

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.  
 PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
 At No. 369, Notre-Dame Street, by  
 J. GILLIES.  
 G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:  
 To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.  
 To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.  
 The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.  
 We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.  
 The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "JOHN JONES, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 5.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JANUARY—1866.  
 Friday, 5—Vigil of the Epiphany.  
 Saturday, 6—FIRST OF THE EPIPHANY.  
 Sunday, 7—First after Epiphany.  
 Monday, 8—Of the Octave.  
 Tuesday, 9—Do. do.  
 Wednesday, 10—Do. do.  
 Thursday, 11—Do. do.

THE NEW YEAR.

Since we last addressed our readers the year 1865 has passed away, and we avail ourselves, therefore, of the privilege that the customs of the season authorize, to wish them all a Happy New Year, and many of them. Would they reciprocate the compliment it is in their power to do so, by discharging their several arrears, and by punctuality, henceforward, in remitting the amount of their indebtedness to this office. This request may, to some, appear singular, ill-timed perhaps importunate, for in the matter of paying, the printer, a very general and deep-seated delusion prevails amongst the public. It is this:—

That a subscriber has done all that can possibly be expected of him, and has fully discharged his obligations to God and man when, for a year or two, he has regularly received his paper, and taken it out of the Post Office. Ask him to pay for what he has received, and he will, in many instances, stare at you with surprise, as at one of the most unreasonable of mortals. "Why bless you, my dear Sir," he will rejoin, "I took your very excellent paper with the view of supporting it, and of encouraging its circulation, and did not certainly expect to be called upon to pay for so doing." He thinks, and this is the delusion which we would desire to point out, and if possible to combat, that the taking the paper, is the sole and ultimate function of the subscriber.

Earnestly, yet respectfully, would we remonstrate against this very popular error, for an error, and a fallacy it is, though popular. To make up a bona fide subscriber, there are two factors required:—The one is the "taking" of the paper; the other the "paying" for it when taken; and of these two factors, the second is, in the eyes of the printer, at all events, by no means the less important. This, we are aware, will to many put the functions of a "subscriber" in a very novel and startling light; and their surprise will be by no means lessened when we assure them that the order to "stop my paper" from one who has taken it for three or four years without paying thereon a cent, is not altogether a satisfactory settlement in full—in so far at least as the printer is concerned. Simple and elementary as these truths may appear to some, we may be pardoned for insisting upon them, seeing that so many of our patrons are, if not profoundly ignorant of, at all events perfectly indifferent to, them. We will however adopt the first hypothesis—that of ignorance; and we trust that the theory which we have advanced—to the effect that a paper is not effectually encouraged, or supported by the mere taking of it for a number of years, without payment—novel and startling, as at first blush, that theory may appear to many—may meet with respectful consideration and careful study from that very numerous body of our readers whom we address in conventional phrase as our "Delinquent Subscribers."

To another, and we are happy to say a very numerous class of our readers, who have shaken off, or who perhaps have never been subject to the delusion above mentioned, we return our hearty thanks; and tender them an assurance that, in so far as our humble means permit, and as God gives us grace, we will endeavor to make the True Witness worthy in some measure of their continued support, and confidence as a Catholic journal, Conservative and loyal to the British Crown in politics, but strictly neutral as to parties, and aspirants to public office. The fidelity with which we may have redeemed our pledges in the past, will be the measure of the reliance that may be placed upon our promises for the future.

Passing from the consideration of these merely personal matters to those of public importance,

we may observe that the past year has been one of deep significance to Canada. The ever to be deplored—deplored at least by all who would maintain Canadian independence, and Canadian connection with Great Britain—issue of the gigantic struggle which the Southern States for four long years heroically carried on for their independence, has left the Northern States at liberty to direct their arms against this happy and free Province, against the last asylum for liberty on the North American Continent. That they have not as yet done so is owing partly to the fact that the South though conquered and trampled upon by the iron hoofs of the Northerners is not, in so far as the noble spirit of its men and women are concerned, by any means subjugated. They are not, never will be reconciled to the Northern yoke; and though for the moment they may, by the mishaps of the late war, be compelled to bear it, yet it galls them, and they are prepared no doubt to avail themselves of the first favorable opportunity, when their conquerors shall be engaged in war with some European power, to cast it off, and again assert their inalienable, their natural, and constitutional right to national independence. What Poland is to Russia, what British misrule has unfortunately made Ireland towards England—that are the Southern as towards the Northern States: and to make use of a hackneyed proverb, "the difficulty of the latter will be the opportunity of the other"—an opportunity which they will not be slack to seize, and, God grant it, to improve.

In the meantime their own domestic affairs—their financial difficulties of which the only probable solution is "repudiation," and their unsatisfactory relations with the conquered Southern States—prevent or delay the long meditated hostile action of the Northern States against Canada; and give us a breathing time, and time for making preparations for the impending storm. God grant that our rulers may make the most of it, and that the customary party squabbles for place and pelf may not, when the supreme moment shall have arrived, leave us unprepared to meet it. We have so much to love and cherish in that we are British subjects: we have so much to lose, by any conceivable change in our political relations, that our people must be infatuated indeed, if they be not ready to make any and every sacrifice to preserve to themselves and to their children the blessings which they actually enjoy, but of which their apathy under actual circumstances would show them to be all unworthy. Though our soil may be inferior to that of our Southern neighbors, though our climate may be more rigorous, yet in its moral aspect and in comparison with the rest of this Continent, Canada is a very land of Goshen; a land in which the torch of rational freedom, of civil and religious liberty burns still with undimmed lustre; though all around us is thick darkness, the darkness of military despotism "even darkness which may be felt."

Canada is in a transition state, and some changes in our political status are, unfortunately, inevitable; but it should be our care that these changes be as slight as possible, and tend not in the direction of democracy and centralisation, from whence in the nineteenth century, and not from monarchy, not from aristocracy or from the debris of European feudalism, proceed the dangers with which liberty is menaced. The problem which our statesmen are called upon to solve is this: How to combine all the strength of British North America for purposes of defence if our liberties and national independence be menaced; whilst leaving at the same time to each section or Province thereof, its full and perfect autonomy in all that concerns its internal or domestic affairs: how to secure in short unity of commercial and military action, together with a minimum of centralisation. The projected Confederation scheme so long before the country does not appear to the people of the Lower Provinces to combine these two qualities, and it has therefore up to this time been coldly looked upon by them. What may be its ultimate fate it is impossible at present to foresee. Its opponents and its advocates are alike confident of victory; but perhaps the most probable hypothesis is this: that the Lower Provinces will ultimately assent to a Union—but to a Union which shall by greatly limiting the functions of the proposed central government, and by giving to their local legislatures far greater control over their internal affairs, than that allotted to them by the delegates at the Quebec Conference of 1864, give greater prominence to the principle of "State Rights."

God has been pleased to bless the country, with an excellent harvest; and this, and the great demand for grain and cattle from the United States, have caused money to flow freely into the Province, and have given a great impetus to all commercial business. But, as the proverb says, "What is one man's meat is another man's poison;" the high prices, source of prosperity to some, have been to others, the poor especially, a fearful calamity, and the cause of much and bitter suffering. What is sport to the boys who throw the stones, is cruel death to the frogs at whom the stones are thrown; and now in this severe season, when so many thousands are thrown out of employment—when, through no

fault of theirs, they are without food, without fuel, and unable, from the high prices ruling, to give to their little ones that daily bread for which 'twain they cry, it behoves the rich man, if he would not provoke the wrath of Him Who is the Father of the fatherless, if he would not have his blessings changed into a curse, and see his over-cherished gold converted into dross, to open his ears to the cry of God's poor, and to make his less fortunate brethren participants with him of heaven's bounty.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Our dates by steamer *Australasian* come down to the 17th ult. From these it appears that with the conviction of the Messrs. Luby and O'Leary the interest taken in the trials of the Fenian prisoners had much subsided. The Special Commission having finished its business for the present in Dublin, had been transferred to Cork, and was engaged with the trial of McCafferty said to be a Yankee. O'Donovan has been sentenced to penal servitude for life.

The more closely this unhappy Fenian business is sifted, the more clearly does it appear that in no sense whatsoever was it in its inception, or in its design Irish or national: that in no sense of the word are its leaders, and prime instigator patriots. Could one of the brave soldiers who fought for Ireland under the gallant Sarsfield come on earth to-day—and be apprised of the designs and acts of the Fenians, he would as a true Irishman and as a Catholic repudiate them with scornful indignation, he would repudiate all brotherhood, all sympathy with them. So too the men of '98 would repudiate them: so too would O'Connell: so too would that brave Irish gentleman Smith O'Brien, and all who whether wisely or unwisely, whether prudently or imprudently, have with heart and soul loved Ireland as their native land, and sought redress either by force of arms or by constitutional action for her wrongs. Were O'Connell alive to-day we can conceive with what fierce and eloquent invective he would denounce the Fenian leaders, in what solemn notes of warning he would remonstrate with their dupes. This at all events is incontrovertible: That if O'Connell were an Irish patriot, that if Irishmen to-day do well to hold in honor the name of that great champion of their native land, the Fenians should be held in scorn and execration by every Catholic Irishman, as the enemies and foul-mouthed slanderers of their Church and clergy; as, not excepting the Orangemen of the black North, the worst and most dangerous creatures ever nurtured or fostered on Irish soil since the day when the great St. Patrick of blessed memory, banished as the legend has it "all the varmint."

Would we know what Fenianism is, what the attitude which in honor and in duty the Catholic is bound to observe as towards it, we have but to read the plea urged by its chief men in Ireland, by Luby and O'Leary, when on their trial.—They urged, relying of course upon the anti-Catholic prejudices of their hearers, they urged in their defence that, though the cutting of the throats of the Catholic clergy was not a formal or integral portion of their programme, Fenianism was essentially an anti-sacerdotal movement; and Mr. Luby pleaded in favor of the *Irish People*, of which he was the editor, that it had always been devoted to discrediting the Irish Catholic Clergy, to degrading their influence, and to deprecating the interference of the priest with politics—just as the *Rouges* do in Canada, just as Gavazzi and Garibaldi, and the leaders of the European Revolution do throughout the world.—Indeed so identical in principle, and in practice are the Fenians with the worst men of the revolution, that to us it is a wonder that they have not ere now promoted Garibaldi to the office of Captain General of their forces; and named that congenial spirit Gavazzi, the obscene slanderer of the Religious whom Mr. Luby made it his chief occupation also to slander, as their Chaplain. It would be as great a misnomer to speak of the late insurgents at Morant Bay in Jamaica as patriots, as to apply that term to the Fenians.

It is not, thank God, an Irish movement at all—in the sense of being indigenous to Ireland.—It is purely of Yankee origin, conceived as much in hatred of the Catholic Church, as of England, and begotten of the dregs of democracy. This is why all the gentlemen of Ireland, no matter what their creeds or political opinions, stand aloof from it, and look upon with disdain. This is why Irish gentlemen like the O'Donoghue and hundreds of others, who by birth and position, and talents, and services rendered, are the natural leaders of Ireland, scorn to touch it, or to soil their fingers with the thing. This is why the Catholic Church throughout the world, from the Pope in the Vatican, to the humblest parish priest in Ireland or America, denounces it, and declares it to be accursed. Not that these brave Irish gentlemen, the ornaments of their native land, and than whom no better patriots ever shed their heart's blood for liberty and fatherland; not that the Holy Father, the Vicar of Christ upon earth, not that the devoted self-sacrificing Ministers of the blessed Gospel, are ignorant of, or indifferent to, the wrongs of Ire-

land, or would seek to countenance the wrong-doer. No; they disapprove of, detest and anathematize Fenianism because neither its end, nor its means are lawful to gentleman or Catholics; because its end is not Irish freedom or justice for Ireland, but a *Jacquerie*; because it is a secret society whose object is revolution.—Would to God that Irishmen would but give themselves time for a moment's serious reflection on these matters; and address themselves in good faith to the consideration of the question, "How can a movement for the political and social regeneration of Ireland result in good, from which all Ireland's leading statesmen and patriots, all Ireland's native nobility and gentry hold contemptuously aloof; and which has received the malediction or solemn curse of the "Holy Catholic Church?" Is it by such a movement as this, or by the ascendancy of such anti-Catholic principles as those advocated by the *Irish People*, and the Fenian organs of America, that the redemption of Ireland can be worked out; or that great cause promoted, for which priests and bishops and holy men of old were persecuted, hunted like wild beasts, imprisoned, tortured, and cruelly done to death on the scaffold?

Whilst Fenianism has resulted in discomfiture, disgrace, and in giving additional impetus to Orangeism, another, and a very different system, is now being tried to obtain an amelioration of the political and material condition of Ireland. A large body of her representatives have met together, and agreed upon a joint course of action upon the Land, the Church, and the School questions. To their programme the *Times* offers no serious objections; and even upon the Land question it speaks as if English legislators would offer no opposition to a measure for regulating the relations of landlord and tenant, if the Irish themselves can but hit and agree upon a solution of the question. As to the Protestant Establishment it is doomed; it needs not to be assailed from without, for it carries the seeds of dissolution within its own bosom. On the Education question it is evident that the Ministry are prepared not only to treat, but to capitulate; so that from legal and constitutional action alone we may confidently expect a redress of all those hardships of which the people of Ireland have long complained.

"'Tis best to be off with the old love  
 Before you are on with the new."

Old Song.

DR. PUSEY AND THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

—Dr. Pusey has long been compared by irreverent wags to a sign-post which, showing the road to Rome, moves not one inch in that direction itself. But of late a change has come over the head of the Puseyite agitation in this respect.—He moves, visibly and palpably; Romewards too in appearance, and that with vigorous and lusty strides. Whether he will continue his journey to the end, or whether he shall again be doomed to subside into the image of a sign-post, it is hard to say; for Anglicans are most erratic beings, who set all the laws of moral dynamics at defiance, and on whom of all men especially, has been conferred the faculty of turning their backs upon themselves, and of swallowing dexterously their own words.

Dr. Pusey's position at the present moment, as by himself defined, is this. He is prepared, and apparently many of his brethren with him, are prepared, to accept all Tridentine doctrine, in the sense in which it is understood and propounded by the Catholic Church herself. He says:—

"I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, i.e., if it were explained *authoritatively*, i.e., by the Roman Church itself, not by individual theologians only."

To this it may be replied that such an authoritative explanation does actually exist in the shape of the Catechism of the Council of Trent; and at all events, this may be asserted positively—that no possible, no conceivable interpretation or explanation of the Tridentine decrees can bring them into harmony with the 39 Articles, or other existing formularies of the Anglican Church, to which Dr. Pusey still ostensibly or professedly adheres. These formularies, and the Council of Trent, are not only contrary, but often mutually contradictory. Indeed from the language and carefully chosen expressions of the Tridentine Fathers, it is by no means rash to conclude that they had in view, when framing their Canons, the particular heresies which, at about the same date, were being broached in England, and set forth with all the authority of the State. The acceptance in any form, or under any system of the interpretation of Tridentine doctrine, implies the renunciation of most of the doctrines of the Church of England, as by Law established; and this renunciation Dr. Pusey must either publicly make, or else disclaim his adherence to the doctrinal teachings of the Council of Trent.

It may be said that the Christologies of the Catholic and Anglican communities are identical; but if so, why does the latter deliberately withhold from the Blessed Virgin, the title "Mother of God," particularly assigned to her with the view of condemning the Nestorian heresy of the two persons in Christ? And even if this could be

explained away, the glaring contradictions between Tridentine anthropology, and that of the essentially Calvinistic symbols of the Church of England, would still interpose an inseparable barrier to the union of the two contradictory Confessions. No conceivable system of interpretation, or accommodation, could harmonise Tridentine doctrine on Justification, Grace, or Purgatory and on the Sacraments with that of the Anglican church on the same subjects. A man must, if he adopt the one, renounce the other, unless he be so mentally constituted as to believe that not only of two contraries, but of contradictories, both may be and are true.

From this dilemma there is no escape; and we are therefore bound in logic to interpret Dr. Pusey's professed readiness to accept an authoritative interpretation by the Church of Rome of the doctrines of the Council of Trent, as an indirect way of announcing his renunciation of the contradictions of those doctrines, such as are to be found in the Anglican formularies, and notably in the 39 Articles.

E.G.: The latter expressly assert that there are but two Sacraments instituted by Christ Himself in the New Law; the former, that is to say, the Council of Trent, responds: If any man should say that the Sacraments of the New Law are in number more or less than seven, "*esse plura vel pauciora septem*," let him be anathema.—*Sess. vii. canon i.* The Anglican formularies expressly declare "that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel;" the Council of Trent expressly declares that all these, above mentioned, are truly and indeed Sacraments of the New Law, instituted as such by Jesus Christ Himself, and cries out anathema on him who shall deny this. Again the Council of Trent asserts that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls of the departed therein held are assisted by the prayers of the faithful on earth.—*Sess. 25 in princ*; whilst on the other hand, in its 22d Article, the Church of England expressly declares that, "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, &c., &c., is a fond thing vainly imagined, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." By the same authority, Article 28, the doctrine of "Transubstantiation, (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the supper of the Lord," is declared to be "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," and destructive of the "nature of a Sacrament;" whilst the Council of Trent responds—"If any one shall deny the marvellous and singular conversion of the entire substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood—which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly calls transubstantiation—*anathema sit*—let him be anathema.

We might continue till our paper and the patience of the reader were exhausted, in multiplying instances of the essential and fundamental opposition of the two confessions; but the above should suffice to establish our thesis: that is impossible for any one man of sound mind to accept at one and the same time, the Council of Trent, and the 39 Articles; and to justify our conclusion from the published declaration of Dr. Pusey, to the effect that he is prepared to receive all that is contained in the former—to his implicit or virtual renunciation of the latter.

Yet we feel by no means certain that our conclusion though logically inassailable, is, practically, to be relied on. Anglicans, like eels, are very slippery subjects to hold, or deal with. Is not a right reverend dignitary of their Church familiarly and most appropriately known as "Soapy Sam?" so called, we suppose in allusion to his general slipperiness, and to the old-fashioned rustic sport of trying to catch a pig with its tail soaped or greased. Now "Soapy Sam" is a representative man in the Church of England; and Dr. Pusey may after all turn out to be, but as a little pig with tail copiously lubricated, a "critter;" as the Yankees have it, which no man may hold. This suspicion suggests itself to us, nay, forces itself upon us the more forcibly as we consider the strange attitude that he has adopted:—That, to wit, of a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England—professing, therefore, as the condition of his *status*, to hold, *ex animo*, "and in the literal and grammatical sense," all that is contained in the 39 Articles—and professing, at the same time, his readiness to accept all Tridentine doctrines, which, on many most vital points, are the intentional and direct contradictories of the Anglican formularies. In common honesty, in deference to the laws of logic, the renunciation of his Anglicanism, and of his status in the Anglican Church, should, on Dr. Pusey's part, have formally preceded this enunciation of his views with regard to the Council of Trent, and not have succeeded it, or rather been left to be deduced therefrom, by implication.

There is, it is true, a salvo in the shape of an "authoritative explanation by the Catholic Church herself of the Tridentine dogmas—but this is but a "fond thing" vainly imagined, as Anglican slyment for which there is no warranty in the history of the Church. Catholics do not, cannot put, as do Anglicans, a non-natural interpretation on their own symbols; nor can they