

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, GEORGE E. OLBERG, At No. 225, Notre Dame Street.

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3c, can be had at this Office; Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 221 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, OCT. 18, 1861.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

THE "Italian Question" is apparently entering upon an entirely new phase. Hitherto the struggle has been betwixt the advocates of a United Italian monarchy under Victor Emmanuel, and the partisans of the ancient monarchical order. To-day, the cry of the "actionists" or revolutionary party, is still for a United Italy, but united as a republic, not as a monarchy. Garibaldi, not the King of Piedmont, is the hero of the hour, and the idol of the revolutionists; and it is the spirit of Mazzini, rather than that of either the deceased Cavour, or the living Risorgimento, that presides over, and inspires the counsels of the liberals. The "reactionists" may triumph; the "brigands" of Naples may succeed in purging their native land of its foreign invaders, and the expelled dynasties may be restored; or, on the other hand, the cause of revolution, of demagoguism, of Italian Jacobinism may win the day, and for the time present us with another Republic One and Indivisible.—Of either of these solutions, the Italian problem is susceptible; but that which now, seems evidently impossible—no matter what the result of the pending conflict—is the establishment of a Kingdom of Italy. The Naples correspondent of the London Times is very explicit, and very desponding, on this point. He admits that a "constitutional monarchy" under Victor Emmanuel is now almost as impossible for Italy, as was the "constitutional monarchy" of Louis XVI, in which some silly theorists believed even to the Tenth of August. In a revolution the "moderates" the men of half measures, go always to the wall, and the victory remains invariably to those who most consistently and boldly carry out its formal principle. Thus the Jacobins triumphed over the Girondists as well as over the "constitutional monarchists, and the believers in Lafayette; so also in all probability must the Mazzinians and Garibaldians triumph over the partisans of the Kingdom of Italy.

The Protestant press reiterates its statements respecting the serious sickness of Pius IX. In the Catholic journals, on the other hand, and particularly in the Weekly Register of the 28th ult, we find it asserted that, although the Holy Father had indeed suffered from a severe indisposition, which lasted for several days, his health was perfectly restored. So little reliance is there to be placed upon the representations of "Our Own Correspondents" of the Protestant press who write upon Catholic subjects, that we feel inclined to attach little importance to their bulletins from Rome; and we treat them as we do those other silly stories which for some time past they have industriously circulated, to the effect that the armed insurrection of the Neapolitans against the Piedmontese soldiery was subsidised by the Pope. The truth is, that the latter has but little cash to spare, and that what little he has, is being expended—in direct violation of the laws of political economy—in the purchase of "breadstuffs" to be retailed at low prices to the poor, during the coming winter and the anticipated famine. By our last accounts we see it reported that the Holy Father had just laid out Two Hundred Thousand dollars in the purchase of wheat for this purpose.

Another story got up by the revolutionary press—to bring discredit upon the Papal Government—is going the round of the Protestant press. A ruffian of the name of Lucatelli, was arrested almost in the very act of murdering one of the Pontifical Guard, on the 29th of June. Of his guilt there was, and could be no doubt, for he was taken "red-handed," or with the dagger still dripping with the blood of his victim in his possession. Tried, and convicted of the crime of murder, he was sentenced to death, and was guillotined on the 21st ult.; but by way of making political capital against the Papal Government, the lie was industriously circulated that the convict was innocent; and that the authorities who executed him, were actually cognisant of his innocence—the real murderer having confessed his guilt! These are the means by which Italian liberals seek to promote their holy cause.

We have all heard of the "guarantees" said to be offered to the Sovereign Pontiff by Victor Emmanuel, as the price or conditions for the renunciation of the Temporal Sovereignty, and as

an inducement to the Pope to give up his throne, and to accept the position of a subject of the King of Italy. These "guarantees" have been published; and consist of a promise on the part of the so-called King of Italy to respect the independence and ecclesiastical authority of the Pope—expressed in the following terms:—

"The first and most important point is a free Church in a free State, and interpreted in a manner as it has been nowhere else.

"Direct nomination of the Bishops by ecclesiastical authority, without the intervention of the State, the right of Synods and Councils, free correspondence with the Pope, and complete latitude for the publication of Pontifical bulls and charges.

"The pamphlet explains that all these restrictions were made against the encroachments of a foreign Sovereign, and fall away with the temporal power.

"The personal security of the Pope intrusted to the filial loyalty of the King of Italy, and the independence of the Holy See placed under the guarantee of the Powers. The person of the Pope inviolable as well as that of the members of the conclave.

"The countries which formed the States of the Church and the patrimony of St. Peter will be according to the wishes of the populations united to the kingdom of Italy.

"Rome, capital of Italy, remains the seat of the Sovereign Pontiff.

"His Holiness will exercise the Pontificate while conserving all the honours which he has enjoyed.

"The Ambassadors, Ministers, &c., of the Powers sent to the Holy Father, as well as the Ambassadors, &c., of the Pope to the Foreign Powers, will enjoy all the immunities and privileges of the Corps Diplomatique.

"The Pope to conserve his propaganda, his penitentiary, and his archives.

"The landed property and palaces of the Pope, both in town and country, will be exempt from all taxes, jurisdiction, and domiciliary visits.

"The Church of St. Peter and the Palace of the Vatican, with all its dependencies, belong to the Pope and his successors.

"The Holy See will receive, as a sort of tithe, public revenues from his former States. For this purpose a perpetual rent of—will be placed on the Grand Livre of the public debt of Italy.

"Each Power is invited to contribute an annual income proportionate to the Catholic population of the country.

"The Pope will be allowed to choose as much as possible his Cardinals from among the different nations, according to the proportion of Catholics.

"A rent of—will be given by each nation to the Cardinals belonging to that nation.

"Each Catholic nation to give a certain number of guards of honour, chosen by the Legate of the Pope, and kept at the expense of each country.

"During the election of the Pope no crowd or troops other than the Pontifical Guards to approach the palace of the Conclave within a distance of—

"The King of Italy to take the solemn engagement towards the Governments and people to protect the person of the Pope and the independence of the Holy See."

But—and here is the very question at issue—what "guarantee" has the Pope, or can he have, that the King of Italy would faithfully fulfil these "engagements"? that he would not treat a subject Pope, as he has already treated the subject Bishops of the Two Sicilies, of whom he has already imprisoned or driven into exile no less than sixty-seven, out of a Hierarchy of about eighty members. To talk of "guarantees" from a king to a subject is either folly or knavery. An "independent subject" involves a contradiction in terms, unless we mean the freedom which the first Popes enjoyed in the Catacombs, in virtue of the constant persecutions waged against them by the heathen Emperors. This last kind of independence, which is the only independence possible or conceivable even for a subject Pope, we by no means covet for our Pastors, although if it be God's will we are prepared to accept it. In the present state of society there are but two kinds of Papal independence conceivable even—the independence of the sovereign, or the independence of the martyr.

Neither from France nor Great Britain is there much of general interest to report. After many troubles the Great Eastern had been taken in safety into Cork harbour, in which it was found that there was ample depth of water for the modern Leviathan. The discovery has brought to light the capabilities of Cork as a naval depot, and has much gratified the people of that ancient and beautiful city.

From the seat of war in the United States, there is really nothing new to report. There has been, as usual, a good amount of "talk talking" and there have also been some petty skirmishes; but there has been nothing on either side decisive of the fate of the campaign.

The North American and Arabia have both arrived, but by neither is Lord Monck a passenger. The reason for this delay in his coming is not known.

The European political news is of little interest. In France there have been bread riots, and there is much anxiety upon matters of finance.

We recognise the blessed privileges of the saints, and are not so unreasonable as to expect truth or justice, charity or courtesy from the generality of the Protestant press, when treating of the Pope, or the affairs of the Catholic community. Like the eels to their flaying alive, so have Papists become "used" or accustomed, and—shall we say—callous to the obscenities, the scurrilities and mendacities of which they are the continual objects. We look for these things from our Protestant cotemporaries; we are surprised, and an evangelical public is disappointed, if their columns are wanting in smutty stories about impure nuns, and lewd Romish priests; and to the credit of the consistency of our cotemporaries aforesaid, we must admit that the perusal of their columns rarely surprises us, or disappoints the expectations of the most foul-minded frequenter of the Conventicle.

We are of course aware also, that in the eyes

of the Protestant world, is a very grave offence for a Papist to reply, or raise objections, to any of those obscene and infamous calumnies with which their press incessantly teems; that when an Achilli, or a Gavazzi takes up his parable against the Church, it is the duty of the Catholic to hold his peace, and by default to allow judgment to be given against his mother; and that when the Protestant press reproduces the hostile testimony of a Maria Monk, or a Leahey, the Romish journalist may not, under the penalty of being branded as a disturber of the public peace, and as a libeller of the Holy Protestant Faith, undertake to show that the witnesses are unworthy of credit; that the press which so readily retails their obscenities and lying testimony, is vile and unprincipled; and that the evangelical public which greedily swallows all their unclean mendacities, thereby degrades itself to the moral level of the apostates who cater to its beastly appetites.

Yet though we know all these things—though we know from long experience that it is vain to expect that our Protestant cotemporaries shall—upon Catholic topics—keep their tongues from evil speaking, lying and slandering; and though for our occasional exposure of their scurrility, their astounding ignorance, and unscrupulous mendacity, we have been repeatedly reproached with stirring up strife betwixt Catholics and Protestants—in spite of all these things we must again expose ourselves to a repetition of that reproach, by replying to the false and filthy libels against the Pope, against the Bishops and Religious of the Catholic Church, circulated by the Montreal Herald and the Montreal Gazette, upon the authority of one whom, with a glaring manifestation of their gross ignorance, or utter contempt for, facts and truth, they style "A CATHOLIC BISHOP."

The substance of these libels—which respect or decency and our readers, prevents us from giving in full—is this. That the Pope contributes out of his private purse to the support of brothels; that Romish Bishops are, from fear of causing scandal, allowed to commit rape with impunity; that the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, amongst members of Religious Communities after their devotions, is also, and for the same reason, a practice winked at by the authorities of the Romish Church; that at High Mass at Rome, the "Pater Noster" which is chanted aloud, is chanted "farcically," and that the Holy Sacrifice is also accompanied with other blasphemous indecencies which it is impossible to "describe." All these, and other abominations which have not even the merit of novelty, or originality of invention to recommend them, which are as old as the days of Luther and of the obscene author of the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum"—all these falsehoods and obscenities, we say, are to be found in the columns of our above named Protestant cotemporaries, and recommended to the belief of their intelligent, discriminating, and chaste-minded readers, male and female, upon the authority of "A CATHOLIC BISHOP"—a Monsignor Liverani! The object of this is plain enough. The falsehoods of the "converted Romish priest" have been so frequently exposed by the press, and in the Courts of Law, that the testimony against Romanism of the Achillis, the Gavazzis, the Leaheys—the proteges of the "Priests' Protection Society, and of all that unclean brood, is looked upon with feelings far stronger than doubt by all really intelligent and honest Protestants. No one with the feelings of a lady or gentleman would allow one of these wretches to her or his presence; no one, morally superior to the inmates of the brothel, could even listen, or attach any importance, to the testimony of one of these impure outcasts from the Church of Christ. The "converted priest" dodge being thus no longer practicable, "A ROMISH BISHOP" must be called into Court, as an incontrovertible witness against the "Scarlet Woman," and that "Man of Sin," Pius IX.;—and for this purpose Monsignor Liverani is for the nonce raised by the Protestant press to the dignity of "A CATHOLIC BISHOP," and the rabid abuse of the disappointed place-hunter, is quoted as the calm and convincing testimony of a virtuous Romish Prelate.

We will not attempt to disprove the obscene stories circulated by our Protestant cotemporaries; for no one can be called upon to prove a negative, and he who makes the charge is bound in law and in reason to prove the truth of his assertions. But with respect to their witness, we tell our Protestant cotemporaries that Monsignor Liverani is no more a Bishop than is the writer of this article; that though styled from the Government situation which he once held "Monsignor"—a form of address applied it is true to Bishops as well as to other officials at Rome—this Mgr. Liverani has never been consecrated a Bishop; and that the prefix to his name no more implies the possession of any Episcopal character, than does the title "Excellency" commonly applied to certain officials of the British Empire, imply the possession, on the part of the gentlemen so addressed, of any excellencies, moral, physical, or intellectual.

The story of Monsignor Liverani is shortly this. He held for some time a situation at

Rome, as Prothotary, and being a man of some talent and much ambition, he looked forward to promotion in the Government. This was refused; his application for the office of Auditor was not complied with; and to crown all, the post which he actually held, was, for some reason or another which we cannot assign, taken from him, and he was dismissed somewhat unceremoniously apparently, from all offices of honor and emolument under the Pontifical Government. Hence the anger, or rather rancor of the ejected and disgraced placeman, which is natural, and the characteristic of all disappointed place-beggars, and office-hunters, whether in Europe or in America, in the Papal States, or in the Province of Canada. In the latter we have George Brown and the "Clear-Grits," and just as no man would think of quoting their diatribes against the Ministry and actual possessors of office, as valid testimony against the latter—so no honest man, acquainted with facts, would presume to cite the angry libels of the dismissed Liverani against his former employers, as fair or impartial testimony, conclusive as to the corruption and immorality of the Government by which he, the witness, had been employed and dismissed. As a general rule, Protestants are very careful how they give credit to the complaints of discharged servants against their former masters and mistresses; why then do they not employ the same discrimination in the case of witnesses against Popery—especially when the latter come before them in the guise of bogus Bishops?

Another consideration should have weight with the candid and intelligent reader. The infamies pointed out by Mgr. Liverani if they ever existed at all, existed during his tenure of office, and by his own showing were known to him. How came it then that he waited until he had been turned out of office, to denounce those infamies, those subsidizing of brothels, those outrages upon female virtue by Bishops, those foul orgies of Religious after their devotions—those blasphemous indecencies which he tells us he himself has witnessed at High Mass? Ah! Mgr. Liverani, you betray yourself! You know that you are lying; but then you know that there is no lie so gross, so palpable, that it will not find circulation if not credence amongst Protestants, provided only that it involve an attack upon the Pope or the Catholic Church, and be plentifully seasoned with obscenity to suit the Protestant palate.

If Mr. George Brown had, at any time, manifested a disposition, however slight, to abandon his old habit of insulting Catholics, we might apply to him to-day, the well-known adage of the "dog returning to its vomit;" if the Globe had ever purged its columns of its venomous stuff—of its abuse of Priests, Bishops, and Popery, of French Canadians, and of Irish "Dogans"—we might be tempted to make unsavory allusions to the "sow that had been washed and had returned to her wallowings in the mire." Under actual circumstances however—seeing that neither George Brown, nor the Globe, has ever given Irishmen or Catholics any, the slightest, reason for suspecting one or the other of any intention to abstain from insult and abuse for the future, or to make amends for the past, we can only say that the great Corypheus of the "Protestant Reform" party is still at his dirty tricks; and that he is therein ably and eloquently seconded by his natural mouthpiece, the Toronto Globe.

Our cotemporary treats us to a dissertation on Puritanism; he exultingly foretells its triumph over Popery on this Continent; and in a kind of holy rapture, he anticipates the rapid diffusion of Puritan principles, and Puritan morality amongst all the nations of the earth. The mantle of the prophet descends upon him, and in a moment of inspiration he breaks out:—

"It is Puritanism which will govern America, in spite of the Catholic hierarchy and slave power."

Not having studied ourselves in the schools of the prophets, and having passed no examination as a seer or soothsayer, we will not presume to call in question the truth of Mr. George Brown's prediction; but will content ourselves with asking, what is this "Puritanism" with which we are threatened, and which is to bear rule over us? That it is not Christianity, that it is not morality, is all that we can presume to predicate of it, if we may be permitted to judge of it by its fruits there where it has been most rampant.

Upon this point we know that there is much difference of opinion, arising from an unfortunate confusion of ideas. So long as men will be stupid enough to confound austerity of manners, with purity of morals—to accept a sour face as the index of a sound heart—and to believe that a man's acceptability with God depends upon his making himself particularly unpleasant and repulsive to all his neighbors—so long will the error prevail of confounding Puritanism and Christianity; and so long will ignorant and half-educated persons hold up to us, as worthy of our admiration and imitation, what they are pleased to call the "stern morality" of the Puritans.—That the latter had, and have a code of ethics peculiarly their own, we of course admit; but as that code is not based, as is the code of Chris-

tian morals, upon the love of God; but upon the love of mammon, we deny to it the name of Christianity; to which it bears not even the most superficial resemblance. "The good," according to the Puritan code, is simply that which pays—"the bad" that which entails loss, or at best yields no profit. In Puritan phraseology, "thrift" and "morality" are synonyms.

It was from this purely mercantile consideration that the entire system of Puritan ethics originated; and to the same consideration it owes the hold which it still retains over the affections of a large section of the money-making classes, both in Great Britain and the United States. According to this system, fast horses, fast young men, steeple-chases, the "pet of the ballet"—et hoc genus omne—are decidedly immoral; not because of the relation in which these things stand to the law of God, but because they are ruinous to the purse; and pocket. On the other hand—lying and stealing (in the way of business, be it understood)—adulterating goods, and falsifying trade marks—usury, cent. per cent.—the use of false weights and measures—and in a word, all the tricks of trade—are by the same code set down as perfectly lawful; and, so long as they escape detection, and lead not to collision with the law of the land, as estimable, because lucrative practices. The Puritans, in a word, heartily damned those "sins they had no mind to"—such as the money-wasting excesses of the aristocracy and the Cavalier; but in return approved themselves most lenient towards the grosser, but more respectable and more lucrative vices which they themselves "felt inclined to," and by means of which they make the daily bread for which, in public, they profess to return God thanks—doing the devil's work in the livery of the servants of the Holy One.

Not that all, or even the majority of, Protestants are Puritans; for thank God amongst the former are to be found men whom Catholics might well adopt as models of every natural virtue; men who by their honesty, love of truth, and exemplary conduct in every relation of life are an ornament to society. Of such men there is no scarcity in the Protestant world; and therefore we hope that we shall not be so misunderstood as to be deemed guilty of an attack upon the morality of Protestants, because we frankly express our opinion of, and contempt for, the code of ethics which governs the actions of the Puritans, and has justly rendered their name odious to all who detest cant and hypocrisy.

THE "TIMES" ON ITALIAN LIBERALS.—For a friend, the London Times gives the Liberals of Italy some very hard rubs; or, not to put too fine a point on it, the organ of public opinion in England tells us in plain language, that the popular party in Italy is but a gang of assassins and cut-throats, of whom Pianori and Orsini were the fitting representatives. Here are the very words of the Times upon the subject, in an editorial of the 25th ult:—

"The crimes of Pianori and Orsini were the work of men who represented the popular party in Italy. It is beyond a doubt that there were others ready to follow in their steps, even to the guillotine, provided they could remove the mask who was supposed to stand between the Italians and their freedom."—London Times, 25th Sept.

When we call to mind the oration lately given to the assassin Rudio, by the people of Manchester, and ponder upon the fact that the Italian party whom Pianori and Orsini represented, are the objects of British Protestant sympathy; we find it hard to believe that assassination is looked upon as a very serious crime in England; and we are forced to the conclusion that, in practice, it is held by modern Protestants "that the end justifies the means." For amongst a people by whom assassination was generally executed, a Rudio would never have been received with cheers, and plaudits; and a party, of whom assassins such as Pianori and Orsini, were the acknowledged representatives would not be held in honor. From the "popular party in Italy," whom the above named cut-throats, according to the Times, represent, all Catholics, all honest men of all persuasions must recoil with loathing and disgust. This is the reason why we hold in abhorrence, those whom the London Times speaks of as "the popular party in Italy," not because we love Austrian tyranny, or are indifferent to the blessings of national independence; but because we hate cut-throats, and because our religion teaches us to hold in abhorrence the maxim that any end, however desirable in itself, justifies the adoption of evil means to secure it.

The Church Chronicle, a Protestant paper of the Anglican denomination, assigns, or pretends to assign, the reason why the Protestant minister who attends the Montreal jail, refused to baptise the convict Burns. It seems, according to this account, that the latter repeatedly and strongly urged upon the Rev. Mr. Irwin, the Protestant minister in question, his demand for baptism; adding that, so that he could only be baptised, "it was no matter to him whether he was baptised by a Methodist, Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic; and using language in relation to it which plainly showed that he had a very inadequate notion of the real nature of the sacrament."—Church Chronicle.

Our Protestant cotemporary will we hope pardon us if we take the liberty of expressing our doubts of the truth of the above story; for,