

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 210, St. James 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, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. PETERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1872.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

AUGUST—1872.

Friday, 2—St. Alphonsus Liguori, R. C. D. Saturday, 3—Finding of the Body of St. Stephen. Sunday, 4—Eleventh after Pentecost. Monday, 5—Dedication of St. Mary Major. Tuesday, 6—Transfiguration of Our Lord. Wednesday, 7—St. Cajetan, C. Thursday, 8—SS. Cyriacus, Largus, and Smaragdus, MM.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

A report is in circulation that the Duc d'Aumale, intends resigning his seat in the Assembly.

The magnificent Railway station at Metz has been destroyed by fire. This is the fourth large fire which has occurred in that city.

The French Government contemplates the resumption of diplomatic relations with Mexico, the death of Juarez having removed the only obstacle thereto.

An official report is made to the Department of War, announcing the total defeat of Castillo's band of Carlists numbering one thousand men, which has maintained its organization in the north of Spain. Thirteen Carlists were killed and forty-five captured, ten of whom are wounded. The defeated insurgents carried fifty wounded with them. The defeat of another band of insurgents is reported with the loss of three men killed and many wounded.

It is rumoured that the immediate result of the visit of the Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria and the Chancellor to the Emperor William at Ems, will be measures for the suppression of the Jesuit establishments throughout Austria, which have been multiplying rapidly recently, and to which a powerful emigration of expatriated Jesuits from Germany is now in progress.

HOME RULE.—This is the question of the day in Ireland; and though neither Tenant Right nor Education are forgotten, its discussion is assigned at the meetings, at public meetings, and in the press, the foremost place.

As distinguished from Repeal of the Union pur et simple, Home Rule signifies the restoration to Ireland, in her domestic affairs, of the autonomy or power of self-government of which the Legislative Union deprived her. For that legislative, or incorporating Union, it proposes to substitute a quasi Federal Union; the Imperial Parliament, in which Ireland according to wealth and population will continue to be represented, to retain absolute control over all matters of general or Imperial concern.

Simple though at first sight the proposed reform may appear, and equitable as is the demand that Ireland should be allowed to legislate for her own domestic affairs, it will, we expect, be found more difficult of immediate attainment, even than the Repeal of the Union pur et simple that the great O'Connell agitated for, and for which Home Rule is proposed as the substitute. The latter is we think brought forward as a kind of compromise motion; and yet though proposed as such, it is open to more grave objections, and is more incompatible with the actual political order of the British Empire, than would be a return to the relations that subsisted betwixt Great Britain and Ireland at the close of the eighteenth century.

Home Rule for Ireland of course may come, for no one can pretend to predict what political changes are in store for us; but when it does come it will come, not alone, but as part of a sweeping, radical change in the British political system. "Home Rule" for Ireland; if it mean anything, means Federation; and must therefore be applied, not to Ireland alone, but to all the other component parts of the British Empire: to England, to Scotland, and to Wales. These too, when Ireland shall have her Home or Provincial Parliament, retaining at the same time the right to send her representatives to an Imperial Parliament, must each have their own separate local, or Provincial legislatures as well. The Imperial Parliament when it renounces authority over the

domestic affairs of Ireland, and leaves these to the management of an Irish legislature, must at the same time give up its power to legislate for the domestic affairs of England, Wales, and Scotland, and must be content to leave these to the case of English, Welsh, and Scotch legislatures. It would not be just to leave to Ireland, when in the enjoyment of a Provincial legislature of her own invested with the exclusive right to manage without interference, the domestic affairs of Ireland, the power of, in any manner, interfering with the domestic affairs of the other members of the Empire. And yet this injustice it would be impossible to avoid; if together with Home Rule for themselves, Irish representatives were legally entitled to sit, and vote in a legislature which had any control over the domestic affairs of England, Wales, and Scotland. Home Rule for Ireland—though nothing more than what Ireland is entitled to—cannot stand alone; but must, if it come at all, come attended with Home Rule for England, Home Rule for Scotland, and Home Rule for Wales. All of these must have their own Provincial legislatures if Ireland is to have her domestic legislature in Dublin; and therefore, we repeat, Home Rule for Ireland, involving as it does a radical change in the political system of the British Empire, a revolution not in details merely, but in principle, is actually more difficult of immediate attainment than Repeal of the Union, pur et simple. This, as we know from the failure of previous efforts, it is difficult to obtain, or to wrest from the Imperial Parliament; but far more difficult will it be to win the assent of that body to a change which, whilst restoring to Ireland the right to the exclusive management of her domestic affairs, would still leave to Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament, sitting at Westminster, power, and the legal right to legislate for the domestic affairs of the other members of the Empire. Home Rule in this sense is impossible, whilst Repeal is only difficult; because Home Rule so limited though only justice to Ireland, would be injustice to England, Wales, and Scotland; but Home Rule in any other sense is simply Repeal.

And yet it may come, and in time very probably will come; not by itself—not so much as a measure of justice to Ireland, but as part and parcel of a great, thorough political revolution—a revolution as thorough as would be a change from our present form of government to a republic. There are causes in operation to bring about such a change; amongst others the constantly increasing pressure of business under which the Imperial Parliament labors, and which is so heavy, that it can scarce get through a part even of the work that every session brings before it. If some of the local legislation and private bills brought before it, could be delegated to local legislatures, and referred to Provincial bodies for discussion, it would still have enough to do, in attending to other matters of general or Imperial interest.

But this entails the transformation of Parliament into a Congress; of the United Kingdom, into a Federated Kingdom. It seems to us that the advocates of Home Rule have scarce deemed to bestow a thought upon the momentous changes which these words imply.

To the superficial observer a Parliament such as that which sits at Westminster, and a Congress such as that which meets at Washington, are pretty nearly one and the same thing. To him, however, who looks beneath the surface of things, it is evident that there is no resemblance, no analogy whatsoever betwixt them—further than this: that they are both representative and deliberative bodies. Their functions, however, and powers, are essentially different.

Parliament in the United Kingdom, or that which is meant by the word Parliament, is a body politically omnipotent; whose powers and functions are unlimited, undefined by any other body, or by any written Constitution. It may go, in the matter of legislation, in whatsoever direction it listeth, and as far soever as it may seem good, and no one can pretend that it has deviated from constitutional paths, outpassed its limits, or transgressed its bounds. There is none with either power, or with right to say to it, "thus far shalt thou come, and no farther;" no other body sits over against it, to survey its proceedings, to sit in judgment on its acts, or to pronounce upon its competence. This is the form, or essential characteristic of our Parliament, that in virtue of which the British political system, whether for good or evil, is what it is.

Congress, on the contrary—applying that term to denote the central legislature of a Federation—is a body whose powers and functions are expressly limited, and defined by some other body, or by a written Constitution. Its path is strictly marked out for it, from which path no not by one hair's breadth, may it deviate. Over and against it there is a Judiciary whose duty it is to interpret the written Constitution, from whence Congress derives its being; and to rebuke and check the latter should it attempt to transgress the limits therein assigned

to it. It is impossible to imagine two legislative bodies more essentially distinct, than are a Parliament such as we have in Great Britain, and a Congress, or reunion of representatives of Federated Provinces—respectively; the one is the contradictory of the other. Now Home Rule, which, if in any way different from Repeal pur et simple, would give us a Federated, instead of a United Kingdom, necessarily implies the substitution of a Congress for a Parliament; in other words, a thorough or organic change in the existing political system of the British Empire.

This is why we look upon Home Rule for Ireland as of so difficult attainment; because, if anything more than an ample name, it means Federation instead of Legislative Union; and must therefore in justice to the other parts of the Empire, be accompanied by the establishment of Federal relations betwixt all its several component parts. Yet though its immediate attainment as a separate measure seems impossible, it may be believed that it must come at last, if any political relations betwixt Great Britain and Ireland are to be preserved.—Symptoms are not wanting of a growing tendency in Great Britain to adopt the political institutions of the U. States; whilst, strange to say, in the latter there are equally prominent symptoms of a growing tendency to revert to the British political system. The formal difference betwixt the two consists not in that one is called a Monarchy, the other a Republic; not that in one the office of chief executive magistrate is hereditary, in the other elective; but in this, that in the one there is an omnipotent unlimited Parliament, in the other a limited Congress, hemmed in on all sides by a written Constitution whose limits it may not pass, and over and against which sits a Supreme Court, legally competent to adjudicate upon its acts, and on appeal practically to veto, or disallow them, if contrary to the written Constitution of which it—the Supreme Court—is guardian and interpreter.

Now, at the present moment, whilst in the U. States the written Constitution is trampled under foot; whilst all its wise provisions for securing the rights of the several Federated States are set aside at the point of the bayonet; and whilst in fact Congress has usurped, or arrogated to itself the functions of a Parliament, doing, under the tyrant's plea of necessity, these very things—such as making paper rags or promissory notes worth about 50 cents in the dollar a legal tender at par—which by the written Constitution in virtue of which it has its being, it is expressly prohibited from doing; we see going on in Great Britain, and on the other side of the Atlantic a movement in the contrary direction. We hear the cry of Home Rule raised in one section of the Empire; a cry which means, if it mean anything except "Repeal," Federation; and we see high legal authorities of another section bringing in measures for the establishing of a Supreme Court of Appeal other than the hereditary chamber of Parliament. These things have their meaning, and are pregnant with coming changes. They indicate the existence on this Continent of a strong tendency towards centralisation and the minimisation, if not extinction, of State autonomy or Home Rule; and in Great Britain of a counter current in favor of decentralisation, of Federation, and in consequence of a Congress in lieu of a Parliament.

LETTER II.

PROFESSOR M'LAREN AND ENGLISH HISTORY.

MOST LEARNED PROFESSOR.—It is one of the peculiarities of colonial life that vices and prejudices long ago driven by the inexorable march of progress, from the mother country, seek refuge like the bears and wolves, in the outskirts of civilization. Orangeism long ago ostracised by the refinements of imperial manners, has been obliged to betake itself to our Canadian wilds, there to find that old vigorous wild life, which is no longer possible in polished England. In accepting a colonial home therefore we must accept with it the inevitable.

As we remarked in our last, most learned professor, you are not strong in history. Orange orators seldom are. "The great William" you tell us "lived in an age of toleration."—(Mail, July 13.) Certainly Professor, certainly! In an age when the penal laws against Catholics were yet unrepented; and when it was still! Death—by the refined mode of hanging, disembowelling and quartering—to be a Priest. 2. Death to say mass. 3. Death to hear Mass. 4. Death to go to confession. 5. Death to hear a confession. 6. Death to reconcile a Protestant to the Catholic Church. 7. Death to be reconciled to the Catholic Church. 8. Death for a Priest to be three days in England without becoming a Protestant. 9. Death to receive a Priest into your house. 10. Death to give food or raiment to a Priest, &c., &c., &c.

A truly tolerant code, worthy professor. The age which held on its statute books such benign laws, must indeed have been tolerant. But the Orange mind appears to be unable to grasp the idea, that there can possibly be any toleration accessory towards Catholics. The

Young Briton's motto, "No Peace with Rome," is evidently according to the most approved code of Orange ethics.

You will remember, most learned Professor, that when James II. ascended the English Throne, it was illegal for the Sovereign (it is so even to this day) to exercise the Catholic religion. Your saintly Dutch King, "the great William," had he wished to become a Catholic for conscience sake, dared not have done so. And this you call an age of toleration? Nay more. Not only was the monarch precluded from saving his soul according to the dictates of his conscience, but noble, commoner and peasant were equally precluded. The exercise of Catholic worship was in that age proscribed by law. And this is toleration.

Nor were Catholics the only ones who were persecuted for their religion in this age which you call tolerant. The covenanters of Scotland, the dissenters of England, as well as the Quakers, shared with their Catholic brethren that benign zeal of the age, which considered it its duty to force every one to believe exactly as it believed, or—go to prison. You will remember that the first unconstitutional acts of King James, and the ones which perhaps went as far as any others towards the calling in of your friend Dutch William, were James' leniency to the Catholic religion, still proscribed by law, and his order for the discharge of all persons confined for the refusal of the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. This act of James was indeed a return to a more tolerant order of things, but remember it went far to cost him his crown. And this you call a tolerant age? By this unconstitutional order the dissenters enjoyed a respite from the persecutions which they suffered under the conventicle act; and Catholics to the amount of some thousands, quakers to the amount of twelve hundred, were freed from prison, though two hundred quakers were still detained in consequence of a conscientious refusal to pay tithes towards the support of a religion in which they did not believe. Thousands of Catholics and 1400 quakers in prison for religion in a tolerant age! Good! most learned Professor!

You will notice, most learned Professor, that we have not gone back more than five years from the date of the accession of England's Dutch King, for our proofs of what you style the tolerance of the age in which he lived.

As proof that the penal laws against Catholics and dissenters were still in operation in that tolerant age in which the "Great William" lived, we would point to the fact already mentioned, that in the first year of James II.'s reign, thousands of Catholics and fourteen hundred quakers occupied the prisons of England as recusants.

As further proof of the highly tolerant temper of the nation in that same most tolerant age, we would further point out, most learned Professor—1st. That in the last year of Charles II., and not six years before Dutch William's accession to the English throne, an attempt was made in Parliament to procure the liberation of the Catholics and dissenters, who crowded English jails, and filled; 2nd. That the week of Charles' death, a second attempt was made and likewise failed; and 3rd. That it was not until James acted "unconstitutionally," by taking the matter out of the hands of the parliament and people, that their liberation could be effected.

As further proof how tolerant with that toleration which you call tolerant, the age was of all opinions, that opposed it, we would remind you of the murder of Archbishop Sharp for his prelacy by the saintly covenanters of Scotland, just ten years before the Dutchman's accession; and the deluge of blood that was shed in judicial murders during what is facetiously called Judge Jeffrey's campaign, not five years before that event. The narrative of Archbishop Sharp's murder, as narrated in the chronicles of the day, is so racy and so redolent of toleration that we cannot refrain from giving it. Amongst the men of Fife was one James Russell of Kettle, whose fanaticism had been inflamed by the persecuting spirit of the age (toleration), until he mistook the cravings of revenge for what he termed the outpourings of the spirit. During a fortnight he spent much of his time in prayer; he felt, he said, that he was destined to render some extraordinary service to God; and he renewed his former engagements against papists and prelatists and all enemies of Christ, i.e., all who did not believe righteously in covenant doctrine.—Under the influence of these feelings, he sought the company of enthusiasts equally tolerant (of papists and prelatists) as himself; consultations were held to prevent the extinction of the gospel; and it was declared a duty to put to death their chief adversaries, the Archbishop of St. Andrews and Carmichael commander of the forces. With this holy and tolerant object in view, nine of the brethren, having Hackstone of Rathillet for their leader (had they had the "Young Britons" at hand they would doubtless have enrolled under their banner with the beautiful motto—No peace with Prelacy until Prelacy is at peace with

(God) undertook to surprise Carmichael while he was enjoying his favorite amusement of hunting; but a friendly voice admonished him of his danger and by a timely flight he escaped from the field to his garrison in Cupar. But if they were balked in the knight, they were rewarded with the bishop. Whilst the Saints were employed in lamenting their disappointment a boy, pointing to a carriage with six horses at a distance cried out, "There goes the bishop." "Truly," exclaimed the Saints, "this is of God; the Lord has delivered the wretch into our hands; we must not go backwards but must execute the justice of God." Rathillet's address to his followers before entering the fray, is an amusing illustration of Covenant theology and the toleration of the age. Gentlemen, he said, I am ready to venture all I have for the interest of Christ; but I will not lead you to this action: for I am the personal enemy of the bishop, and shall be accused of seeking revenge, (the good man thought more of what people would say than of his duty) but I will not prevent you from obeying the call of God, neither will I leave your company." With this these holy men set upon the poor bishop, wounding him and his postillion with their pistols. The aged prelate frightened and wounded, begged for mercy, offering them money and promising them pardon. They answered in the usual jargon of the Conventicle, that "God had imposed upon them a duty they dared not transgress; his time was come; he must make himself ready for death, judgment and eternity." You may perhaps discover in all this, most worthy Professor, nothing else but an example of that outpourings of the spirit, which you appear to mistake for toleration, but the non-Orange portion of the community will see in it only another proof of that disgracefully intolerant spirit of the age, which culminated in calling in a foreign usurper to occupy the British throne; because the lawful occupant happened to have a not too wise leaning towards popery. But to continue our narrative, Guillon, one of the party, moved with pity, cried out "spare his gray hairs," and solicited but in vain, the interposition of Rathillet, who stood near muffled in his cloak. The Bishop's daughter who had accompanied him was in no danger except from her efforts to save her father; the prelate offered his hand in friendship to one of the ruffians, who with a blow of his sword nearly severed it from the arm, and Balfour aimed a stroke at his head, which though partly broken by the hat, inflicted a severe wound along the cheek. He fell on his face and lay apparently dead; but his daughter's incautiously remarking that life was in him still, the words caught the ears of Russell who was employed saint-like in rifling the carriage. The assassin immediately returned to the body, hacked the skull to pieces and ordered the servants to take away their priest and convey him home. The satisfied Saints then calmly withdrew to a neighboring cottage, where they devoted several hours in prayer, first in common and afterwards separately and in private. We are indebted to Russell, one of the chief actors in this brutal scene, for the facts of our narrative.

With such facts as these before us, it is difficult to conceive how a learned Professor, even under the excitement of an Orange celebration, can be carried away so far as to assert that this "was an age of toleration." In uttering it, he must have felt, that every one present was as ignorant or as bigoted as himself.—SACERDOS.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS. SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS. No. VIII.

"Bring up your children in the correction of the Lord."

We considered in our last, Christian parents, how children had to be corrected in order to be corrected in the Lord. We will consider to-day, when, that correction must be given, in order to obtain the blessing of God, without which all correction will be of no avail. Upwards of a thousand years ago, St. Jerome recorded a fact, that is as true to-day as it was in his time. "Parents," he says, "are the last to learn the evils that go on in their own household, and are generally ignorant of the very vices of their children which are sung of by all their neighbours." Alas! how true this is—and alas! how long it has been true—and alas! that it should be true. Parents are the last to learn the faults of their children, because a foolish love, which certainly is not of God, blinds them to their faults. The faults of other children they can see with as clear a perception and as keen a sight as the eagles can see the sickening lamb; but the faults of their own children they cannot see.—Christian parents! this is a fatal blindness—fatal to your children, and fatal to your duty towards your children. How often does it, alas happen, that when the friendly voice of a neighbour warns the parents of those evils in their children, which a foolish parental blindness will not allow them to see, those parents will feel offended—perhaps fly in a passion, and attribute to envy, the Christian admonition which that kind neighbour is giving. Is this an exaggeration? No! even we, the priests of God's