

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES
FOR GEORGE E. CLERK, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:
Town Subscribers.....\$3 per annum.
Country do.....2½ "
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.
Single Copies, 3d.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 4, 1857.

The editor of the TRUE WITNESS trusts that any errors in the present issue may be attributed to, and excused because of, his absence from town for a few days.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Atlantic arrived at New York on the 31st ult.; she brings Liverpool dates to the 19th.—Her news is no way important. The Divorce Bill continued to be opposed. A Paris letter in the London News says, "it is generally asserted in well informed circles that in case the Government succeeds in procuring the conviction of Ledrue Rollin a demand will at once be made on the British Government for his apprehension and surrender under the extradition treaty." It is said that he intends leaving England for the United States.

The telegraphic squadron was at Plymouth.—Its future movements were to be decided on at a meeting of Directors in London on the 19th of August.

Matters look gloomy enough in India. The London News correspondent says General Dongoni had departed from Paris for India; and that it was expected he would be at the head of the insurgents in Delhi before November. It was he who stirred up the last Burmese war. Plowden writes from Ningpoor for help; he fears that the mutineers from Jubbulpore will come down upon him. As yet the Bombay and Madras troops are faithful. Delhi was not taken up to the 28th. Sir Henry Lawrence died of wounds received in a sortie from Lucknow; and it is reported that General Barnard is dead also. All the troops in Oude mutinied.

Of the absurdity of attempting to decide any disputed question by an appeal to the Scriptures alone, of the insufficiency of the Bible, interpreted by "private judgment," to settle controversy, we have a striking instance in the debates in Parliament upon the Ministerial Divorce Bill. Both parties—the supporters as well as the opponents of that measure—agree that God's Will, as revealed to man through the Scriptures, should be law to the nation as well as to the individual. Both appeal to the same Scriptures, quote the same texts, and admit their authority; and having done so, arrive at the most opposite conclusions. Thus approving the truth of the old proverb, that the Bible is as a nose of wax, which every man can twist into whatsoever form he listeth.

The opponents of the Bill maintain that, even if Divorce be not by Our Lord Himself absolutely, and under all circumstances forbidden, it is a relief to be accorded only in cases of adultery, and then only to the aggrieved party; but that the other, or guilty party, cannot, even when divorced, claim the privilege of entering upon another matrimonial contract during the lifetime of her former husband.—ST. MATT. v. 32, six. 9; ST. LUKE, xvi. 18. The supporters of the Bill, interpreting these, and parallel passages by their "private judgment," insist that there is nothing therein which prohibits the re-marriage of a woman divorced for adultery; and hereupon endless disputings, jargon, and splashing about of words, which tend only to make the question more obscure than ever. Thus must it ever be with appeals to the Bible, unless we admit a judge, or interpreter, to declare unto us the true meaning of its sacred text.

And for this reason is it, that the Catholic always avoids chopping scripture with Non-Catholics; and that the TRUE WITNESS declines entering into any scriptural argument with the Ottawa Commercial Times upon the question of the lawfulness of Sunday sports: meaning of course such sports only as are, per se, perfectly innocent; which do not tend to the violation of any moral precept, and which do not prevent, interfere with, or produce indifference to, the proper worship of God upon the Lord's Day.—We understand the texts of Scripture which have reference to the obligation of Sabbath observances—their nature and extent—upon Christians in one sense; our opponent understands them in another, and we may say, in a contradictory sense. "Private judgment" for "private judgment," ours is as good as his, and his "private judgment" is as good as ours. He will not yield to us; and we, certainly, will never yield one iota to him, or to the entire Non-Catholic world. We have studied the Bible as closely as he has; and are as fully qualified to decide upon its meaning as is any Protestant minister upon the face of the earth. If, on the one hand, we yield in all things an unqualified submission to the teachings of, and the authoritative interpretation of Scripture by, the Catho-

lic Church—on the other hand, we assert, to the fullest extent, the right of "private judgment" against the whole Non-Catholic world. Amongst them, there is not one for whose opinions we care one straw, or whose assistance, in the interpretation of Scripture, we would condescend to accept—not one whom we would acknowledge as "Rabbi," or as qualified to instruct us upon any matter connected with religion.

Now, evidently where such irreconcilable differences of opinion exist upon a purely religious question, and one which can therefore be settled only by a tribunal having jurisdiction in things spiritual, there is but one course to be pursued by those who do not mutually acknowledge such a tribunal, and submit themselves to its judgment. That course is one of mutual toleration; by which we mean that neither should attempt to enforce, except by moral means, his opinions upon his opponent. The advocate for Sunday sports has, of course, no right, and should not be allowed, to enforce such sports upon his puritanical fellow-citizens; neither should he be allowed so to amuse himself on Sundays, as to disturb or interfere with the latter's devotional exercises.—On the other hand, it would be unjust to allow the Puritan to enforce his gloomy and fantastical Sabbatarian notions upon his non-puritanical brother, or to prohibit the innocent amusements of the latter, "because they clash with the other's "private interpretation" of the Scripture. All that we contend for, is the right of every man, as before the civil magistrate, to observe his Sunday as he pleases, so long as in so doing he interferes not with the rights of, or give annoyance to, any of his fellow-citizens; that which we deprecate is, the attempt of one denomination to enforce, by the arm of the law, its peculiar interpretation of Scripture upon the entire community, and to make the civil magistrate the arbiter in a controversy purely spiritual. This may seem "blasphemous" to the Ottawa Commercial Times; to others it will appear as the assertion of the fundamental principles of all "civil and religious liberty."

Were the observance of the first day of the week, as a day of total abstinence from all innocent amusement as well as from all labour, a precept of the moral or natural law, it would no doubt be the duty of the civil magistrate to enforce that observance by civil penalties. But it is not so; it is from revelation only that we can learn the duty of specially devoting a seventh day to God. Reason teaches us not to steal, not to shed blood, not to commit adultery, but human reason cannot of itself assign any cause why the seventh day in particular, should be kept holy unto the Lord. In the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Neither is it," the observance of a seventh day's rest—"a principle of the natural law; we are not instructed by the natural law to worship God on the Sabbath rather than any other day." Still less can reason, or the natural law engraven on the heart of every man, teach that amusements perfectly innocent on six days of the week, are sinful on the seventh.

Now the civil magistrate has no right to assume unto the interpretation of revelation, neither has he any authority to adjudicate upon disputed questions of faith, he can have, therefore, no right to enforce a judaical observance of the Lord's Day, seeing that the obligation of such an observance is at least a disputed question at the present day, and, if history may be relied upon, was never dreamt of in the earlier days of the Church, or indeed till long subsequent to the great apostasy of the XVI century.

The doctrine in fact of the lawfulness of Sunday sports is purely the growth of British Puritanism, and is altogether unknown in every other Protestant country in Europe. Luther taught no such doctrine; and still at Geneva, the stronghold of Calvinism, the Sunday evenings are commonly spent in dancing, playing ball, and in other similar amusements. Even in England, till the middle of the XVII century Sunday sports were not only tolerated, but were strongly recommended from the pulpit by the clergy of the Established Church. We have therefore all Christian antiquity, and the practice of the overwhelming majority of the Protestant world at the present day on our side; and if we be blasphemous for asserting the lawfulness of innocent Sunday sports we shall at all events have the consolation of being damned in very good company.

THE "POT AND THE KETTLE."—Nothing can be more amusing—to the spectator at least—than the squabbles betwixt the Protestants of different "doctrines," and their mutual interchange of disparaging epithets, such as "heathen, infidel" &c., wherewith the asserters of the right of "private judgment" delight in to batter the reputation of those who presume to differ from them. The Rev. John Styles of Ebenezer chapel looks upon his reverend, but erring brother, the Rev. Snawley Stiggins, over the way, as a reprobate and a son of perdition; and groaning and shaking his head in a manner most unpleasant to behold whenever the name of the latter is mentioned. [N.B.—Mr. Styles' pew rents have been declining rapidly for some months past, and

the trustees of his chapel have had to speak to him seriously upon this matter once or twice of late.] In like manner Silas Mawworm, an elder and a chosen vessel, with a red nose and a great gift of extemporary prayer, mourns over the backslidings of his dear brother Elikamah Moulds, who keeps the opposition grocery store on the other side of the street; whilst it is well known that Mrs. Deborah Frowsy—a mother in Israel—cannot contain herself at the sight of poor Miss Miggs, who has become a "medium," and is visibly falling away from grace, and in flesh, under the combined influence of spiritual revelations and tight lacing. "How these Protestants do hate and calumniate one another"—is the involuntary exclamation of every one who has time or patience to wade through the foul puddle of Protestant controversy, or to climb the sterile cliffs of evangelical theology.

Of this odium theologium, so characteristic of all the sects, the Montreal Witness presents us with some most ludicrous specimens; the object of our cotemporary's wrath being the celebrated Protestant divine of Boston—the Reverend Theodore Parker; and the immediate cause of the outburst thereof being the proposal to extend to him an invitation to lecture before one of our Montreal institutions. We more than suspect that there is a good deal of professional jealousy at the bottom of this business; and that the affected zeal for Christianity of the writers in the Montreal Witness, is but a cloak for the malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness with which one reverend gentleman in the Protestant preaching line of business is apt to look upon his brothers in the same trade.

As an orator, the Rev. Theodore Parker is without a rival in the Protestant pulpit; and he is admitted by all who have heard him to be one of the brightest ornaments of the Protestant church in the United States. It is but natural then that the humdrum preachers of Montreal should entertain a wholesome dread of so very dangerous a rival, and that they should look with alarm upon the comparisons which would doubtless be instituted betwixt their style of preaching and his. To prevent the dangerous consequences (to their pew rents) which would infallibly ensue from such rivalry and such invidious comparisons, the "Saints" of Montreal prudently determined to raise an outcry of infidelity and heterodoxy against the Boston divine, and thereby prevent his lecturing in this city. In this they have for the time succeeded; so completely are Protestants under the thumbs of their ministers; so incapable are the former of all honest and independent action. Poor miserable priest-ridden creatures, they dare not speak, they dare not even think, but as the Brother Barnacles, or Brother Tadger is pleased to dictate.

The protesting doctrines of the Boston divine, upon the infallibility of the Bible, issued "By His Majesty's Special Command," provoke much vituperation, and some very remarkable logic from the opponents of the Rev. Theodore Parker. Presumptuous man! He will not take even the word of a King James for the inspiration of the Government version of the Scriptures:—"The infallibility of the Roman Church"—asks the Reverend gentleman—"who believes it?" (Nay rather who asserts it? No Catholic certainly.) "The infallibility of the Bible—its divine origin, its miraculous inspiration—do the scholars of Christendom believe that?... They leave it to the clergy."

Thus argues the ultra-Protestant, who having rejected the authority of the Church—the sole authority for the inspiration and the Canon of Scripture—reasonably refuses to believe that for which there is not a particle whatsoever of evidence. Whereupon the Montreal Witness bursts forth in the following choice invective against his brother Protestant:—"The sacred document on which rests all the structure of Christianity, is declared at the outset as not inspired, and, therefore a book of fables, conceived in fraud and deception."—Montreal Witness, 5th ult.

The rapidity with which our evangelical friends have leaped to a conclusion is certainly amusing. Because a book "is not inspired" therefore it is a "book of fables conceived in fraud and deception." This test if applicable to one book is applicable to all; and, as the Montreal Witness itself cannot lay claim to "inspiration," therefore we are at liberty to esteem it a concoction of "fables, conceived in fraud and deception."

But why, instead of abusing the Rev. Mr. Parker for his non-belief in the inspiration of a certain book, does not the Montreal Witness seek to refute him, by proving that inspiration?—if, without the testimony of the Church it can be proved. One such proof would be more damaging to its opponents, and more serviceable to its cause than whole columns of vulgar abuse and rabid vituperation of a divine and a scholar who, with all faults, is immeasurably the superior of his impertinent assailants.

Let it not be supposed that we have any sympathy with the Reverend Theodore Parker or his doctrines. His "great talents," which even the Montreal Witness recognises, cannot conceal from Catholic eyes the hideous deformity of his teachings; but as these are but the logical consequences of Protestantism—i.e., the denial of the authority of the Church as the sole medium appointed by Christ himself for the transmis-

sion of His revelation to all nations, and through all ages—"all days, even unto the end of the world"—it is Protestantism in general, and not the Rev. Mr. Parker in particular, who should be held responsible. "I would not believe the Scriptures," says St. Augustine, "unless the authority of the Church moved me thereunto." "As a Protestant," replies the Reverend Theodore Parker, "I reject the authority of the Church; and therefore as a rational being, I do not believe the inspiration of the Bible." Had St. Augustine been a Protestant, and as he was undoubtedly a man of "great talents," he would have held in the fourth century the same doctrines respecting the inspiration of the Bible, as those which are promulgated by the great Protestant divine of New England in the nineteenth, and held, if not avowed, by the great majority of intelligent, well educated and free thinking Protestants in both hemispheres.

ORANGEISM IN CANADA.

The following notes upon Orangeism will be found worthy of an attentive perusal. They are from the Liverpool Journal, an English Protestant periodical:—

It is worthy of being placed upon record that, in this year of grace 1857, "blank calendars, maiden assizes," truly describes three out of four provinces, and but for the loyal fraternity of Orangemen, Ulster would not, as it does, form the unenviable exception. So far as Belfast, the capital of the province, is concerned, the industrious and peaceably disposed inhabitants have certainly a right to demand of the authorities whether "the Queen's Government is to be carried on" in that city, or whether the scandalous outrages against all law and order, which commenced on the Twelfth, and continued for more than a week, are to be the rule for the time to come. Writing on Tuesday last, the Northern Whig states that "for the last eight days and nights the town of Belfast has been in a condition requiring martial law," and yet, to judge from the published reports, it would appear that the measures of prevention taken were so very inadequate as to recall to mind the impunity with which Orange outrages had been committed in the "good old times" when a prince of the blood royal was grand master of this "loyal institution." Some of the rioters taken into custody by the police, and brought before the magistrates at the Police Court, were in most cases fined 40s. with 20s. costs, or the alternative of three months imprisonment, but the sentence was regarded most cavalierly by the delinquents. "The vagabonds who are made amenable (says the Mercury) have not the money—it is paid by subscription; this shows the sympathy that exists," and the same journal remarks that "the great error committed was dealing mercifully with them." And this is strictly true. The money will be supplied by the "brethren" who have means, whereas if imprisonment with hard labor was voted out to such "celebrations" of Orange anniversaries. The subject was forcibly alluded to on Tuesday last by Judge Moore, in addressing the grand jury of the county Antrim. After stating that when he commenced the business of that circuit he indulged in the expectation that he should have been able to congratulate them upon the almost perfect state of quietness in the country, but that the recent events had completely disappointed him, as he found the crown book inundated with the names of persons accused of violating the law,—his lordship added:—"The offences imputed to that vast number of persons I believe to have arisen from those party processions which, I regret to say, appear to have existed not only in this county but in other counties on this circuit. There was a time when these processions were very prevalent,—they were found to endanger the public peace and accordingly an act of parliament was passed, some years ago, declaring them illegal, and subjecting every one engaged in them to punishment on being convicted."

That the law alluded to by the learned judge was enacted, was mainly owing to the exertions of the late Joseph Hume, who, on the 23rd of February, 1856, brought the operations of the Orange lodges under the consideration of the House of Commons. On the occasion he quoted from the evidence of Mr. Innes, given before a Parliamentary committee, to show that "The Duke of Cumberland, while he was considered grand master of the Orange Society, was proposed by the members of the institution to be considered as the successor to the Crown." It will be recollected that this was shortly before the demise of William the Fourth, and the accession of Queen Victoria; and, to ensure the setting aside of the heir apparent, the Princess Victoria, in favor of Cumberland, in the event of the death of the reigning monarch, active measures were taken to establish Orange lodges in the army, and, how far they succeeded, appeared from a letter addressed to the Marquis of Londonderry by Colonel Fairman, who had travelled over the country as the emissary of the Grand Orange Lodge of England, in which he says, "We have the military with us, as far as they are at liberty to avow their principles and sentiments." A host of evidence of a similar tendency was produced by Mr. Hume, who concluded by moving a series of resolutions, to the effect that an address be presented to the king, praying that his Majesty would direct measures to be taken to remove all officials from the public service who belonged to the Orange Society. Ultimately Mr. Hume withdrew his resolutions in favor of the following, which was moved by Lord John Russell, and adopted by the House:—"That a humble address be presented to his Majesty, praying that his Majesty will be graciously pleased to take such measures as to his Majesty may seem advisable, for the effectual discouragement of Orange lodges, and generally of all political societies, excluding persons of different religious faith, using secret sign and symbols, and acting by means of associated branches."

In consequence of this decided manifestation upon the part of the House of Commons, in a few days after an address "to the members of the loyal Orange institution" was issued, which was signed by the principal office bearers, the first name being that of "Ernest" Duke of Cumberland, in which they complained that "the severe duty has devolved upon us of recommending that, in the spirit of the generous devotedness which has always characterised the Orange society, you now dissolve." Deeply compromised as they were in the loyal proceedings laid bare by Mr. Hume, the leaders had no alternative but to publicly separate themselves from the fraternity; however, their "recommendation" was lost upon the great bulk of the members, who continued to give tacit evidence that their "loyalty was still the same," and at this moment the lodges are as numerous in Ireland as they were twenty years ago, although the Party Processions' Act has been a bar to such open demonstrations of "physical force" as those which have taken place this month. Whether we shall be treated to similar displays in the time to come will altogether depend upon the nature and amount of punishment awarded to the parties who may be found guilty at the assizes which are now pending, and to the precautions taken by the authorities immediately previous to the next "anniversaries."—There is every reason to expect that the Earl of Carlisle will take the subject into serious consideration. More than twenty years ago, when acting as Chief Secretary for Ireland, under the Viceroyalty of the Earl of Mulgrave, his Excellency, then Lord

Morpeth, addressed the following letter to Lord Dunsmuir, who had recommended a member of the Orange society for the office of Deputy-Lieutenant:—

"Dublin Castle, Dec. 29, 1856.
"My Lord—As your lordship, in your letter of the 27th instant, in recommending Mr. H. Smith, states that you suppose him still to be an Orangeman, and as it is his Excellency's intention not knowingly to make any more appointment of members of that society, his Excellency must, therefore, repeat that, unless Mr. Smith either denies his connection with it, or signifies his intention of withdrawing from it, he must decline to nominate him a Deputy-Lieutenant of the county Meath.

"His Excellency cannot close this correspondence without expressing his most entire and unqualified dissent from the opinion which appears to be conveyed in the latter part of your lordship's letter, that magistrates, by becoming Orangemen, are thereby more fit to watch the evil designs of the Ribbonmen.

"Should such designs exist to the extent, and amongst the persons your lordship supposes, his Excellency would look alone for support, in their expression, to the open, unsuspected, and impartial discharge of their duty by magistrates, as such, and not to their connection with the Orange institution.—I have,

(Signed)

MORPETH.

"The Lord Dunsmuir."
"This was the first blow given to Orangeism in 'high places,' and that the entire system should be exploded during the vicereignty of the same excellent nobleman, would be 'a consummation devoutly to be wished' by every friend to the peace and prosperity of the country."

"They manage these things better in England" than in Canada. There, Orangeism is looked upon as a disqualification for office; here, as a recommendation. In Ireland, a Magistrate who should so far forget himself as to give the slightest countenance to an Orange assembly would be—as was the case with Lord Roden, Mr. Beers, and others—at once and ignominiously dismissed from the Commission of the Peace; here, Her Majesty's Representative sanctions, in his official capacity, and acting in the name of the Chief Magistrate of the realm, encourages the most offensive displays of these same Orangemen.

For this, as we have already had occasion to remark, Catholics have no one to blame but themselves; and it is therefore very foolish on their part for them to cry out against the arrogance, and rapidly increasing influence of Orangeism.—Patiently, and with drudge-like servility, we have offered our cheeks to the smiter, and held out our hinder ends to be kicked; should we then wonder, have we any right to complain, if we have been cuffed and kicked accordingly? It is absurd, we say, to hear men, who allowed the deliberate insult offered to us last year by the Governor-General and his Ministry, to pass unnoticed, unavenged, complaining of the consequences of their own apathy, and almost incredible servility to "Jark-in-Office."

The fact is, that the opinion has gone abroad that we are a set of "place-hunters;" and that, in pursuit of our favorite game, there is no indignity to which we will not cheerfully submit.—That this opinion is, to a certain extent, justified by our own conduct, is evident from this—that, in spite of the long continued insults and injuries we have received at their hands, the present Ministry—the very men who advised the Governor to give an official sanction to Orangeism—find themselves warmly supported both in the Catholic press and by Catholic votes at the hustings. Of course these ignominious services are well paid for; but the dirty profits of the individual, are a very poor set off against the dishonor that his mercenary conduct has brought upon the Catholic body.

Instead then of clamoring for laws against Orangeism—laws which, as all experience has shown, must be inoperative for good—let us see if we cannot ourselves apply a remedy to the evil complained of, and in some measure redeem our reputation for courage, and honesty of purpose. We complain, and with reason, of the rapid growth of Orangeism, which has increased until, in Upper Canada at least, it has become a power in the State, not the less real, not the less formidable, because unknown to the Constitution. Let us then abstain from encouraging it ourselves, and insist that it shall not be encouraged by any of our public servants. Let us, by our acts, unequivocally declare to the world, that no man, no matter how exalted his situation, or how great his former services, who directly or indirectly has encouraged, or coquetted with Orangeism, need expect the slightest countenance from any Catholic voter at the next election; and in the meantime, let us insist that, here in Canada, the principle universally admitted in theory, and acted upon in England—that no public functionary shall take any part in any party political demonstrations whatsoever—shall for the future be rigorously and impartially applied to public servants of every degree—from the constable in the streets, to the Governor-General in his viceregal chair. Thus, deprived of official patronage, Orangeism would soon die of sheer inanition.

PROTESTANT PROGRESS.—Some idea of the rapid progress that the Mormons are making in England may be formed from the following extract from the Bath and Cheltenham Gazette:—"It is known that in England and Wales there are (the Protestants of the Mormon denomination)—have actually put, or are now putting, into circulation Five Millions of large-type tracts, consisting each of sixteen pages. It further appears from the Millennial Star, the Mormonite organ, that a reinforcement of not fewer than seventy five additional emissaries, destined principally for this country—'England'—are now on their way from the Salt Lake."

No one who has analysed the phenomena of the history of Mormonism, or examined its credentials, can be surprised at the ready acceptance that this new form of Protestantism meets with