

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAYAt No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

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
paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by car-
riers, Two Dollars and a-half; if paid in advance,
but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.Single copies, price 3d; can be had at this Office;
Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at
T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 22,
Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson &
Sons; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence
and Craig Sts.Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the
Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 18, 1862.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.—This paper will be, for the future, addressed to our subscribers by Spencer's Addressing Machine, and by referring to the stamp they will at once see to what date they have paid up. From the 16th prox. all our Quebec subscribers will receive their papers through the Post Office, and the terms will be—Two dollars per annum, if paid in advance, but Two and a-half for those in arrears. Indebted subscribers will please settle with our agent, Mr. O'Leary, as quickly as possible.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

As an appropriate pendant to the picture of Catholic unity furnished by the late great meeting at Rome, we have from the pencil of the *Times* correspondent another picture illustrative of the discord which rages in the bosom of the so-called Italian Parliament, and which characterises all its debates. The Italian Revolution is not yet accomplished, and already are the actors therein tearing one another to pieces. There are almost as many hostile parties as there are members of the Legislature; and it is impossible to peruse its proceedings without being convinced that the unity of the country which it pretends to represent is an impossibility. The admirers of Cavour denounce the policy of Rattazzi; the friends of the latter lay the blame of all that takes place on the shoulders of Ricasoli; and the whole batch of these unprincipled political adventurers is well summed up by the correspondent of the *London Times* in the following pithy phrase:—

"There is no dirt they will not eat."

The Roman correspondent of the same journal writes despondingly. The Papacy is as firm on its basis as ever, and recent events have shown that its champions are numerous, zealous and not to be despised. The writer evidently does not believe that Louis Napoleon has either the intention or the desire to come to extremities with such formidable antagonists.

Before Richmond matters remain in *statu quo*, but in the West the Federals are getting the worst of it. Nashville is seriously threatened by the Confederates, who have also made many prisoners from amongst the Northern regiments. The water in the rivers is now falling so that gunboats can hardly navigate them; and deprived of the co-operation of these, the Northerners will find it no easy matter to retain possession the conquests which they made in the Spring.

THE "TEMPORAL POWER" AND ITS ASSAILANTS.—We have no right to expect that Protestants should say anything in favor of the Temporal Power of the Pope; but we have the right to complain when, to make out a case for the spoliation of the Sovereign Pontiff and the overthrow of the most ancient throne in Europe, they have recourse to insult, and calumny, and untruth. As a Temporal Sovereign, the Pope is as legitimately subject to free criticism as is any other European potentate; but even the Pope has the right to demand that the case as between him and his enemies, be stated fairly, and that he himself be treated with as much courtesy as that which the usages of society exact should be shown towards an Emperor of the French, or a Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. Pius IX can claim this much in virtue of his temporal, if not of his spiritual status—as a Prince, if not as a Bishop; and if not in virtue either of his temporal or spiritual position, he may surely claim it in virtue of his personal character; for even the *Times* correspondent, writing an account of the late proceedings of the Canonisation at Rome, in spite of his Protestant prejudices finds himself compelled to apply towards the Pope the epithets of the "benevolent and the good."

The occupant of a throne from its antiquity so venerable, and from his personal character so worthy of respect and love—deserves better treatment than that which he meets with from the Protestant press generally, and from a writer in the *Montreal Gazette*—whom we quote below—in particular:—

"What a world of difference between these poor monks, and those be-purpled cardinals preaching the temporal power of the head of the church as a thing which must be upheld spite of all complaint, spite of all opposing interests, human and divine. What mean those words—one asks again and again, here in Europe—'My kingdom is not of this world'?

Look at the dead face of the large, bald, saint who has just passed away, and see how the piety of the world is irradiated with a joy, not of this world, but of the next, and then march out before your mind's eye the possessions of priest-craft, who are now grasping, with uncertain hands, wealth and its enjoyments, and temporal power—and the delight which it gives to ambitious minds, and mark how the slimy trail of the serpent is visible upon the robes of those who are the dedicated ministers and teachers of a religion sent from Heaven to the plighted followers of the Divine Exemplar of that faith. Listen to the new thunders from the Vatican breathing curses against all who dare assert and maintain the doctrine of popular self-government, for the people of Rome—mark how the bishops receiving their *mot d'ordre* are coming away to preach a crusade in favor of the right divine to govern wrong; and then ask yourself if they and such as they in other lands and other churches can be accepted as exponents of Christianity."

Doubtless diatribe and vulgar abuse are easier than argument and logic; doubtless it is far easier to blackguard the Pope than to show cause why he, the oldest Sovereign in Europe, should resign his dominions at the bidding of Victor Emmanuel; and yet is it doubtful whether even the "tall writing" of the *Montreal Gazette's* correspondent will succeed in convincing plain and unprejudiced readers that the Pope is wrong in replying "non possumus" to those who modestly request of him to lay down his sovereign dignity, and to acknowledge himself the subject of the King of Sardinia—because forsooth Rome would suit the latter admirably as a capital for his lately acquired conquests. Is there any sovereign in Europe who would accede to such a request? or one to whom such a request could be made without provoking the indignant comment of the civilised world? Let us take a case in point.

Suppose, for instance, that some fine day the Emperor of Russia should take it into his head that Turkey should be annexed to his dominions, and that Constantinople was the "natural capital" of his thus extended Empire. Suppose that acting upon this "idea," he and his friends, aided and abetted by the Greek Christians in Turkey, should call upon the Sultan to resign his Crown and sovereign dignity, and to content himself with the position of a Russian subject—how would the other Great Powers, how would the diplomatists of Europe, treat such an impudent demand? And yet such a demand would be reasonable and modest compared with that which is made upon the Pope; for surely if the temporal sovereignty of a Christian Bishop over Christians be an anomaly, that of an infidel over Christians is a far greater anomaly, and calls far more loudly for redress from the hands of Christendom.

We are not called upon to show cause why the Pope should be a temporal sovereign, but his enemies are bound to show cause why he should not continue to be so. We can plead in his behalf, prescription, and the "best of titles"—as the Protestant historian Gibbon is forced to admit; and we can show from history and from the international Treaties of European nations, that the Pope is as legitimately a Sovereign Prince, as is Queen Victoria or the King of Prussia. Why then should the Pope, the representative of the most ancient and the most legitimate dynasty in Europe, be called upon to unbind the regal diadem from his brow, to descend from his throne, and to swear allegiance to a *parvenu*? The Pope is in possession, and has been in possession ever since the greater part of Europe emerged from barbarism—and any lawyer will admit that such possession, such prescription afford a strong argument in his favor.

Why then should the Pope be called upon to abdicate? Is it because these are abuses in the Papal Government? But are there not abuses in the Turkish Government?—and yet the Sultan is not called upon to abdicate in favor of the Emperor of Russia. Is it because there are discontents and revolutionary movements amongst some of his subjects? But is there not discontent in Ireland, and are there not in that country abuses compared with which the worst evils which have been urged against Papal rule sink into insignificance? Is it because the Pope is a tyrant, and by cruel oppression has forfeited his right to the allegiance of his subjects? But even his enemies and revilers cannot speak of him except as the "benevolent and the good." It is because—but we waste our time in these enquiries. No cause, can be shown why the Sovereign of the Papal States should be called upon to abdicate, which would not be conclusive also against the rule of Queen Victoria in Ireland and in India, and against authority everywhere; and the reason why the Pope is treated differently from all other Princes is this:—1st. He is, in a material point of view, weak; that is to say he has neither a large army nor a large navy at his command, and can therefore be attacked with perfect safety; in the second place, the enemies of the Church perceive intuitively that to reduce the Pope to the condition of a subject would entail the overthrow of that peculiar ecclesiastical organisation known in history as the Roman Catholic Church, and would lead to the breaking up of its one religion into a countless multitude of national or State religions. For these reasons then, we find British Protestants, who in the case of Ireland or of India, are the loudest in proclaiming the duty of obedience to legitimate authority, and repudiating the novel doctrine of the "right of insurrection," and who enforce their views of order and government at the point of the bayonet

and at the muzzle of the gun, are with amusing inconsistency, loudest in their praise of revolution, and Jacobin principles in Italy.

To argue with such men is impossible, for argument presupposes the mutual recognition of certain universal, immutable, inflexible principles. We cannot argue with men who in one breath assert that any people discontented with its rulers has the right to depose them; and who in the next, assert that the discontented people of India are bound to yield true allegiance to the alien rulers whom the fortune of war has placed over them; and that the Catholics of Ireland have no right to take up arms for Irish national independence, and an Irish Republic. With such men we cannot argue; but we may contradict some of their misstatements, and this we shall attempt with reference to the assertions of the courteous and intelligent correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette*. The latter says "the temporal power of the head of the church" is, according to Catholics:—

"A thing which must be upheld spite of all complaints, spite of all opposing interests—human and divine."

This is false, because Catholics contend that the Temporal Power of the Popes should be upheld by all honest statesmen, because it is eminently conducive both to the temporal and eternal, the material and moral, interests of the human race: because in short, it is the key stone of our existing social system, and of Christian civilisation. These are the grounds upon which Catholics defend the Temporal Sovereignty of the Spiritual Head of their Church.

That which distinguishes European from modern Asiatic as well as from ancient heathen, civilization is the separation of the two powers—the spiritual and the temporal. European civilisation and European liberty are the fruits of this separation or distinction, as Asiatic despotism and consequent barbarism have ever flowed from their confusion. For this separation or distinction, we of the West are indebted not to Christianity viewed merely as a moral, philosophical, or religious system, but to Christianity as embodied in the ecclesiastical organisation known as the Papal Church. The two Powers were, as has been often recognised, united in one person at Rome, in order that they might be separate or distinct everywhere else. The Temporal power of the Pope is thus the only sure guarantee against State-Churchism, or the assumption of spiritual authority by the head of the State; and is thus the best guarantee for civil and religious liberty all over the world.

True however to its origin, Protestantism ever tends to reproduce the social and politico-religious conditions of heathendom; and true to its instincts, this end it seeks to accomplish by the destruction of the temporal power, or secular independence of the Pope. Every man must be either subject or sovereign. Strip the Pope of his Temporal Power and he would be a subject, dependent upon his sovereign, without whose leave he would not even be able to hold communication with the other Pastors of the Christian world. Thea would the Catholic Church be broken up, and subdivided into a number of national or State-Churches each subject to its secular prince. This also was the politico-religious condition of the pre-Christian world—as the Protestant historian Ranke in the introductory chapter of his "*History of the Popes*" aptly points out:—

"If we take a general survey of the world in the earliest times, we find it filled with a multitude of independent tribes. . . . The independence they enjoyed was not merely political; in every country a local religion arose; the ideas of God, and of divine things became as it were appropriated to certain places; national deities of the most diversified attributes occupied the world; and the law obeyed by their rotaries became inseparably identified with that of the State."—*Ranke's Hist. of the Popes*.

From this condition the world was delivered by the Popes. They emancipated religion from the control of the Emperor, and by the establishment of their Temporal Power the Church became independent of the Civil Magistrate. This great deliverance, which by no other agency could have been effected, was the work of the Popes and the object of all their struggles with the Emperors. The former asserted their Temporal Power as the means for securing that spiritual supremacy which the latter were ever seeking to engross. Thus Ranke again says:—

"It seems too, to me, to have carried with it a palpable inconsistency, that the Pope should have exercised on all sides a spiritual power of the highest order, and have been at the same time subject to the Emperor. The case would have been different had Henry III actually compassed his design of elevating himself to be the head of all Christendom; but as he did not succeed in this, it needed but a certain evolution of politics, and the Pope might by all means have been hindered by his subordination to the Emperor, from being fully and freely, as his office inferred, the common father of the faithful."—*Hist. of the Popes, Intro.*

This is the secret of the present outcry against the Temporal Power of the Popes. Protestantism by its essence tends to reproduce the social and the politico-religious conditions of heathendom, and to give us State-Churches and national religions, in lieu of One Indivisible Church, and One Catholic Faith. The motto of Protestantism is "*cuius regio, illius religio*;" and this is the essence of State-Churchism, since it implies that all spiritual, as well as secular, jurisdiction should be vested in the civil magistrate. But so long as there is a "common father of the faithful,"

this concentration of the two powers is impossible; and the object of Protestants, therefore, in seeking to make the Pope subordinate to, or subject of, a particular secular sovereign, is that he may no longer be the "common father."

And this is our justification of the Temporal Power. We assert it, not as an end, but as the means to an end; that end being religious liberty, or the emancipation of the Church and of religion from all dependence upon the civil power; and as the sole means by which that end can be effected, we maintain that the Pope or "common father of the faithful" must not be the subject of any particular secular sovereign—or in other words that he must be himself a sovereign. This is what we mean when we cry out for the "Pope King;" and seeing that, in theory, all men at the present day, admit that the separation or distinction of the two powers—the temporal and the spiritual—is absolutely necessary; and seeing also that the preservation of the independence or Temporal Power of the Pope is the only means by which that end can be accomplished, and the union of the two powers in the hands of the civil magistrate prevented—we do think that we poor Papists should get, not abuse, but some credit for our consistency, and our practical adherence to the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty.

SUNDAY SPORTS.—Only because directly appealed to, and invoked by the *Montreal Witness* of Saturday 5th inst. do we presume to interfere in the controversy betwixt our contemporary and his correspondent—"Papist"—upon the subject of "Sunday Sports." We believe that "Papist" is fully competent to conduct the business without our assistance; and if we offer a few remarks upon the subject it is merely in reply to the questions addressed to us by the *Witness*.

We would remind the latter that the only reason which we Catholics know of, for observing the first day of the week, or Sunday, as a holy day, or in any manner differently from that in which we observe any of the other days of the week, is the injunction of the Catholic Church; and that as it is solely in deference to her authority that we observe the day in a peculiar manner, at all, so also it is from her, and from her teachings alone, that we learn how, and with what observances the Sunday should be sanctified or kept holy—what things should be done on that day, and what things should be left undone.—The natural law gives us, and can give us, no information upon the subject; and of the supernatural law, from which alone we can learn that there is imposed on Christians the obligation of keeping Sunday "holy," the Catholic Church is the sole guardian and infallible interpreter. We cannot therefore test her teachings by any other standard—for that would be tantamount to admitting that, besides the Catholic Church, God had Himself established some other medium equally authoritative and infallible, for communicating to man His will as supernaturally revealed through Christ. We observe Sunday in a peculiar manner, only because the Catholic Church enjoins us to do so, and only in the manner in which she enjoins the day to be observed. If we did not recognise her teachings as the "Word of God," that is to say, as of divine authority, we should not observe the day at all differently from that in which we observe all other days; and if we recognise her authority as competent to enjoin a peculiar observance of the day at all, it would be most illogical for us to criticise or call in question the competence of those injunctions as to the manner in which the day should be observed. This premised, we will reply to the question put to us by the *Witness*:—

Q. "Does not"—our contemporary asks—"the *True Witness* approve of, and even enjoin Sunday sports?"

A. The *True Witness* has never enjoined "Sunday Sports" in the sense of asserting that there was any obligation however slight on any man to engage therein; but the *True Witness*, taking the teachings of the Catholic Church as his infallible guide in such matters, has asserted that there is no harm in such sports, provided that they do not interfere with the seasons allotted to divine worship; that they are not evil *per se*; and that they do not, directly or indirectly, lead to a violation of any religious duty, or moral obligation. Sunday, so the Church—the only authority upon the subject which we recognise—teaches, should be observed as a day of abstinence from all servile work which can possibly be dispensed with; as a day on which it is obligatory on all Christians, not hindered by sickness or other reasonable cause, to hear Mass devoutly, and if possible to assist at other offices of devotion; and during the entire course of which, the heart of all Christians should in an especial manner be directed towards God, and occupied with spiritual things. Any sport which does not prevent, or interfere with the performance of these obligations, is as legitimate on Sunday as on Monday or on Thursday.

Again our contemporary asks:—

Q. "Does the Church of Rome condemn Sunday pleasure trips?"

The Church of Rome, or Catholic Church, has not, *totidem verbis*, condemned "Sunday pleasure trips;" because the term is so vague that under it may be comprised "trips" of the most

innocent, and of the most dangerous description. A stroll of a Sunday evening by a father of a family with his wife and children, across the fields, through the woods, or by the banks of the murmuring stream, is a "Sunday pleasure trip," and such a trip the Church by no means condemns. But as those "trips" which steam-boat proprietors in the summer time, are in the habit of advertising with a view to the pecuniary emoluments likely thence to accrue to themselves, are often indirectly the cause of sin, of drunkenness and debauchery, by gathering together young and idle persons of both sexes; and as they impose upon engineers, stokers, and others the necessity of servile work which might well be dispensed with, the Church, speaking by her pastors, strongly disapproves of them, and exhorts her children to keep away from them altogether, as very dangerous, and as a proximate occasion of sin. It is the accessories or accidents of those "trips," rather than the "trips" themselves, which the Church condemns; for she does not teach that the artisan, the mechanic or hard-worked citizen, who, during six days of the week is closely pent up in the city, is guilty of any sin whatever, if on the first day of the week, or Sunday, he indulges himself and family in the unwonted luxury of fresh air, and lovely scenery.

Whether the Church is right or wrong in these her teachings is but another form of the question—"Is the Church infallible in matters of faith and morals?" and this question is but another form of putting the historical question, on which the entire controversy betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism depends—"Is the Catholic Church the sole medium by Christ Himself appointed for perpetuating and making known to all generations, the substance of His teachings?" Into this one question, every possible controversy in the supernatural order betwixt Catholics and Protestants must in its last analysis resolve itself; and this being so, it is the sole question which the former should ever condescend even to discuss with their non-Catholic opponents. Thus, for instance, on the Sunday question. If the Church be what she claims to be, the one infallible medium for communicating the will of God to man, what she teaches on the subject of "Sunday sports" must be in conformity with that divine will. If, on the other hand, she be not what she claims to be, if she does not speak as the oracles of God Himself, then is she unworthy of our attention, on any matter either of faith or morals; and there is no conceivable reason even, why we should abstain from our ordinary sports and occupations on Sunday, or treat the day with any peculiar mark of respect, or religious observances.

THE ORANGEMEN AND THE 'PROTESTANT REFORMERS.'—We have always insisted that on all politico-religious questions, in which the interests and the rights of Catholics were concerned, there was as difference betwixt the "low" Orangemen and the "Protestant Reformers" of whom Mr. George Brown is the chief. Orangemen we have always contended, in so far as Catholicity is therein concerned, is but "Clear-Gritism" organised.

A writer in the *Toronto Globe* the appropriate organ of the Orangemen, fully confirms these our views, and contends that 'Oan Ferguson—that *beau ideal* of the "low" Orangeman—and not Mr. Cameron is the exponent of Orange policy on the School Question, and other politico-religious questions of the day. The writer who signs himself *Orangeman* says:—

"The great body of Orangemen not only entirely agree with Mr. Ferguson's views on both these questions—(Separate Schools and Ecclesiastical Corporations)—but they have heartily and tangibly approved of his successful efforts put forth in reference to these questions of public policy."

ANOTHER MURDER.—In another column will be found the details of the brutal murder of Sergeant Quinn of the 16th by a private of the same corps. This is the second crime of the same description occurring within a week, and is one which unfortunately is by no means rare in the British service. With all due deference to the proper authorities, it seems to us that it is a great mistake to hand the blood-stained criminals over to the Civil power. They should be dealt with and that summarily by Court Martial; and upon conviction, execution should take place within half an hour of the breaking up of the Court. There is nothing so effectual as prompt and severe punishment to deter from crime; but in the ordinary course of events the punishment of the soldier who shoots his non-commissioned officer is deficient in promptitude. If the would-be assassin were convicted that within twenty-four hours after the perpetration of his meditated crime he would be hanging a corpse on the gallows, the trick of shooting sergeants would at once, and for ever be put a stop to.

REGIOPOLIS COLLEGE, KINGSTON.—Through some strange fatality we have been disappointed of an expected report of the Annual Examination at this important educational institution of Upper Canada. We hope however in our next to be able to make amends to our readers, and to the College.