

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES. SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on the Union Bank of London, The Bank of Ireland, The National Bank of Scotland, HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street, Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON. At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes. To Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum. To Country, do. \$2, do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1855.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

The Promulgation in the Diocese of Montreal, of the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God, will—in accordance with the terms of the "Mandement" of His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, given at Rome on the 27th February last—take place on Sunday next, being the Feast of the Holy Trinity, in all the churches, chapels, and religious communities of this Diocese. There will also be a solemn Triduum, at the exercises of which the Faithful are exhorted to assist in so far as their avocations will permit. The Decree will be read after the last Gospel at High Mass on Sunday; whilst it is being read the whole congregation will kneel. Immediately afterwards the "Te Deum" will be sung, followed by the "Inviolata," with versicle and prayer of the "Immaculate Conception." The Faithful, as a mark of respect upon this solemn occasion, are invited to furnish themselves with tapers, which having been blessed, they will light and hold in their hands during the reading of the Decree, in testimony of their Profession of Faith in the Dogma of the "Immaculate Conception."

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The following is a summary of the news by the Pacific, as transmitted by telegraph:— In Great Britain the democratic movement is gaining ground, and the cry for "administrative reform" is becoming louder and more decided. The Queen had made a distribution of medals to returned officers and soldiers from the Crimea. Rumors of dissensions in the Cabinet were rife; Lord John Russell is said to be the cause. In the House of Lords a motion of want of confidence in the ministry had been lost by a majority of 101 to 71; in the Commons the Bill to abolish Church Rates had been carried by a majority of 28. From France we learn that the assassin Pianori had suffered the punishment of his crimes; but no admissions of any consequence were made by him. The Great Exhibition opened on the 15th ult., and every thing was quiet in Paris. The German Powers are exciting much dissatisfaction. Sweden seems to be on the eve of joining her forces to those of Russia; and the last named power is making extraordinary efforts to recruit her armies. From the seat of war we have nothing of importance. The bombardment has ceased, and it is not known when it will be recommenced. Sebastopol has suffered but little, and the garrison quickly repair the damages done. Lord Raglan writes that the approaches are continuing slowly; but surely, and that several sallies had been repulsed with severe losses to the besieged. General Canrobert had resigned; and his post was occupied by General Pellissier. The Baltic fleet was slowly wending its way up the Baltic.

PROVOCATION OF PARLIAMENT.

At one o'clock on Wednesday, the session was brought to a close by His Excellency the Governor General in person. Having summoned the Legislative Assembly, His Excellency proceeded to give Her Majesty's assent to a number of Bills which have been carried through their different stages. Amongst these we are happy to see "An Act to amend the Laws relating to Separate Schools in Upper Canada." To an address from the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly recapitulating the labors of the session, His Excellency replied with the ordinary speech; in which, thanking the members of the Legislature for their services, he dismissed them to the enjoyment of the summer holidays. The speaker of the Legislative Council then gave notice that the Provincial Parliament be prorogued until Saturday 7th July.

CALVIN AND SERVETUS.

The Montreal Witness has evidently undertaken the task of re-writing history, for the especial use of the conventicle. In a late issue of that erudite journal we read:— The Montreal Herald has seen fit to give another hit at the so-called cruel fanaticism of Calvin, but this time we are pleased to notice he neither repeats, nor tries to defend, his former assertion, that Calvin condemned Servetus to the flames. Our cotemporary, however, has been in search of historical evidence, and brings out as his authority some modern writers, who, long after the event, assure us on their own authority that Calvin caused Servetus to be roasted. Such evidence in matter of history is beneath discus-

Let, therefore our great reformers be happily free from any slanderous aspersions which are not warranted by facts. Montreal Witness. As our cotemporary thus denies Calvin's share in the death of Servetus, we propose to furnish him with a few "facts" which he indeed may profess to consider as "beneath discussion," but which, nevertheless, have wrought conviction in the breasts of some of the most learned, impartial, and painstaking historians of whom the Protestant world can boast—of writers like Grotius, Gibbon, Hallam, and hosts of others, whose opinions will be of weight, and whose relation of "facts" will be appealed to as authoritative, when the Montreal Witness shall be forgotten. But to come to "facts."

In the first place, we must admit that the Montreal Herald erred in attributing the death of Servetus to the "cruel fanaticism of Calvin." Of this charge we fully acquit Calvin; for it is evident, from his own letters and other existing cotemporary documents, that, in his conduct towards Servetus, Calvin was actuated by purely personal motives. It was as the enemy of Calvin, and for having laughed at his "Institutes," and not as the author of the "Christianismi Restitutio," not for having reviled the doctrine of the Trinity, that Servetus suffered at the stake. Calvin was "cruel" indeed, but no "fanatic." A fanatic is an earnest man; sincere, though mistaken; and his errors are oftentimes rather to be attributed to the head, than to the heart. Now, Calvin was certainly no fanatic in this sense of the word; he was merely a cold, calculating, vindictive villain; who sought to conceal the malice of a fiend under the garb of a reformer of religion. Thus Grotius, when discussing the errors attributed to Servetus, says:—

"I dare pronounce no positive opinion upon Servetus, as I have not well studied his cause; neither dare I trust the testimony of Calvin, his capital enemy, when I know how iniquitously and cruelly the same Calvin treated men far better than himself—Cassander, Castilio," &c.—Grot. Op. Theol. iv., 639, quoted by Hallam.—Lit. of Europe.

Of the same opinion was the Protestant historian Gibbon; who, speaking of the death of Servetus, and Calvin's share therein, says:—

"The zeal of Calvin seems to have been envenomed by personal malice, and perhaps envy. He accused his adversary before their common enemies, the judges of Vienna, and betrayed for his destruction, the sacred trust of a private correspondence.—The deed of cruelty was not varnished by the pretence of danger to the church or state."—Decline and Fall, c. 54.—note.

In the same strain writes another Protestant historian, Hallam; whose means of information, were perhaps as good as those of the editor of the Montreal Witness. Hallam says in his chapter on the "History of the Literature of Europe," from 1550 to 1600, quoting Mosheim and Allwoerden in support of his opinion:—

"Servetus, in fact, was burned, not so much for his heresies, as for some personal offence he had, several years before given to Calvin. Servetus had, in some printed letters, charged Calvin with many errors, which seems to have exasperated the great reformer's temper, so as to make him resolve on what he afterwards executed."

Again, the same writer in his Constitutional History of England thus compares the conduct of Cranmer and Calvin:—

"The death of Servetus has weighed down the name and memory of Calvin. And though Cranmer was incapable of the RANCOROUS MALICIOUSNESS OF THE GENEVAN LAWYER, yet I regret to say that there is a peculiar circumstance of aggravation in his pursuing to death this woman, Jean Boucher, and a Dutchman that had been convicted of Arianism."—Const. Hist. c. 2.

No—Of the charge of "fanaticism," at all events, Calvin must be absolved; and the Herald ought, in justice to the "great reformer's" memory, to retract the accusation so unwarrantably made against him in its columns. But, as the Witness seems to expect a verdict of acquittal for Calvin, not only on the charge of "fanaticism," but on the charge of having caused Servetus to be put to death as well, we will furnish our evangelical cotemporary with some more "facts"—taken, as are the above, for the most part from Protestant historians, and original documents still existing in the public archives of Europe.

The first "fact" we shall cite is a letter, in Calvin's own hand, bearing date February, 1546—seven years before the death of Servetus—and in which the writer makes no secret of his blood-thirsty intentions. This letter is addressed to Farel, Calvin's predecessor at Geneva, and is preserved at Paris, in the Dupuy collection, "chamber of manuscripts." It is appealed to by Hallam, quoted by Witengobart, a Dutch ecclesiastical historian, and by Grotius, who had seen it. Of its genuineness there can therefore be no doubt. Now in this letter, Calvin, after mentioning that Servetus had hinted to him his intention of visiting Geneva, significantly adds:—

"Si venerit, modo valeat mea autoritas, vivum excite nunquam patiar." "If he comes, and my authority is of any influence, I will never allow him to depart alive."

In another letter, written about the same time to Bolzec on the same subject, Calvin expresses the same amiable intentions, towards Servetus:—

"I have determined if he [Servetus] comes, never to allow him to depart in a sound skin—nunquam patiar salvum exeat."

This letter also is quoted by the Protestant historian Hallam, who refers the reader to the "Life of Servetus," by Allwoerden—a work founded "on materials collected by Mosheim, who put them into the author's hands."—Hallam. Lit. Hist. Europe; though by some critics the whole work has been attributed to the Protestant historian Mosheim himself.

Our cotemporary will please notice that all our "facts" are derived from Protestant authorities; who,

if worth anything as witnesses, against Popery, must be, at least, as good witnesses when testifying against Protestantism. He will also be pleased to remark that, the proof that Calvin compassed the death of Servetus, years before he had the chance of accomplishing his design, rests not on the authority of some modern writers, but on cotemporary documents, and on the authority of Calvin himself. But we will give him some more "facts":—

1. The death of Servetus was, by Protestants, attributed to Calvin, during the lifetime of the latter. 2. Neither Calvin, nor his friends, denied the soft impeachment; but, on the contrary, justified it, on the plea that heretics should be put to death. These "facts" are sustained by the following proofs:—

Shortly after the death of Servetus, the "gentle" Melancthon wrote to Calvin—his "very dear brother"—approving of the conduct of the Genevese authorities in "putting this blasphemer"—Servetus—to death; and returning thanks to the Son of God, who has been the spectator and the judge of your [Calvin's] "combat, and who will be the rewarder thereof." The church also, both now and in time to come, will owe you her gratitude.

In 1554, one year after the death of his enemy Calvin published a work in refutation of the heresies of Michael Servetus, "in which is taught that heretics are to be coerced by the right of the sword;" thus avowing, and vindicating the propriety of putting Servetus to death—so little did he deem that that act was one of which his admirers, in future ages would seek to absolve him. In reply to this treatise by Calvin, appeared a little tract by Sebastian Castilio, under the assumed name of Martin Bellius—in which the writer opposed the sanguinary theories of Calvin. This again elicited another pamphlet on the same subject from Beza; who adopted the opinions of Calvin on the propriety of putting heretics to death, and did his best to make it appear, not that Calvin was averse to killing Servetus, but that he was in favor of a less cruel mode of punishment, than that which was adopted. But, as all history shows us that Calvin was omnipotent at Geneva, that his word was law, and that to oppose it, was looked upon as opposition to the word of God, we place but little reliance on the assertions of Beza in this respect, though they are backed by the protestations of Calvin.

Here again we have a mass of "facts" drawn from Protestant and cotemporary sources; which, if Protestant history be not a monstrous conspiracy against truth, even on Protestant subjects—as it most undoubtedly is when it treats of Catholicity—clearly, and beyond the possibility of cavil, establish these facts:—

1. That Calvin by his influence, caused Servetus to be put to death; "that, for this purpose he himself accused Servetus, and betrayed for his destruction the sacred trust of a private correspondence."—Gibbon.

2. That Calvin had harboured this design for years before he got the chance of carrying it into execution; being excited thereunto by personal hatred of Servetus, who, having poked fun at Calvin and at Calvin's theology, "had exasperated the great reformer's temper so as to make him resolve on what he afterwards executed."—Hallam.

3. That Calvin was not a fanatic as the Montreal Herald insinuates—for fanaticism implies enthusiasm—but a malignant, cold-blooded murderer, whose treachery and barbarity towards Servetus were only exceeded by his infernal hypocrisy, and simulated zeal for religion.

Having then, by Protestant testimony, cleared "our great reformer from any slanderous aspersions not warranted by facts"—we leave him in the hands of the Montreal Witness, wishing him joy of his great spiritual father, for whose reputation he is so properly zealous.

"He had acquired an immense ascendancy over that republic."—Hallam.

We acknowledge the receipt of a communication on the subject of "Common Schools," over the signature "Another Teacher;" complaining of the tardiness of the Government in the matter of justice to Catholics, and of the delays which occur in the apportioning the funds granted for Teachers' salaries, both in Upper and Lower Canada. If we do not insert our correspondent's letter, it is because we trust that the new School Law will in a great measure remedy the evils complained of; and because, though we would by no means pledge ourselves to accept that measure as a full and final adjustment of the question, we feel inclined to give it a fair trial; after which, should it be found not to work satisfactorily, we shall still be at liberty to demand such additions or alterations as circumstances may require.

So much indeed depends upon the spirit in which the different clauses of the School Law are interpreted—so much upon the prudence and impartiality of those by whom its provisions are to be carried into execution—that it is very difficult, and would most certainly be very imprudent, to hazard any opinion upon the merits of the new Law. It has, we believe, been introduced and carried with the best intentions. It is designed to alleviate the burdens under which the Catholic minority of Upper Canada have so long labored; and, we certainly think that it is a great improvement upon the old School Acts. We accept it therefore, thankfully. But it does not seem to accord to the said Catholic minority all that they have the right to ask—all that the Government, which is bound to deal impartial justice to all its subjects, ought to grant. It does not secure to the Catholic minority in the Upper Province, all the advantages which are accorded by law to the Protestant minority in the Lower; and is therefore not a full and perfect measure of justice. What we have the right to ask—what in common justice the Government is bound to grant—and what, if we are but true to our-

selves, we shall in time obtain—is this. That, in Upper Canada, where the Catholics compose only a minority of the population, every right, privilege, and facility for establishing, controlling, and supporting their separate schools, shall be by law secured to the said Catholic minority, as is by law secured to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. More than this, we have no right to expect.

However, let us be thankful for what we have got, and show that we are animated by no cautious spirit of opposition; but are ever ready to give credit to the Government for all the good it does. If we do not look upon this Act of 1855 as a payment in full of all our claims, let us accept it as an instalment upon the debt due. The debt is acknowledged—the principle, that the religious scruples of the minority entitle them to the right of separate schools for their children; supported by a fair share of the public funds, and subject solely to the control of the denomination establishing them, has been again formally recognised and sanctioned by the Legislature; all that remains to be done is to insist that the said principle be fully and fairly applied, to Catholics in Upper Canada, to Protestants, in Lower. In this we of course must expect opposition. Opposition from the advocates of "State-Schoolism," and from the enemies of "Freedom of Education;" opposition perhaps, from some of the Government officials, who, as we already know to our cost, are strongly opposed to the growth of Popery; and who will, of course, use all their influence to render inoperative the favorable provisions of the new "School Law," by giving to them, in every case, an interpretation adverse to Catholic, and favorable to Protestant, or Non-Catholic, interests. We may expect too, that they will avail themselves of every doubtful phrase, of every legal quibble upon which they can lay their hands, to defeat the intentions of its framers; and we must be prepared to find in them persevering, and consistent, if not very honorable, antagonists. All this, and much more—hostility and opposition from "Jacks-in-Office" and deputy "Jacks-in-Office," from "Municipalities" and "Boards" without end—must we expect. But we need not despond; nay, we have much for which we should be thankful. The great principle is now fully admitted that, in education, as in religion—in School, as in Church—the State is bound to respect the conscientious scruples of a minority; and that it is as unjust to tax a man for a school of which he cannot conscientiously approve, as it would be to compel a Protestant to support a Catholic Church, or to charge a Methodist Protestant with the expenses of Mormon Protestant worship. If Protestants are not content with this—if they object to see any portion of the public funds, to which both Catholics and Protestants contribute, allotted to the support of Catholic, as well as Non-Catholic schools—they must then be prepared to adopt the "Voluntary" system in education, as well as in religion; but never, no never, will the Irish Catholics of Canada tamely allow themselves to be taxed by Protestants for the support of Non-Catholic schools. As well might they be in Ireland, and be once more paying tithes to a Protestant parson, as submit to such an infamous extortion in Canada. The hell-begotten incubus of the "Establishment" is, we trust, at its last gasp in the old world; and we feel pretty sure that the days of "State-Schoolism" are numbered in the new.—Amen.

THE GRAY MURDER CASE.—The Government has not as yet seen fit to make public the "Report" of Mr. Monck, upon which the convict Gray received a full pardon for the crime of murdering his wife.—We know not how to account for this singular reticence upon so important a subject; one which so intimately affects the impartial administration of justice in the Province, and with all the circumstances of which therefore the public have the right to demand that they be put in possession. We have indeed heard it hinted—and from a high quarter—that Mr. Monck's "Report" is kept secret, because it does not justify the action of the Government towards the convict; because it leaves no moral doubt, that Gray was indeed guilty of the crime of which he was convicted after a long and impartial trial by a jury of his fellow-countrymen, and that his pardon was but a concession to popular clamor, unwarranted by the circumstances of the case. How far these rumors and hints are founded on fact, we cannot pretend to say; but, it certainly does look very mysterious—it does seem as if there was some truth in them; or else, why is not the "Report" itself given to the public?—and why is not the witness, J. Reilly, brought to trial for the perjury of which he certainly was guilty, if Gray did not murder his wife? Is it—can it be—that the Government is afraid to prosecute the said Reilly? Can it be, that it is unwilling to stir the business any further, for fear of bringing to light the conduct of certain Protestant magistrates, who took, or pretended to take, J. Reilly's depositions; but which depositions were not produced on the trial, where they might have been subjected to a rigid examination—for reasons best known to Gray's friends? We hazard no opinion upon any of these questions; but justice, and the interests of the public demand that Mr. Monck's "Report" be given to the world, and that, if Gray is innocent of murder, his perjured accusers be made to suffer the punishment due to their crimes. Of course, if the "Report" is not published we may be well assured that it is because it will not bear inspection, and because it does not justify the conduct of the Executive towards the convict. In justice to Gray then the "Report" should be published!

The Globe and his worthy confederates have got hold of a cock and bull story about the tyranny of the Christian Brothers at Toronto towards their pupils. As the facts of the case have been violently distorted by a mendacious Protestant press, in order to cast