from Spain, of the *Montreal Herald*:—

1. "Some enterprising Englishmen however are already in Madrid distributing bibles right and left."

2. "It"—the Madrid press—"is described as positively infamous, and degraded to the lowest degree. The journals contain no articles or correspondence, but are made up of a sort of *olla podrida* of scurrility and obscenity, a mass of gossip, scandal and lies."

These certainly are three decided proofs of the spread of Reformation principles in Spain—Sacilege; great circulation of Protestant bibles; and a corresponding spread of obscene and scurrilous literature.

* We learn from the *Times* correspondent that one of the wretches employed in the sacrilegious work was killed by the falling in of a vault, which for a time suspended the destruction and desecration of the Church.

ROMANISM FASTENING UPON CHINA.—Under this dreadful caption we find in a late issue of the *Montreal Witness* a remarkable testimony to the rapid progress that Catholic Missionaries in China are making; a progress so vast, and at the same time so cleverly conducted, as to inspire the Protestant witness thereof with the most lively dread, lest in a few years the entire country be converted.

The article in which these facts are recorded is from a very evangelical source; and the facts themselves with which it deals, are furnished by the "intelligent correspondent" of the *Boston Journal*, writing from the vicinity of Shanghai. The writer states only what he has seen and heard; and thereupon the Protestant paper whose sad duty it is to comment thereon, breaks out in the following melancholy strain:—

"Compared with these, how feeble are all the movements of Protestants in that country!"

M. Larocque, son of our well known citizen, A. Larocque, Esq., has we are happy to learn so far recovered from the severe wounds by him received at the battle of Mentana, whilst serving in the Pontifical Zouaves, as to be able to return to the scene of his gallant exploits, and to resume his military duties. The best wishes and prayers of the Catholics of Canada accompany him.

SPAIN.

There are two congenial classes which are rejoiced at the present turn which affairs have taken in Spain. They are the Rationalists, and Protestants, or, in other words, Protestants of extreme views, and moderate Protestants. The difference between these branches of the Reformation consists in this, that while one party rejects the divinely constituted authority of Heaven, the other refuses submission to the divinely constituted authority on earth; the first attacks the source of revelation: the second, the agent to whom that revelation was confided; the former would measure Infinite Reason with the contracted rule of human intellect; the latter, adds a Bible to that rule, and hugs itself under the delusion of possessing faith. In fact, all Protestantism is founded upon rationalistic principles. If here and there it may appear otherwise, it is simply because its rationalism has not reached that degree of development observable elsewhere. We prove this assertion from the fact that, wherever Rationalism assails Catholic principles and teachings, the affinity between ordinary Protestantism and the attacking agent is seen immediately. There is a sympathy between them which clearly betrays their common