

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 696, Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
E. J. OLECK, 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 Depot,
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 Sub-
scription from THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 15.

ECCLIESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1867.

Friday, 15—St. Faust et Jovite, M. M.
Saturday, 16—Of the Sixth after Epiphany.
Sunday, 17—SEPTUAGESIMA.
Monday, 18—St. Simeon, B. M.
Tuesday, 19—Agony of Our Lord.
Wednesday, 20—Of the Feria.
Thursday, 21—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

OFFICE OF THE

ROMAN LOAN.

At the Banking House of Duncan, Sherman
& Co.,

11 NASSAU STREET, CORNER OF PINE.
New York, January 30th, 1867.

To ALFRED LAROCQUE, Esq.,
Agent of the Roman Loan,
Montreal, Canada.

Dear Sir,—I have the honor to inform you that I
have received instructions to keep this Loan open,
until the same is absorbed, as it is expected in Rome
that the late direct appeal of the Holy Father to the
Clergy will produce this result before the First of
April.

Very respectfully

Your obedient servant,

ROBERT MURPHY,

General Agent for the United States,

British Provinces and South America.

Bonds of 500 francs are sold for \$66 00
Do 125 do do 16 50

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Rarely has a Speech from the throne at the
opening of Parliament, been so full of matter,
and of promises of good things to come, as was
that delivered on the 5th inst. by the Queen. It
pledges the Derby Ministry to grapple with, if
not settle, all the great internal and external
questions of the day. It promises an extension
of the franchise, to be coupled we suppose with a
distribution of seats. It promises a landlord and
tenant Bill for Ireland: and this, if it can be so
drawn up as to give security to the latter, will go
a great way towards the suppression of Irish
disaffection—which in its essence is, at the pre-
sent, neither national, nor religious, but agrar-
ian. So also we are promised a settlement of
the Confederation question for the Colonies, and
of the disputes arising from the claims of the
Northern States for compensation for damages
inflicted on their commercial shipping, by the
Confederate States man-of-war *Alabama*. In a
word—the Royal speech promises everything to
every body; and if one half of the expectations it
holds out be realised, the Derby Cabinet will
have earned for itself a place in British history
not inferior to that of any of its predecessors
since the days of Pitt. The New York papers,
upon the faith of their London correspondents,
pretend that the Queen was by no means well
received by the people in the streets, on her road
to open Parliament: that she was greeted, not
with cheers, but with cries of "reform, reform!"
ominously suggestive of those cries of "To your
seats O Israel!" which once assailed the ears of
an English king. There is we suspect far more
of romance, than of truth in these stories, and
their peculiar origin requires us to accept them
not only with caution, but with distrust. There
is, no doubt, much distress in London amongst
the working classes, in consequence of the ces-
sation of the demand for labor. This again is
owing to the fact, that the manufacturers of Bel-
gium and France have entered into competition
with the British manufacturer: and this again is
the direct work of the "Trades Unions," which,
regardless of the laws that regulate wages, have
endeavored to force the latter by means of legal
combination and illegal intimidation, above the
level warranted by the ratio of supply to demand,
and by the profits on capital. The latter there-
fore naturally seeks for more lucrative invest-
ment in countries where labor is cheaper, and its
supply more certain. The trial of Mr. Eyre,
late Governor of Jamaica has commenced.

From Ireland there is, nothing new. Though
the result of the inquest has not been made
public, it is to be feared that, at a late election,
the men of the Lancers, heedless of the command
of their officers, behaved in a very disorderly
manner, charging on the crowd without orders, or
necessity; and thereby inflicting severe wounds

on many of the bystanders, and, in several in-
stances, depriving others of life.

All was quiet at Rome up to latest dates, but
this is indicative rather of a lull in the revolu-
tionary storm, than of its dispersion. The East-
ern horizon is black with clouds. Greece is
arming, and seems bent on a war with Turkey,
in which of course Russia will take part, and
which will very likely involve all the other Great
Powers of Europe.

The impeachment of the President by the ex-
treme revolutionary or Jacobin party, is still the
common topic of conversation in political circles
in the U. States: and we suppose that there, as
in other countries, the disease must run its course.
The day of reaction, violent in proportion to the
violence of the present action, must however set
in, some day, sooner or later: and though it may
be too late probably to save the Constitution, it
will bring with it well merited retribution on the
heads of those now triumphant.

Rumors are afloat that Lord Monck will re-
turn no more to Canada, but that he will be
replaced by Lord Naas, an Irish peer. This may
be only a canard. It was also expected that
Earl Carnarvon would, during the course of the
week following, 8th inst., lay before Parliament a
Bill for the Union of the B. N. A. Provinces.

THE REV. FATHER BAKEWELL AND THE
CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN'S SOCIETY. — The
reverend gentleman above named, we are happy
to say, had a first rate audience on Wednesday
evening 6th inst., and his audience had in return a
first rate lecture. Indeed considering that the
lecturer was a ripe scholar and profound thinker
as well as a sincere and humble Christian, it
could not well have been otherwise.

The subject of the lecture—a full report of
which the limited space at our command prevents
us from laying before our readers—was "The
Social Effects of Protestantism." All So-
ciety, civil or ecclesiastical, political or religious,
depends for its stability upon the principle of
"authority." But all authority presupposes the
idea of "right;" and as there is no "right" ex-
cept from God, so also without God there can
be no rightful authority. But, in like manner,
a true idea of God supposes a true theology; but
without an infallible, everpresent divine teacher,
or Church, there can be no true theology, or
idea of God; no sound basis therefore for
"right" or "authority;" no stability therefore
for Society.

The lecturer appealed to history in confirma-
tion of this his thesis. The great religious apos-
tacy of the sixteenth century struck directly at
the principle of authority, to which it gave a
severe wrench, as it were, from which society
has been suffering ever since. Though aimed
apparently primarily at Church or religious au-
thority, the blow fell quite as heavily upon
State or political authority. The civil wars of
England in the seventeenth century; the great
social cataclysm of the eighteenth, known in His-
tory as the French Revolution; and the dis-
turbed state of European society in the nine-
teenth were the direct and logical consequences
of the anarchic principles laid down by the leaders
of the Protestant Reformation.

If it be objected that this is a Romish or one-
sided view of the subject, it may be replied that
this also is the view taken by many of the most
prominent non-Catholic writers of the present
day upon sociology and kindred topics. In his
great work on the French Revolution, Louis
Blanc begins with Huss and Luther, and traces
the progress and workings of the principles by
these heresiarchs laid down, until they culminated
in the bloody tragedy of which he is the his-
torian. In fact, so far is this idea of the evil
effects of the Reformation upon Modern Society
from being peculiar to Papists, that it will be
found to underlie the theories of the chief So-
cialistic writers of the age. "This is their theory:
—There are three principles on which all So-
ciety must be founded—these are, "Authority,"
"Individualism," and "Fraternity." The first
was the principle of the Catholic Church, which
ruled Christendom down to the sixteenth century,
when it received its death blow from the Re-
formation. The second, "Individualism" express-
ed theologically by the formula "right of private
judgment," ruled next; to it still belongs the pre-
sent, and will belong, until the triumph of the prin-
ciple of the Revolution, which is to-day as it was in
'93, an uphill effort to organise by means of the
guillotine of course, Society upon the third prin-
ciple, that of "Fraternity." Of course the
great obstacle to the realisation of this glorious
dream, is the Catholic Church with its principle
of "Authority;" and if it be true that the
stability of Society be bound up with the suc-
cessful maintenance of this principle, then of
course it follows that the stability of Society is
dependent upon the triumph of the Catholic
Church.

We beg leave respectfully and gratefully to
acknowledge the good service that the "Catholic
Young Men's Society" of this City is conferring
upon us all, by its encouragement of such Lec-
tures as that which was delivered before it on
the evening of the 6th inst. We hope for the
sake of the society, and of the community that
it will be able to continue this good work.

THE ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY AND THE
MONTREAL GAZETTE.—An article over an as-
sumed name, and containing several offensive
allegations with respect to the St. Patrick's So-
ciety, appeared a few weeks ago in the Montreal
Gazette. The Office Bearers of the Society
feeling it beneath their dignity to enter into any
manner of controversy with one who skulked be-
hind the shelter of an assumed name, and yet
anxious to rebut the offensive portions of the
allegations of their assailant, called upon the
editor of the *Gazette* to give up the name of his
informant. This the *Gazette* did not do; and
B. Devlin, Esq., the President of the Saint
Patrick's Society, made allusion to the matter
in a speech by him delivered on Monday even-
ing, the 4th instant, at the regular monthly
meeting of the members. To this exposition of
the matter, as given by Mr. Devlin, the *Gazette*
of the 8th takes exception; laying down some
very extraordinary principles with regard to the
obligations, in honor contracted by an editor to-
wards every person whom he allows to be at-
tacked through the medium of his columns, by an
anonymous assailant:—

"To one point in Mr. Devlin's speech we owe it
to truth to take exception. We did not simply de-
cline to give him the name of our correspondent, as
he, in his speech, gives the public to understand.
But the answer we gave him was, after consulting
with the correspondent, that the name would be fur-
nished, if a denial were made of three out of five
charges, and that he (the correspondent) would go
to proof on that issue. The terms were not very
difficult, while they would have afforded a sharp
issue; and certainly would not have implied any
greater loss of dignity, than the statement in rebuttal
which the President of the Society has now seen fit
to make. Such being the facts, and the name of the
correspondent obtainable on such easy terms, Mr.
Devlin will probably himself see that he has over-
done the thing, in expending so much wrath upon
the writer of that letter, while he, himself, declined
the very easy test, which would have given him the
name. That writer did, in our opinion, all that he
could have been reasonably asked to do; and more
than most people would have done."

It will be seen from the above that the editor
of the *Gazette* lays down the law, that he is not
in honor, or morally, bound to give up, on de-
mand of the person assailed through his columns,
by an anonymous assailant, the name of the said
assailant, unless the complainant specify at least
three charges as false and calumnious; and he—
the editor of the *Gazette*—hesitates not to add,
that no more can be expected either of him, or of
his anonymous correspondent.

This is indeed strange law, and argues sad
obliquity, or obtuseness of moral vision, on the
part of him who propounds it; strange of all
perhaps in this—that he who now lays it down,
in order to screen an anonymous calumniator
from the moral consequences of his slanderous
utterances, but a few days ago asserted quite
another principle:—to wit—That, if a journalist
make his journal the medium for giving publicity
to—not three, or two, but—one single offensive
statement, derogatory to the honor of a third
party, he, the editor, is bound in honor, on
demand of the person aggrieved, and denying the
truth of that one single offensive allegation, to
give up the name of his correspondent; or else to
hold himself responsible for the truth of the facts
alleged, and of the statements by him made pub-
lic. This is the true exposition of the law.

For were it otherwise—were the law really
what the *Gazette* asserts it to be—see what might
be the consequences! An unprincipled scound-
rel might publish an article making "five" al-
legations respecting some person to whom he
bore ill-will, of which "three" should be true
and harmless, "two" false and offensive; and
yet when called upon for his authority, or for the
name of his informant by the person ag-
grieved, the editor publishing these five allega-
tions, might make answer:—Furnish a denial of
three out of these five charges; and then, but
not before, will I give you the means of meeting
your enemy in open day, and on equal terms." This, we say, is, according to the law as now
laid down by the *Gazette*, all that the editor of a
journal, and an anonymous assailant of his neigh-
bor, can be called upon to do.

For instance: Mr. Smith having been charged
in an anonymous communication published in
one of the morning papers—with being a drunk-
ard—with ill-treatment of his wife—with wearing
a wide-awake hat—with smoking a cigar after
dinner—and with taking pleasure in skating—
would not be entitled to claim the name of his
calumniator, unless he first gave a formal denial
to "three out of these five charges." On what
authority does the editor of the *Gazette* lay
down such a monstrous proposition as this?
which would always ensure immunity to the
cowardly and anonymous traducer of his neigh-
bor, who should but take the pains of mixing up
"two" false and calumnious allegations, with
"three" others, true and indifferent.

As the editor of the *Gazette* seems to labor
under a strange misconception as to the moral
obligations of a journalist, and the laws of honor;
and as this, we hope, the consequence of ignor-
ance rather than of moral depravity, we will en-
deavor to set him right upon the matter.

We beg leave, therefore, to inform him that,
in the matter of circulating offensive reports,
injurious to another, an editor of a journal has
no rights distinguishable from those of any other
person. That he has no more right, morally, or
according to the laws of honor, to publish, or cir-

culate in his paper, a story reflecting upon
another's good name, than he has to publish or
circulate a similar story by word of mouth;
that he has no more moral right to publish in his
paper one single charge injurious to his neigh-
bor's reputation without having first convicted
himself, to the best of the means within his reach,
of its truth—than he has to publish a similar
story, and without similar precautions, in the
streets, in the public room of the hotel, or at the
mess table; that if he transgress in this respect
he is as strictly bound in honor to give up to the
person aggrieved the name of his correspondent,
as he would be to give up, when called upon to
do so by the aggrieved party, the name of his
informant, or authority for repeating by word of
mouth, a slanderous or offensive tale. The
possession of a press and type carries with it no
immunity from the moral code, or the laws of
honor; and he who, whether, by word of
mouth, or through the press, becomes a medium
for giving currency to one single statement re-
flecting upon another's honor or good name, is
bound, immediately and on demand, to do one of
two things. Either to give up to the person
aggrieved the name of his assailant, or else to
stand responsible for the truth of the offensive
allegations. This is the law current amongst all
gentlemen; and this was the law, in short, which
the *Gazette* laid down but a few days ago to the
Globe; we, in return, now take the liberty of lay-
ing it down for the *Gazette*, in hopes that, hence-
forward, it will amend its ways, live cleanly and
honestly, and forego the company of any anony-
mous correspondents, who are always a bad and
dirty lot, given to evil speaking, lying and slan-
dering.

"Almost every act, legislative or administrative,
which Congress or President has done in reference
to the South since the war began was unconstitu-
tional."—*Mont. Herald*, 6th inst.

Now the *Herald* has always warmly espoused
the cause of the Northern as against the South-
ern States; we may therefore accept, without
hesitation, its testimony as given in the above
short extract.

We wonder that the *Herald* does not per-
ceive the logical consequences of the damning
admission as against his friends, the Northerners.
If indeed the every action of the President and
Congress since the commencement of the war
has been unconstitutional, then have they and
their adherents, and not the Southerners, been
the "rebels." If the *Herald* does not see this,
it is because, from want of reflection, he con-
founds the legitimate functions of President and
Congress of the United States, with those of
Queen and Parliament of Great Britain. True,
the latter may legitimately, and without any
constitutional limitation, conjointly do anything
and everything they please. But the constitu-
tion of the United States, is not as the Constitu-
tion of Great Britain; and neither separately,
nor yet conjointly, has, or have, President and
Congress any more right to do an "unconstitu-
tional action," than has the Queen to levy taxes
by her own authority, and of her mere proper
motion. The functions of President and Con-
gress, conjointly as well as separately, and the
extent of the sphere within which these functions
may rightfully be exercised, are as clearly de-
fined and marked out by the constitution of the
United States, as are the limits of the constitu-
tional functions of the Queen—of the House of
Lords—and of the House of Commons, consid-
ered separately. There are indeed no limits to
the constitutional action of the latter acting con-
jointly; separately, the powers of all three are
strictly defined and limited. The Queen may
not levy taxes; the Lords may not originate or
amend a money Bill; the Commons can exer-
cise no military, judicial, or other executive
functions. And just as the British Constitu-
tion, though giving unlimited or undefined
power to the conjoint action of Queen, Lords
and Commons, strictly limits the separate func-
tions of every one of these bodies; so, in like
manner, the United States Constitution limits
and defines the functions of President and Con-
gress when acting conjointly, as well as when
acting separately. If either, or if both trans-
gress those defined limits, they thereby forfeit all
claims upon the obedience of the people; just as
would the Queen of Great Britain, were she to
levy taxes without the consent and co-operation
of Lords and Commons. These simple elemen-
tary truths seem to have escaped the notice of
the *Herald*.

The *Herald* will say that it was impossible for
the Northern States either to reduce the seceded
Southern States to subjection, or to reconstruct
them, without violating the Constitution—and this
plea too we will at once admit. But what fol-
lows? Not that the Congress and President had
the right to violate the Constitution, but that
they had no right to attempt, even, to coerce the
seceded Southerners by force of arms; or to re-
construct them. We are speaking not of "might,"
but of "right;" but it is a self-evident propo-
sition that, even conjointly, President and Con-
gress, had no right, and never can acquire the

"This the *Herald* admits; for if their functions
were not limited by the constitution, then no action
of theirs could be unconstitutional."

right, to violate the constitution in virtue of which
they exist. In short, that they have no "rights,"
save those given to them explicitly, or implicitly,
by the Constitution.

No Constitution can give or recognise the
"right" of its own violation. It may concede ex-
traordinary powers for extraordinary occasions—
such as the suspension of Habeas Corpus, and the
substitution of Martial Law; and then the
exercise of these extraordinary powers in ex-
traordinary circumstances, is as constitutional as
is the exercise of ordinary powers in ordinary
occasions. Thus the declaration of Martial
Law in Ireland by the British Government in
case of insurrection would not be unconstitutional;
but merely an application of the Constitution to
a particular emergency. Never, however, under
any conceivable circumstances can a Govern-
ment, or the members of a Government, have
the "right" to do that which is unconstitutional;
for to assert the contrary implies a contradiction
in terms. In its last analysis all unconstitutional
action is rebellion, for all rebellion consists essen-
tially in unconstitutional action. Admitted the
premises of the Montreal *Herald*, and it follows
as a logical consequence, that the President and
the Congress of the Northern States are, and
have been the "rebels," because guilty of un-
constitutional action. For under the political
order of the United States, rebellion implies dis-
loyalty or disobedience, not to a person, but to
the written Constitution.

If—and we hesitate not to assert the principle
however startling it may appear—if a Govern-
ment cannot subdue or successfully resist, the
political action of any portion even of those
whom it may term its subjects, without violating
the constitution, or having recourse to unconsti-
tutional action, it has no "right" to subdue
them, no right to oppose them. So true is this
that we hesitate not to maintain that, were it
impossible for the British Government to put
down Fenianism in Ireland without violating the
Constitution, it would have no right to put down,
or oppose, Fenianism. If, the British Govern-
ment, would, of course, in case of an outbreak in
Ireland or any part of the Empire, have a "con-
stitutional" right to employ all weapons, to em-
ploy all means to suppress that outbreak—such as
Martial Law, and the suspension of the Habeas
Corpus Act; but not to save the Empire from
disruption would it have the right to do one un-
constitutional action. If, the British Govern-
ment,—that is to say Queen, Lords, and Com-
mons acting conjointly—can do nothing uncon-
stitutional; for though as a monarchy it is limit-
ed, considered as a Government it is unlimited, and
its every act is, and must be, constitutional.—
This is the peculiar feature which distinguishes
the British from the United States Federal Gov-
ernment; for the latter is essentially a "limited
Government," limited by a written constitution,
to which it owes its being, from which alone it
derives its right to the obedience of the people,
and to which in return it is bound to yield true
allegiance, and humble obedience. Ceasing to
do so, it forfeits all its rights, it becomes morally
dead and stinking, so that no man is bound to re-
gard it. In short, in governments, all unconsti-
tutional action is political suicide; and can no
more be justified even on the tyrant's plea of
necessity, than could be the action of him who
should cut his own throat, to save his life.

CRIMES OF THE NEAPOLITAN CLERGY.—
We have often heard these men denounced as
great criminals, but we have not hitherto heard
any specific charges preferred against them. We
knew that they had been robbed, exiled, and
imprisoned without form even of trial, and without
any pretence even of law; but we were still at a
loss to know the precise nature of the offence for
which they had been thus punished, and cruelly
dealt with. At last however, the matter is made
plain, and the mystery of iniquity of these vile
Romish priests, has been published to the world
by the London *Times*, in an editorial on the
state of Italy, under date 14th ult. In this
article, the nature and the extent of the wicked-
ness of these priests are set forth at length:—

"The possession of a large portion of the landed
property has also hitherto enabled the clergy to ex-
ercise the baneful influence of unbounded and indis-
criminate charity."—*Times*, Jan. 14th, 1867.

This then is their crime, this the very head and
front of their offending. They—the priests—
were rich, and exercised unbounded and indis-
criminate charity. Well have these wicked men been
punished. Disciples and imitators of one Who
also was guilty of a similar offence in Judaea, and
Who was crucified betwixt two thieves because
of the "baneful influence" that he also had
acquired over the people—they have been robbed,
and persecuted, slandered and spitefully en-
treated:—

"The clergy's power to do mischief is being cur-
tailed by the confiscation of their property."—*Times*,
14th Jan.

One comfort is that this accusation of "un-
bounded" charity, exonerates the Romish clergy
from another contradictory charge often brought
against them—to wit that of sensuality, or self-
indulgence. Of course, if the said priests ex-
pended a chief portion of their wealth upon them-
selves, and the gratification of their own desires,
they would have had nothing left wherewith to
perpetrate the odious crime of "unbounded and
indiscriminate charity."