

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS,

GEORGE E. CLERK and JOHN GILLIES,
At No. 233, Notre Dame Street.

TERMS:

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 so 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, three pence; can be had at this Office; at Flynn's, McGill Street; and at Pickup's News Depot.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, G. E. CLERK.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 2, 1859.

We would call attention to the change in the Proprietary of this journal, which came into operation from the commencement of the present Volume. In consequence of this alteration, we would urge upon our subscribers who are in arrears the importance of a prompt liquidation of their accounts.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

To all appearance the real Italian Difficulty is only now beginning, and has been brought about by the success of French arms in Italy. Napoleon has, in fact, been placed by his victories somewhat in the condition of the man who won the elephant in the raffle, and who was ruined in consequence. The victories won in Italy have been to the French Emperor that elephant.—They have encouraged revolution in several of the Italian States, whose people have forcibly driven their sovereigns away. Hopes have thus, by the success of French arms, been excited, and passions aroused, amongst the Italians, which the Emperor cannot gratify without assuming an attitude of decided hostility towards the Holy See; or suppress, without provoking against himself the wrath of all the revolutionists of Europe. If by force of arms he restores the exiled princes to the thrones whence by their subjects they have been driven, he will again be singled out as the mark for the assassin's dagger; if he favors the revolutionary party, he must break with Austria, and involve himself in hostilities with Rome. At present his position is apparently most embarrassing; on every side of him the path is bestrewn with thorns, and he can neither advance with safety, nor retreat with honor. Whether the Conference at Zurich shall succeed in extricating him from this painful dilemma in which his very victories have placed him, remains yet to be seen. He has, however, one consolation. He has given his good people of Paris a spectacle, in the shape of the triumphant entry of his gallant army into the City. All Paris turned out, and cheered lustily; for there were tattered colors and captured cannon, though other results from the slaughter of Magenta and of Solferino there are none to boast of. Still it was a grand military spectacle; and if not altogether so effective as those which graced the first Empire, when the victor had something more substantial to show for his victories, and when he led Kings and Emperors captives behind his chariot wheels—yet it cannot but have proved highly flattering to the spectators, who above all things delight in military pageants.

The British Parliament has been prorogued; and the legislators of the Empire are recruiting their faculties on the moors, and amidst the stubbles. The invasion panic seems in a great degree to have subsided; and though the question of "Coast Defences" still occupies a prominent place in the British press, save for Punch's humorous reminders, we might almost believe that the fears of the French Emperor's designs against his ally, had given way to a blind confidence in his good intentions.

The Jason from Galway, 20th ult., adds but little to our budget of news. The Zurich Conference was doing nothing; the National Assembly of Tuscany had formally pronounced against the recall of the ancient dynasty; and that of Modena was making a similar stand. The most important item of English news is, that the Great Eastern was to make her first trial trip on the 3d inst.; and on the 15th instant would start for her run across the Atlantic. The accounts of the coming harvest are most favorable.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.—"The priest has no right to meddle with politics," says the Protestant statesman. "The domain of politics belongs exclusively to me, as the affairs of religion belong to the priest; and I will not allow the latter to intrude upon my domain." And this silly clap-net passes for sound practical philosophy with the common kind of Protestants; who are as incapable of reasoning upon any subject in which the interests of their bellies is not involved, as is the ox in the pasture. But even Catholics, or persons calling themselves Catholics, reiterate sometimes the same unmeaning verbiage; and it is to them that we would ad-

dress a few words upon the inconsistency and absurdity of their conduct.

Religion belongs to the Priest, you say; and you must admit that all that can affect, directly or indirectly, the religious and moral status of the individual or of the community, in like manner falls within the Priest's legitimate jurisdiction. To assert therefore, consistently, that the Priest has no right to interfere with politics, or with the acts of the statesman and legislator, you should be prepared to assert that politics, or the acts of the civil ruler, can have no effect, direct or indirect, on the religious and moral status of the governed. Are you prepared to assert this? and if you are not, how can you pretend that the Priest, to whom you accord supreme authority in the moral and religious order, has no right to interfere with politics, by which that order is often seriously affected?

The position of those who refuse to the Priest any jurisdiction in the domain of politics, and who at the same time admit that the acts of the statesman are often pregnant with important results, either for good or evil, to the cause of religion and morality—is absurd, and therefore logically untenable. It is a false position; a position adopted for the most part by knaves, with the view of covering their ultimate nefarious designs upon civil and religious liberty.—When the politician cries "no priestcraft—no priest's interference with politics"—he virtually claims for himself the right of supreme and independent jurisdiction in the domain of conscience, asserts his right to legislate for the Church as well as for the State, and assumes to himself the functions of the Priest; to whom, in theory, he accords the exclusive control over the affairs of religion. Let us take a case in point.

No one, we suppose, will deny, that education must exercise a considerable influence upon the religious and moral condition of the people subject to it. The question of education, or the School Question, is therefore a question with which it is the duty, as well as the right, of the priest to interfere; and the statesman who refuses to the latter that right, or obstructs him in the discharge of that duty, virtually arrogates to himself the right of supreme and independent jurisdiction over matters in which religion is deeply and directly interested.

Again, it will be generally admitted—that the moral and religious condition of a people must be affected, either for good or evil, by the relations subsisting amongst them betwixt the sexes—that the moral and religious condition of a people which countenances polygamy will vary greatly from that of a nation of strict monogamists—and that, therefore, the acts of the legislator which prescribe the terms of the sexual unions of the people, carry with them important moral and religious consequences. With what show of reason then can the civil legislator claim for himself the exclusive right of jurisdiction in the premises? or treat the action of the priest—the sole legitimate authority in the moral and religious order—as a wanton interference?

And so with almost every conceivable act of the statesman. Scarce is there one in which, either directly or indirectly, the interests of religion and morality are not concerned, and which does not carry with it consequences in the moral, as well as in the material order. Granting to the State absolute jurisdiction in the latter, or material order—in the former, or moral order, it cannot pretend even to any such right. Within its own limits we allow it to be supreme; but no one will claim for it a supremacy beyond those limits. And so long, but so long only, as its functions are confined exclusively to matters connected with our bodies, our roads, streets, canals, and sewers, will we admit the impropriety of any priestly interference with those functions.

But when the civil legislator, leaving his own domain, trespasses upon the domain of others; when he interferes with questions in which our religious and moral, as well as our merely material, interests are concerned, then is it time that he should be warned back; and that the rights of the true lord of the Manor be asserted against him. This it is that Protestants complain of: for the same feelings of hostility to the game-keeper that prompt the poacher detected shooting in another man's preserves, prompt the civil statesman to exclaim against the impertinent and wanton interference of priests with politics.

But do Protestants practise what they preach? does the history of Protestantism since the great apostasy of the XVI. century, warrant us in believing in the sincerity of those of its professors who now in the XIX. century clamor for the total separation of religion and politics? On the contrary: "State-Churchism," or the particular union of Church and State known by that name, is a plant of Protestant growth; and if in some Protestant communities this particular form of connection has been repudiated, it has been so repudiated, only because there the Church has been merged into the State, and the two Orders have become confused instead of being united.—The Anglican, who recognises in the head of his State, the head also of his Church, and whose Bishops are members of Parliament, cannot consistently exclaim against the intervention of the Catholic Priest in politics. Neither can the

spiritual descendant of the Puritans; of those political preachers, the trumpeters of rebellion in the days,—

"When pulpit drum ecclesiastic
Was beat with fist instead of a stick."

All denominations, by turns, have interfered and that actively, with the politics of their several States; and the most incessant, and active in that interference, have been those who piqued themselves the most upon their opposition to Popery. These facts, of which no student of history is ignorant, we cite, not in vindication of the action of the Catholic Church; but as a proof of the inconsistency and hypocrisy of those who, with an utter disregard for facts, condemn that action as wanton and unprecedented.

So long, and in so far, as politics can affect the interests of religion and morality; so long as they exercise an influence upon the Church as well as upon the State; so long, and to that extent, is it the duty of the true Priest, of him who is not a hireling, to interpose his influence in politics. The State undertakes to control the education of our children—to regulate the terms of the sexual unions of its subjects—to limit the right of the individual to dispose of his own property as he pleases for religious and charitable purposes—challenges for itself the right to confiscate our ecclesiastical endowments—and in innumerable other instances directly interferes with our religious institutions—and yet it is urged that the Priest, the divinely appointed guardian of religion, the supreme judge upon earth on all matters that concern our spiritual interests, shall not interfere to remind the statesman that, in his public as well as in his private capacity, he is God's creature, and owes account for all his actions to his Creator!

Case then, we say to the statesman, to legislate in matters extending beyond the material order. But this is impossible, it will be said; for in the actual order of things, the material and the spiritual—things temporal and things eternal—are as intimately and inseparably connected and blended together, as are soul and body. True; and therefore is it that the attempt to divorce them must ever prove a failure; therefore is it that the cry against priestly interference with politics is, and must be, so long as the present order of things subsists, so long as the nature of man is what it is, pure bunkum.

With regard to the particular occasion which has elicited these remarks, we cannot do better than lay before our readers some extracts from the *Hamilton Spectator*; wherein our Protestant cotemporary ably and conclusively replies to the hostile criticism of the *Herald*, the *Globe*, and others, upon the action of the Catholic Hierarchy of Canada:—

"The *Herald* says: 'For a long time past, it seems to have been the chief aim of every Ministerial journalist to break down the character of Mr. McGee. A singular failure has been the result; and now a new power has, therefore, taken the field in aid of the spent forces of the former assailants, and the victor, in the fair conflict of reason, is, if possible, to be suppressed in the name of religion.' We need hardly say that the whole of the above extract is a mere tissue of untruths. It is unfair to impute to the Ministerial journals a desire of breaking down the character of Mr. McGee, when they do nothing more than expose his want of political honor and consistency. This they have, undoubtedly, the right to do; and how far they have succeeded must be apparent enough by this time. As to a new power having taken the field, any one who reads the last number of the *True Witness* will perceive that the bishops have merely followed up the course they took some months since in laying down certain rules for the guidance of their organ. The *True Witness* having acted up to the principles laid down by the heads of the Church, there could not be anything wrong in the bishops expressing their approval of the organ's conduct in adhering to the course marked out for it. More than this they have not ventured to do; but it so happens that, in applauding the conduct of the *True Witness*, they at the same time denounce, by implication, the conduct of the junior member for Montreal; that is, they fully approve of the course pursued by the *True Witness*, which embraces its damaging exposures of Mr. McGee's deviation from the line of policy laid down by the heads of the church.

In what way it can be said that the Catholic episcopacy have come to the aid of the Ministry, we are at a loss to divine, since it must be evident to all that the bishops are careful in giving preference to any political party. Their approval of the course taken by the *True Witness* affords no indication of a leaning towards the Ministry; in fact the *True Witness* has never shown any preference for the powers that be, and the bishops in their manifesto applauded the independent stand it has made. It is clearly false, then, to assert that a new power has taken the field in aid of the Ministry. There can be no doubt that the bishops do not approve of Mr. McGee's political conduct, inasmuch as they denounce Representation by Population, and are strongly at variance with him on other points. The "new power" has done nothing beyond sustain the *True Witness* in its course; and we cannot see that the Ministry have reason to rejoice over the manifesto in question, further than that Mr. McGee's alliance with the Clear Grits is disapproved of, and his adherence to their views denounced as inimical to the interests of a very large body of the electoral community.—There is nothing of a partizan or political character in the document that we can perceive, for we presume the episcopacy have a perfect right to advise the Catholics as to the course they may pursue with regard to certain measures likely to affect them.—All religious bodies claim a similar right, and we cannot see that there is anything wrong in the issue of the manifesto complained of by our Anglo-Rouge cotemporary. It is a matter concerning the Catholic body alone, and it is for them to say whether they will accept the advice of the episcopacy. The matter in dispute affects the interests of Catholics solely, and we can only express our views of it as mere on-lookers. We can have no particular interest in the matter, one way or the other, hence we do not think the Bishops will be regarded as allies by the Ministerials, simply because they have come forward to endorse the conduct of their organ. It is not true that they have come to the aid of the Ministry; nor is it to be feared that their advice will influence the Catholics, so as to induce them to take a certain position, as hinted at by the *Herald*. The manifesto has reference solely to the conduct of the *True Witness*, and could not be intended to influence the body generally."

THE BELLEVILLE ABDUCTION CASE.—The *Montreal Herald* has, at last condescended to notice this case of fraud, and oppression practised upon a poor Irish Papist; assigning as one reason of his previous silence, his ignorance of the facts and circumstances of the case, beyond what had appeared in the *TRUE WITNESS*.

"Beyond the statement of her father, as given by the *TRUE WITNESS*, we were, and we are, in total ignorance of the facts and circumstances connected with Mary Martin's alleged conversion and abduction." But this is no valid reason; and at all events, the *Montreal Herald*, in the case of Miss Starr, saw no valid reason for refusing to call for investigation into the particulars of that young lady's bogus abduction, in the fact that, "beyond the statement of her father, as given by himself," he was, at the time he commenced his attacks on the Seminary, Clergy, and Sisters of Charity, "in total ignorance of the facts and circumstances of Miss Starr's alleged conversion and abduction." In the bare, unsupported, and as events proved, the, in many respects, mendacious statements of Miss Starr's father, the *Herald* found motives amply sufficient to induce him at once, and without investigation, to devote columns of his journal to attacks upon the Catholic Clergy; though he refuses to call attention to the case of Mary Martin's abduction, because he knows nothing of the facts and circumstances of the case "beyond the statement of her father." Why! what more did he know of the Starr case, when he first began to discuss, and to direct public attention to it? and why, if the bare statement of the Hon. Leander Starr sufficed to throw the press of the *Herald* into spasms of righteous indignation—why should the equally well authenticated statement of Mary Martin's father be allowed to pass unnoticed? We can see no reasons for the difference, save those which we indicated.—Patrick Martin is a Papist, and a poor man, not moving in good society. Mr. Starr is a rich Protestant; but, if certain printed documents lately laid before the public with reference to a certain Hon. Leander Starr may be relied upon, he has certainly no right to claim precedence over Patrick Martin; who if a poor man, is, according to our correspondent's statement, "a perfectly honest man."

Another reason, more futile even than the first, is assigned by the *Herald* for his refusal to call for an investigation into the particulars connected with the abduction of Mary Martin. He says:—

"Admitting the correctness of the *True Witness*'s narrative, we can find no analogy whatever between the Martin and the Starr cases, beyond the fact of both the young women having abandoned the faith of their parents."

Mark the bad faith of the *Herald*, in the words "BOTH THE young women;" as if, in the Martin, as well as in the Starr, case, the persons said to be abducted were entitled to the name of "young women." Miss Starr was 21 years of age, and, therefore, legally a woman, when she of her own free will, and *proprio motu* left her father's house. The "young women" in the Martin case are mere children, one barely sixteen, the other scarce twelve years of age; both of whom are, according to the statement of our correspondent, kept secreted from their parents by Protestants. In this sense there is no analogy betwixt the Starr and Martin cases; but we will allow the *Herald* to continue his exposition of his reasons for not noticing the latter.

"In Miss Starr's case there was, avowedly heartless deceit, towards her parents, and on the part of her newly chosen spiritual guides. It was their avowed deception towards her parents, in her and in her ecclesiastical advisers, that we condemned; and not her conversion or their endeavors to make her a convert. In Miss Martin's case, as related by the *True Witness*, we find no evidence of deceit either in the girl herself or in the person of the name of Lamb in whose service she is said to have been."

No; but evidence of violence; of an attack by Protestants upon a Catholic's house for the purpose of tearing his child from him; and of the forcible detention of his children by Protestants, in violation of his rights as a British subject, and as a father. It is of these things, and not of the "conversion" of his children, that we complain; and it is grossly dishonest on the part of the *Herald* to conceal these, the important features of the case, from his readers. Had Miss Starr been torn from her father's house by a Popish mob; had she been subsequently carried away, and access to her denied to the father by force—would not the *Herald* have deemed these things worthy of comment in his columns? would not the Protestant press from one end of the country to the other, have teemed with invectives against the tyranny and lawlessness of Popery? Why then does the *Herald* in his editorial comments upon the Martin case suppress all allusion to the violence and cruel outrage, of which, if our informant's statement be correct, the father has been the victim at the hands of a savage Protestant mob? It will be seen that we do not vouch for the truth of the version communicated to us; but that we content ourselves with urging the propriety of investigation into its truth, and with invoking for that purpose the aid of our Protestant cotemporaries who were most zealous in the Miss Starr case.

The *Herald*'s attacks upon the integrity of the young lady in question, and the accusation of deceit which he urges against her, it is not our

duty to notice; we leave that duty to her male relatives, and her big brother if she has one.—But the imputation of deceit to our Clergy, we again hurl back in the teeth of their libeller. The only appearance of culpable deceit in the entire transaction arose from the young lady's concealment of her change of religion, and her compliance with her father's commands to attend Protestant worship. But this weakness on the part of the young lady was not only not countenanced by her spiritual adviser, but was by him strongly condemned. For the rest there can be no culpable deceit in withholding the truth from those to whom no confidence is due. The General who purposely deceives his enemy as to his intentions, the number, and position of his troops, is guilty of no moral offence; neither is the private individual, who refuses to answer a question which he is not bound to answer, or which he is bound not to answer. This was the case of the priest who was cognisant of Miss Starr's place of residence. He was not bound to answer any questions put to him by Mr. Starr, as towards that person he had contracted no obligation, and owed no confidence. He was bound not to answer any person whomsoever; because as a priest he was not at liberty to divulge secrets made known to him in his professional capacity, and because as a gentleman he was bound not to divulge a secret which he had promised not to betray.

Since writing the above we have seen a Belleville Protestant paper which promises to publish its version of the particulars of the Martin case. This is all we ask; for we have carefully abstained from pronouncing any opinion as to the truth of the facts communicated to us by our Belleville correspondent. If false, and proved to be so, we will at once publish a denial of their truth; but if true, or not impugned, we contend that a gross outrage upon Patrick Martin has been committed; and that, poor man, Irishman, Papist, though he be, he is entitled to protection and reparation from the laws of his country.—This is all we ask for him; and it was for this that we invoked the co-operation of our Protestant cotemporaries.

From want of space we were compelled last week to postpone some remarks that we had designed to offer upon the *Globe*'s article of the 23rd ult.; and his strictures upon the letter from the Bishops of Canada that appeared in the *TRUE WITNESS* of the 19th of last month.

The *Globe* accuses the Bishops of coming to the help of the Ministry:—

"They—the Ministerial press of Lower Canada—'fairly run over with joy at the idea of the Catholic Bishops being brought to the help of the Ministry.'"

This accusation, or rather insinuation, is utterly false. Throughout the document referred to by the *Globe*, there is not the slightest shadow of an allusion to the Ministry; not a word that the most malicious ingenuity can torture into an expression either of censure upon, or of approbation of, the political acts of the Government. Indeed, seeing that the "independent" course of the *TRUE WITNESS* is therein lauded; and that the course of this journal has been strongly and steadily that of "Independent Opposition"—it is hard to conceive how even the *Globe*, even with its habitual contempt for truth, could have dared to tell its readers that the Catholic Bishops had been "brought to the help of the Ministry."

At the same time, we are "free to confess," in Parliamentary language, that—considering the attitude adopted by some of the Catholics of Upper Canada, (who undoubtedly are the best judges of their own interests), and the policy advocated by their organs of the press—we see not why we of Lower Canada should any longer continue a war, carried on hitherto with many personal sacrifices, to our own disadvantage, and for the sole interests of people who not only do not thank us for our pains; but who treat an alliance with us as a nuisance, spurn our proffered aid, and who ally themselves with our most bitter enemies, with those who design to impose upon us "Representation by Population"—a measure, which, disguise it as they will, must be fatal to our dearest interests. We of Lower Canada have our own interests to attend to; and the first aim of all our political action should be to stave off the danger with which Lower Canada is menaced by the agitation for organic changes in the Constitution. Every other consideration must with us yield to the immediate interests of Lower Canada; the great question with which we have to deal is how to maintain the "Constitution of Canada as it is;" this is the problem which we must impose upon our representatives to solve.

Besides, our former friends of Upper Canada have to all appearance, and if there be any definite meaning in words, thrown the "School Question" overboard. We are told by those who profess to speak the political sentiments of the Irish Catholics of Canada, that the latter hold precisely the same views on the Voluntary Principle as are held by the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada; that they—the Irish Catholics—hold the "Voluntary Principle in its broadest application."

Now the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada make no secret, never have made any