

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS,

GEORG E. OLERK and JOHN GILLIES, At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

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

TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3d., can be had at this Office; Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 12, 1860.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The mails from Europe bear tidings of chequered fortunes in Italy. On the one hand we have to deplore the capture of Ancona with General Lamoriciere, and its gallant garrison. On the other hand, we have cause for rejoicing in a serious defeat of Garibaldi near Capua, with the loss of some 500 killed and wounded, and 200 prisoners; and in the daily increasing animosities between Garibaldi, who would revolutionise on his own account—and the partisans of Victor Emmanuel who desire to reap where Garibaldi has sown. The latter has completely thrown himself into the arms of the Mazzinians who are ultra-demagogues, and his career seems destined to end most disastrously for himself and most gloriously for the cause. With great qualifications as a leader of filibusters, impetuous courage, dogged perseverance, and a good military eye, he is evidently the destined of the talents of an organizer. The storm that he has raised he can neither quell nor direct, and in his own person, he will not give another instance of how much easier a thing it is to evoke the winds, than to compress them again within their cavern.

The Pope has called on France to arrest the progress of the Sardinian troops within his territories, and declared his design, should France remain idle, to abandon Rome. Additional troops have already been ordered to the Eternal City, and the French advanced posts have been pushed two miles beyond the walls. The King of Naples with the remnant of his troops, some 50,000, it is said, is determined to show fight; he has inflicted well merited punishment upon a General Sforza, one of his treacherous and cowardly officers. Lord John Russell has given a warning to Sardinia not to hazard an attack upon Venice. The weather in the British Islands was at last dates, unfavorable for harvesting operations, and breadstuffs were again slightly advanced in price.

The fine steamer *Connaught*, Capt. Leitch, with a crew of 124 men, and some 470 passengers, was destroyed by fire on the 6th instant, when about 150 miles East of Boston. Owing to the skill, courage, and perseverance of the commanding officer, all hands were saved.

A great Orange meeting was held at Toronto on Friday last, at which Gowan, J.H. Cameron, and the turkey of Toronto jail cut a prominent figure, and evacuated a vast amount of rapid nonsense. Having succeeded in making themselves odious to all loyal British subjects, the Orangemen of Upper Canada are now bent upon making themselves as ludicrous as possible.

NEW POLITICAL COMBINATIONS.—The *Globe* is doing a little business in the prophetic line.—Looming in the future he sees a great Protestant coalition against the Papists of the Lower Province. "We venture to state our belief," says the inspired Brown, seated on the three-legged stool of the *Globe* office—"that the chances of a coalition of English against French, of Protestant against Catholic, and therefore of an Upper Canada, instead of a Lower Canada domination for the next parliamentary term, are quite equal to those of any other coalition."

To give even George Brown his due, we should add that he deprecates any such a coalition; and that while perseveringly blowing the embers of strife, national and religious, he professes an ardent longing "to put an end to the dangerous antagonisms of race, religion and locality" which now distract the body politic.—Nothing can be more liberal, more beautiful, than the *Globe's* sentiments, only unfortunately he will not carry them out into practice. "We contend for equal rights for all," says our Clear-Grit cotemporary; "we ask nothing for Upper Canada that we are not willing to give to Lower Canada," exclaims this new apostle of peace and good will. Unfortunately for the *Globe's* entire policy belies every one of its professions; and whilst clamoring for "equal rights" for all, it still means to assert the odious principle of Protestant Ascendancy.

"We ask nothing for Upper Canada that we are not willing to give to Lower Canada."—This is false, Mr. Brown. You and all your party demand for the Protestant majority of the Upper Province the legal right to tax the Catholic minority for school purposes to which the latter are conscientiously opposed; but you are not prepared to admit in the Catholic majority of Lower Canada any such right to impose their will in educational matters upon the Protestant minority of their section of the Province. You claim, and with good reason, separate schools for your co-religionists in Lower Canada; but you are not prepared to accede to the demands of the Catholic minority of the Upper Province for the same privilege, for the enjoyment of the same right to educate their children as they please without interference on the part of the majority. Here is the test which we apply to all your professions of liberality. So long as you avail yourselves of your numbers and political power in the West, to impose a compulsory and odious School system upon the Catholic minority, so long do we know that those professions of liberality are but a snare and a delusion.

Leave education free, and unfettered; recognise and act upon the principle, the only sound principle, that education belongs to the Family and not to the State, apply to the School the same maxims that you apply to the Church, and then, but not till then, will we give you credit for liberality and sincerity in your advocacy of "equal rights" for all.

But this you dare not do. You have risen to power by inflaming the passions of the mob, and by appeals to the passions and no-Popery prejudices of a bigoted and ignorant rabble. You assert for Protestants—being in the immense majority in your section of the Province—the right to tax their Catholic fellow-citizens for the support of schools which—whether rightly or wrongly matters not for our argument—the latter believe to be "dangerous to faith and morals;" you claim for yourselves and your Protestant allies the right to decide how and by whom the children of Catholics shall be educated; you trample under foot their rights as citizens, and as parents responsible to God and to Him alone, for the education of their children; and with malice inveterate in your hearts, but a sickly smile of maudlin plianthropy on your lips, you present yourself before us as the champion of civil and religious freedom. Before we can believe you, or the reality of your repentance, you must retrace your steps, you must swallow all your own words, you must undo all that you and your party of Protestant Reformers have done against our schools and against Freedom of Education; and you must publicly proclaim yourself a convert to the wholesome doctrine, that the State has no right to tax any man for the support of a Church or of a School, of a religious system or an educational system to which he is conscientiously opposed. But this you dare not, cannot do, for by so doing you would break irrevocably and irretrievably with the very political party, with the only political party, to which you are indebted for all your influence. You must be either George Brown, or be nothing; the champion of State-Schoolism *versus* Freedom of Education, or else the baffled foe, prostrate beneath the feet of the despised and long abused "Dogsans."

And herein to the calm on-looker consists one of the most amusing features of the actually existing political complications. George Brown, once the fiery denouncer of "separate schools," is reduced to the most humiliating silence on the School Question, incomparably the most important social and politico-religious question of the day. He dare not now, as formerly, denounce "separate schools," or clamor for the repeal of the clause authorizing their existence; because by so doing he would deprive his *Katholik* friends and supporters of the last miserable shadow of an excuse for their countenance of the enemy of their religion, the scurrilous and obscene reviler of their clergy and religious Sisterhoods. He dare not, on the other hand, declare himself favorable to "separate schools," or betray the slightest disposition to relax in his efforts to impose the accursed and degrading yoke of State-Schoolism upon the Catholic minority, for by so doing he would quickly lose caste with the "Protestant Reformers," and be stripped of all political influence. He is therefore constrained to an ignominious silence; he is, as it were, bound over for the time to keep a civil tongue in his head; and most ludicrous is it to watch the manner in which he trims his sails, so as to avoid as long as possible, being taken aback in a squall of popular indignation from one or the other of the two parties on whom he feels that his chances of reaching the long coveted port of a Government situation are dependent. Watch the *Globe* closely, would we say to the readers of that journal whose eyes these lines may chance to meet. Watch and see if it be not as the TRUE WITNESS says; and if it be not true that the *Globe* is now obliged to preserve a most ignominious and dishonest silence on the School Question of Upper Canada.

But especially would we exhort Catholics to note this fact, and to bear in mind that even if George Brown is one whit more favorably disposed to their rights as parents over the education of their children, to-day than he was six years ago, he has as yet given no outward symptoms of that change; and that, as they value their credit for consistency and honesty, as they value the immortal souls of their little ones, and as they fear that great God Who will one day summon them to judgment, so are they bound to treat every enemy of their schools, as the enemy of their Church and their God.

A Catholic of Toronto, who would seem to be grievously tormented by a Protestant, sends us the subjoined communication and requests an explanation:—

To the Editor of the True Witness.

"Sin—I take the liberty of forwarding the enclosed paragraph, taken from page 81 of a Roman work called *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, A. D. 1558, published in Latin and English by J. G. Rivington, London, 1838, requesting an explanation in the columns of your journal as soon as convenient.

"The passage has been pointed out to me by a Protestant gentleman in proof of the charges frequently brought against the Order of Jesuits, and as a reply to my denial of the principle contained in it being a Catholic one. Relying on your theological experience to clear up the mystery—I remain Sir, &c. Inquirer.

The following is the "enclosed paragraph" referred to:—

"Visum est nobis in Domino, excepto expresso voto quo Societas Summo Pontifici pro tempore existenti tenetur, ac tribus aliis essentialibus—Paupertatis, Castitatis et Obedientie—nullas Constitutiones, vel ordinem ullum vivendi, posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale, vel veniale inducere, nisi Superior ea in nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute sancte obedientie jubere; quod in rebus, vel personis illis, in quibus judicabitur quod ad particularem unius cujusque, vel ad universale bonum multum conveniet, fieri poterit."

With the work published by J. G. Rivington of London we are not acquainted; but we have before our eyes the "*Constitutiones*," pars VI. c. 5, from whence the passage given above is extracted, and which has we believe been frequently cited by ignorant and by malicious persons as an argument in favor of their thesis—that, by the rules of the Jesuits, and at the

command of the Superior, it is lawful to commit mortal sin. This, we have no doubt, is the object with which the passage has been brought by a "Protestant gentleman" under the notice of *Inquirer*; and it is to the refutation of this implied objection against the moral teaching of the Jesuits, and of course of the entire Catholic Church, that we address ourselves.

The misrepresentations of Jesuit teaching proceed we will assume not from malice—for with malice it is in vain to argue—but from ignorance, and from a misconception of the technical meaning of the terms employed by Catholic theologians. Every science has its technical language; the law has its technicalities, and so has theology, and until these have been mastered it is impossible to convey to persons ignorant of the rudiments of law or theology, the meaning of the terms habitually employed without the slightest danger of misconception, by legists and theologians. It is so in this case; and therefore we must define what, in the technical language of Catholic theology is meant by the expression, "*obligationem ad peccatum non inducere*."

All the commandments of God which are of constant and universal force "*inducunt obligationem ad peccatum mortale*," or bind with such an obligation that he who violates any one of them is guilty of mortal sin. So in like manner with the laws of the Church, which prescribe the duties of fasting and of abstinence, of cessation from all servile work, and assisting at Mass on Sundays and other holidays of obligation. He who knowingly and willingly violates any one of these laws is guilty of mortal sin; and in the technical language of theology therefore those laws are such as "*obligationem ad peccatum mortale inducunt*," not because they impose upon any one the obligation or necessity of committing mortal sin, but because the force with which they bind is such that the consequences of mortal sin are necessarily involved in their infraction.

But, on the other hand, there are human laws, rules, and declarations, the breach of which involves necessarily no sin, either mortal or venial; and of these it is said in theology that they are not competent of themselves, "*obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere*." For example. A Catholic enrolls himself a member of some society such as that of St. Vincent de Paul. All these Societies have their rules and regulations which the members are expected to observe; but if it should so happen that these rules are violated or neglected the member guilty of this violation or negligence is not guilty of sin whether mortal or venial, unless he has also transgressed some precept of God or of His Church—because the constitutions, and rules of these voluntary societies, do not superinduce the obligation of mortal sin; "*obligationem peccati non inducunt*."

And this, and this alone, is exactly what is meant by the passage at which *Inquirer's* Protestant friend at Toronto has taken umbrage.—The chapter from which it is extracted is the last of the section, and is—as its heading implies "*Quod Constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt*"—intended to define the sense and the extent, in, and to which the previous chapters bind the members of the Society of Jesus. After a preamble to the effect that although it were much to be desired that the Society should in all things strictly adhere to their Constitutions, Declarations and Rules of Living, nevertheless, for the sake of giving security to the conscience of those who, guilty of some breach of those merely temporary human regulations might torment themselves with unnecessary scruples deeming themselves fallen into sin, it is carefully explained, that—with the exception of the vows of obedience to the Pope, of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience—these Constitutions, Declarations and Rules of Living cannot of themselves impose an obligation of such a nature that the guilt of sin, either mortal or venial, would be contracted by him who should violate them; unless in those cases wherein for some special good, the Superior should have seen fit to enjoin their strict observance upon some particular member of the Society. In that case, but in that case only, would the said Constitutions, &c., be able "*obligationem ad peccatum inducere*."

A Jesuit, for instance, should confess once a week according to the rules of his Order; yet, should he only go to confession every tenth day he would not thereby incur the penalty of sin either mortal or venial, unless his Superior had enjoined upon him in particular the duty of adhering to weekly confession. So, too, in many other instances, wherein the breach of a merely human regulation would not, except under the special circumstances indicated above, constitute a sin of any kind; and this because, of themselves—"*Constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt*."

We would also refer *Inquirer* to the grammatical construction of the passage for the complete solution of his scruples. According to the English version laid before him by his Protestant friend it runs thus—"That excepting in the express vow by which the Society is bound to the Pope for the time being, and the three other essential vows of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience, no Constitutions, Declarations or any Order of Living, can involve an obligation to sin, mortal or venial, unless the Superior command them (i.e., the *Constitutiones, Declarations, &c.*, aforesaid). For it will be seen that the word "*them*," being in the plural "*ea*," must refer, not to "*peccatum mortale vel veniale*" which is singular, but to the plural "*Constitutiones, Declarations, &c.*" This conclusively disposes of the Protestant objection, which can be of no force unless it be assumed that it is "*mortal or venial sin*" that the Superior has it in his power to enjoin upon or command to his Jesuit brethren.

Our correspondent, if unable to lay his hands upon the original work, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, will also find the obnoxious passage quoted and referred to in "*Rankke's History of the Popes*," vol. 2., under the caption "Progress of the Jesuit Institution." The subjoined is this Protestant writer's comment thereupon in a footnote. We copy from W. Keating Kelly's well known translation, p. 61:—

"*Obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale*," may possibly rather mean the binding force of a constitution, such that he who breaks the latter is guilty of one or the other kind of sin. (The passage thus interpreted would signify—"That no constitution, &c., can force an obligation amounting in its force to the contingency of mortal or venial sin, unless the Superior command those constitutions, &c., *Trans.*") It will at least be confessed that the constitution ought to be more perspicuous; no fault can be alleged against one who shall bona fide refer "*ea*" to "*peccatum mortale vel veniale*," and not to "*Constitutiones*."—*Rankke's Hist. of the Popes.*

Here the Protestant historian frankly admits that by referring "*ea, them*" to Constitutions, Declarations, &c., instead of to "*mortal or venial sin*" the objection against Jesuit morality is at once dissolved. But that the pronoun "*ea, them*" cannot be referred to the antecedent "*peccatum mortale vel veniale*" is evident, because the latter, on account of the conjunction disjunctive "*vel*" or "*or*," is singular, whilst the pronoun "*ea, them*," is plural. Its antecedent must therefore be looked for in the antecedent plural—"Constitutions, Declarations," &c.—and this simple grammatical consideration effectually disposes of the entire question. A Grammar and a Latin dictionary used intelligently and in good faith would of themselves suffice to dissipate the objections raised by the "Protestant gentleman," and submitted us by our Toronto correspondent *Inquirer*—The syntax of the former is as defective as his theology, or he never would have fallen into the grievous error of supposing that the Jesuits can come under an obligation to commit mortal sin.

"Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination."—*Macaulay's History of England*, chap. 1, vol. 1.

The vagaries of great minds, and the amount of faith with which they are received by the commonality when Catholicity is concerned, have always been to us a subject of wonder and bewilderment. At times we have endeavored to account for them by a certain illogical monomania in what are otherwise perfectly logical minds; at others, we have explained them as the effects of the *bona fide* prejudices of Protestant education; whilst at others we have been tempted to attribute them to a *malu-fide* endeavour, in spite of the known truth, to uphold the great Protestant Tradition. But, be the explanation what it may, the fact is still a subject of just wonder and bewilderment,—the ease, the simplicity, and apparent candour with which great minds will draw the most illogical conclusions from the most erroneous premises, drawn from the most erroneous first principles when Catholicity is concerned. Of this class certainly is the extract from Macaulay's History of England, at the head of our article. Now, my Lord Macaulay was a great man; in fact, like Falstaff, he may be said to have had "greatness thrust upon him;" not, it is true, like the Shakespearean worthy by the superinduction of fat, but after the manner of pots and kettles, by the addition of a "handle to his name." Yet, in spite of this greatness, although it may not be polite to term the worthy Baron's words *false*, we are constrained to call them *inaccurate*—yea, *exceedingly inaccurate*; in fact the extreme degree of inaccuracy which is consistent with the "*code d'honneur*" for which we would not call a nobleman a liar for the world, or any other sublunary consideration. We have said that the worthy Baron's words are inaccurate—we ought to have said more; they are *inaccurate* as to their first principles—inaccurate as to the premises—and inaccurate as to their conclusions. With regard to his first principle, however, we have no right to meddle with that. If he chooses to uphold it in spite of right reason, he has a legal right to do so, and it is not our business to blame him for it; the more so especially as he holds it in common with the whole Protestant world "*and they are honorable men*." The worthy Baron would have us believe that, in consequence of a supposed superior material prosperity, Protestant nations are superior in civilization to Catholic nations—to use his own example, *the country* around Edinburgh is superior to *the country* around Rome. Now, the Baron is a Scotchman, and in common with the whole Protestant world, though in an uncommon degree being a Scotchman, he worships the "*baubees*"—deeming riches and worldly prosperity to be civilization—the Mammon of iniquity to be the true God of the Christians. This is his first principle, on which his deductions are founded. Now granting for a moment that his deductions are true, let us apply the test of Scripture to the Baron's theology.—The Apostle (we suppose the worthy Baron would admit him as an authority in matters of faith) tells us "*in omnibus Christus*"—in all things Christ. But Mammon is not Christ; for the Gospel (doubtless another authority with the worthy Baron in such matters) tells us we cannot serve two masters, we cannot serve both God and Mammon. It is evident, therefore, whatever the Baron may have thought and written to the contrary, that riches and worldly prosperity are not true civilization—if civilization be as it ought to be—Christianity, duly and truly carried out. The Baron's first principles, therefore, will not hold good with right reason at least, however Protestant prejudices may be in its favor. The Scotchman's theology may be in favor of Mammon for God; and the Protestant world may subscribe to this article of his creed, but they must excuse the Catholic world if it dissents *in toto* from their dogma, and teaches that Christ and Christianity are true civilization and true prosperity. So much then for the Baron's first principles—now for his deductions.

Supposing for a moment this erroneous first principle granted—supposing it proved that riches and worldly prosperity are true civilization, and that the mammon of iniquity is Christ, (God forgive the blasphemy!) how far, pray you, are Protestant nations superior in civilization to Catholic nations?—To take the Baron's own example, how far are the inhabitants (for we presume it is the inhabitants he means and not the coun-

try) around Edinburgh superior to those around Rome? Leaving out of the question the unfairness of the comparison between the country round Edinburgh—a comparatively fertile country—with the Pontine marches around Rome—a country which in all ages has been all but insupportable to human life—(we should have liked to have set down the Baron in the flesh in the very centre of the Great Dismal)—still in order not to shirk the question, we will draw the comparison, substituting in both cases the city for the surrounding country: Edinburgh for its environs; Rome for the Pontine marches. But there is another unfairness in this comparison. My Lord Macaulay, if he had ever turned his attention to the philosophy of history, must, or ought to have known that nations, like individuals, have their infancy—their manhood and their decrepitude old are, and that it is as unfair to compare one nation in its infancy, with another in its manhood, as it would be to compare an aged or infirm lion, with one in its full vigor and strength.—Rome as a nation has had the day of its splendor, whilst (as the proverb assigns to every dog its day) Edinburgh has yet to have hers. If the worthy Baron would do justice in the comparison, he should compare Rome in the height of her Pagan splendor with "canny auld Reekie" when she shall have attained to the height of her "glorification;" and however that proud city may be entitled to the appellation of the modern Athens, we greatly fear that even that modern and Christian Athens will have to yield the palm to her Pagan rival, as long as splendor and worldly wealth and prosperity are to be the units of comparison. Granting however his own terms of comparison, (for when we descend into the arena, we would wish to give our antagonists every advantage in our power, and to fight him with his own weapons) how far are the inhabitants of Edinburgh superior to those of Rome? In drunkenness and desecration of the Sabbath!—If that is civilization—the "*canny loons*" of "Edinbro'" certainly are not to be beaten in the whole Protestant or even Pagan world, let alone in Rome, the centre of Catholicity. A drunken Italian is on any day of the week a "*vera avis*," a black swan; but on a Sunday, I doubt me, one could not be found, if the finding thereby would pay a king's ransom. Is this the case in the Modern Athens, whose year is a perpetual Bacchanalia, and where, if the statistics of crime are to be believed, there is more beastly drunkenness on any one Sunday, than probably could be found in the whole Italian Peninsula in one year? It ill becomes a fellow countryman of Forbes McKenzie (with his enlightened legislation) to institute a comparison between the inhabitants of Edinburgh and Rome, unless indeed rioting and drunkenness, and clamorous and impurities be, in this enlightened age, deemed prosperity and civilization; and then indeed the inhabitants of Christian Rome, and for the matter of that Pagan Rome either, would have to yield the palm to the Modern Athens. There has been no Forbes McKenzie Act found necessary as yet for Rome, however imperatively it may have been called for in Edinburgh. But the worthy Baron conveniently forgot all this doubtless, when he made his rhetorical flourish, and preferred poetical diction to stern matters of fact. He was helping to uphold the great Protestant tradition, and was not very particular as to the means employed. If inaccurate, perversion of the known truth, or even absolute falsehood, disguised under a flashy rhetoric, would do it, he cared not, so that the thing were done. Unfortunately for our purpose, we have not the statistical returns of the city of Edinburgh convenient to our hand; but equally unfortunately for the Baron's accuracy, we happen to have those of the city of London, the first Protestant city in the world, at our fingers' ends; and from them we may perhaps be able to glean something about this boasted Protestant superiority in worldly goods. We know and feel that it is rather too bad to bring the Baron's figures of speech down to the vulgar level of figures of fact. To measure his flights of rhetoric with the Registrar-General's quadrant may be like measuring Falstaff's waist with an inch rule; but still truth, and a true tailor's fit, require it; and however humiliating it may be to the worthy Baron's rhetoric, still it must be done. From the last returns of the Registrar-General for the city of London, we find that in London—(the city of nabobs and merchant princes—the city of the richest aristocracy in the world) wherein is held the Court of the most powerful sovereign on earth)—in this city of enormous wealth, we find the appalling fact, that *one in every six* of the population, at their leaving this world, do so at the public expense, *either in the workhouse, asylum, hospital, or prison!* Talk of beggary after that. *One in every six!* Merciful goodness! can it be possible that in any Christian country there can be any parallel to this? To talk of the Lazzaroni of Naples—those jolly fellows, who sing and dance under the blue arch of heaven by day, and at night repose under some clustering vine, or beneath some marble portico of a prince's palace; whilst they agreeably diversify their life by an occasional raid upon some gullible English tourist as often as fortune throws one in their way; they are the very aristocracy of beggary, compared with your London gin-palace poor. *One in six!* dying in abject poverty! God help the London Protestant poor, and my Lord Macaulay's figures of speech!

SACERDOS.

The *Scottish Guardian*, a journal of the exceedingly righteous "butter-wouldn't-well-in-his-mouth" tribe, has a special correspondent of the puritanical or evangelical type in Montreal, who deems it his duty to send home filthy and obscene libels against the Prince. Our Montreal cotemporarys are justly indignant with the cowardly foul-mouthed libeller; and one of them—the *Commercial Advertiser*—insinuates that "comparing the style of the communication with the other false accusations systematically published against the Prince by a journal of this city, there is more than a presumption that the editor of the *Witness* can place his finger on him"—the anonymous correspondent of the *Scottish Guardian*.