

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by

J. GILLIES,

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS:

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 to paid, 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 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 & Son; 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, NOV. 21, 1862.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

A Revolution in Greece, and the abdication of King Otho, seem like a burlesque upon the great events to which the world of late years has been accustomed; and yet there is nothing of higher interest to report this week, than this paltry Greek Revolution. Speculation is active as to the person upon whose brows the vacant crown of Greece shall fall. Prince Albert is designated as a candidate for the not very enviable honor; and it is also hinted that Garibaldi, if he recovers, is to be invited to fill the empty throne. It will of course be expected that the successful candidate shall profess the form of religion prevalent in Greece; and this fact may perhaps operate to the exclusion of an English Prince, though it will prove no obstacle to the pretensions of one, who like Garibaldi is of no particular religion, and who looks upon all creeds as so many forms of a nearly effete superstition.

The ultimate designs of Louis Napoleon with regard to Italy are as unfathomable as ever; but the opinion now most generally prevalent is, that he is determined to keep his troops in Rome. The Piedmontese may grumble at this, but must perforce submit, and devote their military energies to the conquest of the Kingdom of Naples—an event, to all appearance, still very remote. A scandalous story that has been industrially circulated by the Protestant and Jacobin press, to the effect that there has been a serious quarrel between the Queen of Naples and her husband Francis II. and that the former had in consequence retired to a Convent, is formally contradicted.

The distress amongst the operatives in England is increasing; but for the present all ideas of recognising the South, or of interfering in any manner between the belligerent parties on this Continent, even if ever seriously entertained, seem to be laid aside by the British Government.

The war still lingers on in the States without any very striking events for the press to record. As, ostensibly, McClellan was dismissed for his inaction, we suppose that his successor General Burnside will find himself compelled to adopt a system of tactics very different from those of the "Young Napoleon." A serious battle may therefore shortly be expected. The Washington Cabinet, through the insolence and brutality of its subordinate Butler at New Orleans, now finds itself involved in difficulties with the French Government. The latter demands full and immediate satisfaction for injuries inflicted upon French citizens at New Orleans, hinting that if this be refused, force will be employed. It seems probable that Butler's acts will be disavowed by his superiors, and that the demands of France, backed as they are by threats, will be docilely complied with. Spain too has a quarrel with Abe Lincoln's Government; and Prussia has its grievance to allege, and its claims for reparation. "One war at a time" will however probably still be the rule of our neighbors, as it was in the Trent affair of last year.

GARIBALDI AND THE AMERICAN WAR.—Harper's Weekly calls itself "a journal of civilisation;" and truly it is the journal of civilisation in the United States. Its publishers are Methodists; its editor is understood to be a Methodist preacher—whether he be the veritable "retired clergyman whose sands of life have well nigh run out," and whose advertisement of a cure for consumption, to be furnished on the receipt of postage stamps, long adorned the columns of the Weekly, we cannot state. The often avowed purpose of publishers and editor, is to make as much money for the concern as possible. They have declared again and again that they look upon their paper as a mere affair of business;—and they have but one rule in conducting it—to make it pay.

It is consequently a happy blending of the leading features of the two weekly papers, which probably have the largest circulation in the United States—the *New York Police Gazette* and the *Christian Advocate*. The Americans are an eminently religious people, so Harper is down on Sabbath breaking and Popery; but the flesh and blood, so Harper publishes any striking ob-

scenity which comes to hand. It out-cants the *Advocate* in cant; and it got ahead of the *Police Gazette* in the matter of the Sickles' trial, being the only paper which published a *fac-simile* of the shocking written avowal of her shame, which the Hon. Mr. (now General) Sickles compelled his wretched wife to set down on paper. The Americans are a liberal people—nay, liberal indeed with things which are not their own, and still more so with things about which they care nothing; so we were charmed to read in Harper that American Jews are as good Christians as any going, inasmuch as they contemplate breaking down the middle wall of partition which separates them from American Christianity, and celebrating their Sabbath on the first day of the week. We doubt the fact, though Harper announced it; but of the consequences of the fact there can be no doubt. If they will eat pork, and observe the "Christian Sabbath," there will be little to choose between the Jew and the Methodist—which is a thousand pities for the Jew.

A late number of Harper's Weekly is adorned by a very affecting picture of "Garibaldi sick and in prison." He is represented in his shirt sleeves as usual, and looks altogether as little like that object beloved of the gods, a great man struggling with misfortune, as well may be. But Garibaldi is a great man amongst the people of whose civilisation Harper's Weekly is a type and exponent, and of course he is a hero to the publishers thereof. The recent rumor, that the Italian soldier has offered his sword to the U. States in the present emergency, has doubtless led to the perpetration of the affecting wood cut.

We hope the rumor of Garibaldi's offer may turn out to be true. We hope that he may recover, regain his freedom, and reach with his band of free lances the shores of the boasted land of Liberty! Garibaldi, the rebel, aiding to put down, what he and his new allies call, rebellion; Garibaldi, the patriot, fighting against those who are in arms for the sole purpose of defending their hearths and homes; Garibaldi, whose war-cry has been "Italy for the Italians," winning the South for the Yankees; Garibaldi, whose watchword at home has been that Government derives its just power from the consent of the governed, in arms as a volunteer, to force upon equal sovereign and independent States the yoke of the stranger; this would be a sight upon which we should love to look; this would force upon public attention the fact, that the high sounding words of the European Liberals, in favor of human rights, are but bluster; that they have no faith in them—no love for them; and that they are actuated by some other motives in their efforts to overthrow the peace of nations and disturb the order of the world.

Garibaldi, too, would soon sink to his true level in the United States. He may be a good guerrilla fighter, but he has not shown that he has any ability as a General on a large scale. He would come with a great reputation, with large pretensions; and he would fail and fall, as better men than he have failed and fallen in this unhappy war. The native American feeling would soon be roused against him and the brigands who might follow his fortunes from his native shores; and in a few months from his arrival, the notorious Garibaldi would be laid on the shelf. His failure there would run him in Europe. Harper would join full-tongued in the hue-and-cry against the favorite, so soon as the popular voice had changed, but no more would it delight to honor him in wood-cuts; in a very brief space even his name would be heard no more; and he would be added at last to the great multitude of bastard heroes of whom it is written—"memoria eorum perit cum sonitu." Sad fate—sad hell of those who have had in life no higher object than to make a name!

Our views of the Italian question are well known. When a great Prelate exclaimed to a powerful King—"Robber, take your hand from the throat of the Vicar of Christ," he spoke the sentiment of the Christian world, and that sentiment is ours. The attack upon the Patrimony of St. Peter is robbery and sacrilege. What the Pope cannot in conscience yield, none have a right to demand from him. The cry of a United Italy, the talk of Italian Nationality, is a cry got up to forward an attack upon the rights of the Church; the whole thing is done by the enemies of Christ to injure religion; and the cry does not express the sentiments of the Roman States, who, so far as they are not debauched by the emissaries of the Revolution, are loyal subjects of the Pope, and averse to the contemplated change. These facts are well known.—We do not for a moment admit that the factions in Italy, opposed to the temporal power of the Pope, represent the people of Italy; still less that the people of the Roman States desire to dethrone their King; nor do we say that, if they do so desire, they would have the right to do so. Other rights besides those of the Roman people are involved in this question—rights certainly no less sacred, no less assured. But, for the sake of argument, let us admit all these things; and then ask, on what ground Garibaldi can defend his course in Italy, that does not afford the fullest justification to the people of the Confederate States, and condemn, trumpet-tongued, the at-

tempt at their subjugation; to which he is about to lend his sword?

The people of the Southern States are entirely united in their opposition to the Federal Government; of this there is not the shadow of doubt. They are the citizens of Sovereign States which possessed, before the Union, all the machinery of government, as they possess it now. They did not, after their separation from Great Britain, agree to form the Union—which Washington himself called "an experiment"—because they wanted a system of laws, or a framework of Government; all these things they had. It is certain that, had Secession been considered impossible at the time the Union was made, it would never have been formed; that the right has been heretofore claimed by the New England States themselves; and that the States now in arms against the South would, at this moment, refuse to unite amongst themselves by an indissoluble tie. It is a principle admitted by every American, that Government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. The Southern States desired to secede in peace, as they had the right to do; and, even were that right denied under the Constitution, it cannot be pretended, in the face of the Declaration of Independence, and in accordance with the genius of their institutions, that the Federal Government should be forced upon the acceptance of the entire population of thirteen contiguous States, all united to a man in the desire to throw it off.

The South claims, of course, that this is no rebellion. The Southern States claim, and we know that they receive, the free and hearty allegiance of their citizens; they maintain that they are merely insisting upon their rights. But even were it a rebellion, with what face can a European rebel chief offer his sword to the American Government to put down a rebellion of such magnitude; involving the unanimous determination to be independent, on the part of more than a third of its citizens, being the total population of more than one-half of its settled and cultivated territory, when that Government claims to have been the first to unfurl to the world the banner of freedom, and owes its very existence to the principle, that Government loses all its rights when it loses the confidence and affection of the people.

This also, in the course of revolving years, thus we were to see. But who could have foreseen it?—who would have said that, in America, the hatred of rebellion would be first kindled by the one act of resistance to assumed authority, which the whole universe unites in admitting to have been made with full warrant of right; and that the chosen hero of the revolution in Europe should have volunteered his services to help to fix again upon the necks of a struggling people a yoke which they detest?

THE "GLOBE" AND THE CONVICTED COMMON SCHOOL TEACHER.—The Toronto *Globe* notices at last the scandalous case of the fellow Hay, Head Teacher of the Cornwall Common School; but our Clear-Grit contemporary misunderstands, or misrepresents the arguments of the TRUE WITNESS against the Common School system itself, which we thereupon based. We do not condemn that system because one of its servants has approved himself a scoundrel; for to do so would be illogical, and dishonest, and altogether in the Protestant line of argument against Popery as a system, because some of the adherents of the latter have been very bad men. No! we condemn the Common School system of Upper Canada because, as it is actually worked, a man may be retained as a Head Teacher, although his guilt and immorality have been publicly proved in a Court of Justice. It is not upon the offence of the man Hay, but upon his retention in his situation as Head Teacher, after his offence has been proved in a Court of Justice, that we base our arguments against the Common School system—as one which offers no guarantee for the honesty of school teachers, and which unblushingly outrages the first principles of morality and decency.

And yet if Protestants approve of that system, we have not a word to say against it, provided only that they have not the impudence to ask us to contribute towards its support. See what an outcry Protestants raise against the conventional establishments of the Catholic Church, when some filthy Maria Monk, Chiniquy, Garuzzi, or Achilli retails his slanders against the morality of their inmates; and yet these establishments are supported by Catholics exclusively, and the latter dream not of invoking the arm of the law to compel Protestants to pay one farthing towards their support. Much more then have we, Catholics, the right to raise our voices against the Common School system of Upper Canada, under which fellows convicted of seducing their female pupils are still retained in their situations as Head Teachers; and to the support of which we, Catholics, are, by an infamous and tyrannical law compelled to contribute out of our own pockets. We do not presume to interfere with the educational system of Protestants; but as freemen, we do protest, and loudly protest, against being taxed for the maintenance of a School system under which abominations such as those lately brought to light by the trial of the

Head Teacher of the Cornwall Common School can be, and actually are, perpetrated. If Protestants like to have lecherous scoundrels as teachers of their sons and daughters, we have not a word to say in the matter—but then we contend that this is a luxury for which Protestants should be content to pay out of their own pockets; without dipping their fingers into the pockets of their neighbors, who think that a man convicted of the worst of vices, is not a proper person to be intrusted with the guiding of youth in the paths of virtue.

It is amusing to notice the pretended scepticism of the *Globe* with respect to the guilt of Hay; and to contrast that scepticism with the avidity with which it gives ear to, and repeats every scandalous rumour against the morality of Catholic priests and religious, that the malice of the enemies of the Church can invent. Every filthy calumny retailed by a Leahy, a Chiniquy, or a Garuzzi is, in the estimation of the *Globe* a Gospel truth not to be contested; the verdict of a Jury composed wholly we believe of Protestants, against a Protestant Common School Teacher is to be accepted with suspicion, or rather not accepted at all, if it affirms his guilt. We do not, as the *Globe* falsely pretends, "assume" Hay, to be guilty. The solemn verdict of a Jury has, after due deliberation, after having heard the evidence on both sides of the question, and listened to all that Hay could urge in his defence, or in mitigation of his offence, publicly pronounced him to be "GUILTY;" and neither *Globe* nor TRUE WITNESS has any right to call that verdict in question, unless it can be shown that there are grounds for believing that malice, and prejudice against the accused dictated it. This, we need not add, has not been so much as insinuated, and we have therefore the highest moral and legal certainty of the guilt of Hay. There are no assumptions, no presumptions on our part; and therefore we have the moral and legal right to condemn a School system which retains as one of its Head Teachers, a man convicted of an offence so gross as that which has been clearly brought home to the Head Teacher of the Cornwall Common School.

THE PROTESTANT PRESS UPON THE FORCE OF AN OATH.—There is no point upon which Protestants are more severe against us poor Papists than upon that of oaths, and the obligations which oaths impose. We are accused, constantly, of holding very lax opinions upon these matters; every scribbler against the Jesuits, the extent of whose controversial studies has been limited by the perusal of the Reverend Josiah Blathersgate's "Testimony against the W— of Babylon," cites garbled and second hand quotations to prove that the Catholic Church countenances perjury, and asserts the lawfulness, or at all events the sinlessness, of swearing deliberately and knowingly, to that which is false; and the charge that Popery inculcates upon its professors the damnable doctrine that "Faith is not to be kept with heretics," finds even in this enlightened nineteenth century ready acceptance amongst the votaries of an intelligent and progressive Protestantism. Such being the case, it is profitable as well as amusing to note in what light Protestants view an Oath and its obligations; and for this purpose we will cite the language and deliberately expressed opinions thereupon, of the great organ of British Protestantism, the *London Times*.

This journal in its issue of the 29th ult., has a bitter article against the Yankee General Butler, and the reign of terror which that otherwise than honorably distinguished officer has inaugurated at New Orleans. The story as told by the *Times*, is one with which our readers must be already acquainted. Butler, with the cunning of a fellow who had been a low attorney's clerk, or something of the kind, before the Fates, and Abe Lincoln made a General of him, issued a Proclamation requiring every person in the City of New Orleans to register himself or herself as either a friend or an enemy to the Yankee Government; and insisting, at the same time, that they who registered themselves as "enemies," should register also every item of their property. In short, by the Proclamation every one was obliged either to take an oath of allegiance to the Yankees, or to submit to a wholesale confiscation of property.

Under these circumstances numbers of New Orleans ladies, against whom the Proclamation was especially directed, to save their properties took the oath of allegiance; and registered themselves as friendly to, and supporters of a Government which in their hearts they detested, and whose odious yoke they were determined to throw off at the first opportunity. The *Times* not only condemns the unmanly conduct of the Yankee General; but he defends as lawful, and as in accordance with the system of ethics, which he as the great exponent of Protestant principles professes, and seeks to inculcate, the action of those who took the oath of allegiance, whilst enemies at heart, to the Yankee Government. "Nothing," so argues this great Protestant writer, "nothing is clearer in law and ethics than that an oath extorted by unlawful coercion is void. Nothing is so essential to the character of an oath than that it should be thoroughly and universally understood, otherwise an oath would cease to be the band of so-

ciety, and would become the instrument of thieves and brigands." "But it is a horrible outrage for a wretch like this Butler, who probably in his life has never done one act of manhood; to drive up a whole population; under the muzzles of cannon, and under the threats of being utterly despoiled, to commit a sort of white perjury."—*Times*.

Or, not to put too fine a point on it, it is, according to high Protestant authority, lawful, or only "a sort of white perjury," to swear falsely in order to save one's property from confiscation; for the alternative presented by General Butler to the people of New Orleans was this—"Swear allegiance, or surrender all your effects, lands, houses, cash, and property of every description." We will not stop to criticise the principles of ethics as laid down by the Protestant *Times*; but we will ask of our readers, calmly and dispassionately to consider how such a declaration concerning Oaths and their obligation, if emanating from a Catholic source, would have been received by the Protestant community.

A NEW "REVIVAL" DODGE.—We take it for granted that our readers know what is meant by a "Protestant Revival;" and that they are aware that the great object of the minister who presides over, directs and excites those melancholy exhibitions of human weakness and depravity, is to "keep the interest unflagging," or in the language of the worldlings and unconverted "to keep the steam up." Many are the strange dodges resorted to for this purpose; of these, many are simply ludicrous; the greater part are decidedly blasphemous; but the following, which is duly recounted in the columns of the *Hamilton Times*, is worthy of the inventive genius of the great Artemus Ward himself.

From the above named journal we learn that a Mr. Hammond, an "evangelist," as our contemporary calls him, but whose real occupation is that of an itinerant mountebank, is doing a brisk business in the "Revival" line at Hamilton. The first symptoms broke out amongst the girls of the Knox's Church congregation; then the boys "took bad;" and finally, for these things are like other epidemics, the grown up members were affected, and the disease declared itself fully in the shape of a "Revival."

But it is not sufficient to "get up" a "Revival;" the job is how to "keep it up;" or going, when once it is started. Being essentially abnormal, like all other abnormal things it must, in the natural order of events, run its course rapidly, and give place to a reaction proportionate to the violence of the previous action. A Revival is a kind of moral intoxication; and though it is an easy matter to the practised hand to administer the requisite amount of stimulants, and to elicit the unnatural, or rather infra-natural phenomena of a Revival, it is a much harder job to maintain the action of the stimulus, and to prevent its speedy evaporation. In the case of Mr. Hammond's Revival we are told that "the interest was unflaggingly kept up for two whole hours;" the means by which this "keeping of the steam up" was effected is also revealed to us—and a most excellent dodge it was too.

"Regenerated Pughists" are becoming a bore; evangelical cabmen are at a discount; even the time honored "converted priest," long the standing dish, or *piece de resistance* of the "Protracted Meeting," delights no more; and fails, even when insisting in his most sanctimonious, and whining nasal accents, upon the abominations of Romanism, to keep the "interest from flagging." He, that is to say, "the converted priest" is nearly "used up." He is as smutty as ever, but his smutty stories have lost their savour, and his obscenity its relish. None of the usual devices for "keeping up" the steam of his "Revival" recommended themselves to Mr. Hammond, who wanted an article startling and original—or rather one which, even if old, might be introduced to his audience by a novel and startling title. The "*properties*," or stock in trade of the professional Revivalist are often very limited. One man, with a slight change of costume, often plays many parts; as for instance that of "The awakened sinner," then of "The anxious inquirer," or perhaps that of "The brother rejoicing in hope"—just as by a very trifling readjustment of a few outward fixings, the world renowned Artemus contrives to make a half dozen or so of wax figures do duty for all the "Crowned Heads, Literary and Military Celebrities, and Distinguished Criminals" of both hemispheres.—Everything in a Revival depends upon a name; and where one name fails to attract, or "keep the interest from flagging," another shall draw a crowded house. So in the case of Mr. Hammond's great Evangelical Exhibition at Hamilton—where the showman introduced his crack hand, or *mimo buffo*, under a new title, that of:—

"A MAN WHO FOR MANY YEARS HAD BEEN PRAYING TO THE VIRGIN MARY."

The dodge answered amazingly. Up went the steam, and the interest rose higher than ever, as our comical friend detailed the process by which his eyes had been opened, and he himself had been "snatched as a brand," &c., &c.—"Many were in tears while he told the striking story of his having come to the meetings a careless man, and of his being led to attend to the things of eternity. He declared that his happiness was unspeakable since he had found peace."

We congratulate Mr. Hammond upon the