

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.
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.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 8, 1873.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.
AUGUST—1873.
Friday, 8—SS. Cyriacus and Comp., MM.
Saturday, 9—Vigil of St. Peter of the Shackles.
Sunday, 10—Tenth after Pentecost.
Monday, 11—Of the Octave.
Tuesday, 12—St. Clare, V.
Wednesday, 13—Of the Octave.
Thursday, 14—Vigil of the Assumption.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

By the latest accounts the health of the Pope is excellent; and his bodily vigor and spirits unimpaired.

The present position of Italy is only second to that of Spain in material and moral ruin. No one has any illusions as to the durability of the present Cabinet. It may precipitate, it cannot avert, the catastrophe. The men composing it are tarnished in honor, bankrupt in political honesty, and not one of them enjoys the public esteem. To the Left the triumph of the Consorteria will widen the gulf between it and the Administration and absolve it from all support. Moreover, the Government has now given the Left all it asked, or nearly so, in the suppression of the Religious Orders, and may expect the usual wages of the Scept to its instruments—desertion when no longer needed.

It seems that Victor Emmanuel is extremely offended with the pilgrims of Paray, and especially at the words "Sauvez Rome et la France, au nom du Sacre Cour!" which he considers a menace to Italy.

In Venice the cholera has broken out with considerable violence, and threatens to spread, and the misery caused by the earthquakes in the adjoining provinces is augmented by the dread of the pestilence, and by the ruinous price of all necessaries of life.

The *Republique Francaise* is so astonished at the Christian tone pervading the National Assembly, as to say:—"Never did we witness so singular a spectacle. We had before us, not politicians, nor representatives of the people but actual pilgrims and crusaders! They expressed approval or disapproval, just as if they had all been making acts of faith. We felt as if France was back again in the middle ages!"

The Mayor of Villedieu has publicly insulted the procession of Corpus Christi; but there is a spirit now in France which will show him that, though the Mayor, he has violated the law with great scandal and will be made to suffer the penalty he so richly deserves.

The Carlist arms are again successful. The important town of Puycedra, which was a short time ago unsuccessfully attacked, has at last been taken by Prince Alfonso and the gallant and chivalric Saballs. The important town of Berga, with its garrison of 500 men, has also surrendered.

The Military Governor of Saragossa, who had been ordered to send the troops of his garrison to Madrid, has replied that he could not comply because that the Carlists had crossed to the right bank of the Ebro in force. He also apprehended a fresh Carlist rising in his province. According to Carlist reports General Cabrinyeta was killed by his own soldiers at Alpens.

We publish, at request, a communication from the Rev. Mr. Cramp, Protestant minister, on the New Brunswick School question, appending thereunto such comments as seem to us to be called for.

To the Editor of the True Witness.
SIR—Some one has sent me the True Witness for June 27, and July 4.
If I were an adept at abuse I would reply to your Editorial of the 27th ult.; but as I cannot pretend to any skill in that line, I shall refrain, although it is in my power to prove that in regard to the omission in my article as published in the *Telegraph*, I am guiltless of the "trick" which you impute to me. Having reviewed the whole case as carefully as I can, I am unable to adopt any other conclusion than that which has been repeatedly avowed, and which I now present to you in a somewhat different form.
1. Civil government is instituted for the preservation of life, liberty, and possessions. It is an institution to protect man in the enjoyment of his rights.
2. Civil government is not instituted for the propagation or defence of religion. Man is not responsible to man for his religious views or actions, but only for his outward life, as a member of society.

3. If the State undertakes to teach religion, it has passed beyond the limits of its power. It should protect all men, whatever may be their religious sentiments or practices, as long as they live peacefully, and do not injure their neighbors.
4. Taxation for religious purposes, whether direct or indirect, is contrary to the rights of man, and inconsistent with the objects for which civil society is constituted.
5. If education is provided by the State, it should be so administered as to avoid interference with religious rights and liberties.
6. The Free School System is so constructed; the children of persons of all sects and classes are instructed together; but their instruction in religion is left to their parents and their religious teachers.
7. The Separate School System does not meet the case. While the money levied on Protestants in Quebec and on Roman Catholics in Ontario is employed for the support of Protestant or Roman Catholic Schools, respectively, they all receive payments from the public funds, and so they are all taxed for each other's support—Protestants for Roman Catholic schools, and Roman Catholics for Protestant schools.

8. When Roman Catholics complain that they are treated with injustice, in that they are taxed for the support of a system of education which they repudiate, because it is not religious, the following considerations may be suggested in reply:—
1. They are not all agreed. The complaint is not the complaint of the body, but of persons who wish to influence and govern the body. The Free School System is thankfully received and honestly worked by large numbers of Roman Catholics.
2. Permission to Roman Catholics to apply their portion of the school-tax to the support of schools of their own, will not relieve them from the supposed injustice, unless they decline to receive aid from the public funds, and so sustain their schools entirely by their own money, because they will still be taxed, though indirectly, for a non-religious education.

3. The full and fair establishment of Separate Schools would be a death-blow to the Free School System. The Episcopalians have as much right to Separate Schools as the Roman Catholics; and other denominations have as much right as they. Admit those rights, and the fabric of education, free to all, falls to the ground.
4. Separate instruction in religion after school hours, either by the same teachers or by ecclesiastical personages, removes all difficulty, and should satisfy all objectors, Protestant and Roman Catholic. The case of the Catholic School in Carleton, St. John, N.B., may be adduced in illustration. It is placed under the control of the School Trustees, and Protestant as well as Catholic children receive instruction, pursuing the studies prescribed by the Board of Education under the Common Schools Act. At 3.30 P.M. the Protestant children retire, and then "each teacher instructs his or her Catholic pupils in their Catechism for half an hour."—(*St. John Telegraph*.)

5. The recent action of the Dominion House of Commons, by which the Government were directed to advise the Governor-General to disallow certain Acts passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick, was illiberal and unjust; and the combination of members of that House, Liberals and Conservatives, Protestants and Roman Catholics, in an attempt to trample on the independence of one of the Provinces of the Dominion, deserves to be severely reprobated.
6. The promise of aid to the Roman Catholics, in prosecuting an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council bears the appearance of partisanship and one-sidedness, and justly subjects the Dominion Government to censure.

Such are my views. They differ from yours, and from those generally entertained in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but I do not think that they can be successfully assailed.

Wolfville, N.S., July 17, 1873.
The first paragraph of this letter is the writer's reply to an article that appeared in our issue of the 27th of June, over the signature *Mark*, wherein the Rev. Mr. Cramp was taxed with duplicity in that he sent to, and caused to be published in, the *St. John, N. B. Telegraph* a letter professedly identical with one on the same subject—the N. B. School Laws—addressed to and published in the *Montreal Gazette*; but which nevertheless differed in a most important respect from the letter sent to, and published by the *Gazette*, in that an entire passage was omitted from the *Telegraph* letter, which however was retained in that sent to the *Montreal* paper.

The *Gazette* version of the letter read as under:—
"It comes to this. Let the Roman Catholics avail themselves of the provisions so liberally made for the whole population. If they cannot, or will not, do it, let it be considered whether some plan may not be adopted (there will be difficulty and awkwardness in it, I know), whereby dissenters from the established order may support their own institutions, without being called on to sustain what is contrary to their conscientious convictions at any rate." &c. &c.

Now in the letter to the *Telegraph*, professedly identical with that sent to the *Gazette*, the entire passage printed in Italics was omitted, although by far the most important in the entire letter, as conceding all that Catholics contend for. All that they ask is, that, since mixed or common schools are "contrary to their conscientious convictions"—whether these conscientious convictions be reasonable or not is a question which no secular tribunal can so much as entertain—they be not "called on to sustain" such schools, either directly or indirectly. This principle is recognised and acted upon in this Province in the case of Protestants as well as Catholics, and therefore, we suppose, the Rev. Mr. Cramp thought it well in an article designed for the Lower Canadian market, to adopt it as his own, and as that of these in whose name he spoke. But from an article intended for the exclusive benefit of the New Brunswick market, where the same principle is not recognised, but is outrageously violated by the Provincial Legislature, the passage was carefully eliminated. This is what *Mark* calls, and which all men whose moral sense has not been blunted by the infected atmosphere of the conventicle, call duplicity, or "contemptible trickery." The Rev. Mr. Cramp says that "it is in his power to prove that in regard to the omission in his article, as published in the *Telegraph*, he is guiltless of the trick" imputed to him. If he have it in his power so to do, why does he not do it?

J. M. CRAMP.

why does he content himself with the bare assertion that he can justify his double dealing?

For the rest, Mr. Cramp's communication is but the old rignarole which we have often had dinned into our ears. With the merits of the question he does not attempt to deal; he assumes all that has to be proved; he argues from premises which we deny; and above all he always calls things by their wrong names. It is impossible to argue with such a one; for unless there be community of premises, or first principles, all controversy is impossible.

He assumes, for instance, and this error underlies and vitiates all his argument, that Education is the function of the State.

This we deny. We insist that it is the function of the Family.

He calls the *State School System* the "*Free School System*," thus again convicting himself of duplicity, or of using the same words, sometimes in one sense, and sometimes in another and contradictory sense. For instance: if asked to define, a "*Free Church System*," and wherein it consisted, the Rev. Mr. Cramp would say, that Freedom of the Church consisted in its total emancipation from all State control; in its being supported by the voluntary contributions of those, and of those only, who saw good to avail themselves of its services; and that a Church System imposed on the community by Act of Parliament and to the support of which all were compelled to pay, whether they approved or disapproved of it, was not a "*Free Church system*," even though its services were open free of charge to all, but the direct contradictory of a "*Free Church System*."

But when Mr. Cramp comes to the School, he uses the word *Free* in the very opposite sense. He does not thereby mean a system of school, free from State control; to which no one who conscientiously objects to that system is compelled by law to contribute; but he means that which, in the exactly analogous case of the Church, he would denounce as *State-Churchism*, and rank oppression on tender consciences. He would not have called the State Church system in Ireland a "*Free Church System*" although sustained upon precisely the same principles as is that system of schools which in New Brunswick he calls a "*Free School System*." Out upon such duplicity, and scandalous abuse of terms. A system, whether of religion or of education imposed by law, irrespective of conscientious scruples, subject to State control, and to the support of which all, without regard to their conscientious convictions, or if you will scruples, are by law compelled to contribute is not a "*FREE*" system, and no one knows that better than does Mr. Cramp.

The Rev. Mr. Cramp is for the Voluntary system in religion; it suffices, he will tell you, for the Church, and for man's spiritual needs. Compulsory, or State taxation, in aid of the Church is an infraction of man's rights, and civil liberties.

For the sake of argument let all this be granted. But carry out your principle, we say, to Mr. Cramp, fully and fearlessly. If the Voluntary system is sufficient for the Church, it is enough for the School. If Religion, or that which concerns man's spiritual interests, may be safely entrusted to it, much more then may Education, as that which concerns man's secular interests, be also safely left to it; for all experience shows that men are always more ready to provide and to make sacrifices for their secular interests, than they are for their spiritual interests. If then the Voluntary System be good for the Church, it is good for the School. If it suffice to make ample provision for man's spiritual interests, it will suffice for his secular interests. To the safeguard of the Voluntary System, then, let us leave both Church and School, both Religion and Education; and let the State mind its own business of which Education is not a portion.

But we are not advocating, either to the one or to the other the application of the Voluntary principle. All that we contend for, the very utmost—is, in the words of the Rev. Mr. Cramp, this:—
That there, where there is a School system established by law, "dissenters from the established order may support their own institution without being called on to sustain what is contrary to their conscientious convictions."

Either directly or indirectly; and that no portion of the funds to which they contribute be applied to any schools, unless their schools also receive a share of the funds devoted to school purposes.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.—The tendency of the age or "modern progress" is towards religious liberty; the Catholic Church is opposed to that progress, and is at conflict with the liberal tendencies of the nineteenth century. Therefore she is the enemy of Religious Liberty.

So be it. That there is antagonism, bitter and irreconcilable, betwixt the Church and Modern Liberalism, betwixt the Catholic religion, and the spirit of the age must be admitted. But does it thence follow that the Church is to blame? Let us see whither Liberalism

leads; what the religious liberty that it proposes to establish, rather than it has established.

Surely no Protestant can object if we pursue our enquiries with the spectacles of the *London Times*; or, if from the columns of that journal, we seek to ascertain wherein consists that progress towards religious liberty, which the Catholic Church sets herself against.

It is in Germany that the spirit of the age has developed itself with the most perfect freedom; it is to Germany therefore that we must look, would we know whither modern progress tends, and how far its advance conduce to the promotion of religious liberty. Or rather, seeing that Germany under the present regime is held up by the Protestant press throughout the world as the country in which religious liberty as the Protestant public understands it—it is to what is actually being done in Germany that we must look, would we know what it is that Protestants understand by religious liberty, and what it is that under that name the Catholic Church opposes. We copy from an editorial of the *London Times* of the 21st ult.:

"Germany erects, defines, and fortifies the rights of the Civil Power. The measures now in the German Parliament, and likely to become a law"—(they have actually passed into law)—"amount to a secular organization, so complete as not to leave the Pope a soul, a place, an hour that he can call entirely his own. Germany asserts for the Civil Power the control of all education, the imposition of its own conditions or entrance to either Civil or Ecclesiastical office, the administration of all discipline, and at every point, the right to confine religious teachers and preachers to purely doctrinal and moral topics."

The Civil Power of course determining in virtue of its infallibility what is true in doctrine, what is pure in morality. Thus the State or Civil Power will not allow the priest to denounce as adulterous and contrary to the law of God sexual unions which it may please to encourage or tolerate amongst its subject. Nor is this all; for as the *Times* continues:—
"Henceforth there is to be neither priest, nor Bishop, nor Cardinal, nor preacher, nor proclamation, nor public act, nor penalty, nor anything that man can be, or do, or say, for the soul's good of man in Germany without the proper authorization, mark and livary of the Emperor."

This is "*Religious Liberty*"—as understood by Liberals, and as enforced by them wherever they have the power to enforce it, amidst the loud plaudits of the vast majority, not of all indeed, but of the vast majority of the Protestant world.

It is not new. The world has seen something exactly like it before. Indeed, though it may seem to detract from the merits of Prince Bismarck as a legislator to say it, he has but servilely copied the pattern of "*Religious Liberty*" so gloriously established many long centuries ago by the Roman Caesars, and rigorously enforced by the enlightened rulers of the Pagan world. Ignorant writers, unlearned in the meaning of words as interpreted by a Protestant dictionary have spoken of these times, when no man might preach, or teach, or do, or say anything for the soul's good of man, without the authorisation of Caesar, or of the consul—as times of persecution; when in fact it was in these days, when for the unpardonable offence of disobeying Caesar and refusing to burn a grain or two of incense before his image, men and women were torn to pieces on the rack, or cast to the wild beasts in the Colosseum, that the true principles of Religious Liberty were best understood, and the most faithfully carried out.

But such is the perversity of man, such the power of "*un homme Dieu*," to use the language of the Communists, and most advanced Liberals—it is to be feared that the enlightened legislation of the new German Empire will prove as ineffectual as that of Imperial Rome. We fear, we say, that there are still many infatuated creatures in Germany, as elsewhere, who hold to the old superstition that there really is a God—*un homme Dieu*—whom it is better to obey than it is to obey man, and who will conform their practice to their faith, and whose only answer to the Bismarckian edicts will be—"We will not obey;" who will in consequence continue to preach, and teach, to hear confessions, to give or withhold absolution, to administer, or refuse the Sacraments, utterly careless as to what the Civil Power enjoins upon these matters; and whom no threats, no penalties, will frighten, or deter from the exercising of their prohibited functions.

But the present, or more immediate lesson to be derived from the analysis as given in the *London Times* of the Ecclesiastical Laws of Germany is this—We thence can learn what, in the mouth of Liberals, the words "*Religious Liberty*" really signify, whither it is that "modern progress" tends, what it is that the Catholic Church resists, in opposing herself to that progress.

We have been careful to note that not all Protestants approve of the ecclesiastical legislation of Germany, and there are even in England some Protestant papers in whose columns that legislation is severely criticised. Amongst the papers that have taken this side of the question, we must make mention of the *London Spectator*, which, however, has brought the

editor of a German Catholic paper—the *Germania*—to grief. He, not understanding the true principles of "civil and religious liberty," translated from the *Spectator*, and published without a word of comment in his own paper, one of these criticisms; for which offence he has been convicted of sedition and sentenced to four months imprisonment. Truly they are to be esteemed happy who live under a Liberal and Progressive Government.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN TORONTO.—In the *Montreal Witness* of the 29th ult., and amongst the special items forwarded to that journal by telegram from Toronto, we find the following paragraph:—
"A crowd of ruffians carrying an Orange flag, marched down Richmond Street, and stoned the Christian Brothers, and doing considerable injury. Stones were also thrown at the residences of Catholic citizens."

It does not seem that the City authorities made any efforts to repress these attacks upon the Papists, neither does the *Witness* utter a word in reprobation of the means which its pet lambs, the Orangemen, resort to in order to uphold the glorious principles of civil and religious liberty. But suppose the case reversed; that a band of Irish Romanists had "marched" through the streets of Montreal with flags flying; had attacked first, and considerably injured, some Protestant educational institution, and had afterwards, finding themselves unassisted by the Police, proceeded to pelt with stones the residences of the Protestant citizens, indiscriminately, would the *Witness* have been thus silent?

What an outcry did that journal raise some years ago, when the men of a Volunteer encampment, into which a tract pedlar had impudently poked himself, contrary to all military rules, with his controversial wares, pelted the intruder with potatoes and beef-bones! a measure to be condemned certainly, since the fellow, though the aggressor, might have been got rid of by the use of less violent means. But, improper as was the action of the Catholic Volunteers, how trivial the offence of which they were guilty compared with that of the Orange *canaille* of Toronto, for which the *Witness* has not one word of censure!

EXEMPTION FROM MUNICIPAL TAXATION.—The *Montreal Witness* publishes a return or list of all the Religious and Charitable properties in Montreal, exempt from taxation. From this it appears that the assessed value of such property so exempted amounts to \$3,930,700; of which Catholics own a little more than two-thirds, that is to say \$2,722,200; the balance, or \$1,208,500 being the amount at which Protestant Charitable and Religious Property exempt from Municipal taxation is assessed.
Now taking into account the relative numbers of Catholics and Protestants in Montreal, it cannot be pretended that any undue privilege or advantage has been extended to the former. Catholics and Protestants, as before the law, are, in the matter of exemption from Municipal taxation, on a footing of perfect equality; nothing has been accorded to the one, which has not at the same time been freely accorded to the other.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of the following standard Catholic works from Messrs. D. & J. Sadlier, Montreal, published by P. Donahoe of Boston:

THE VALIANT WOMAN—A series of discourses intended for the use of Women living in the world, by Mgr. Landriot, formerly Bishop of La Rochelle, now Archbishop of Rheims, and translated from the French, by Helena Lyons. Second Edition. Price, \$1.50.
RUSSERT AUBREY OF AUBREY CHASE: An Historical Tale of 1681. By the Rev. Thomas T. Potter. Price, \$1.25.

POINTS OF HISTORY.—This little book contains a series of articles on several very important and much disputed events, for instance: The Inquisition; The Albigenses and the Waldenses; The Massacre of St. Bartholomew; The Fifth of November; or Gunpowder Plot; Galileo and the Inquisition; Religious Toleration. Price, 60 cents. Any, or all, of the above will be sent, free by mail, on receipt of price by the Messrs. Sadlier.

WELL DESERVED.—Mr. Thomas Barry, of the Customs, after a faithful term of service of more than twenty-nine years, has been granted leave of absence for more than two months by the Honorable the Minister of Customs, and avails himself of the opportunity thus afforded to visit his native land. He left this city on Thursday evening last for Quebec, where he has a large circle of friends, who honored him with a supper and corresponding entertainments, at Hinchey's Hotel on the evening following.—Mr. Barry is well known in this Port as an intelligent, obliging, and active public officer, and we are sure that a large number of citizens participate in our hearty desire that his visit to the Green Isle may afford him abundant enjoyment.

Several cases of cholera morbus are reported in Toronto.