

character to come amongst us, and to speak of Queen Victoria, the head of the Anglican sect, in the same insulting terms that Gavazzi employed when speaking of Pius IX, the Sovereign Pontiff of the Catholic Church; were he to advocate her destruction, representing her as a monster of iniquity, and her subordinate clergy as villains, murderers, and devils: our Protestant brawlers would soon find out that "freedom of discussion" has its limits, and that those limits had been reached: they would soon find reasons, and means, for silencing the presumptuous lecturer who should dare to apply to Queen Victoria, the foul epithets, and ribald abuse which Gavazzi applied to Pius IX—and they would do right. Yet Pius IX. is, to say the least, fully as much entitled to respectful treatment, and to be civilly spoken of, as is Queen Victoria; and if Protestants will brook no insult to the latter, as little reason is there why Catholics should tamely submit to hear insulted, one whom they justly revere, as the Head of their Church upon earth, and as above all mere temporal princes.

To be consistent—not that we are so unreasonable as to expect logic, or consistency, from Protestants—but to be consistent, the Protestant should tolerate the utmost licence of speech on all occasions, and on all topics. For, as he has no criterion whereby to distinguish good from evil, or the true from the false, save his "private judgment;" and as one man's "private judgment" differs from another man's "private judgment," so it is a manifest violation of the fundamental principle of Protestantism—"the right of private judgment"—for any man, or any number of men, to impose restrictions upon any other man's "private judgment," or to object to any conclusions to which he, in the exercise of that right, may arrive. The Catholic is consistent, because he recognises no limits to "freedom of discussion" save those which God Himself, speaking by the Catholic Church, imposes. The Protestant is a hypocrite—that is, one whose professions and practices are at variance—because, whilst professing to uphold the right of the "private judgment" of the individual, in practice he will not tolerate the exercise of that right. With him "freedom of discussion" means only the right, for himself, to say every thing—and the right of deciding for others, how much they shall be permitted to say. In other words Protestant freedom is merely the right the Protestant claims to "wallop his own nigger."

The case of the man Narcisse Filiau, about whom such an outcry has been raised by the Protestant press, has been satisfactorily explained. The defendant was "at the door of the church" but on consecrated ground, the property of the Fabrique. Under these circumstances, it is clear that the authorities of the church had the right to insist that, Narcisse Filiau, whilst voluntarily standing upon their property, should comply with all such conditions as they chose to impose, and, at all events, should behave himself decently and respectfully. This, the fellow did not think fit to do: but, by way of insulting the clergy and congregation, he stuck himself at the door of the church—a place where he was only admitted upon sufferance—and ostentatiously kept on his hat, whilst everyone else was uncovered for the passing of the Procession. The proper way to have treated him would, perhaps, have been, there and then, to have kicked him off the property of the church, on to the streets, or public thoroughfares, where he would have been at liberty to have kept his hat on till the day of judgment if he liked. Instead of this, the constable summoned him for disorderly conduct, and endeavoring to interrupt the Procession. Filiau was sentenced to pay a trifling fine.

Hereupon the *Globe* breaks out in a manner terrible to behold, and enough to drive all elderly females, and persons of weak nerves into fits. "Odd's pistols and daggers—flints and triggers—spades, scythes and pick-axes"—roars out our friend Bob Acres of the *Globe*, "we must stand this: what is the good of our civil and religious liberty if we may not behave ourselves as we like, inside Popish Churches and Popish churchyards?" And Bob proceeds to lash himself into a fury directly. 'Tis a pity that Bob should have got into such a passion, or he might have seen under his very nose a still more glaring interference on the part of civil authority, with the right of private judgment, than that which he so furiously condemns in the magistrate who sentenced Narcisse Filiau.

There is a small steamer which plies occasionally on Sunday betwixt Toronto and the opposite island; and for this offence the proprietor has been fined five pounds on several occasions. The case, will, it is said, as in the affair of Filiau, be taken to the higher courts. Against this interference with the rights of the individual, the *Globe* however has not a word to say:—Whence comes this silence on the part of the zealous advocate of Religious Liberty?

Granted, that in our mixed community the State is bound to observe a strict neutrality upon all religious questions, and has therefore no right to compel any of its subjects to join in any outward marks of respect to religious ceremonies of which they disapprove. Granting all this, the State has still the right to prevent any one of its citizens from offering insult to the devotions of another; it has therefore the right to inflict punishment on one, who like Narcisse Filiau, goes deliberately out of his way, and on to his neighbor's property, with the express design of insulting him, and disturbing his devotions. For, be it borne in mind, this man Filiau was not on the Queen's highway, or on any public thoroughfare, when he was requested to uncover, but on the private property of the church, where he had no business to come at all, unless he was willing to comply with the terms imposed by those to whom the property belonged. He was at liberty to have kept away altogether; but having thrust himself upon a Catholic

congregation, engaged in Catholic worship, upon exclusively Catholic property, he was bound to submit to all the requirements of the Catholic Church, or else to withdraw altogether. Had he been on the Queen's highway, or on public property, no one would have dreamed of, or been justified in, interfering with him. Thus we see that there were reasonable grounds for the penalty inflicted on Narcisse Filiau.

But what reason can there be assigned for the fine inflicted by a civil magistrate upon the proprietor of the Toronto steamboat? How can such conduct be defended upon Protestant principles? It cannot be defended at all: it is a monstrous outrage upon "civil and religious liberty" as defined by Protestants—it is the virtual denial of the "right of private judgment." If we are told that Sunday is the Sabbath, we ask—"Who made it so? Or, if you think fit to make it your Sabbath, what right have you to insist that I shall make it mine? All you have a right to demand is that you be left free to keep your Sabbath how, and on what day, you think fit, without molestation from me, or others. I intend for my part to keep my Sabbath on Tuesdays, and to pursue my ordinary avocations on Sundays." What right, we should like to know, has any one Protestant, or any number of Protestants, to make the keeping of Sunday, as Sabbath, compulsory? Upon what principle of justice can the observance of their anile superstitions be made binding upon others?—or the breach of them punishable by the civil magistrate? If the Protestant principle be true, every man has the right to judge for himself when, and how, he will keep his Sabbath, provided only that, in the exercise of that, his right, he does not trench upon the rights of others, or compel them to do violence to their individual convictions. Now it does not appear that the owner of the steamboat used any compulsion towards either the crew or the passengers—and yet he was, and has been repeatedly, fined five pounds, for doing that which he has, as against the State, an undoubted right to do,—viz., the right to observe Sunday as he thinks fit.

The *Toronto Leader* has some excellent remarks upon this tyrannical procedure on the part of the Toronto civic authorities:—

"The Police Magistrate has undertaken the duty of punishing sins against the Sabbatarian dogma. It is not with the legality or illegality of the fine that we have to do. There is, we conceive, a much wider question involved. It is more important to enquire on what grounds can the interference of the civil magistrate be justified; and to what extent will the admission of the right of interference compel us to support violations of individual liberty? If the punishment in the case of this steamboat proceed upon the presumption that the running of her is a sinful act—an offence not against society but against heaven, then it is evident that it has an untenable basis. The very question which, in that case, the law would take for granted, is in dispute. One class believes pleasure boating on Sunday to be an offence against heaven; another does not; and if either party undertakes by penal laws to force its views upon the other, we have the old story of religious persecution over again. Toleration would be a meaningless word unless it included the right of acting out individual convictions, so far as this does not interfere with the rights of others."

Upon Protestant principles our cotemporary argues consistently, and therefore soundly. No Protestant legislature has the right to prescribe any Sabbath observances; or to dictate what shall, or shall not, be done on Sunday. This should in every case be left to the conscientious convictions, or "private judgment" of the individual, who alone, on Protestant principles, has the right to determine, when and how, he shall observe his Sabbath.

We are glad to see the firm and liberal stand the *Toronto Leader* is making against the canting hypocrites, who would bring on us, if they could, the gloom and debauchery of a Scotch Sabbath—an institution which every rational being, who has once groined under its infliction, must look back upon with loathing and contempt; and which, we say it advisedly, has made more infidels, done more to disgust the young mind with all religion, than all the writings of all the philosopherlings of the XVIII. century. It is an instructive circumstance that, whilst an ignorant set of fanatics here in Canada are endeavoring to enforce, by law, their contemptible Sabbatarian observances—in England, where the result of these same observances have long been experienced, they are never spoken of except in terms of unqualified condemnation and disgust. Thus, when one would describe the quintessence of hypocrisy, debauchery and villainy, he naturally has recourse to a "Scotch Sabbath." *E. G.*, the *London Times*—at a loss for an appropriate expression by which to convey an idea of its intense horror at the probable results of a Bill lately introduced to put a stop to corrupt practices at elections—sums all up by saying that, in future—"an election day in England will resemble a Sabbath at Glasgow, where the grossest immorality is shrouded in a puritanical assumption of holiness." The *Times* could not have found vent for its disgust in stronger, or more appropriate terms—"A Sabbath in Glasgow."—"Puritanical Holiness."

A MEAN TRICK.—As an appropriate sequel to Mr. Adams' motion to have the portrait of the Mayor removed from the City Council Chamber, we have to announce that the same portrait has been mutilated by some pitiful scoundrel, or scoundrels, unknown. The injury seems to have been inflicted with a sharp instrument, which must have been fastened to the end of a stick, and with which the head and shoulders of the portrait have been cut out, and a large rent made throughout the length of the picture. It is to be hoped that none of the Members of the Corporation were privy to, or engaged in the perpetration of, this dirty piece of spite; and that the principals therein may yet be made to pay for their night's amusement.

Had the Mayor been a Protestant, and had his portrait been thus disfigured, we have no doubt that many of our Protestant cotemporaries would have been ready to make oath that Catholics were at the bottom of it, as in the case of the Methodist chapel in Griffin Town; and again in that of the chapel in the Military burying ground—upon which piece of business the *Transcript* of late has thought it advisable to maintain a discreet silence. Is there not, we would ask of our cotemporary, strong reason to believe that, on the evening on which the beastly outrage to which we allude must have been committed, the non-commissioned officer on guard was a Protestant. Not that we mean now, any more than we did when we last alluded to this dirty subject, to insinuate that the conduct of the men on guard was the result of any religious animosities. On the contrary, we say now, as we asserted then, that it was in all probability the act of a parcel of drunken blackguards, with no more idea of religion, than a horse has of the differential calculus.

It is time that this practice, of attributing every paltry outbreak that occurs betwixt man and man, to religious differences, should cease. It must needs be that, from time to time, offences come; and in a mixed community like ours, nothing more probable than that the aggressors shall be of one, and the victims of another, religious denomination. But it is by no means a logical deduction that this religious difference was the cause, of the outrage committed. If an old sow is but run over by a drunken carter in the streets now-a-days, the affair is magnified at once into an attack upon "Civil and Religious Liberty;" and a repetition of the horrors of the St. Bartholomew massacre. The drunken carter is forthwith denounced as a "bloody, brutal minded, bigoted, persecuting, Papist;" probably, a Jesuit in disguise; and the sow is discovered to have been, during her life time, a downright evangelical Protestant sow; reared by a Protestant butcher, fattened on Protestant grains from a Protestant brewery, and from her pig-hood upwards, predestinated as a solace to Protestant bowels, in the form of Protestant sausages, and Protestant blood-puddings. What more clear, is the conclusion triumphantly arrived at by our Protestant cotemporaries from these premises, than that the Protestant sow thus untimely done to death by a Popish carter, was the innocent victim of a deep laid plot against "Civil and Religious Liberty—Freedom of Discussion—Liberty of Speech—Our Glorious Constitution—Church and State—and Universal Progress?" And forthwith the cry is raised, that, Protestants, waiving minor differences, must cordially unite in one grand defensive league for the protection of Protestant principles, Protestant pork, and the holy Protestant faith.

The *Pilot* of Wednesday publishes a second letter from *Juvenis Hibernicus*, upon the late frustrated attempt at jury packing at Quebec. For reasons best known to its editor, the *Quebec Gazette* refused insertion to this letter, in which the writer shows up the conduct of Mr. Sewell in regard to the summoning of the Panels of Petty Jurors, for the Quarter Sessions, and the Queen's Bench—as, in his former letter, he had previously exposed the trick played in the summoning of jurors to serve on the Grand Jury. We are indebted to *Juvenis Hibernicus* for the following particulars connected with this ugly piece of business:—

1. No omissions occur in the names of Jurors for the Quarter Sessions, all of whom were summoned before the riot, and whose names were taken in the order in which they stood upon the list. From this we may conclude that Mr. Sheriff Sewell thoroughly understood what the law required him to do—before the riots had obscured his intellect.

2. The Panel of Jurors of the 22d of July—before whom the persons accused of rioting were to have been tried—was so drawn up that, instead of containing the names of 16 Protestants, and 14 Catholics speaking the English language, it included 21 Protestants, and only 11 Catholics; thus giving to the former a preponderance of nearly 2 to 1. The writer continues:—

"Having seen it asserted by the apologists of the Sheriff, without contradiction by him, that all the Jurors were summoned before the riot occurred, and some days before Gavazzi came to Quebec, I took the trouble of visiting a number of the Jurors at their domiciles; and I have now in my possession a number of the Jurors' Subpoenas, signed by the Sheriff himself, and not by his deputy, Mr. Von Exter, not one of which bears date before the 6th of June, and some of them being dated so late even as the 30th of June last; I can further say, that not one of those Jurors was served before the 19th of June last."

The *Journal de Quebec* likewise satisfactorily disposes of the trumpety defence put forward by Mr. Sewell's friends in his behalf. The editor asserts that he also has seen no less than five notices addressed to different individuals summoned as Jurors, "all dated posterior to the date of the Gavazzi riots."—Mr. Sewell's friends had better look about them, and try if they cannot invent some more plausible falsehood; for this ridiculous story about the Jury lists having been made out before the 6th of June, will hardly serve their turn.

We learn from the Quebec journals that several attempts have, of late, been made to burn down Catholic Churches in the vicinity of the city. On the 25th of June, and again on the 4th, 13th, 19th, and 25th ult., efforts were made to set fire to the Church at Pointe Levy; and though a reward has been offered for the discovery of the incendiaries these diabolical outrages still continue. On Monday, some scoundrel obtained access to the Sacristy of the handsome new Church of Notre Dame, at Pointe Levy, and set fire to one of the chests, in which the vestments are kept; luckily the flames were extinguished before much damage was done. We will not imitate our Protestant cotemporaries by holding the whole

Protestant body responsible for these outrages. On the contrary, we willingly believe that they are, by all the respectable portion of that community, looked upon with as much disgust as they are by Catholics. At all events, both Catholics and Protestants are equally interested in putting down such villainous practices, and in demanding the safeguard of the law for the property of all religious denominations. A hearty co-operation, betwixt men of all parties, to cause the law to be respected, and to bring malefactors to justice, is more to be desired at the present moment, than the formation either of Protestant, or Catholic Defence Associations.

We read in the *Transcript* that Mr. Thomas McAuley, who was wounded by the fire of the troops on the evening of the 9th June, has caused notice of an action to be served upon his honor the Mayor.—Mr. McAuley is, we are happy to state, recovering from the effects of his wounds. The relatives of the deceased James McRea have also given notice of a similar action,—damages £1,000.

We read in the *Minerve* that the *Fabrique* of Montreal have purchased, for the purpose of a Catholic cemetery, one hundred and fifty acres of land, the property of Dr. Beaubien, situated on Cote St. Catherine.

The sum of £2,500 has been already subscribed towards the erection of the Cathedral in the diocese of Three Rivers.

ORANGE RUFFIANISM.—The *Daily Leader* of Toronto complains that the peace of the western portion of that city has of late been jeopardised, night after night, by large gangs of Orangemen, who, sallying forth from their low taverns, and similar dens of infamy, parade the streets, armed with bludgeons and fire-arms, discharging the latter to the great terror and annoyance of orderly citizens. The object of these scoundrels is a mystery; but it is most probable that they are meditating some dastardly outrage.

Mr. Hincks is said to have stated at the dinner given him at Norfolk, that it is not the intention of Ministers to dissolve Parliament, until after another Session.

The election for the county of Leeds has terminated in the return of Mr. Delong, the ministerial candidate, by a majority of 261.

A woman, in a state of intoxication, and lying across the track of the Lachine Rail-road, was, on Monday afternoon, run over by the cars, and had one of her hands and a foot cut off. The cars were going full speed at the time of the accident.

We have received the copy of a circular containing the report of the proceedings at several meetings held for the purpose of protesting against the Seigniorial Tenure. We decline inserting them, unless paid for as advertisements,—the Seigniorial Tenure question being one which the TRUE WITNESS does not intend to discuss.

THE CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTED. By the Most Rev. Dr. Challoner, J. & D. Sadlier & Co., Montreal. Price, muslin, 1s 3d; sheep, 1s 10d.

This is a very instructive work, containing Scriptural explanations of the Sacraments, Ceremonies, Doctrines and Discipline of the Catholic Church; and a scathing repudiation of the misrepresentations and calumnies of sectarian scoffers. It is published with the approbation of the Right Rev. Bishop of Cincinnati, who felicitates the faithful on its publication, and recommends it to "them and every enquirer after the Truth."

DOCTRINAL AND SCRIPTURAL CATECHISM; By the Rev. Pere Collet, Doctor of the Sorbonne. Translated from the French by Mrs. J. Sadlier. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., Montreal. Price, 1s. 10d.

This is a work which should be in the hands of every Catholic. It clearly and concisely explains every article of the Catholic Faith, and, by numerous references, proves the strict conformity of our religious ceremonies with the sacred Text. We have rarely noticed a publication we would more earnestly recommend to Catholics than this Doctrinal Catechism. Mrs. Sadlier has contributed many valuable works to our Catholic literature, but none for which the community should be more grateful than the rendering into English this excellent expositor of Catholic Doctrine.

THINK WELL ON'T; or Reflections on the Great Truths of the Christian Religion. By R. Challoner, D.D. J. & D. Sadlier & Co., Montreal. Price, Muslin, 1s.

This little volume is admirably adapted to lead the christian soul to a due contemplation of the great truths of Salvation. The attributes of God, the redeeming influence of His divine grace, and His reward to those who faithfully serve him to the end, are dwelt upon in a style to inspire the christian reader with awe, reverence and hope, while its portraiture of Death, Judgment, Hell, Eternity, are well calculated to strike terror into the hearts of the most impious and impenitent, and turn them from the error of their ways.

THE METROPOLITAN. Murphy & Co., Baltimore.

We have received the Metropolitan for August, considerably improved and enlarged by 16 pages, without any enlargement of the subscription. For contents, &c., see seventh page.

Birth.

In this city, on the 29th ultimo, Mrs. Peter Fegan, of a daughter.

Died.

In this city, on the 30th ult., of consumption, after a lingering illness, Thomas Bergin, shoemaker, a native of Thomastown, county Kilkenny, Ireland, aged 29 years and six months.—May his soul rest in peace.