

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 656, Craig Street, by  
J. GILLIES.  
G. E. OLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:  
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.  
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 True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus, "JOHN JONES, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 28.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

DECEMBER—1866.

Friday, 28—Holy Innocents, M. M.  
Saturday, 29—St. Thomas of Canterbury, B. M.  
Sunday, 30—Sunday of Octave.  
Monday, 31—St. Sylvester, P. O.

JANUARY—1867.

Tuesday, 1—Circumcision.  
Wednesday, 2—Octave of St. Stephen.  
Thursday, 3—Octave of St. John.

For the last time this year we address our readers, and avail ourselves of the opportunity to wish them all the compliments of the season, and all manner of prosperity for the year about to open. An eventful year it promises to be; many are already rejoicing in the anticipated downfall of the Papacy, and the collapse of the Catholic Church. These anticipations are doomed to disappointment, but no doubt many trials are yet in store for the Church and her ruler, which they will surmount as they have surmounted so many other storms during eighteen hundred years.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The substance of latest telegrams is to the effect that the Fenian troubles in Ireland have abated, that the island is tranquil, and that confidence is being restored. From the Continent there is nothing new of any interest to report.

There is talk of impeaching President Johnson, and a preliminary motion to that effect has been made in the Congress of the Northern States. We are now told that, encouraged by promises of support from the Mexicans, Maximilian will remain and try to govern that distracted country.

We publish a Circular received by post announcing the retirement of His Lordship the Bishop of Sandwich on account of indisposition. We trust that repose from his labors may restore his Lordship to health.

SHOULD THE STATE TEACH RELIGION?

That of all men, the editor of the Toronto Globe, the organ of Mr. George Brown, should answer this question in the affirmative may, at first sight seem strange, but it is true, nevertheless. Strong indeed must be the logic of facts when such a conclusion is forced upon such a man; and yet to this conclusion is the advocate of pure secularism in the public schools impelled, by the immense and daily increasing mass of petty vices and rowdiness in Toronto.

"Any observant and intelligent man"—says the Toronto Globe of the 19th inst.—"who has occasion to frequent the Police Court, must be forcibly struck with the existence in the city of a large class who are not eminently vicious, or who have not force of character enough to lead them to commit daring or serious crimes; but who yet are given up to the indulgence of their passions, who are so indolent and improvident, and whose moral sense is so blunted, that they are quite unfit to take care of themselves, or those dependent upon them, or to remain at liberty consistently with the peace and welfare of society."

Somewhat similar is the argument of the Southern planters, who contend that, too generally, the lately emancipated negroes, even though free from "daring or serious crimes," are so given up to the indulgence of their passions, are so indolent and improvident, and are so blunted as to their moral sense, that they are quite unfit to take care of themselves, and those dependent upon them, or to remain at liberty consistently with the peace and welfare of society. From these premises, the white planter concludes to the necessity of keeping the negro, for a time, in a state of tutelage, and compelling him to work so that he may neither be a burden upon, nor a menace to society. The Globe, from similar premises, concludes to the necessity of incarcerating these lazy, self-indulgent, and improvident members of the body politic, in reformatories or workhouses, where they may be utilized, taught habits of industry and self-control, educated "into respect for themselves and the rights of others, and reverence for the laws of God and man."

But who is to teach reverence for the laws of God? or in other words, religion—for it is in that reverence for, and in the obedience thence

accruing to the "laws of God," that religion consists. The State, answers Mr. George Brown, shall do this; are the County Councils and Municipalities—these are they who availing themselves of the "Consolidated Statutes" of Upper Canada, Cap. 25, Sections 415, 419, are to undertake the task of educating the lazy, improvident, and vicious into reverence for the laws of God, as well as of man. Here is the plan in its details.

There are many members of the body politic, the Globe complains, who, "when not committing open offences," that is to say offences of which human law can take cognizance, "are allowed to lead their miserable, heathenish lives, and to bring up families to perpetuate the evil." This is the evil; the remedy is to consist in the imprisonment of these heathenish, but unfortunately prolific wretches in reformatories, workhouses, or houses of correction, in which they shall be taught reverence for the laws of God under the auspices of the City Councils, and Municipalities aforesaid.

The social machinery of Mr. George Brown is, so at first sight it seems to us, very complex, not to say cumbrous. It consists of two parts:—First of the "Common Schools," from which all religious instruction, that is to say, teaching of reverence for the "laws of God," is to be carefully eliminated; and then when these Godless and heathenish institutions shall have done their work, and shall have turned out their heathenish pupils into the streets, then they are to be supplemented by the House of Correction, and Work Houses, in which religion, or "reverence for the laws of God," is to be inculcated. Would it not be better in every way, better for the pupils, better for society, cheaper and more simple, to do in the Common Schools that which Mr. George Brown proposes shall only be done in the jail? Is not prevention better than cure? and if the educating of the vicious into a reverence for the laws of God is likely to be effectual for their reformation, is it not equally probable that the same education, if imparted sooner, might have prevented their falling into vice?

And yet the scheme now propounded by the Globe is but part and parcel of the great social machine which it and the party which it represents, are bent on running, and which has for its main object proselytism, or the perversion of Catholic children: first by the heathen and purely godless system of the State Schools; these to be supplemented in due time by the more positive or active agencies of the State Reformatory.—Yes! Mr. George Brown, your plan, complex and cumbrous though it may appear, is a well considered scheme for the perversion of the poorer classes of Catholic society, whom it proposes to place at the mercy of a very unscrupulous and wealthy Protestant majority. Yes! Mr. George Brown, we can see plainly your cloven hoof. In the words of the great Western orator, "We smell a rat; we see it brewing in the storm; and we will do our best to crush it in the bud." For put into plain English, here is the plan in its naked deformity. First, the children of poor Catholic parents are, through the operation of State-Schoolism, to be coerced into the godless common schools wherein, no doubt, their faith and morals will be corrupted; secondly, the Municipalities and County Councils which, in Upper Canada, are almost exclusively Protestant and bitterly anti-Catholic, are to be armed with power to tear from the bosoms of their families those who in consequence of a godless or heathenish education at school, lead godless and heathenish lives; and to commit them, without any positive offence having been legally proved against them, to Protestant institutions wherein they will be taught a religious system in accordance with the views of the Protestant majority. This plan, or one somewhat similar to it, has for some time been in operation in the United States; and through its instrumentality numbers of poor Irish Catholic children, whose only sin was that their parents were also poor, have been kidnapped and condemned to a fate worse than death. This, upon the plea of anticipating, or preventing crime, is the plan that Mr. George Brown is anxious to inaugurate in Upper Canada; and will succeed in inaugurating unless the Catholic laity of that section of the Province approve themselves zealous in defence of their personal liberties as British citizens, and of their rights as parents. If once we allow the civil magistrate to sentence to imprisonment those against whom no crime has been proved, there is an end to all personal liberty, to all justice, and we might as well introduce the Bastille, and *lettres de cachet* at once. Never, upon any pretext, should Catholics consent to arm a Protestant Executive with such tremendous power over the children of their poorer co-religionists; for, no matter what pledges given, or promises made, such power would most assuredly be wantonly abused, and prostituted to purposes of proselytism.

If—and so important is the subject that we fear not to repeat ourselves—if the teaching of "reverence for the laws of God" be effectual to reclaim from vice, much more then will it prove effectual to restrain from vice. Therefore, we

argue, let that reverence be inculcated or taught in the schools established by law, and maintained out of the public funds; instead of being relegated, as the Globe proposes, to the Jail, the Workhouse, and the Reformatory.

But before school-boys can be taught to "reverence the laws of God," they must be taught what these laws are, and wherein they consist: that is to say, we must have religious dogma taught in our schools, if the pupils thereof are to be educated into a "reverence for the laws of God." We must have the "Christian religion"—not the vague abstraction spoken of as "natural religion" taught; and since men do not yet agree as to the "laws of God," since the Protestant will call one thing the law of God, and the Catholic will predicate the same of something else, we must have "sectarian" or distinctive religious teaching in our schools, if we are to have any positive religious teaching therein at all. So, after all, it comes to this:—We must either abandon the godless or common school system entirely; since in schools "common" to both Catholics and Protestants no positive, dogmatic, or religious teaching of any kind whatsoever can be given, no reverence for the laws of God inculcated; or we must be content to supplement the imperfect common or non-sectarian school, by the jail, and Reformatory prison; to which, as the Globe proposes, the Councils of every city and town may have the power of "committing such persons as may be deemed expedient." And this is what our Liberals call liberty!

No movement that has occurred in the Protestant world since the great apostasy of the sixteenth century is more interesting, we may almost say more hopeful, to the Catholic, than is that which is now going on before our eyes in the bosom of the Church of England as By-Law Established. Considered from a religious and Catholic stand point, it is almost the great event of our era.

Protestants too are deeply impressed with its importance. If successful, it will they fear be a movement that will undo the great work of the Reformation, and build up again the walls of that Zion which their fathers with so much fury beat down. How then is it to be met, and dealt with?—for it can no longer be ignored, or laughed at.

There are some who simply propose to leave it severely alone, to let it run its course unchecked. Their policy is that of Gamaliel as towards the Apostles; for say they, "if this counsel or this work be of men it will come to naught; but if haply it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." Therefore they say again, "Retrain from these men"—the Ritualists—"and leave them alone." Acts V. 35, 39. This is the advice of the doubtful, of the cautious, of the timorous, of those who know on how fragile a basis the superstructure of the Established Church is reared, and who have themselves misgivings as to its divine origin.

But this policy, this counsel does not please the majority, or at all events the more energetic and zealously Protestant members of the Anglican fold. These are all for action, immediate, vigorous action, to put down Ritualising practices, and Romanizing tendencies. But here again arises the difficulty:—"What action?"

For on this most important question there are differences of opinion. There are two parties even amongst the men of action. The one is for "Judicial," the other for "Legislative Action."

The difficulties in the way of the first named mode of procedure are many and great: the objections to it are grave; and the Bishops, though urged to action, may well hesitate before they adopt it. For they have the risk of failure before their eyes: they remember with fear and trembling the results of Judicial Action, or an appeal to the legal tribunals for an interpretation and enforcement of existing law,—in the Gorham case, in the Deanison case, in the case of the authors of *Essays and Reviews*, against whom the Bishops set, but all in vain, all the machinery of existing law in motion. They see too how impotent that law is to purge even the Anglican episcopate of such members thereof as Dr. Colenso; and they may well entertain doubts whether it will suffice to put down Dr. Pusey, or his followers the High Churchmen.

Nor are these fears unfounded: for though it is indubitable that the doctrines and ceremonies now taught and practised by the High Churchmen are in glaring contradiction with the spirit of a Protestant Establishment, it is by no means so certain that the letter of the law is not in their favor; so far at least as to tolerate them, even as it tolerates, both those who assert, and those who deny, the fundamental Christian doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. And have we come at once to the essential characteristic of Anglicanism, and that which renders Judicial Action so dangerous to prosecutors; because the law itself is so uncertain, or rather so intentionally ambiguous, that it may be made to say anything, and everything. Unlike the Catholic Church, which in her formularies and symbols is essentially "exclusive," and seeks by the most care-

ful employment of words, to leave no crack or cranny through which any, the minutest error may creep in, it is the characteristic and boast of the Anglican Church that it is "inclusive," and so liberal on matters of faith and doctrine that there is place within its courts for all manner of opinions. Its founders had in view when they drew up its formularies, not truth, which is by its native exclusive, but comprehensiveness: they wished to take in as many as possible of the people of England; and as in their days the old Catholic feeling was still very strong and wide spread in some parts of England, they purposely couched their formularies in words susceptible of contradictory interpretations—one, acceptable to the Puritan section of the nation, the other such as might be acceptable to those who still had hankerings after the old religion. Only on one point were the Anglican formularies explicit—to wit, the recognition of the "Royal Supremacy." On all other matters a great latitude of belief and practice was purposely allowed; and hence is it, that the Church of England, though in its spirit unmistakably Protestant, is, in the letter of its written law, with which alone the Judges can deal, purposely ambiguous, vague, or comprehensive.

For these reasons the Bishops shrink from resource to Judicial Action. They know that the law of their church, as it exists, is but a sorry weapon to rely upon, a sword of very uncertain temper, as likely to break in their grasp, as to inflict a wound upon the adversary. They know too, that the consequences of defeat would be fatal; and they are therefore wisely loath to risk the fortunes of the Establishment, and their own, in such a doubtful contest as would be a resource to "Judicial Action" against the High Churchmen in the present defective state of the law.

There seems nothing left for them then but to try "Legislative Action;" to obtain through the legislature a better and more stringent law, better and more sharply defined definitions, and formularies. But this mode of action, though it might succeed in putting down Ritualism, would be fatal to the pretensions of Anglicanism; for the British Legislature is no longer so constituted as to be even, theoretically, capable of legislating for the Anglican Church, which boasts itself a branch of the Church Catholic.

In the sixteenth century the Anglican Church, and the Anglican State were in theory conterminous. Every Englishman was, in the eyes of the law, a member of the Established Church. The members of the Legislature were so in fact; and therefore the Church was legislated for by her own children, or at all events, by her professed children.

But in process of time, the Legislature ceased to be distinctively Anglican, for Dissenters obtained the right of admission thereto. Again it, in a short time, ceased to be distinctively Protestant, because Catholics obtained leave to sit and vote therein; and yet again, in our days, it has ceased to be distinctively Christian, since Jews and non-Christians are qualified to be members thereof, and there is nothing in the legal constitution of the House of Commons to prevent nine-tenths of its members from being avowedly non-Christians, and the professors of a religion which teaches that Our Lord was an impostor. Would it not be droll to see such a body sitting in solemn convocation and drawing up the symbols and formularies of the Anglican Church! Is it possible to conceive of anything more damaging, more fatal to all the pretensions of that body. The worst enemy of that Church could desire to see inflicted upon it no greater degradation than this.

And the more prudent members of its communion feel this, and shrink therefore from invoking the aid of such a legislature; from committing the revision of the Creeds, and formularies of their Church to a body composed as is the present British House of Commons. And yet, if action at all against the High Church, or Romanising movement, is to be taken; and if, as appears certainly to be the case, "Judicial Action" in the existing state of the law is too hazardous a process, there is no other resource or alternative left to our Anglican fellow-citizens, but this of applying for a new law, for a new code of religion, to a legislature composed indiscriminately of Protestants and Catholics, of Jews and Christians. To this humiliation they will perhaps have to stoop, and well merited and most appropriate will be the punishment. Their fathers of the sixteenth century were so inflated with national pride, that they would not allow an Italian priest to lithe or toll in the realm of England; and so they broke away from the Catholic Church, and called themselves independent, because they had renounced the Papacy.—Their children of the nineteenth century, to save their Establishment from disrapture, must submit themselves and their religion, not to the rule of an Italian Christian Bishop, but of Jews and infidels, of men who scorn Christianity, and spurn the Cross of Christ as an unclean thing. To this has the spirit of nationality, intruding there where it has no right to intrude; that is to say, within the sanctuary, reduced the Anglican Church, the off-sprug of an ill-regulated and misplaced spirit of nationality. Never was re-

tribution more righteous or more appropriate.—Only fancy a wealthy Jew discussing, and voting as to whether the Athanasian Creed should be retained in the English Church, and laying down his opinion as to the sense in which Christ is to be understood as received by the Anglican laity in the Lord's Supper. And yet to this, monstrous as it may seem, will it come if, in despair of the efficacy of Judicial Action, the Protestant party in the Establishment appeal to the Legislature for new weapons to put down Ritualism, and Romanism. So mote it be.

There seems to be much discontent amongst the people on the frontier at the way in which the Fenian prisoners are being dealt with by the Canadian Government. "Is it not bad enough," our fellow-citizens ask, "that for many days our homes and property should have been left exposed to the mercies of a pack of roudies, the dregs of New York hells, and the sweepings of Yankee jails? and are we to be told now that the prisoners are not so much as to be prosecuted by the Government which failed to protect its own loyal subjects?" There is much strong feeling on the matter, as will be seen from the following extracts from a letter that appeared in the Montreal Gazette (Ministerial) of the 22nd inst.:

Dec. 20, 1866.—People grumble a good deal here at the chance afforded to 'foreign' Fenians by the *nolle prosequi* of the Crown officers. If the law was insufficient to convict them, why were they brought out for trial here at such an expense? If it was sufficient, why should Lord Monck have sent for Mr. Ramsay and ordered this discontinuance? The first thing they expected to see was a telegram from New York to the effect that Lord Monck was tendered a 'public reception' by 'President' Roberts and his followers, in recognition of his extreme goodness. If the Fenian 'privateers' had happened to catch his lordship on the ocean the feeling of the frontiersmen would not have been one of unmingled regret.

Were it not safer for me to write to our government, to communicate with the Washington authorities to ascertain if we may continue to offer up prayers for the Queen here on the frontier? He asked a clergyman the other day, in the very bitterness of his heart, "A spirit is growing up here which both our governments may find it difficult hereafter to deal with. For days a pitiful band of thieves were left by our authorities to pillage the frontier people at their will, and that after arms had been deliberately refused to the inhabitants though repeatedly and urgently demanded. After the experience of the June raid the people determined to walk no longer in the ante-rooms of Ministers and of Generals and staff officers to procure means wherewith to defend their own firesides. They clubbed purses together and bought a large number of breech-loading rifles, and a large amount of ammunition. They will hereafter protect themselves, and as they have received so little aid will be little disposed to take orders or instructions from those who owed but refused them protection when most needed. The farce of making war on a grand scale against a pack of mere robbers; the painful inefficiency of military precautions to deal with mere border and bush warfare (proved so often in New Zealand and at the Cape, as well as here) will not be suffered again to bring ridicule on us. When next a Missisquoi farmer back a robber at his door, he will shoot him down like a dog. If many come, he and his friends will take to the woods and from behind fences and trees and stumps pick them off.—There will be very few prisoners brought in—perhaps none, unless first disabled by wounds. They will not care to see the legal farce of a *nolle prosequi* follow upon another military farce of 'grand tactics,' and if this sort of pillage is again encouraged by their neighbours who live on the other side of the frontier, those neighbours may expect retaliation. They seem to have felt no interest in stopping these marauding bands last summer. They will next time have it proved to demonstration, even to their blindness, that they have an interest in keeping the border quiet. They felt no interest and made no exertion to put an end to border forays and incendiarism in 1858 '59, till it was found their barns and houses also could be burned; then an end was at once put to that border trouble.

Such is the feeling only too prevalent here, much to be deplored, perhaps—but *que voulez-vous?* Have they no cause?

THE SWEETSBURGH TRIALS.—Thomas Madden was the first of the raiders of June last called upon to plead. After a long trial, and an able defence by B. Devlin, Esq., who raised every point of law in his client's favor, the jury found a verdict of *Guilty*, and sentence of death was passed upon the convict. The 15th of February next was the day named for the execution of the sentence.

Thomas Smith was then put on his trial, having also the benefit of the legal services of Mr. Devlin. After a lengthy trial the Jury retired but could not agree upon a verdict, so they were discharged.

Terence McDonald was next brought forward. Acts of theft were sworn to against him but the main charge was not proven, since the Jury brought in a verdict of Not Guilty. The prisoner was then taken back to jail, to await his trial on a charge of robbery and attempt at rape. The Court then adjourned, till Monday the 24th.

During the trial of Terence McDonald who claimed the character of a naturalised United States citizen, the question arose as to the effects of naturalisation upon one born a British subject. The Judge ruled that he felt himself for the present bound to abide by the decision of Judge Draper, to the effect that naturalisation in the United States did not exempt any one from his liability as a British subject, but he did not go beyond this.

THE WATER WORKS.—On enquiry we find that the water rates have been well paid up this year, the sum received till date being \$181,647. The whole amount collected up to the close of the last financial year was only \$173,510, showing an excess of above \$8,000 in favour of this year, with still six weeks to run before the accounts are closed on the 1st day of January next. This has been done, too, with one clerk less than formerly in the department.—*Montreal Herald.*