

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE;

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE

GEORGE E. CLERK AND JOHN GILLIES,

At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor G. E. CLERK.

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; Pickups News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dutton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts. Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1861.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

No one can say when, or where, the storm of war will burst, or upon what pretext the sword will be drawn, but the universal feeling is that we are on the eve of a general European conflict. The attitude of Louis Napoleon becomes every day more alarming; the Italian question is as far from solution as ever; Russia and Poland are preparing for another struggle; Denmark is arming, and from every quarter the note of warlike preparation is making itself heard.

Little actual change has taken place in the state of affairs since our last. The French Emperor is daily manifesting his hostile disposition towards the Church and her ministers; and he has at last, by a recent decree against religious associations, imposed upon his Catholic subjects the duty of systematically disobeying the edicts of the civil magistrate. The condition of the Pope's health is creating some uneasiness, and calls for the fervent prayers of the faithful throughout Christendom.

There have been fresh outbreaks with considerable loss of life at Warsaw, and fresh disturbances were anticipated. Large bodies of troops had been collected to suppress the dreaded insurrection.

The *Asia* from Liverpool, the 12th inst., brings tidings ominous of war between Great Britain and France. The *casus belli* is said to arise out of the Syrian question; but as it is always easy to find a stick when you want to beat a dog, so a pretext for a quarrel is never wanting to those who have made up their minds for a fight. War with Great Britain has, we believe, been the "fixed idea" of Louis Napoleon, since his first accession to power.

A FEW OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—That Protestantism is the *cloaca maxima*—or the common sewer of the Church—is a proposition which we should have thought that no one calling himself a son of the Church would have presumed to call in question. Immoral and lewd priests are the filth of the Church, and these she invariably ejects from her system; the filth thus ejected naturally and inevitably, or as the consequence of its ejection from the Catholic system, is absorbed by Protestantism, which thus becomes the receptacle of the filth so ejected. So well aware are Protestants of this fact, that the more respectable sects amongst them, such as the Anglicans, are very unwilling to receive into their communion the "converted priest;" and rarely do we see an Achilli, a Chiniquy, or a Leahy allowed to occupy a pulpit in the Church of England. We have no modification therefore, to make of an assertion of whose truth every Catholic is internally convinced, and so fully persuaded, that when he hears of a priest false to his vow, he immediately concludes that the unhappy man is about to proclaim himself a Protestant. "When the Pope weeds his garden, he throws the filth over to the Protestant side of the fence"—is a trite saying amongst Protestants themselves.

That, as we asserted in our issue of the 1st February last, "To Hell with the Pope," enthusiastic admiration "of an Achilli, a Gavazzi, and a Chiniquy;" a readiness "to pull down Popish Mass-houses" to "assault the Catholic Priest," and to offer "obscene insults to the Romish Sister of Charity"—are "the fruits by which you shall always know the staunch Protestant"—is also a fact confirmed by thousands of instances in England, Scotland, and the United States—by the Lord George Gordon Riots, by Orange Processions, by the burning of the Charleston Nunnery, and by the innumerable outrages to which the Priests, the Religious, and the monastic establishments of the Catholic Church are always and everywhere exposed, from the more fanatical or "staunch" section of the Protestant community.—In illustration of our meaning, we will suppose a case of by no means improbable occurrence in the Courts of Law.

The guardianship of the orphan child of the deceased Bill Sykes is claimed—on the one hand by the managers of a Catholic Asylum on the plea that the defunct was a Catholic; and on the other hand, by the Directors of a Protestant Orphan Asylum, on the plea that the said Bill Sykes was a "staunch" Protestant. The ques-

tion of fact in such a case for the jury to decide would be whether Bill Sykes aforesaid was a Catholic or a Protestant?

For the Catholic claimants we will suppose that it is proved that Bill Sykes was born of Catholic parents, baptized in a Catholic Church, by a Catholic priest; and therefore it is contended that the religion of the deceased must be assumed to be the Catholic religion.

On the other side, we will suppose that it is proved—that Bill Sykes, for many years previous to his death, never went to Mass on Sundays; that he had been often seen staggering half drunk through the streets with an Orange lily in his hat, and shouting "To hell with the Pope"; that on one occasion, he had been taken up by the Police for breaking the windows of the Catholic Church, and upon another occasion fined for an indecent assault upon a Romish priest, who was carrying the B. Sacrament to a dying man; that he—Bill Sykes aforesaid—had been in the constant habit of insulting the Romish Clergy whenever he met them on the streets or the thoroughfares; and that it was his common amusement to set his celebrated bull-dog upon the Sisters of Charity, one of whom, when carrying relief to a sick child, had been worried, and severely injured by the savage animal. With such evidence before them, would not any jury, no matter how composed, find that the deceased Bill Sykes was a Protestant, *i.e.*, a baptised Non-Catholic? And would not the Court order the custody of his orphan child to be transferred from the Catholic, to the Protestant Orphan Asylum? Assuredly they would; for these are the fruits by which you shall always know—we do not say the Anglican, or the Presbyterian, or the member of any sect in particular, but simply—the "staunch" Protestant, or man of strong "No-Popery" principles.

It is also objected to the TRUE WITNESS by Mr. McGee that we have spoken of Titus Oates as "an illustrious martyr and confessor of the Holy Protestant Faith." Premising that the words "Holy Protestant Faith" were by us used only in fun—such a thing as "the Holy Protestant Faith" being an absurdity, because involving a contradiction in terms, and an expression therefore which no one but an illiterate washerwoman, whose education had been sadly neglected in early life, would ever employ seriously—we will proceed to show, why, and upon what authority, we call Titus Oates, who was flogged, and who had his ears docked, "an illustrious martyr, and confessor" of Protestantism. We call him so in short, because he was so considered, and so treated by a large number of his contemporaries; because, if a Popish King flogged him, a Protestant sovereign rewarded him for his sufferings, by according to him a pension for life.

After his conviction and flogging, Titus Oates was regarded by the more zealous Protestants themselves, as a martyr in their cause, and the Catholic has the right to speak of him as such. Thus Macaulay says:—

"He (Titus Oates) was still regarded by many fanatics as a martyr; and it is said they were so far able to corrupt his keepers, that in spite of positive orders from the Government his sufferings were mitigated by many indulgences. While offenders who compared with him were innocent grew lean on the prison allowance, his cheer was mended by turkeys and chine, capons, and sucking pigs, venison pasties, hampers of claret, the offerings of zealous Protestants."—*Hist. England*, c. XIV.

Nor did these offerings to this illustrious martyr come only from the poor and ignorant. He had a large body of admirers in the House of Lords; and in the House of Commons his worshippers were still more numerous and enthusiastic in admiration of his services, and active in their sympathy with his sufferings. In the House of Lords, Macaulay tells us that, after the Revolution, there was a party in whose eyes Titus Oates,

"was a man who had rendered inestimable service to the cause of liberty and religion, and who had been required by long confinement, by degrading exposure, and by torture not to be thought of without a shudder."—*Id.*

In the House of Commons, the friends of the well-flogged and ear-cropt Protestant martyr, were more plain-spoken. According to the Protestant historian Macaulay, by that body, the representative of the English Protestant community—"the courage and patriotism of Titus Oates were extolled," the verdict against him was declared "corrupt," and a petition was presented to the king that the noble martyr might receive a recompense for his services and sufferings in the cause of liberty and religion, in the form of a pension. With this petition William complied, and Titus Oates was remunerated with the sum of £300 per annum.

These then are the reasons for which we call Titus Oates an "illustrious Protestant martyr and confessor." He was so considered and treated by the "zealous Protestants" of his own age; he was so considered and treated by the vast majority of the English House of Commons, and by a large party in the House of Lords; and he was treated and recompensed as a martyr by the Protestant King William of immortal memory. If such honors do not entitle their recipient to a high place in Protestant martyrology, and justify the expressions we have employed towards him, we must confess our ignorance of the meaning of words; nor can we see why it should

be a reproach to the TRUE WITNESS that it has spoken of one, whose courage and patriotism were extolled by a Protestant House of Commons, whose services and sufferings in the cause of Protestantism were solemnly recognised and lauded by a Protestant Legislature, and munificently rewarded by a Protestant King, as of an "illustrious martyr and confessor of the Holy Protestant Faith."

Here we close our notice of the objections urged by Mr. McGee against the TRUE WITNESS; and as at the beginning, so at the end, we challenge any one to convict us of error, either in our statement of facts, as tested by Protestant history, or of error in our conclusions when tested by Catholic theology. Our columns are open to any one who will dare to enter the lists against us.

ORANGEISM AND RIBBONISM.—We copy the annexed document from the *British Herald*, the Orange organ of Upper Canada:—

RIBBONISM IN CANADA.—Below we publish verbatim copies of two communications sent to Mr. Robert Garvin of York Mills of a threatening nature so well known in Ireland—but which it was to be hoped would not be heard of in Canada. We beg to call the attention of the Crown Officers to this fact, and hope through the medium of these remarks that the writers or senders of these infamous productions will be reminded that there is law for such cases. In case it should be of any avail we also draw the attention of the Romish Priesthood to the fact, that they may, if they have the inclination, have the opportunity, of warning their flocks of the wickedness as well as illegality of such proceedings. Mr. Garvin is, we understand, a very inoffensive man, and has given no cause whatever for such abominable threats.

Robert Garvin This is your coffin if you Dont Quit that damned Orange Lodge you will be Butchered By our Party. Signed By order thirty this 17th day of March 1861. No Humbug.

March 21st 1861. Robert Garvin We Warn you a Gain or you will surely be murdered this is the Last time We Will Warn you, their is some others in that Lodge that will hav to leave to 2 Harveys, Lloyd and others but we want to begin with the Captain First We will have No damned Orange Meetings in This neighborhood.

We hazard no opinion either as to the genuineness of the above document, or as to the existence of Ribbon Societies in Upper Canada. We would only remark upon the absurdity of our Orange cotemporary's appeal to the "Romish Priesthood," as if they had, or could have, any influence, or means of influence, over Ribbonmen, or members of any secret society.

The chief means by which the influence of the "Romish Priesthood" can be brought to bear upon "Romanists," is the Confessional. But Ribbonmen, in that they are members of a secret society, never approach the tribunal of penance, never draw nigh to the priest to confess their sins. The member of a secret society, no matter by what name called—Ribbonman, Free Mason, or Odd Fellow—is, *ipso facto*, excommunicate, and has no more part in the Sacraments, or blessings of the Catholic Church than a dog has. It is therefore impossible for the "Romish Priest" to exert any influence through the Confessional over the Ribbonman; for the simple reason that no member of a secret society ever approaches that tribunal, because he knows that absolution cannot, under any conceivable circumstances, be given to any one who, upon any pretence whatsoever, is a member of a secret society.

If Ribbonism exists in Canada—which we neither admit nor deny—it is because the same law holds good in the moral as in the physical order—in politico-dynamics, as in electro-dynamics; and because one body in a state of intense Orange excitement must, by the laws of induction, naturally tend to elicit the development of Ribbon excitement in contiguous social surfaces. If, therefore, Ribbonism exists in Upper Canada, it exists solely as a consequence of Orangeism; and to get rid of the former, we must first endeavor to get rid of, or carry off the latter.

Whatever may have been the case with Orangeism in Ireland, and in its inception, in Canada and at the present day, it is an organisation purely aggressive; of which there can be no stronger or more conclusive proof than this:—That Orangeism is there most rampant where the Catholic element is weakest; whilst if it were a defensive instead of an aggressive organisation, the very opposite phenomenon would be conspicuous. Orangeism as a defensive organisation would flourish most there, where Protestantism was most in danger, because most closely in contact with powerful Popery; but it would be neglected and allowed to die out, where Papists were poor, sparse and unimportant. The fact, however, is that, here in Lower Canada, Orangeism is almost unknown, and if it exists, it courts concealment. Here, where Popery is influential and powerful, the man who should assert that Protestants required the aid of any secret organisation to protect them in the enjoyment of their rights, would be laughed at as a fool, or scouted as a knave—for here where Popery is most powerful, the most perfect liberty, civil and religious—in the Church and in the School—obtains for men of all Protestant deno-

minations: Papists and Protestants live in peace, neither trespassing upon the rights of the other; and there is consequently no pretence, even, for the existence of an anti-Catholic organisation.

It is in Upper Canada only, where Papists are few, and both politically and socially unimportant, where in consequence the most nervous of old Protestant women cannot pretend to have anything to fear from Popish hostility, that Orangeism asserts its noxious presence openly; and this is so, because Orangeism is essentially aggressive but aggressive there only, where it can be aggressive with impunity. Its animating spirit is that of the blustering bully.

Well founded doubts in the integrity of the administration of the Law in Upper Canada, presided over as that administration is by Orangemen, are also another predisposing cause to Ribbonism. Catholics have but too good reasons to fear that for them there is but scant justice to be obtained in Courts of Law; and nothing more tends to provoke men to seek by illegal means redress for their real or fancied grievances, than loss of confidence in the legally constituted tribunals. If therefore Ribbonism does exist in Upper Canada, it must be attributed in part to the impolicy of our rulers in confiding the administration of the laws of that section of the Province to notorious Orangemen, to the members of a secret politico-religious society, and the sworn enemies of Catholics. Personally, we have no imputations to make against the gentlemen alluded to. They may be, we have often heard them spoken of by Catholics as, liberal and amiable gentlemen in private life, and indeed we can readily admit them to be so. But as members of an oath-bound, secret society they are not their own masters, and are at all events always liable to the suspicion of being controlled by secret counsels in the exercise of their public functions. This suspicion is most injurious to society, for it pollutes the stream of justice at its fount; and therefore is it that every wise statesman, that every good citizen, no matter what his creed, should insist that no share in the administration of the laws should be entrusted to any member of a secret society.—We ask for no general exclusion of Orangemen from places of honor or emolument; but we insist, and ever shall insist, that, no matter what may be the political exigencies of a party, it is unjust, and inexpedient to place either Orangemen or Ribbonmen in offices directly or indirectly connected with the administration of the law.—The surest means means to put down Ribbonism, if it exists, are the discouragement of all secret societies, and the restoration of confidence in the integrity of our legal tribunals by the exclusion of all known members of secret societies from the Bench, and from official situations in the Courts of Law generally. The remedy we propose is infallible, and of easy application.

PROTESTANT FESTIVALS AND CATHOLIC FASTS.—The essential antagonism of Protestantism and Catholicity is nowhere more conspicuous than in the manner in which their respective adherents observe the Festivals and Fasts of ancient Christendom. When the Catholic fasts, following therein the example of antiquity, the Protestant feasts and makes merry; when the former keeps his festival, the latter, if of the Puritan type, deems it his duty to look as austere and gloomy as possible, and to make himself particularly disagreeable to all his neighbors.

Sunday, the Lord's Day, has from time immemorial been observed by the Catholic Church as the hebdomadal festival of Our Lord's Resurrection; and in compliance with her injunctions, her faithful children observe it as a day of total cessation from all servile work, as a day particularly to be dedicated to the service of God; and as a day also of innocent recreation for mind and body, wearied with the labors of the past week. Sunday, in Catholic countries, is essentially a holiday or Festival.

In Protestant countries, where the Puritan or Calvinistic element prevails, Sunday is a wretched caricature of the old Jewish Sabbath; a day of gloom and weariness, in the course of which it behoveth every one who would maintain his reputation as a "professor," to look unamiable, and to make himself, and every body near him, as unhappy as possible. All healthy, innocent amusements are denounced as sinful; even a walk by the running stream, or by the beached margin of the sea, is groaned at by the more straight laced, as a great abomination, and a stumbling block to Israel; whilst a game at ball of a Sunday afternoon is popularly believed to have the effect of hardening the heart, as well as the hands, and of exposing all who engage therein to the certainty of very unpleasant quarters in the next world. For those who play at ball on Sundays, Tophet is prepared—this is an article of the Calvinistic Faith; no wonder that from such a hideous religion, the warm and generous heart recoils with disgust, and too often seeks refuge even in infidelity and the distractions of sensual debauchery. If a Christian Sunday, spent as the Church enjoins, is a boon from heaven to man, a Calvinistic Sabbath is the nearest approach to hell upon earth that can well be conceived. "Thank God"—we have often heard

Protestants themselves remark—"thank God Sunday comes but once a week!"

But if Puritan Protestants observe Catholic Festivals as the most austere of fasts, as days of gloom and mortification, they make ample amends for their self-imposed penance, by their system of commemorating the Fasts of the Church; and by turning the seasons by her appointed for penance and humiliation, into occasions of feasting, banqueting, and sensual enjoyment.

The anniversary of Our Lord's Crucifixion, of His bitter agony, of His cross and passion, has, by the Catholic Church ever been observed as the day on which, of all others, it behoved the Christian for whom Christ died, to mortify himself, and to refrain from all carnal gratifications. The dutiful son will so commemorate the anniversary of the death of a beloved parent, the faithful widow will so mourn the loss of the cherished companion of her youthful days; with what feelings then must not the Church celebrate the sufferings of her divine spouse! or how can she refrain from tears, when in her ears are ringing those words of awful import—those words wrung from her dying Lord by an agony which mere human heart cannot fathom—"My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me!" Cold and insensible indeed must be the heart of that pretended Christian, who on Good Friday can find time for administering to his pleasures, and flattering his appetites.

And yet this day, of all days of the year, is the great Festival of English Protestants. To them Our Lord's agony is one of the jolliest things imaginable; and the anniversary of His cruel scourging, His crown of thorns, and death on Calvary is hailed as the natural and most appropriate season for feasting, dancing, pic-nics, and riotous fun. It is thus, according to the *London Times* from which we copy, that Protestants celebrate the "Festival of the Crucifixion of Christ":—

"London's holiday and great day out for the mass of the working people is always Good Friday. It has, somehow, not unnaturally, gradually come to be regarded by the great body of our hardworking people less as a solemn religious festival than a kind of festive anniversary on which, as on Christmas, care may be thrown to the winds, and the mind and body given up to innocent and rational recreation. Before Lent has well begun, thousands of people have made their arrangements for a day in the country on Good Friday; and when the weather is bad (as is the case in 19 Good Fridays out of 20) it is regarded as very little short of a national misfortune and public grievance. The weather yesterday was fortunately all that could be desired, sufficiently cloudy in the forenoon to make people for a time anxious and doubtful, and lead them to appreciate with double zest the reprieve of mild spring weather that closed the day so gloriously. On these holidays the popular rush is always to the Crystal Palace. Nor was the attendance, as has usually been the case on these occasions, at all confined to that general class known as "holiday folk;" for, judging from the large number of private carriages outside the building, the representatives of the upper ten thousand were there in considerable numbers. The scene in the garden resembled an universal *fete champetre* or picnic on the most colossal scale. The debris of bits of bread, discarded sandwiches, &c., scattered over the grass, seemed almost enough to feed a moderate-sized town. There was no lack either of abandoned stout and porter bottles; but in mere justice to the thrift of the visitors, it should be stated that none of these latter were left behind until they were perfectly empty."

It is not easy to determine whether a Protestant Sabbath of the Puritan type, or a Protestant annual jollification upon Good Friday, is the more revolting, the more incompatible with the spirit of Christian charity.

IS THE QUEEN A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?—As Her Majesty is undoubtedly the head of that body, it would appear to be a logical necessity that she must be also a member thereof; yet if the *dictum* of the *Toronto Echo*, a Church of England paper of the "Low Church" type, is to be accepted as true, the Queen is not a member of the body of which she is the head:—

"The attendance, even occasionally, of members of the Church of England at places of Roman Catholic worship, or indeed at places of any worship but their own, is utterly inconsistent with their professed membership with the Church, and involves a sacrifice of truth and principle. For the time being, they take their place among the worshippers of a false or erroneous system, or at any rate of what they, as members of the Church, should believe to be such; and so far they are countenancing error."—*Echo*

Now Queen Victoria, as is well known, though head of the Church of England, when in Scotland habitually attends a Presbyterian place of worship, and joins in the prayers of a body which some years ago classed Prelacy with Popery, and looked upon both as the children of the devil. This is no affair of ours; but we should like to see the *Echo's* mode of treating the matter, and how it will attempt to reconcile habitual compliance with what our cotemporary must deem to be "an erroneous system," with "professed membership with the Church." The *Echo* has, unintentionally we believe, *unchurch'd* his head. Our cotemporary has some further remarks upon the same subject, which we commend to the serious attention of those members of the Church of England in Canada, who take part in the religious exercises of the French Canadian Missionary Society:—

Neither has it any relation to the question of the greater or less degrees of error in the several dissenting denominations. That some hold much in common with ourselves,—that by some, the great essentials of Christianity are sedulously kept in view, we can readily admit, and rejoice that such is the case; but this does not justify their separation, nor does it justify Churchmen in countenancing their separation.