

## The True Witness

## CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,  
GEORGE E. CLERK,  
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street,  
MONTREAL.

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not in advance, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars. Single copies, price 25, can be had at this Office: Parker's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. P. Parker), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Doolittle's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 27, 1861.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The news by the *Perrin* will cause much pain to all Her Majesty's loving subjects. After upwards of twenty years of happy wedded life, the Queen is now left a widow, by the very sudden death of H. E. H. the Prince Consort. We pray God to comfort her in her heavy affliction, and trust that in the love of a grateful people she may find some consolation amidst her domestic troubles. The Prince died on the 16th inst. of a gastric fever.

We wish that we could give assurance of a peaceful and honourable termination of our difficulties with Washington; but it is not in our power to do so. There are many and contradictory rumours upon the subject; some to the purpose that Messrs. Sibley and Mason are to be released immediately—others to the effect that the Government of the Northern States is determined to maintain its right to their possession. In the meantime preparations for the defence of the Province continue with unabated vigor, and the entire community seems actuated by the most excellent sentiments. If we may have war—which God in His mercy forbid—the enemy will meet with a warm reception in Canada. Shoulder to shoulder must we stand, to meet the invader should he set foot upon our soil; and thus putting our trust in the Lord God of Armies, we shall show that a people fighting for their homes, their liberties, their Queen and their religion, are not easily to be conquered. So come the battle when it may; and God defend the right.

The news from Continental Europe is of no very great importance. The intentions of France, in case Great Britain should be involved in war with the Northern States, excite much discussion. The Parisian press professes entire neutrality, but recognises the legitimacy of the *casus belli*, and avows that no nation could patiently put up with such an outrage as that which Capt. Wilkes offered, when he claimed the right to seize political offenders, upon the high seas, when under the protection of the British flag. From Italy there is nothing new. The ill-celebrated fragments of the bogus Italian Kingdom seem about to fall to pieces again; and the brave General Borge, the commander of the loyal troops in Calabria, has, it is said, been captured by the Piedmontese, and shot for the thirteenth time. He is so used to being shot, however, that we expect soon to hear of his reappearance, in the vicinity of Naples.

It is important that our neighbors on the other side of the Lines, should clearly understand the sentiments entertained towards them, and towards the British Government, by the Catholics, and by the Irish Catholics of Canada especially. Great misapprehension prevails upon this subject.

The New York *Metropolitan Record* of the 21st instant, has the following, with reference to our Irish friends:—

"There is not an Irishman in the South or in Canada, that would not eagerly accept the opportunity now presented of paying off the debt of centuries which they owe to the English colony."

We speak only for ourselves—that is for Canada; and in so far as the latter is concerned, we assert that the anticipations of our New York contemporary are as groundless, as their enunciation is insulting, and in the highest degree dishonouring, to the Irish Catholic subjects of Queen Victoria in Canada.

For the groundlessness of the assertion—that in the event of a war with the United States any section of our Catholic community would fight on the side of the invader, against "the English enemy"—we need only refer the New York *Metropolitan Record* to what is taking place around us, and to the spirit of the Irish Catholic press, of which clear indications will be found in another column. Upon the insult offered to the Irish Catholics of Canada by the insinuation of our New York contemporary, we have a few remarks to make.

The New York *Metropolitan Record* professes to be a Catholic paper, and as such must recognise the fact that his Church—our Church in short—teaches that allegiance is a duty which cannot be violated without mortal sin; that, except in cases of extreme oppression and injustice

and in such cases exists at the present moment either in Canada or in Ireland—the subject can not, without incurring the penalty of mortal sin, take up arms against the government under which he lives; and that rebellion and treason are offences against the Divine, as well as against human law. To insinuate therefore that Irish Catholics—subjects by their own free will and deliberate act, of Queen Victoria—who have voluntarily chosen Canada as their future home, and the home of their children—and who have therefore voluntarily taken upon themselves the duties and obligations of British subjects—look upon their fellow-subjects as "enemies," and are panting for vengeance upon the government beneath whose flag they have spontaneously placed themselves—is to impugn their honor, honesty, and religious sincerity. It is equivalent to asserting that the Irish in Canada are traitors to their Church; hypocrites who profess with their lips a religion which they deny in their hearts; and double-faced scoundrels whose word no man should rely on. The New York *Metropolitan Record* but repeats the slanders of the vile Orange press, and gives the sanction of his influential columns to the mendacious calumnies of our bitterest enemies.

Or does our New York contemporary pretend that loyalty and obedience are obligatory only upon Catholics, who are not British subjects? or will he venture to assert that the Church has one law for the United States, but by which Catholics in Canada are not bound? Hardly will he dare to adopt this mode of argument, and yet none other will serve his turn. How for instance shall he be able to show that it is the duty of the Irish born Catholic, by naturalisation a citizen of the State of New York, to remain faithful to the Union—to fight, perhaps, in the ranks of the Federal army against "rebels"—and to abstain, certainly, from giving the latter any countenance or encouragement—if he denies the moral obligation upon the Irish Catholic in Canada to remain a faithful subject of Queen Victoria, and to refrain from aiding and abetting her enemies, even if he does not take up arms in her defence. Is not the law of God, as expounded by the Catholic Church, the same in Canada as it is in New York?—and if it is—if the Catholic citizen of the latter who should take up arms against his government would be guilty of mortal sin by so doing, how could the Catholic subject of Queen Victoria be sinless, who should act in the manner and spirit which the New York *Metropolitan* falsely attributes to the Irish Catholics of this Province?

It cannot be urged that the government of Queen Victoria is so unjust and tyrannical, either in Ireland or in Canada, as to justify rebellion, or armed insurrection against it. On this point let us hear what the Catholic Prelates of Ireland have to say:—

The Apostolic Delegate and Primate of Ireland, the Archbishop of Ireland, the Most Reverend Dr. Cullen, says:—  
"No grievances, no afflictions, will induce us to join in chanting the praises of sedition and rebellion. We shall ever be good and faithful subjects, not through any romantic or absurd sentimentality, but through principle, and for conscience sake. The writers in the English press seem to think that we are all conspirators, and that we desire nothing so much as a French invasion. I am persuaded that every man in Ireland would look upon any foreign invasion as the greatest calamity that could befall the country."

The Primate of All Ireland, the Archbishop of Armagh, the Most Rev. Dr. Dixon, says:—  
"Of Her Most Gracious Majesty, whom may God long preserve, she has no more loyal subjects than we are."

The Archbishop of Cashel, the Most Rev. Dr. Leach, says:—  
"We know how to preserve in violation the allegiance we owe to the Queen as our only temporal Sovereign; and to none of Her Majesty's subjects do we yield in obedience to her authority."

The Bishop of Limerick, the Right Rev. Dr. Ryan, says:—  
"The people would prove themselves to be not only good citizens and loyal subjects, but sincere and pious Christians. Let no one imagine that it is not part and parcel of Catholic discipline and Catholic morality to obey the chief authorities in the State."

The Bishop of Cork, the Right Rev. Dr. Delaney, says:—  
"We need not delay in declaring our loyalty to the gracious Sovereign beneath whose sceptre these great realms are governed."

The Bishop of Ossory, the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, speaks:—  
"Of Catholic Ireland, with five millions of faithful and loyal subjects ready to maintain with their blood and lives if necessary their kingdom and their Queen against foreign invasion."

The Bishop of Galway, the Right Rev. Dr. McEvilly, says:—  
"We will yield to no other portion of our fellow-subjects in sentiments of undivided allegiance to the gracious Sovereign of these realms. From the dictates of duty we never fail to proclaim, with the Apostle, that obedience—voluntary, interior, hearty obedience was to be tendered to all persons who were placed in high authority over them, and this not only to those who wielded the supreme, but also the subordinate occupiers of authority, governors, and magistrates, so long as they inculcated nothing evil, and outstepped not the limits of their authority."

For not only is the temporal power from God, but the different gradations, and species, and distributions of governing authority are also arranged by Him, and exist by His sanction and ordinance."

The Bishop of Elphin, the Right Rev. Dr. Gillooley, says:—  
"We have always been dutiful subjects of the British Crown. Allegiance to our gracious Queen is with us a duty prescribed by allegiance and strictly enforced by the Church."

The Bishop of Ferns, the Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, says:—  
"The history of the Irish people proved that they were, as they ever would be, faithful to her gracious Majesty."

And the Bishop of Killaloe, the Right Rev. Dr. Flannery, says:—  
"The loyalty of the Catholics of Ireland is called in question, but only by their enemies. The meetings of the people are declared by the anti-Catholic writers, and anti-Irish newspaper proprietors, and

political essayists, to prove that the people of Ireland are not loyal. Let no man taunt Catholics with disloyalty. Catholicity is loyal in principle, allegiance is inculcated by the tenets of our Holy Religion. There is not in Her Majesty's wide-spread dominions a people to whom we will yield in devoted attachment to her person and throne."

Now are we to look upon these venerable Prelates, above cited, as fools or as knaves? as men ignorant of the doctrines of their religion and of the duties and obligations which it imposes; or as knaves and hypocrites, wilfully misrepresenting those doctrines, and invoking the sacred name of God to what they know to be a lie? In one or the other of these characters must we look upon the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, if we deny that Irish Catholics are bound by the law of God to be loyal subjects of Queen Victoria, even in Ireland, where they have grievances to complain of, and where they and their Church have been grossly ill-treated by British Parliaments, and British Sovereigns.

But if in Ireland, Irish Catholics are bound to loyalty by the Divine Law, as expounded by the Church,—how much more unjustifiable would not their conduct be, if in Canada—where, as against the British Government, the utmost ingenuity of malice would fail to detect the faintest shadow of a grievance—they were by their acts to justify the anticipations of the New York *Metropolitan Record*? We earnestly entreat of our contemporary to reconsider his hasty and groundless judgment; we beg of him to retract his calumny against us, and we implore him not to judge of us by those emasculated specimens of Catholicity which he sees around him, and not to measure us by the miserably low standard of morality which obtains almost universally in the United States. Our professions are not deliberate lies; if we call ourselves Catholics, we are also prepared to perform all those duties, to God and to man, which our holy religion imposes upon us; and in the words of the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Killaloe, we would respectfully remind the New York *Metropolitan Record* that,

"The loyalty of the Catholics of Ireland is called in question, but only by their enemies."

We write these things in sorrow and in shame; for we are jealous of the good name of our Church, and we feel that more is done by her pretended advocates, the lay directors of the Irish Catholic press in the United States, to sully that good name, to bring her teachings into disrepute, and to cast doubts upon the consistency and morality of her doctrines, than by all the enemies of our holy religion in Europe or in America. Achilli, Gavazzi, Leachy, and Chiqui have said nothing more dishonouring to the Church, and to her children, than is implied in the passage by us quoted from the New York *Metropolitan Record*; and whilst the calumnies of the former may be met by the rejoinder that they are but the forgeries of an enemy, the equally injurious aspersions upon the integrity of our Spiritual Mother, are utterances of a brother Catholic, and are therefore doubly dangerous.

The most serious charge against Catholicity, that which finds the most ready acceptance with our enemies, and which most strongly prejudices the minds of well disposed Protestants against examining into, even, her claims as the divinely appointed teacher and expounder of God's law—is that she encourages or tolerates violations of that law, for her own ends—that her morality is lax and mutable; and that she adapts her precepts to the exigencies of the moment, and to the tastes, passions, and prejudices of her followers. To this charge, we should at once feel ourselves compelled to plead "Guilty," were the New York *Metropolitan Record* and its contemporaries in the United States, trustworthy exponents of Catholic morality; and no man who loves truth, and who hates a lie, spoken or acted, should for one moment remain a member of a Church of which such journals were the faithful organs.

For, if we were to judge of the teachings of the Catholic Church upon the duties of subjects towards their rulers, by the language of the journals by us referred to, we should be unable to avoid the conclusion that the Church taught the lawfulness, nay the duty, of rebellion and armed insurrection against those rulers—when by so teaching she could enlist in her favor the sympathies of the disaffected; whilst at the same time, through the lips of her Prelates and Clergy she inculcated the obligation of loyalty towards those same rulers, when by so doing she hoped to make for herself friends amongst the powerful, and rulers of the earth. Of two things one—Either the morality of the Catholic Church is, what her enemies say it is; or the New York *Metropolitan Record*, and its contemporaries, who flatter themselves with the prospects of an insurrection against the British Government by the Irish Catholics of Canada, are the libellers of the latter; because they represent them as ready to act contrary to the precepts of the religion which they profess, and therefore as sneaks, liars, and hypocrites. We can entertain a certain kind of respect for the man who boldly and openly repudiates Christianity, and frankly tells you that he neither believes its dogmas, nor will consent to be bound by its precepts. But for the double-faced scoundrel, for the mean canting knave, who outwardly makes

profession of a religion; any one of whose precepts he has deliberately made up his mind to violate; there is no epithet vile enough; and no language is strong enough to express the abhorrence, disgust, and contempt that every honest man must entertain towards him.—Jemmy O'Brien has left behind him a name by no means savoury; but even a Jemmy O'Brien would feel ashamed to acknowledge as his countrymen, fellows who could act as the New York *Metropolitan Record* and its contemporaries boast that the Irish Catholics of Canada are about to act in the event of a war with the Northern States.

How THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TREATS ITS CATHOLIC SOLDIERS.—No inconsiderable portion of the Northern army is composed of Catholic soldiers, who, true to the precepts of their Church, have gone forth to fight the battles of the Government of which they have constituted themselves subjects. This is as it should be; for the Catholic resident in the U. States is just as much bound to loyalty, as is the Romish subject of Queen Victoria in Canada. The treatment, however, which Catholic soldiers receive from the hands of the Government for which they are fighting, is not such as to induce the belief that their services are highly appreciated.

We copy from the correspondent of the *Boston Pilot*—a warm supporter of the Federal party—who writing from Cairo, Illinois, under date 5th instant, thus describes the condition of Catholic soldiers in the Federal army:—

"These boats are to be manned by 500 marines, one-half of whom are Catholics, and yet they have no chaplain, and no chance of attending their religious duties. Here are now, on board the boats, 200 Catholics, most of whom will undoubtedly be killed within a month, and yet they are left by the Government without any religious attendance whatever! The officers of these marines are not to blame; on the contrary, every man of them, with Captain Dove at their head, are perfect gentlemen, and are glad when a Catholic priest calls to see their men. But why does not the Government provide these men with the only sort of religious attendance that could make them sober and moral, and contented with their lot. In fact it would seem as if some of the officials valued the liberation of a black slave a thousand fold more than the salvation of the souls of any number of Catholic soldiers. There are now at this post about 2000 Catholic soldiers, and the Government have provided but very inadequately for their religious wants. Hence dozens, if not hundreds of Catholic soldiers, have died unconfessed and unabsolved, and unprayed for, during the past six months. Whose fault is it that this crying evil has not been brought to the notice of the Government ere this? I am at a loss to learn; but I know the facts are as I state. Colonel Lawler, of the 18th Illinois Volunteers, to be sure, has had a Chaplain with his regiment; but he has had all he could do to keep him, in spite of bigotry, and, as a consequence, there have been no less than fifty-two charges made against him by his subaltern officers."

The above extract furnishes ample proof of the strong Anti-Catholic feeling with which the "Defenders of the Union" are for the most part animated. Their triumph, if they do ultimately triumph, will be the signal for such an outbreak of popular fury against Catholicity, and against Irish Papists in particular, as this Continent has not yet witnessed. God help the poor Catholics who are fighting the battles of the Northerners. They are doing their duty as good, consistent, and therefore loyal Catholics, it is true, and are therefore deserving of our respect; but at the same time they are preparing a rod for their own backs, which will be unsparingly applied at the earliest opportunity—and in this respect they deserve our pity.

What manner of men these Federal troops are; how our Churches and Convents would fare at their hands, were we, through our treachery or supineness, to allow them to set foot upon our free soil, may in like manner be estimated from the subjoined extract, which we make from the same correspondent of the *Boston Pilot*, whose columns, we may be sure, do not exaggerate the brutality of the Northerners:—

In a late *Pilot*, you mentioned a rumor of an outrage committed by the Federal soldiers at Fredericktown, Mo. There is no doubt but the Federal soldiers there sacked the Catholic Church, took Father Tucker's horse as a prize, took the vestments, and "horrible deeds" stole the chalices and ciborium and trampled on the Blessed Sacrament! This is no rumor but a fact. I don't know the officer who was in command; but I learn that one Colonel Plummer was present. I don't believe that it was done by Germans. The Germans are not so savage as some who boast of a higher civilization."

No! we don't think that they were Germans who committed the outrages recorded above.—In all probability they were the fellow-countrymen of the brave Americans who a few years ago pillaged, polluted, and burnt the Charleston Convent; and who, on many a subsequent occasion, have distinguished themselves by tarring, and feathering priests, and other sportive acts of a similar character.

"WHO IS A PROTESTANT?"—Our argument with the *Christian Guardian* as to the meaning of the word Protestant amounts to this. That, considered etymologically, historically, or theologically, the definition by him given in the annexed terms is defective:—

"The only definition of a Protestant is—Every one who protests against Popery on the ground that the Holy Scriptures are the only authority in matters of doctrine, and that we are justified only by faith in Christ."

This definition we reject—1st—on etymological grounds—because it is the act of protesting, and not the reason for protesting, which according to the etymological origin of the word, makes a man a Protestant, or one who protests; 2nd—on historical grounds—because as originally applied to a party or sect detached from the Catholic

Church, the term Protestant had no reference whatever to "Holy Scripture" or "justification," but was intended solely to denote the party in Germany who adhered to the Protest of the Princes and free cities of the Empire, against the action of the majority of the Diet of Spire of 1529, as an invasion upon the civil rights of the minority. The Protesters protested upon political grounds; and based their Protest, neither upon the exclusive authority of Holy Scriptures, nor upon the doctrine of justification, but upon the fundamental laws of the Empire. In the words of the Protestant historian, Ranke:—

"They especially insisted on the fundamental principles of the law of the Empire. They declared that they could not be obliged, without their consent to give up the privileges secured to them by the recess lately drawn up at Spire, which had been confirmed by strong mutual promises, and attested by their common seals; that the attempt of other States to repeal this by their separate act was null and void, and had no authority over them; that they should go on to conduct themselves towards their subjects in matters of religion according to the terms of the former recess, and as they thought they could answer it to God and the Emperor."—*Ranke's Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, I. V. c. V. and they appealed, not to Scripture, but—

"to the Emperor, the next general free assembly of holy Christendom, or to a Congress of the German nation."—Ib.

Such, in substance, was the original Protest and the grounds upon which it was based. It was simply a protest of a minority against the political acts of the majority—for the Diet was a secular not an ecclesiastical assembly; although in virtue of their rank as members of the Empire, ecclesiastics were represented therein, even as Anglican Bishops have a seat in the British Parliament.

We rejected the definition given by the *Christian Guardian*, because a definition of which any term requires itself to be defined, is radically defective, and therefore worthless. Now one of the terms in our Methodist contemporary's definition is "Holy Scriptures;" but our contemporary does not so much as indicate any means by which we are to determine what "scriptures" or writings are "holy;" and therefore, as failing in this vital point, the entire definition is worthless—for that which itself requires to be defined can be of no use as a definition.

Our contemporary feels the force of this, and tries to shuffle out of it, by the old trick of changing the terms in which our objection is couched. We asked the *Christian Guardian* how we are to ascertain what "scriptures" fall within the category of "holy?" And to this our opponent replies by changing the term "holy" into "genuine." As thus:—

"The genuineness of the Scriptures, and what books compose the Sacred Canon? are questions which he ingeniously raises to divert attention from the point in hand."—*Christian Guardian* 16th inst.

Now from first to last of our argument we never made any, the most remote, allusion to the "genuineness" of any scriptures, but simply to their "holiness" in the sense of inspiration, or supernatural authority; but a writing, book, or scripture even upon sacred subjects, is not necessarily "holy" in the sense in which the *Christian Guardian* employs the term, i.e., of doctrinal authority—because it is undoubtedly genuine. The *Christian Guardian* uses the word "holy" in the sense of "divinely and supernaturally inspired;" and if belief in scriptures, "holy" in this sense, be essential to constitute a Protestant, it is impossible to determine whether a man is a Protestant or not, until we know what Scriptures are "holy;" that is to say "divinely and supernaturally inspired." Our objection, therefore, upon theological grounds, to the definition given by the *Christian Guardian* is most pertinent and unanswerable.

And our definition of a Protestant—as "any baptised person who protests against the authority of the Papal Church"—is, we contend, the only true definition—both in its extension, and in its restriction—of the term in dispute. That we have good authority for what we say, shall, we think, appear from the perusal of the following passage from a well-known Protestant historian:—

"The electors of Saxony, the Marquis of Brandenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Duke of Lunenburg, the Prince of Anhalt, together with the deputies of fourteen imperial, or free cities, entered a solemn protest against this decree, as unjust and impious. On that account they were distinguished by the name of PROTESTANTS, an appellation which hath since become better known, and more honourable, by its being applied indiscriminately to all the sects, of whatever denomination, which have revolted from the Roman See."—*Dr. Robertson's History of Charles 5th*, book V.

This is the definition given by an illustrious and eloquent Protestant historian, a distinguished divine of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and one of the most prominent members of the General Assembly of that body during a great part of the eighteenth century. With all due respect for our Methodist contemporary we think that the opinion of such a man is, at least, entitled to as much attention as is that of the editor of the Toronto *Christian Guardian*; and fortified by such authority, we contend that our definition of the word "Protestant" is unexceptionable, both in its extension and in its restriction.

In its extension; because, according to Dr. Robertson, the appellation Protestant hath, because better known and more honourable, "by its being applied indiscriminately to all the sects of whatever denomination."

And in its restriction; because the term "Protestant" is applicable to those sects only "which