

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR, GEORGE E. OLBERG, At No. 223, 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 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, price 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickups News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; J. T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickups), 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, AUG. 30, 1861.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Rumors are again in circulation—similar to those which preceded the late Italian campaign—of a serious misunderstanding betwixt the French Emperor and the Austrian Government. The latter is at present hardly in a condition to undertake a war, and in this perhaps is to be found the secret of Louis Napoleon's bold and hostile tone. The Hungarian Diet has given in its ultimatum, refusing to accept the terms proposed by the Imperial authorities at Vienna. It refuses to send Deputies to the Reichsrath, or Imperial Parliament; and insists upon the recognition of Hungary as a separate and independent State, connected only with the other members of the Empire by the political accident that the King of Hungary is also Emperor of Austria.

Still the Italian problem presents no prospects of a speedy solution. The Sovereign Pontiff has not dismissed Mgr. de Merode from the Ministry; and though this may not lead to any immediate action on the part of the French authorities, it cannot but be very disagreeable to Louis Napoleon, whose ambition it is to play the part of dictator at Rome, rather than that of a simple ally and protector. The health of the Sovereign Pontiff is quite satisfactory, and Rome is tranquil.

General Cialdini is making but little progress towards the suppression of the Bourbon reaction and the subjugation of the Two Sicilies. He has taken into his counsels the agents of Garibaldi, and the friends of Mazzini—men thoroughly unprincipled, and whom no wickedness can appal. By help of these tools he hopes to succeed in quenching the last flames of loyalty, patriotism and love of liberty amongst the Neapolitans. The Times' correspondent, who of course represents everything in the light most unfavorable to the latter, is obliged to confess that hitherto the sanguinary measures of Cialdini have failed of their object; and that the "brigands," if occasionally repulsed, are far from being discouraged or even weakened, but have merely retired to the mountains with the view of taking up a stronger defensive position. The same authority reluctantly admits the existence of a "widely spread conspiracy" for the destruction of the intrusive government "in which not merely the brigands, but the inhabitants of the towns are engaged." Symptoms of disaffection in the ranks of the Piedmontese army—in which there are many old soldiers of the Bourbon monarchy—are not wanting, and desertions are constantly occurring in spite of the precautions of the officers.—Victor Emmanuel may call himself King of Italy if he will, but he has a hard task before him before his kingdom can become un fait accompli.

The domestic news is of slight importance;—but our readers will be glad to learn that the steamer Etna, for whose safety fears were entertained, has been heard of. She had been obliged to put back to Queenstown under sail, her machinery having suffered considerable injuries.

The Civil War in the United States lingers on, marked by no very important features since our last. To the enthusiasm with which the first appeal of President Lincoln to the people of the

Northern States was answered, has succeeded an apathy, or indeed aversion to the prolongation of the mutually disastrous conflict, which manifests itself in the daily increasing difficulty of filling up the gaps in the ranks of the Federal army. To make amends however for this indifference and want of military ardor, the Northerners are very active in suppressing every vestige of personal liberty which they have hitherto, in spite of their democratic institutions, tolerated; and in putting down every expression of opinion of which the most sweet voices of the majority do not altogether approve. Grand Juries smell treason in the simplest paragraph; detect rebellion in the faintest indication of any recognition of Southern rights, by a Northern journalist—and "present!" the offending editor accordingly, whose paper is forthwith suppressed. Neither Liberty of the Press, nor Liberty of the Person, has any existence in the Northern States, except upon paper. Amongst the publications thus arbitrarily treated, we find the name of the N. Y. Freeman's Journal, an ancient and honorably distinguished Catholic periodical, conducted with consummate ability, as will be admitted by those of its contemporaries who on several important points dissent from its conclusions. In short, the worth and the intelligence of the country are crushed down by a despotism as cruel as any the world ever witnessed, and the "Free Republic," the chosen home of democracy, is become the den of an unclean mob, the very stronghold of absolutism and tyranny by brute force. Such are the first apparent results of the civil war. They have dissipated effectually the strange delusion that democracy and freedom are identical, and have shown the world how frail a thing must be that boasted American Constitution or system of "self-government, which is unable to bear the first serious strain to which it has been exposed. Of the effect of the war upon the political influence of the United States, and upon their commercial prosperity we need not dilate; but even its social and domestic consequences are amusing if not edifying. Thus we find it recorded that a patriotic matron of Murfreesboro' N. C., the wife of a Mr. Charles Foster has applied for a divorce, upon the ground that her husband is an "abolitionist."

PROTESTANT JESUITRY.—With Protestants the terms "Jesuit" and "dissembler"—"Jesuitry" and "craftiness"—are almost synonymous. Indeed, both in Webster's Dictionary, and in that published by Dr. Worcester, we find the words "Jesuit," "Jesuitical" so defined; and this prejudice against the Jesuit is so deeply rooted in the Protestant mind, especially amongst the ignorant who of course constitute the majority, that it is almost useless to attempt to eradicate it.—No society, no body of men, have ever been the victims of such constant calumny and unscrupulous malignity as have been the children of Loyola. Always since their origin—and it is their glory and their best title to the love and respect of the Christian world that such should have been the case—have the Jesuits been the foremost object of the hostility of the combined forces of infidelity and of Protestantism. Lewd Catholics have made common cause with Protestants in this anti-Christian war. During a great part of the last century, all the Protestants, all the prostitutes and all the scoundrels—crowned and uncrowned—of Europe, were up in arms against the Jesuits. Infamous sovereigns, such as Louis XV. of France with his filthy army of concubines—cruel and unprincipled statesmen such as Pombal—avowed infidels such as Voltaire—and evangelical professors, marched lovingly together beneath one banner, on which was inscribed the truly Protestant device—"Ecrasez L'Infame." The Jesuits succumbed to the storm; and the French Revolution, the Reign of Terror, and the public worship of a naked strumpet on the high altar of Notre Dame, soon proclaimed to the world the reality and extent of the victory.

But the worst cause must needs have its plausible pretext; but the greatest knaves must advance some specious reasons in explanation of, and as an excuse for their most knavish actions. So too the great anti-Jesuit league of the XVIII. century had its pretext, its manifesto, in which it proclaimed to the world its reasons for declaring war against the Society—and this pretext was the dishonesty and immorality of the Jesuits. It was the pure love of virtue, the desire to restore Christianity to its pristine purity and loveliness, and nothing else, which forced all the profligates, drunkards, cut-throats, gamblers, hoary debauchees and gorgeously painted harlots in royal chambers, together with the stinking gin-drinking denizens of the stews and brothels in the suburbs—to cry out for the suppression of the Society of Jesus, and the expulsion of its members. The teachings of the Jesuits were incompatible with the refined tastes of Continental Europe which delighted in the "Chevalier de Faublas;" the virtuous Pompadour and the chaste inmates of the pair aux cerfs, could not breathe the atmosphere polluted by men who obeyed the instructions of a Loyola, who followed the example of a St. Francis Xavier, and

Carlyle's History of French Revolution, and Frederick the Great—passim.

encouraged the superstitious practices of a St. Louis de Gonzaga. The Jesuits were accused of corrupting the morals of the eminently Christian and exemplary eighteenth century. They were accused of teaching the most infamous of doctrines—that it was lawful to commit perjury and murder; that the ends justified the means; that to take an oath with a mental reservation to violate it, was perfectly legitimate and honorable; and we know not what other horrors besides.—These accusations were aptly supported by a formidable array of garbled quotations, of passages from the Fathers' writings divorced from the context; and when these failed, by forgery, and falsehood. By these arms did the combined forces of Harlotry, Infidelity, and Protestantism triumph over Jesuitism.

Of course, when so much dirt has been thrown some of it must have stuck; and though no educated man, no scholar or student of history would dare publicly to repeat the calumnies against the Jesuits which found extensive circulation, and easy credence in the last century—as for instance, that they instigated the crime of Damiens—still the impression amongst Protestants, especially among the vulgar and illiterate, that Jesuits hold and inculcate peculiar and infamous doctrines respecting the obligations of an oath, and the duty of truthfulness is ineradicable. Have they not seen with their eyes, and in their own excellent newspapers, the very words of the Jesuit text books which teach the lawfulness of false swearing? have they not heard them with their ears, repeated from evangelical pulpits? "What further need have we of witnesses!" they exclaim in the spirit of the high priest and the Sacerdotalism when the great master of the Jesuits stood arraigned as a criminal before them—"What further need have we of witnesses? Have we not read it in the Record, and in the Gospel Messenger, peradventure in the columns of the Montreal Witness? Did not Brother Blatherskite make it—oh! so graciously—the subject of special supplication to the throne of grace at the last hebdomadal prayer meeting? Did not that eminent man, the Reverend Mr. Abednego Slyme insist thereupon in that sweet and soul-searching discourse upon the text "Come out of her my people."—Rev. xviii 4.—which he delivered at the urgent request of the "Apostate Priest's Protection Society?" "What further need have we of witnesses?" So judgment is given against the Jesuits by an intelligent Protestant jury.

Such a vast and unwieldy mass of credulity and prejudice cannot be easily overthrown; nor do we design to attempt even the more than Herculean task of cleansing the Protestant mind of the accumulated filth and superstitions of ages. Only we would remark, that if "Jesuitism" be the synonym of "deceit"—perjury a jesuitical practice—and mental reservation an institution of Loyola—then are evangelical Protestants in general, and Anglicans in particular, most consummate Jesuits.

Everybody we suppose is aware that the Anglican clergyman before he can hold a benefice, must subscribe the "39 Articles," and solemnly proclaim, before God and man, his belief in all that is therein contained; so that, according to the Declaration which precedes those "39 Articles," it is strictly prohibited to any man to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.—Book of Common Prayer.

This is the solemn promise which every Anglican clergyman makes, the solemn obligation which he voluntarily and deliberately contracts, when he accepts office under the ecclesiastical establishment of Great Britain. Nothing can possibly be plainer, or conceived more explicit.

And yet everybody knows that there is, perhaps, not one amongst the Anglican ecclesiastical office-holders who believes the "39 Articles" which he subscribes; or—so blunted is the Protestant conscience—who makes any secret of his disbelief therein. Men sign the Articles, and reserve to themselves the right to disbelieve and to deny openly any one of them to which they may take exception; and this right a Protestant public, indifferent to truth, and tolerant of perjury, cheerfully recognises.

This wholesale and notorious mockery of truth, which is fast bringing religion into contempt, has long attracted the attention of many serious and well disposed Protestants—amongst others of Lord Ebury; and has prompted them to agitate for a revision of the Anglican Liturgy and Articles. This agitation has however met with strenuous opposition from the Prelates and the influential portion of the Protestant press; for so notoriously rotten is the fabric of Anglicanism, that the first interference therewith will bring the entire building toppling down about the ears of the rash innovator. Lord Ebury finds therefore little sympathy in Parliament; and the London Times, the exponent of British Protestantism, openly defends the practise of falsehood and perjury, upon the grounds that the subscriber to the "39 Articles," subscribes with a "mental reservation" or "understanding,"

which exculpates him from all sin in the eyes both of God and man. "Everybody," so urges the Times "knows that the subscriber does not believe, and will not teach as true, the Articles which he solemnly professes to believe, and promises, so help him God, to teach. Nobody knows, it is true, how much, or how little of those Articles he believes or disbelieves; but it is generally understood that the subscriber's individual conscience, or private judgment, is the sole standard by which he will, as an Anglican clergyman interpret and expound both the Liturgy and the Articles. This unblushing avowal of a doctrine which Protestants calumniously impute to the Jesuits, we find in a late number of the London Times; and as it is a moral curiosity, and a striking instance of Protestant regard for truth, we lay some extracts thereof before our readers:—

"Lord Ebury has given up one task and taken up another, which, however, if we are not much mistaken, he will find quite as puzzling an one as that which he had abandoned. The revision of the Prayer Book he finds a large subject; the Prayer Book covers a good deal of ground, and this ground is hedged in by all sorts of inveterate prejudices. Let us try then something simple at first, says his Lordship, something perfectly easy and rudimentary, a relaxation of the terms of subscription.

"An alteration of the terms of subscription sounds a simple sort of thing, as if everything you had to do was enclosed within a short compass, and you had only to change a word or two in a formula. But what a world of questions, controversies, distractions, comparisons, and decisions is contained in this little nutshell! Many people have gone into this question, and by no means stupid people either, but they have most of them left off with the confession that they might have employed their time better, and that it was a very unmanageable subject.—Paley proved to demonstration that all the clergy could not possibly subscribe to everything in the 39 Articles, because the 39 Articles, when analyzed, proved to contain three hundred and forty theological propositions; and it was contrary to possibility that ten thousand persons should be all of the same opinion on so many subjects. The terms of subscription, however, were not in the slightest degree affected by that discovery; people went on very quietly signing the Articles as before; nor, probably, if a deeper theological chymist had discovered three hundred and forty thousand implicit propositions, would it have made much difference.

"The truth is that, as everybody knows, the terms of subscription are practically constituted by the understanding which accompanies them,—an understanding of historical growth, thoroughly recognized and sanctioned; and, in fact, an essential part of the doctrinal fabric of the Church. Everybody knows that everybody is doing who signs the Articles,—all the Bishops know, all the Bishops' chaplains know, all University Vice-Chancellors know. It is as settled an understanding as that which accompanies the Queen's veto, or the Champion's challenge, or the conge d'elire; and it is this circumstance—that the terms of subscription proceed to the extent they do upon an understanding—which makes this such a difficult matter to deal with. For, how are you to express an understanding, and an understanding of the exceedingly balanced and complicated kind which this is,—which is not an understanding that you may believe nothing, because nobody would say that an open and avowed infidel was justified in signing the Articles; nor yet an understanding, as the fact of recourse to it implies, that you must believe everything; nor yet an understanding as to any precise medium between these two extremes; but which is, nevertheless, an understanding which works well, which is not practically abused to any large extent, and which secures for the Church on the whole a believing and orthodox clergy?"—Times.

There might be some excuse offered for this kind of "mental reservation" or "understanding," if it were known how far it extended; for if we know the sense in which a man swears, the precise form of words employed is but of secondary importance. But the Protestant casuist exacts no such condition; and he allows the meaning of the oath or subscription to be determined by the unexpressed "mental reservation" or "understanding" of him who subscribes; and which "understanding" of course varies with every individual. Indeed, of the same individual, it can hardly be predicated that he will adopt the same "mental reservation" or "understanding" to-morrow, as that which he applies to-day as a salve to his conscience, and as an anodyne to scruples ament perjury and false swearing.—Thus we see that, according to the moral standard applied to the most solemn acts of the teachers of truth and of revealed religion, it is lawful to subscribe Articles which the subscriber disbelieves, provided he do so with a "mental reservation" or "understanding," known only to himself, which no one can express, and of which no one can determine the limits.

Where there is so little regard for truth amongst the teachers, it is not to be expected that its obligations should press very heavily on the taught; where it is "understood" that a man may deliberately lie before God, and without offence may solemnly profess to believe that which he disbelieves, it is not wonderful that the duty of telling the strict truth to an importunate tax-gatherer is not generally felt or acknowledged by a large class of that Protestant community which takes its lessons in morality from such guides as the Anglican clergy and the London Times. Accordingly we find the latter complaining of the strange disregard for truth displayed by the Returns of the Income Tax; "which," says the London Times, "always suggest some curious and rather anxious speculations on the subject of an Englishman's conscience."

"We have a great respect for that conscience, but we do not believe it to be morbidly sensitive," continues the same great Protestant moralist; who then proceeds to give his reasons for doubting the morbid sensitiveness, or indeed delicacy, of that conscience he so much respects. Those reasons are based upon the incredible and manifestly fraudulent Returns of the Income Tax; from which it appears "that in all Great Britain, there are little more than twenty-five thousand persons receiving £500, or more from

trades and professions." We continue our quotation:—"According to the Return, that is the total number of bankers, merchants, shipowners, manufacturers, shopkeepers, tradesmen, of all sorts, lawyers, medical men, engineers, surveyors, artists, and professional men of all kinds in this island deriving as much as 500l. a-year from their callings. In other words, there is only that number of trading and professional incomes of that amount; and everybody who receives 500l. a-year by the exercise of his wits or in the way of dividend from a business is one of an exclusive class of only twenty-five thousand Englishmen and Scotchmen so fortunately situated."—Times.

Yes! strange as it must appear to those who have heard, or read, about the wealth of the industrial classes of Great Britain, about the "merchant princes" of London, the enormous fortunes accumulated by successful lawyers, physicians, bankers, and professional men of all classes, if—(there is much virtue in an if)—if the Returns made by these classes can be relied upon as true—there are only 6,073 persons enjoying a professional income of £600 in all England, Scotland, and Wales; and only 1,965 persons receiving an income of £900 from similar sources! Well may the Times conclude that the conscience of the English professional classes is not "morbidly sensitive."

The explanation of the phenomenon presented by the Income Tax Returns is, however very simple. The professional classes follow the example of the Levite, and subscribe Schedule D of those Returns upon the same principle as the latter subscribes the 39 Articles; that is to say with a "mental reservation" or "understanding" known only to themselves. We may be permitted to doubt if the Chancellor of the Exchequer approves of this practice as enthusiastically as does the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Globe is frank and outspoken in its hostility to Lower Canada. That its designs, and the designs of its party, are to swamp the "inferior race" is a fact of which they make no secret:—

"We care not, in fact, what mitigations are put in by Lower Canada. Grant to Upper Canada greater representation than Lower Canada in any shape, and representation by Population will very soon afterwards be conceded. Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coule."—Toronto Globe.

The Globe is correct. Any, the slightest, concession by Catholic Lower Canada to the unjust demands of the Protestant section of the Province would be fatal to the autonomy of the former. Give Upper Canada an inch, and it will, so the Globe assures us, take an ell. Forewarned, forearmed.

We confess we are often perplexed by the tone of the Ministerial organs, or by journals so styling themselves, in both sections of the Province, upon the important, and to Lower Canada vital question of representation. The Leader of Toronto, and the Quebec Chronicle of Quebec, both pretend to be Ministerial organs, and they both, the one directly, the other indirectly, advocate concession to the clamours of the Clear-Grits and Protestant Reformers. Is there then, division in the Ministerial camp? or is it in contemplation to treacherously sacrifice the rights of Lower Canada by making the question of "Representation by Population" an open question in the Cabinet? We hope not; but on a matter of such transcendent importance the intentions of the Ministry should not be doubtful.

The Chronicle advocates concessions, hints at compromises, and plainly gives us to understand that the cry "stand and deliver" with which the Clear-Grits of Upper Canada incessantly assail our ears, is, though manifestly unjust, too strong and too determined to be any longer successfully opposed. Lower Canada must yield a little, says the Chronicle; the Globe, with a frankness that does it credit, and which should suffice to put the people of Lower Canada on their guard against the treacherous counsels of the Chronicle, tells us what will be the inevitable result of those concessions. They will be used as a means of extorting from us still further sacrifices; until bound, bleeding and helpless, Catholic Lower Canada lie prostrate beneath the hoofs of the Protestant Reformers.

"NO SURRENDER!"—This should be the motto of every true Canadian, of every Catholic. If perish we must, let us at all events perish with honour; if we must succumb, let us succumb with dignity, and not without a struggle; if it be doomed that our enemies must triumph, let it be our care to make that victory cost them dear, to make it a victory over which the victors shall have as much cause to mourn as if it had been a defeat. Let us, in short, sell our lives dearly.—"NO SURRENDER;" no talk even of surrender, compromise, or concession should be tolerated on the part of those who claim to represent us, and to protect our interests. All parley with the foe is treachery to Lower Canada and should as such be punished: all ambiguous language should be resented as an open declaration of hostility.

If we would not make another Ireland on this side of the Atlantic, if we would not entail upon ourselves and our descendants the curse of Protestant Ascendancy which has been the bane of Ireland—we must listen to no terms of compromise. "Repeal of the Union" pur et simple—or "Equality of Representation." This should be our ultimatum, from which no fear of consequences should induce us to withdraw one iota. Do the people of Upper Canada feel themselves aggrieved by being legislated for by a body in which they are not represented according to their numbers? If so, we have not the least desire to