

## 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, in case the paper be continued, the  
terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.

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 Correspondent 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 Sub-  
scription from THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1868.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE, 1868.

Friday, 19—Sacred Heart of Jesus.  
Saturday, 20—St. Bernabe, Ap.  
Sunday, 21—St. Louis de Gonzague, O.  
Monday, 22—St. Norbert, B.C.  
Tuesday, 23—Vig. St. Julianus, V.  
Wednesday, 24—St. John the Baptist.  
Thursday, 25—St. William, B.C.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The many defeats on the Irish Church question that Mr. D'Irsh has experienced in the House of Commons have at last determined that gentleman to try the effect of an appeal to the people: and in consequence it is expected that the present Parliament will soon be dissolved, and the month of December is spoken of, as the date for the meeting of the next. The elections will probably be carried out on the No-Popery cry; and this if skilfully raised may no doubt have its effects, but the general democratic tendency is certainly to the abolition of all church establishments whether in England or in Ireland. It remains to be seen whether hatred of Catholicity, or love of democracy, is the stronger in the breasts of the new constituencies.

On the Continent of Europe everything seems to be quiet for the moment. The second detachment of Papal Zouaves which left Canada on the 14th of last month, had arrived at Brest on the 27th, and were en route for Rome.

The question of "raid, or no raid?" is still discussed in our Provincial papers. The more general, and apparently the better founded opinion seems to be that there will be no raid: and if, as it is reported is the case, the United States authorities are determined to enforce their own laws against their own citizens, a raid is impossible. Without the connivance of the Government of the United States a raid upon the Canadian frontier is physically impossible, and such connivance would inevitably lead to war. The extreme republicans in the States assert positively that the impeachment was sold: they evidently have not a very high opinion of the morality of their own statesmen, and fellow-countrymen.

THE FEAST OF CORPUS CHRISTI.—The Procession which annually takes place on the Sunday within the Octave of this great Festival was a most brilliant affair, and as usual we have but to congratulate ourselves on the good taste, and good feeling displayed by our Protestant fellow-subjects.

The procession which was of great length, and must have numbered from twenty to thirty thousand persons of all ages and conditions in its ranks, passed along Notre Dame and St. Joseph Streets to Mountain Street; at the junction of which with St. Joseph Street a handsome *repasoir* with altar handsomely decorated had been erected, from which was given Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, by the Very Reverend M. Bayle, Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, who under the magnificent dais bore the sacred host. Then turning up Mountain Street to St. Antoine Street along which it passed, the procession continued its route by Craig Street and up St. Joseph Street to the Parish Church of Notre Dame, where again Benediction was given, and the imposing ceremonies were brought to a close.

Along the line of route, and especially in St. Joseph Street, which was one mass of verdure, the streets were handsomely decorated with arches of evergreens erected by the residents of the districts; the sidewalks were bordered with branches of trees, and from house to house lines were stretched across the street from which flaunted gayly in the breeze, the flags of the different nations. If as the *Gazette* says a British flag was in one case displayed reversed, or Union down, that our contemporary may be sure was the result of inexperience in the handling of flags very excusable amongst people not used to the business. It was not by design our contemporary may be sure: for the Queen has no more loyal subjects, the British Empire no more de-

voted citizens, than the Catholics—lay and cleric—of Lower Canada.

The Festival of Corpus Christi was solemnised in Williamstown on Sunday, the 14th inst., by a public procession through the village, of the Most Adorable Sacrament.

The "Holy of Holies" was borne by the celebrant of the Mass, under a canopy of cloth of gold, which was carried by six gentlemen of the parish.

On each side of the Dais, three others held aloft handsome lanterns: and immediately before the censer-bearers, torch-bearers and children of the Sanctuary, walked twelve charming little creatures, robed in spotless white, who strewed the way with choicest flowers.

The procession rested at the Convent, where Benediction was given. The chapel as well as the grounds were ornamented with that taste and elegance proverbial among the Nuns of the Congregation of Notre Dame.

The singing of the young ladies surprised and delighted all that heard it.

From the Convent the cortege, which was even larger than usual, returned to the Church, where the Blessed Sacrament was enthroned and remained exposed till the evening service. Too much praise cannot be given the good and zealous people who planted evergreens and erected beautiful arches along the route.

We understand the solemnity was honored at St. Raphael's and Alexandria in the most satisfactory and edifying manner.—*Com.*

The question of naturalisation, and its effects in absolving the adopted citizen from the obligations of allegiance contracted by birth, is of course still attracting much attention in England, as well as in the United States. In the last named country it is made the standing diet at mass meetings; it furnishes able editors with a theme most effective for calling into play the faculties of that noble bird, the "American Eagle," and for holding up to the scorn and execration of the world that old decrepit, toothless animal the "British Lion," and it was lately by the President in his Message directly recommended to the notice of Congress, which was invited to make an authoritative statement of the national will upon the subject. A short time ago the *N. Y. Nation* a weekly of highest standing in literary circles exhorted to great caution in dealing with the matter in dispute; remembering that by the highest legal authorities on this Continent, such for instance as Chancellor Kent, the English view of the laws of perpetual allegiance had been sustained. However, argued the *Nation*:—

"It should be remembered that with the laxity and fraud which attend naturalization in several places—New York for instance—we might—if we acted under the guidance of such lights as Messrs. Banks, Chandler, and Robinson, find ourselves called on a dozen times a year to wage war for the deliverance of scamps who have never passed more than one week on American soil, and that in a New York grog shop.—*N. Y. Nation*, Dec. 5th.

But the United States journals are not all edited with the wisdom, ability and honesty of the *N. Y. Nation*. They seek for the most part, to flatter and follow, rather than to enlighten and guide the public whom they address: and hence the wild and extravagant terms in which they define what is, or rather what in their opinion should be, the effects of "naturalisation" or political adoption.

The English view, handed down from the days when feudalism determined every man's social status, and political obligations, and expressed in the formula "once a subject always a subject" is admitted on all hands to be untenable in the condition of modern society. Lawyers may quote the aphorism, and Judges may enunciate it, but no one believes it, and the British Government does not act upon it. This in a recent letter to the *Times* was well pointed out by *Historicus*: for the British Government did not interfere during the late war betwixt the Northern and Southern States, to protect British born subjects, but naturalized Yankee citizens, from the effects of the draft, or conscription: whilst it did so interfere in the case of its subjects who had not become naturalized. This shows that, in the eyes of the British Government, the former had forfeited their rights to its protection, and were therefore absolved from the obligation of allegiance to it. No matter what the theory, in practice Great Britain does recognise the fact that its natural born subjects, may under certain conditions shake off their duty of allegiance; and therefore in so far as Great Britain is concerned, there will be no great difficulty in inducing it so to modify its theory as to bring it into harmony with its actual practice, and with the modern system of social and political life.

But the United States' view of the effects of naturalisation, or rather the popular view of these effects, is at least as illogical and as incompatible with civil government, as is that expressed in the pithy sentence, "once a subject, always a subject." The United States government, though in theory it may lay down the axiom, that every naturalised or adopted citizen is absolved from the obligation of the allegiance contracted by

birth, does not believe in, would not in its own case, act upon, such an axiom.

For instance:—if during the late war, a native born United States citizen, a "copperhead," or Southern sympathizer, had run over from New York to some of the South American Republics, and that availing himself of their easy naturalisation laws, had there enrolled himself one of their citizens; and if thereupon returning to New York he had claimed in virtue of that naturalisation or adoption, exemption from the draft, upon the plea that he was the citizen of another State, and was therefore, and thereby, absolved from his allegiance to the Government of the United States—we may be certain that his plea for such exemption would have been scouted without serious discussion.

And besides, were it to be admitted that, as the Yankees pretend, the act of naturalisation of itself absolved the naturalised or adopted citizen from all obligations of allegiance to the government of his native land, even whilst actually resident in that land, it would be in the power of the United States Government, and by one stroke of its pen, to absolve all the disaffected in Europe, all who wished to get rid of the burden of natural allegiance, of their natural obligations.

For no proposition can be more self-evident than this, or less liable to be contested:—That every sovereign and independent City or State has the right to confer its freedom, or citizenship upon whomsoever it will, and upon whatsoever conditions it pleases to exact. Every such sovereign and independent State has the right therefore to confer the right of citizenship with all its political privileges upon, say all the people of Ireland, or of France, and upon no other condition than that of their being willing to accept it, and making a statement to that effect before the United States Minister at London or Paris, or United States consul at any Irish or French sea port. No one can deny the right of the Yankee Government to do this, were it so pleased.

But if, as the Yankees pretend, every one, on whom their Government confers the right of citizenship, or adopts as one of its citizens, is, even whilst resident in the land of his birth, and within the reach of the Government to which his allegiance is by birth due, *ipso facto* released from all the obligations of that allegiance, it follows that every Irishman in Ireland, that every Frenchman subject of the French Emperor, and actually resident in France, might by a simple act of the United States' Government be released from his allegiance to his former government: that every French peasant might be released from the burden of the conscription, upon the plea that in virtue of his naturalisation he no longer owed allegiance to France or to the French Government, but to the Government of the United States of which he was an adopted or naturalised citizen. This we say would be the inevitable logical conclusion in which we should be entangled were we to admit the monstrous claim set up by the vulgar in the United States, to the effect, that every one whom the law of the said States recognises as a citizen, is thereby absolved from the duty of allegiance to his natural prince. Evidently then the Yankee theory of the effects of naturalisation will not hold water: it is fully as monstrous as that elaborated by feudal lawyers from the old feudal system of Europe, and enunciated in our Courts as still part and parcel of the Common Law of England. Times have altered since that system was in vigor, and we must need consent to change with the times—and to adapt our practice to the new social and political order that actually obtains.

The truth would seem to lie between two extremes: One the English or feudal; the other the Yankee statement of the case. To determine exactly and with mathematical precision this middle point: to define sharply how, and under what conditions allegiance may be transferred from one government to another, may be a hard task, and one certainly not to be accomplished by noisy stump orators, and blustering pot-house politicians. It will tax to the uttermost the faculties of the legislator and diplomatist: but the task, if undertaken in good faith, and with a sincere desire to avoid strife, may, we think be accomplished. It may, for instance, be provided—that to effect a real permanent transfer of allegiance, there shall be a real and permanent transfer of domicile: so that a British subject may no longer be able to run across the Atlantic from Cork to Boston one day, and return the next, from Boston to Cork, an American citizen. It may, by mutual consent be enacted betwixt the two great Powers that the citizen of one, serving under the flag of the other, or engaged in any manner in its service, whether by sea or land, shall, no matter what the accident of his birth, be esteemed to all intents and purposes a subject or citizen of the State under whose flag he is serving, or in whose service he is engaged, if recognized as an adopted, or naturalised subject or citizen of that State: but that if the so adopted subject or citizen, of his own accord, and on his own business, return to the land of his birth, and there

again take up his residence, his old obligations shall again revive, and remain in force so long as he shall remain there.

In some such arrangement we believe that the negotiations still pending betwixt Great Britain and the United States on this very complicated question of allegiance, and naturalisation will terminate. We are confident that no one in the first named country will insist upon the enforcement of the old, we may obsolete maxim of "once a subject always a subject." We have every reason to believe that if the great statesmen and jurists of the United States are allowed to have their say in the matter, and if their voices be not drowned in the clamor of an ignorant rabble, the extreme pretensions of the Yankee press will be abandoned—and that thus a friendly solution, and one honorable to both parties may be arrived at. Of this we may be certain however: that if the United States will never admit the extreme feudal doctrine of allegiance, so neither will the British Government ever recognise the right of the United States to absolve all its subjects in Ireland from the obligations of allegiance, by the simple process of conferring upon them *en bloc* the rights of United States citizenship—which would be the logical, indeed inevitable conclusion were it to admit that every one upon whom those rights of citizenship are conferred is, *ipso facto* released from the obligation of allegiance to the government of which he was born a subject.

SPIRITUAL WIVES.—This is the caption of a very remarkable and interesting analysis in the April number of the *Westminster Review*, of a very remarkable work, lately published under the same title by W. H. Dixon, the writer of an earlier work on the Protestant sects of America. If in the first, he seems chiefly to dwell upon the intellectual aberrations of these sects, in his later work it seems to be his main object to indicate their moral eccentricities, as exemplified in those peculiar sexual relations which amongst themselves obtain, and which they seek to render general.

Why should "a lady," so is the problem stated by the *Westminster Review*, "who prefers to live in temporary, rather than in permanent marriage," be scouted, or condemned?—She asserts a right to think for herself in the matter of wedlock as in everything else. Free love, she thinks, is a necessary sequence of free faith. Why then in acting on her right, should she suffer a social stigma?—as if she had thereby been guilty of some moral wrong. The *Reviewer* thus continues:—

"In a country where no church is recognised as infallible, and where therefore no code of morality can claim to be of divine authority, such a question seems capable of but one answer."

And that answer is—that there is no moral difference betwixt what human law calls marriage, and that which it calls concubinage—unless God Himself shall have prescribed the terms and conditions of the sexual relations: for God alone can impose moral obligations.

Now has God determined these terms and conditions? If so—then all sexual relations not in strict harmony with those terms and conditions are immoral. If He have not so determined them—or if having determined them, He has given us no means of knowing with infallible certainty wherein those terms and conditions consist, then every man or every woman is morally at liberty to determine them for herself or herself. This idea underlies the Free Love movement as it obtains amongst the greater number of the more advanced Protestants both in Europe and in America: and the position of the "Free Lovists" who stand upon this principle is logically unprejudiceable. If there be no infallible Church, then there can be no infallible means of ascertaining what God has determined concerning the sexual relations of His creatures: and in that case, every one is, *morally*, at liberty to do therein as seemeth good in his own eyes—and the State has no right to abridge the freedom with which God has endowed him.

This is one side or aspect of the "Free Love" movement, which no one who holds to the Protestant principle of private judgment and private interpretation, has the right to censure. But there is another side, which is to the Catholic still more revolting, though it too is strictly in harmony with Protestant principles, and though it too, cannot be justly attacked by those who deny the existence of a living and infallible interpreter of Scripture.

Besides those who insist that what the State calls marriage, and temporary unions formed betwixt man and woman at pleasure, and broken off at pleasure, are both morally indifferent, since God Himself, Who alone can impose moral obligations has determined nothing clearly in the matter—there are many Protestant sects which interpreting the Scriptures by their "private judgment," claim a positive divine sanction for their peculiar sexual arrangements. The members of these sects admit that God has legislated upon the subject; but insist that their practices are in harmony with the Divine laws: whilst the other class of Protestant "Free Lovists" insist that God has not legislated upon the matter at all. Of the two classes the members of the first

indicated are by far the more abominably licentious.

A very remarkable, and indeed the most significant, fact connected with this class of "Free Lovists"—those for instance who interpreting the Bible for themselves, pretend to find warrant therein for the indulgence of all their lusts, is this: That it is almost exclusively recruited from the evangelical Protestant sects which have resource to periodic "revivals;" and that its members have always undergone the process of "conversion." It seems says the *Westminster Reviewer*:—

"that while under the pressure of social ordinations, the vast majority of persons acquiesce in the existing state of things, no sooner do those who acquire the consciousness that they are 'born in sin, and shapen in iniquity,' undergo the mental change consequent on 'spiritual regeneration,' than they claim exemption from the obligation of human laws in respect to their sexual relations, and interpret the Book which they still hold to be a divine guide of life, in whatever way best accords with their own intuitions."—p. 219.

That they should spurn with contempt all "human laws" imposing restraints upon their "sexual relations," is but right, for man has no right to legislate in the matter: that they should interpret the Bible, each man for himself, is but a sound Protestant principle; and that each should find therein exactly what best suits him, is but a necessary result of such a search, in a book wherein the peculiar sexual relations of the Patriarchs, of David, and Solomon, and other Scripture characters, are indifferently recorded without a word of censure. The only thing noteworthy is this: That these things occur to those only amongst Protestants who have experienced the spasmodic religion of the Revival, and undergone the process of "spiritual regeneration." With some of these the effects of the revival are but transient, and pass away as does the stimulus of a whiskey debauch, leaving the patient languid, and indifferent to all things, connected with religion. But on other temperaments, the effects are permanent, and manifest themselves for the most part in uncleanness and lewdness of living. We again copy from our author, treating of the terrible Revival of 1832 in the State of New York:—

"With the vast majority of those who had been affected, the effect was but temporary, and soon wore off. But with some it remained to influence and change the whole course of their lives. Conscience of being saved from sin these called themselves Saints. They announced their separation from the world, and they set themselves vigorously to organise 'the new heaven and new earth' wherein dwelleth righteousness. The enjoyment of 'perfect love' was the first desideratum. 'When a man becomes conscious that his soul is saved, the first thing he sets about is to find his Paradise, and his Eve.'—It is a very sad fact," observes our author with quiet sarcasm, "which shows in what darkness men may grope and pine in this wicked world, that when these Perfect Saints were able to look about them in the new freedom of Gospel light, hardly one of the leading men among them could find an Eden at home, an Eve in his lawful wife."—p. 217.

And so these "perfect saints" looked elsewhere for their Edens and their Eves, and of course they soon found what they sought. In their Bibles they read also how saints of old had taken unto themselves wives many, and concubines many, and they quickly followed the example. Then took root and grew up the disgusting system of "Spiritual Wives," a system which flourishes most on this Continent because of its physical conditions, because of the abundance of rich and unoccupied land that it still contains. But the system itself is not American, is not Yankee, but is essentially Protestant, and a legitimate logical deduction from the Protestant premises; that there is no infallible Church, or living medium of communication betwixt God and man: that there is no living, divinely appointed interpreter of the Christian scriptures, and that, therefore, every man is at liberty to interpret them for himself, and to deduce therefrom his own system of morality. Thus both classes of "Free Lovists" arrive practically at the same result. One—that which denies revelation, Book revelation as well as Church revelation—evolves its system of 'Free Love' from the depths of its own moral consciousness: the other, which admitting Book revelation denies Church revelation, pretends to evolve its system, "Spiritual Wives" from the Bible: but in both cases the system evolved is one and the same, or if there be a difference, it is altogether in favor of the first named class.

Much has been said and written of late respecting the action of the British Government in India, and the land regulations, as betwixt the Government and Zemindars or landlords on the one hand; and betwixt the latter and the Ryots or tenants on the other hand; and it is sometimes asked why the Government does not carry out the same policy in Ireland. The following explanation of the Bengal settlement, as given by the *Times* would show that the tenants, or cultivators of the soil of Ireland, have no reason to pray for such a settlement of their land question as that which has been come to in India:—

The conditions under which the Permanent Settlement of Bengal was effected were these:—There were three parties who might claim some interest in the land—the Government which had, or at any rate exercised, the right of demanding for the land such rent as it thought proper; the Zemindar, who collected that rent from the ryots or cultivators; and the ryots themselves, who ultimately paid the rent. The Zemindar might, without any great stretch of comparison, be likened to the middleman, whose function all authorities on Irish affairs unite in considering as most injurious to the cultivators of Ireland