

THE TRUE WITNESS

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. OILLIES
FOR GEORGE E. CLERE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

Town Subscribers.....\$ 3 per annum.

Country do.....2 1/2

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

Single Copies, 3d.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 14, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE *Canada* brings dates from Liverpool to the 1st inst. The vessels composing the expedition, for laying down the submarine telegraph, were at Cork, ready for a start, and there seems to be perfect confidence in the success of the gigantic undertaking. The Parliamentary news is of little interest.

A report of the capture of Delhi, not fully confirmed, but which may be traced to a Madras letter dated June 27th, was in circulation at the time of the *Canada's* sailing. What is authentic is, that several sorties of the besieged mutineers had been repulsed, but that the mutiny was spreading, and that the entire Bengal army was tainted with disaffection. Other revolts amongst the Sepoy troops, and attributed to the same cause as that in which the present is supposed to have originated—a suspicion on the part of the natives that the British government had a design of interfering with their peculiar religious and social organization—have occurred before now, but none so general or so serious as this. In 1806, the Sepoys at Vellore rose and massacred the European troops then in garrison at that place, committing horrid barbarities; but that and similar outbreaks, was, and have always hitherto been suppressed with signal punishment inflicted on the mutineers. In the present instance it is to be supposed that the valour of British soldiers and British officers will again triumph over every obstacle; but the mutiny put down, the serious question will still present itself—how is India to be governed, or rather garrisoned for the future? In the opinion of many, the British Empire in the East is doomed. From China the news is favorable; the enemy's fleet has been destroyed, with slight loss on our part.

From Paris we learn that the trial of the Italian conspirators had been fixed for the 6th and 8th inst. The harvest prospects throughout the Continent were most excellent.

THE "HEADSHIP" OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Our controversy with the *Montreal Herald* embraces two points—1.—Did Henry VIII. claim the right of "Headship" over the Church of England, and exercise the "Royal Supremacy" in virtue of an Act of Parliament—26th Henry VIII.; or as a right held immediately from God, and inseparably attached to the crown of the realm? 2.—What was the extent of power claimed by the king in virtue of his assumed right of "Headship"—and wherein did it differ from the power acknowledged by all Catholics to be inherent in, and inseparable from the See of Peter? We contend that Henry VIII. claimed his spiritual authority as a divine right, held immediately of God—and that, if Cranmer may in any sense be accepted as the exponent of the principles of Anglicanism, the King of England is, in theory, invested with greater power than the warmest defender of the Papal prerogatives ever assigned to the Sovereign Pontiff. Cranmer—the Archbishop of Canterbury—the Primate of the Church of England—Henry's confidential adviser—and, according to Hallam, "the most conspicuous in moulding the faith and discipline of the English Church, which has not been very materially altered since his time"—is the witness to whom we appeal, and whom we quote in support of our position. Now what are the express words of Cranmer as to the origin and extent of the Royal Supremacy? Here we have them:—

"All Christian Princes have committed unto them, immediately of God"—(not in virtue of any particular Act of the Legislature)—"the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance; and in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is appointed to their several offices—as for example, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, Lord Great Master, and the Sheriffs for Civil Ministries; and the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, and such other priests, as be appointed by His Highness in the ministration of the word—as for example, the Bishop of Winchester, the Parson of Winwick. All the said officers and ministers, as well of that sort as the other, must be appointed, assigned, and elected, and in every place by the laws and orders of the Kings and Princes, with divers solemnities, which be not of necessity, but only for good and seemly fashion."

Here then, in plain unambiguous language, we have before us the claims of the King as to the origin and extent of his supremacy; and it matters not in so far as our argument is concerned, whether these powers were formally recognised by the other estates of the realm as inherent in the sovereign. But, the *Montreal Herald* not-

withstanding, we assert that these powers were recognised as attached to the Crown, and were by the King exercised to their full extent.

The Act 26th Henry VIII., to which the *Herald* appeals in support of his argument, that the "Headship" of the Church was conferred on the King by Act of Parliament, is an Act simply declaratory, in so far as the Royal Supremacy is concerned. That "Headship," or supremacy, had, in fact, been recognised by Parliament as already existing, two years before, in "an Act for regulating the succession to vacant bishoprics"—*Hallam's Const. Hist. c. 2*; and could not therefore have been conferred by the statute to which our cotemporary refers us. That famous statute was never appealed to by the Sovereign, or by Anglicans, as the source or origin of the Royal Supremacy; which, on the contrary, it was always asserted, was, as laid down by Cranmer, an inherent indefeasible portion of the Royal prerogative. Indeed, we have little doubt that, had the editor of the *Herald* dared to enunciate his views as to the origin of the said supremacy in the days of the "bluff King Harry," he would have been quickly accommodated with a very unpleasant ride on a hurdle to Smithfield, alongside of, perhaps a Catholic priest, and a puritanical repudiator of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Our cotemporary will, we trust, pardon us if we differ from him upon another point. The Articles of the Church of England, as originally drawn up by Cranmer, Bucer, and others, were imposed upon all the clergy and universities, without having been assented to, either by Convocation or Parliament; though, in consequence of the King's sudden death, it would appear that the subscription did not actually take place.—*Hallam's Const. Hist. c. 2*. From this it is evident,—the *Herald* notwithstanding,—that the King, acting by the advice of his most intimate councillors, and of the leaders of the reformation, did suppose that, in virtue of his Royal supremacy, "he could settle the doctrines of the church without the consent of any of its members, lay or clerical, through their representatives." In the days of Elizabeth, indeed, when the voice of the Puritans first began to make itself heard in Parliament, this assumption of power was openly called in question; but in the days of Henry VIII. and his son, no one, unless a Papist, dared to hint that the King could not, *proprio motu*, declare and define the doctrines of the Church upon all disputed points; or that he was not the sole and absolute judge in all causes, spiritual as well as temporal.

Had we time and space we might easily multiply instances, illustrative of our thesis, that the "Headship" of the Church of England was claimed by Henry VIII. as a right held, not by consent of people, Convocation, or Parliament, but, immediately of God; that in virtue of that pretended "Headship," he claimed a power equal in extent to that assigned to the Pope by Catholics; and that in these claims he was supported by the leaders of the Reformation movement, and by the Anglican church. It will however be sufficient for our purpose to cite the following from the Protestant historian Macaulay, which we commend to the notice of our cotemporary. Speaking of Henry, ("who chose to be his own Pope") Cranmer, Somerset, and Elizabeth, "the four great authors of the Reformation," Macaulay says:—

"Three of them had a direct interest in the extension of the royal prerogative. The fourth (Cranmer) was the ready tool of any who could frighten him. It is not difficult to see from what motives, and on what plan, such persons would be inclined to remodel the Church. The scheme was merely to rob the Babylonian enchantment of her ornaments, to transfer the full cup of her sorceries to other hands, spilling as little as possible by the way. The Catholic doctrines and rites were to be retained in the Church of England. But the King was to exercise the control which formerly belonged to the Roman Pontiff. In this Henry for a time succeeded."

How far the Protestant Church of England herself acquiesced in this scheme, the same Protestant writer informs us in the following passage:

"She continued to be, for more than a hundred and fifty years the servile handmaid of monarchy, the steady enemy of public liberty. The divine right of Kings, and the duty of passively obeying all their commands, were her favorite tenets.... Once, and but once—for a moment and but for a moment—when her own dignity and property were touched, she forgot to practise the submission which she had taught."

The *Globe* complains bitterly of the "proselytising" practices in the Catholic colleges of Lower Canada. "The Canadian public"—he says—have "been assured that, in the Roman Catholic educational institutions of Lower Canada 'no proselytism,' direct, or indirect, is permitted;" and upon the strength of this statement, "not a few credulous Protestant parents have been led to entrust their children to Roman nunneries and monasteries." The *Globe* then proceeds with his charge against the said "nunneries and monasteries," of which the following is a resume.

A "correspondent"—name not given of course—has written to the *Globe*, informing the editor that he—the correspondent aforesaid—had sent his son to a "monastery in the Lower Province"—name of monastery of course not given—upon the distinct understanding that no tampering with the boy's religion should be allowed, and that he should not be compelled to join in Catholic, or hindered in the exercise of Pro-

testant, acts of devotion. "Hardly" continues the complainant, "has the young man become an inmate of the cloister ere he discovered that the orthodox maxim that faith ought not to be kept with heretics was religiously acted upon in the 'Diocese' of Quebec." Protestant children were required to attend mass; "physical force was occasionally resorted to" in order to procure a compliance with the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, and the reading of the Bible was prohibited to them by the "son of Ignatius Loyola;" who upon one occasion, the *Globe* adds, was knocked down by a refractory Protestant from whom it had been attempted to snatch the Bible.

This is the story of the *Globe*; but as with the ordinary prudence of Protestants when bringing their accusations against Papists, the writer purposely abstains from giving the name of his informant, the name of the "monastery" where the pretended outrage occurred, or indeed any circumstances whereby the actors in the transaction may be identified, we do not think that it requires any serious notice from the Catholic. An anonymous accuser is invariably either a liar or a coward, probably both; and were there any the slightest grounds for the charge brought in the *Globe* against our Catholic educational institutions in Lower Canada—were not the editor of the *Globe* fully persuaded that the story as told by him would not bear investigation—he would have given us the name of his informant, or at least of the "monastery" in which the outrage is said to have occurred.

We would remind the *Globe*, however, and his friends, that the directors of our Catholic colleges and convents are not very anxious to receive Protestant pupils within their walls; that the reception of such pupils is a great favor, a great act of condescension and charity on the part of our Sisters and Catholic professors towards their Protestant fellow-citizens; and that it would be in better taste were the latter to show themselves grateful for favors received, instead of calumniating their benefactors. If Protestants like not the course of training adopted in our Catholic institutions, the remedy is in their own hands; and all they have to do is to refrain for the future, from sending their children to Popish "nunneries and monasteries."

THE political, and politico-religious controversies of the French Canadian press are, we see, beginning to attract the attention of the English speaking portion of the community; and the *Montreal Herald* devotes nearly a column of its issue of Tuesday last to a translation of an article from the *Pays*—the organ of the Anti-Catholic, or Protestant section of the French Canadians. As the subject of these controversies is one which deeply concerns us all, and as the theories of the *Pays* are susceptible of an application fatal to our best interests as citizens, and as Catholics—we avail ourselves of the *Herald's* translation, to call our readers' attention to the fact, that they have as much to dread from Lower Canadian "Rougeism," as from "Orangeism," and "Clear-Gruism," in the Upper Province. Under different standards, and with diverse battle cries, our enemies have still one common object, and are inspired by one sentiment. That sentiment is hostility to the Catholic Church: that object is the subversion of all personal liberty, or individual freedom of action.

The Pays says:—

"We must not dissimulate; the strife here is not between whig and tory, liberal and conservative, reformer and non-reformer, within the framework of the institutions which it is attempted to work; but between the past and the future: between the authority of divine right and popular sovereignty: between despotism and liberty." The Italics are our own.

Here, as elsewhere, now, as in times past, society and liberty are menaced, and seriously menaced; the sole question at issue betwixt us and the *Pays* is—"From whom, and from what quarter, does the danger proceed?" That there is here, as elsewhere, strife betwixt "despotism and liberty," we admit; but the question arises—"Who are the friends of liberty, who are the upholders of despotism?"

Liberty, as understood by the Catholic, consists in submission to legitimate authority, and exemption from all other control. "Legitimate" authority, as defined by the Catholic, is that authority alone, which is from God, or of "divine right;" for all power—i.e., legitimate power—is from God, and that which is not from God is not legitimate, or entitled to our respect. The *Pays*, as the organ of democracy, places "divine right," or authority of divine origin, in opposition to "popular sovereignty;" and, in this sense, "popular sovereignty," must be odious to the Catholic, and the symbol of absolute despotism.

Despotism, as defined by the Catholic, is the Government of mere human will; nor does it matter whether that will be the will of one, as in a monarchy—of a few, as in an aristocracy—or of an immense majority, as in a democracy. In other words, despotism is the ascendancy of "might" over "right;" of "human will" over "human reason;" and is equally odious whether it be asserted and exercised by a minority over a majority, or by a majority over a minority.—But all exercise of authority not from God, is the Government of mere human will.

That all men are naturally equal, that conse-

quently no man has any inherent or natural right, to exercise any control or authority over his equal, we suppose the *Pays* will admit; but if, of himself, no one man has any such rightful authority over his brother, no number of men can, of themselves, have any right to control or exercise authority over any one individual of their number—for every multiple of nothing must still be nothing. From man therefore, as the sole factor in the social problem, it is impossible to deduce the "right" of civil Government, or of human sovereignty in any form. But any Government, or sovereignty, of which "might" only, and not "right," can be predicated, is a despotism, call it by what name you will—no matter by whom, or in what manner, its functions are exercised. Now, by placing "divine right," the only absolute "right," in antagonism to "popular sovereignty"—by eliminating the divine element from the problem which he attempts to solve—the *Pays* leaves us no alternative betwixt anarchy and despotism. God alone can impose a duty; to man, speaking in his own name alone, his equal man has always the right to reply, "Non serviam"—"I will not obey;" and if therefore in popular sovereignty there be nothing but the human element, there can be no obligation upon the individual to yield obedience to it—no sin in his treating it with contempt.—If the *Pays* wants a "reason" why man should yield obedience to civil government, he must needs have recourse to God, and to the "divine right" of that government. But from this resource he has cut himself off; and his theories, if logically carried out, would terminate, as all such theories have always terminated, in the establishment of pure unmitigated despotism—the substitution of "might" for "right," and the subjection of human reason to brute will—as the only refuge against the still greater evils of anarchy.

Strange, and except upon the hypothesis of diabolical agency, inexplicable, is the policy of those French Canadians, who, like the *Pays*, consent to play the game of Upper Canada radicalism, and who are doing their best to lay the country which they profess to love, prostrate at the feet of its bitter and irreconcilable enemies. Poor silly creatures! Can they not see that, even whilst applauding them as fine spirited fellows, and patting them on their backs, their Anglo-Saxon allies can scarce conceal the contempt which they feel for them—which every man of common sense and ordinary penetration, must feel for them. The preservation of a distinctive Canadian nationality amongst the hostile races by which it is surrounded and outnumbered, is possible, but upon one condition only—that Canadians remain truly and frankly Catholics. It is their Church, and their Church alone, that has, in spite of so many adverse chances, in spite of the strenuous efforts of the Anglo-Saxon race, hitherto maintained that nationality intact; and to her alone, do Canadians owe the miraculous preservation of their laws, and their language, as well as their religion. Her priests, her Bishops, have been, and are the true, the best of, Canadian patriots; and if ever the day arrives when their influence over their flocks shall have been lost, and their counsels disregarded, the last, the fatal day for a distinctive Canadian nationality will have arrived likewise. The Church, and the Church alone, we repeat, is, in Lower Canada, the guardian of the national liberties of the French Canadian people; she is the sole barrier betwixt them, and their Protestant Anglo-Saxon neighbors, seeking to extirpate them; the day that sees that Church curtailed of her power, and her children forsaking her maternal shelter, will also see the unhappy Canadians "improved off the face of the earth"—as it is written in the book of Brother Jonathan.

"Since our last article on the *Fete Dieu*, the *True Witness* has not had a single word to prove the legality of that procession."—*Montreal Witness* 8th inst.

"Another subject on which the *True Witness* sees it wise to maintain a profound silence, is the incendiary fire in Griffintown on the night of the Orange Ball, and the attacks of the Protestant Fire Companies, together with the sacking of the St. Charles Saloon on that night. Our zealous upholder of supposed law in the case of the *Fete Dieu* calls for no investigation into these intolerable crimes."—*Id.*

Our saintly cotemporary has contracted such an inveterate habit of "evil speaking, lying, and slandering," that it is scarce worth the while of any respectable person to notice his attacks. Yet our readers will we trust pardon us, if we pay the creature the unmerited compliment of a passing notice.

We have not attempted to "prove the legality" of the *Fete Dieu* processions—because, upon every principle of law and logic, the *onus probandi* rests with him who asserts their illegality: the presumption being, until the contrary can be shown, and the words of the Statute to that effect cited, that they are legal. They were legal before the British ever got possession of Canada; they have been in existence ever since, without a word of protest against their legality, from either the Imperial or Colonial authorities, though the attention of both has been drawn to them; their legality has been, not created, but recognised as an existing fact, by the presence of British troops; and with these strong presumptions of the legality of the *Fete Dieu* processions in our favor, we cannot—as any one acquainted with the laws of evidence will inform the editor of the *Montreal Witness*—be called upon to prove their legality. It is for our opponent to prove their illegality if he can. But this he knows he cannot do; for,

such is his horror of Popery, that we may be sure, that—if he fancied he had the remotest chance of success—i.e., of proving the said processions "illegal"—he would long ago have incited legal proceedings against the Bishop of Montreal and the other members of the Catholic Church, who on Sunday the 14th of June last must have openly violated the laws of the land if the procession of the *Fete Dieu* be illegal. It is in the Courts of Law, and there only, that the question of the legality or illegality of the said procession can be authoritatively decided, and to them we leave the decision.

That everything connected with the practise of the Catholic religion, and "contrary to the laws of Britain" was, as our cotemporary pretends, prohibited by the treaty of Paris, is false. At the date of that treaty the sanguinary Protestant penal laws, making the exercise of the Catholic religion a felony, were still in force in Great Britain; whilst from the terms of the treaty it is clear that the intention of its framers was to secure—(except where expressly stipulated to the contrary)—to the French Canadians, upon their becoming British subjects, the full and unmolested enjoyment of all the religious rights and privileges which they had enjoyed under the dominion of the French Kings. We less wonder however, at the erroneous interpretation put by the *Montreal Witness* on that treaty, seeing that he is so ill-informed upon cotemporary events as to inform his readers that the *Fete Dieu* processions are no longer allowed in France; the fact being, that at the very time he perpetrated this egregious blunder, the *Univers* and other French journals were giving full accounts of the great splendour with which the processions of the *Fete Dieu* had been celebrated throughout the Empire.

Passing on to his personal attacks upon us, and the course pursued by the *True Witness* with reference to the riots on the 12th and 13th ult., we think that the best mode of answering him is, simply to publish, side by side, the following extracts from the *True Witness* and the other *Witness*—leaving our readers to form their own conclusions thereupon.

<p><i>Montreal Witness</i>, (EVANGELICAL) August 8th.</p> <p>"Another subject on which the <i>True Witness</i> sees it wise to maintain a profound silence is the incendiary fire in Griffintown, and the attacks on the Protestant Fire Companies," &c.</p>	<p><i>True Witness</i>, (POPISH), July 24th.</p> <p>"We should be well pleased to see a sound punishment inflicted in due course of law upon the cowardly fellows who ill-treated the men of the Union Fire Company."</p>
--	---

<p>August 8th.</p> <p>"Our zealous upholder of supposed law in the case of the <i>Fete Dieu</i> procession, calls for no investigation into those intolerable crimes against the peace of society, demands no maintenance of real and acknowledged law in the premises."</p>	<p>July 31st.</p> <p>"The line of policy to be adopted by the Corporation is very clear.—First, to use every means within their power to detect and bring to punishment the assailants of the Fire Companies on the night of the 13th; secondly, to take every precaution within their power to prevent the recurrence of a similar outrage."</p>
--	---

<p>August 7th.</p> <p>"Mr. Coutsol has been conducting an investigation into the cause of the origin of the fire at Douglas Saw Mills on the night of the 13th ult. The results has not yet transpired; but we hope that the investigation will be a searching one, and that, if it should appear that the fire was the work of an incendiary, the utmost vigilance may be employed by the authorities to detect and bring to punishment the guilty parties."</p>	<p>July 17th.</p> <p>"We cannot terminate our notice of these melancholy and disgraceful proceedings without, as Catholics, heartily expressing our condemnation of the violence of which, we fear, it is but too true, that several of the party opposed to the Orange firemen were guilty.... These men should be given plainly to understand that, by calling themselves Catholics, they give scandal to religion; that if Irishmen, they are a disgrace to their country; and that, no matter what their creed or nation they are a curse to society, and abhorred by all honest citizens."</p>
---	---

<p>August 8th.</p> <p>"But by his silence shows, either that he is intimidated, or that he approves of the deeds in question."</p>	<p>July 17th.</p> <p>"We cannot terminate our notice of these melancholy and disgraceful proceedings without, as Catholics, heartily expressing our condemnation of the violence of which, we fear, it is but too true, that several of the party opposed to the Orange firemen were guilty.... These men should be given plainly to understand that, by calling themselves Catholics, they give scandal to religion; that if Irishmen, they are a disgrace to their country; and that, no matter what their creed or nation they are a curse to society, and abhorred by all honest citizens."</p>
--	---

If to speak in the terms given above, be "to maintain a profound silence"—if the language of the *True Witness* be that of one who is "intimidated" or who "approves of the deeds in question"—if to condemn be to "approve"—and if to call for a "searching investigation" be precisely the same thing as to "call for no investigation"—then indeed we will acknowledge the editor of the *Montreal Witness* to be an honest man. But as it is not our intention to call our cotemporary hard names, we shall leave it to our readers to form their own opinions as to the honesty and credibility of the *Montreal Witness*.

The *Toronto Mirror* has—as from his antecedents we expected—struck out of his columns the most objectionable part of Amos' filthy advertisement—which he inserted in ignorance of its contents, and after a positive assurance that the book it recommended to the youth of both