

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

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

TERMS:

Town Subscribers.....\$ 3 per annum.  
Country do ..... 2 1/2 "  
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.  
Single Copies, 3d.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor  
of the TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post  
paid.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The mail by the *North American* brings important news from India, from which it would seem that the campaign in Oude has been barren of results. The hot weather was setting in, which would put a stop to active operations for some months; in the mean time, Sir Colin Campbell was preparing to advance upon Rohilcund. It was rumored that the British had experienced a reverse near Allahabad. On the whole, the news is not cheering.

In the House of Commons, Mr. D'Israeli has succeeded in carrying his second resolution declaring it expedient to confide the Government of India to a Secretary of State, by a vote of 351 to 100. Threats of a dissolution are held out by Lord Derby in case the Commons should prove restive. From France there is little new to report; only the tone of the *Univers* is more than ever hostile towards Great Britain. A note, demanding an indemnity of 100,000 francs for the imprisonment of the two English engineers, has been presented to the Neapolitan Government, and favorably received. From Russia we learn that great excitement prevails amongst the serfs, and that in several localities the services of the military have had to be put in requisition to restore order.

The *Niagara* from Liver pool Stb inst., arrived at Halifax on Wednesday. There is nothing positive from India, but it is said that Sir Colin Campbell, who is to be created a Peer, is urgent for reinforcements. European political news unimportant. Breadstuffs tending downwards.

THE ORANGE BILL.—Although defeated for this Session by a small majority in a full House, we must not suppose that the Orangemen are in the least disheartened, or that they have any intention of abandoning their policy of procuring from the Legislature the official recognition of their Society as a perfectly legal organization. On the contrary, their organs announce their intention to renew the battle; and with good reasons look upon the late proceedings in Parliament, as giving them assurance of ultimate success. Indeed, the Orangemen have partially succeeded in their main object. They have obtained a respectful hearing from the Legislature, and the active support of the Ministry, who, on the Orange question made "common cause" with George Brown and his "Clear Grit" allies; and have therefore succeeded in wringing from the Legislature, as they had previously succeeded in wringing from the head of the Executive, a formal recognition of their existence as a component part of the body politic; for this we have to thank those renegade Catholics, who, to save their places and salaries, voted for the first and second readings of the Orange Incorporation Bill.—We have therefore no reason to congratulate ourselves as if we had won a decided victory; we have as yet merely succeeded in postponing the evil day for a season; and it depends altogether upon our future conduct, whether this partial victory be not converted into a signal and irreparable defeat.

Not that under any circumstances, so long at least as Canada retains its connection with Great Britain, there is any actual danger of an Orange Incorporation Bill becoming part of the law of the land. Even were such a Bill to pass both Houses of our Colonial Legislature, and to receive the Governor's assent, we may be morally certain that no Ministry at home would dare to advise the Sovereign to sanction it. Of this, of course, the Orangemen themselves are well aware; for they are not such fools as to deceive themselves, or to allow others to deceive them, as to their true position. It is not then the Bill itself that we dread; but the moral effect of a formal recognition by our Canadian Government, of a "secret political society," organized for the sole purpose of perpetuating "Protestant Ascendancy;" and whose object is consequently the humiliation of Her Majesty's loyal Catholic subjects throughout the Empire. For, as the "Ascendancy" of any one religious denomination is incompatible with religious equality, so—upon the principle that if two men ride upon one horse, one must ride behind—that Protestant Ascendancy, which it is the express object of Orangeism to establish and perpetuate, would necessarily be destructive of religious equality, and therefore of religious liberty in Canada.

But we are told that Orangeism is not a political, but a "religious and charitable society;" therefore equally entitled with any other religious or charitable society to the countenance of the State. "Whereas"—says the preamble to the Orange Bill—"there has for many years existed in the Province of Canada a Religious and Charitable Association under the name of the Grand Lodge of the Loyal Orange Association of British North America—therefore," &c.—Now is this allegation true?—is the Orange Association primarily, either a religious or a charitable organization? This is a question of fact, which can be best settled by reference to the history of Orangeism, and the confessions of its own children.

And it must be remembered that in solving this question, we are much assisted by the positive assurance of Mr. Benjamin's own organ, that what Orangeism was sixty years ago, that it is to-day. If in its origin it was a political, rather than a religious society, if the objects of its founders were rather to uphold a particular form of Government in Church and State, than to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, shelter the houseless, provide attendance for the sick, and dry up the tears of the fatherless children and widows—then such it is now; and such in Canada in 1858, as in Ireland in 1798, are the chief objects of the society which now comes knocking at the door of the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation, upon the plea of being, not a political, but a "religious and charitable association." What then, we ask, was Orangeism in its origin?—what the objects of its founders?

"Orange Societies"—says Sir Jonah Barrington in his *Personal Sketches*—"Orange Societies, as they are termed, were first formed by the Protestants to oppose and counteract the turbulent demonstrations of the Catholics who formed the population of the South of Ireland. But at their commencement, the Orangemen certainly adopted a principle of interference which was not confined to religious points alone, but which went to put down all popular insurrections which might arise on any point. The term Protestant Ascendancy was coined by Mr. John Gifford, and became an epithet very fatal to the peace of Ireland"—p. 155.

This is the testimony, as to the origin and objects of Orangeism, of one who was himself an Irishman, a Protestant, and an Orangeman: of one therefore who is certainly fully qualified to give conclusive testimony as to the origin and objects of the Society of which he was a prominent member. Now Sir Jonah Barrington assures us that the primary object of the Orange institution was to oppose and counteract the Catholic population of the South of Ireland, and to assert "Protestant Ascendancy" as the principle upon which the Government of the country should be conducted. This was sixty years ago; but what the Orangemen were sixty years ago, that says Mr. Benjamin's mouthpiece—that are they to-day.

Or if we look to its annual celebrations, and examine the events thereon commemorated, we shall find equally conclusive evidence as to the essentially political and sectarian character of Orangeism. We have Catholic charitable societies, such as the society of St. Vincent de Paul and others; these too have their festivals, their special days, on which they commemorate some act intimately connected with the objects of their institution, or the memory of some one whom they propound to all their members as a model and exemplar to be imitated. The objects we say of such societies, and their true character, may always be concluded with infallible certainty from the deeds and person which and whom they commemorate on their annual festivals. For a charitable society will certainly not commemorate events connected with civil strife and warfare; nor will a religious association—if its principal festival, the anniversary of a bloody contest and the defeat of a gallant people fighting for their sovereign and their religion, their liberties and national independence. But the event *par excellence*, which the Orange Association commemorates, is the slaughter of Erin's best and bravest at the Boyne water, the conquest of Ireland by the Anglo-Dutch under the invader William of Orange, and long years of "Protestant Ascendancy," and cruel persecution of Ireland's faithful Catholic children. If an association were formed in Canada to commemorate the defeat of the gallant Montcalm, and the triumph of British over French arms; and if not content with periodically insulting the people of Lower Canada, by annual processions, accompanied with offensive banners, and opprobrious war-cries, it were to appeal to the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation upon the plea of being a "charitable and religious society"—we should have a correct, though, but a feeble copy of the position of the Orange Societies of Canada; and yet we doubt not that, if such an anti-Canadian association were in existence, and were so to apply to the Legislature, we should find a few miserable lick-spittles like Cartier, Alley, and Loranger, voting the degradation of their own countrymen and co-religionists, and in abject humility prostrating themselves beneath the feet of their arrogant foes; whilst so-called French Canadian and Catholic journalists would not be wanting to apologise for the poltroons, and in long-winded sophisms, to offer excuses for the infamous treachery of their ministerial patrons.

Nor is it any reply to these arguments against the "charitable and religious" character of the Orange Association to assert that it does make provision for the necessities of its own members, and does provide the poorer amongst them with food, raiment, shelter, and medical attendance when sick. All these things may Orange societies do; but these are not the primary objects of the institution. There are amongst the thieves, pick-pockets, and prostitutes of London associations of an analogous character; which provide for their members in certain emergencies, and furnish them, sometimes with legal assistance when in the hands of the ministers of justice, or with drugs and medical attendance, when from foul disease they are no longer able to pursue their nefarious commerce. Now if to do these things be sufficient to entitle the doers to the epithet of "religious and charitable," then to say the least, the thieves, and prostitutes of London are as much entitled to ask an act of Incorporation from the Imperial Parliament, as are the Orangemen of Canada, to ask—on precisely the same grounds—for a similar act of formal recognition from our Provincial Legislature.

Yet were the former rash enough to make the attempt, they would undoubtedly be met with the reply that theft and fornication are things essentially evil; and that an association of thieves and prostitutes, in spite of its occasional charities towards its own suffering members, was not a legitimate object of legislative recognition.—Why then should Orangemen be treated differently? Are not all "secret political" societies essentially evil, and dangerous to society?—are not all associations of men, bound together by secret oaths, and in virtue of their secret organization, exercising a powerful political influence—the objects of every wise and virtuous statesman's abhorrence? A "secret politico-religious" society is *malum per se*—essentially evil, always and under all circumstances; and therefore as little entitled to a respectful hearing from the Legislature as would be a society of professed thieves or prostitutes. But by voting for the first stages of the Orange Bill, our precious Catholic ministers declared—in direct violation of the teachings of the Catholic Church—that there is nothing essentially and necessarily evil in a "secret politico-religious" society; for a Bill which evidently involves an evil principle, is never allowed to be read even a first time in the Imperial Parliament, and should therefore be in like manner rejected in our Legislative Assembly.—Our *Kaatholic* Ministers have therefore ratified a false principle, and inflicted an incalculable, and we fear, irreparable injury upon the cause of religion and morality in Canada. We should add that in the Toronto papers, M. Cartier is reported as having said that he "did not know that Orangeism was a secret society." This of course is an error of the reporters; for with all his faults, M. Cartier is too clever a man to have uttered such a manifest falsehood; and one which could have been refuted in an instant by the production of the "Blue Books" on Orangeism, which are to be found in the Library of the House, and with whose contents M. Cartier is of course well acquainted.

"The devil a Puritan that he is, or anything constantly but a time pleaser."—*Twelfth Night*.

Mister George Brown is an ill-used, and a most unjustly abused man. He is called a bigot, and a fanatic; and his diatribes against our clergy and religious sisterhoods, are most falsely attributed to his ardent zeal for the holy Protestant faith. This is unjust towards Mr. Brown; for "devil a bigot or fanatic is he, or anything else but a time server."

Mr. Brown is, in short, a clear sighted, cool-headed, and smart man of business; one of those shrewd, prudent, calculating and well ordered sort of persons, whose passions are always subordinate to their material and pecuniary interests; and who are altogether incapable of any hasty or passionate act, for the good reason that they are never susceptible of any honorable or generous emotion. These men are neither bigots nor fanatics; though of course if it suits their book, if it promises to advance their worldly interests, they will ape the language and manners of the Exeter Hall "swaddler," and outdo in extravagance the craziest "No-Popery" buffoon that ever ranted from a tub. A bigot or fanatic is one who is sincere even in error; who is unreasonably and obstinately, but conscientiously attached to a particular set of opinions; and who—if ready to persecute others—is willing to die at the stake, rather than abandon one iota of his principles. Now assuredly Mr. George Brown is not justly obnoxious to the reproach of sincerity, of conscientiousness, or fidelity to principle: and we protest therefore against the injustice of calling him, as do some of our cotemporaries, "a fanatic and a bigot." Never was there a man who had less of fanaticism or bigotry in his composition, than this same Mr. George Brown.

The simple truth is, that the "No-Popery" dodge is about the best possible, "dodge" for a public man to adopt in Upper Canada at the present moment, and Mr. G. Brown adopts it accordingly. In the same way in Lower Canada,

during election time, the "bons principes" dodge is the paying "dodge," and our Cartiers, our Lorangers, and Alleyns, adopt it accordingly—are loud in their professions of attachment and fidelity to the Catholic Church, fervent in their denunciations of "Rougeism" and most devout in their attendance at church, especially when they have a chance of being noticed. Yet who would dream of calling M. Cartier, Mr. Alley, or M. Loranger, a bigot, or a fanatical Catholic? These men have as little of the fanatic or bigot about them, as has Mr. George Brown.—They are not fanatics, "or anything constantly, but time-servers;" and the only warm attachment with which they can be justly taxed is, an ardent and undying attachment, through good report and evil report, to their places and Government salaries.

There is of course a good deal of bigotry in Upper Canada; a vast amount of unreasoning and irrational hatred of the Catholic Church, and her discipline—her doctrines, and her tyrannical restrictions upon the lusts of the flesh. Of this bigotry and fanaticism, Mr. George Brown, though no bigot or fanatic himself, cleverly avails himself; turning it to his personal advantage, and making use of it as an instrument or tool wherewith to build his political fortunes. To suppose that he in the slightest degree participates in that hatred, or is the victim of the prejudices under which his tools labor, would be to do great injustice to the honorable member for Toronto. He has taken up with the "No-Popery" line of business for the present, not from taste, but simply because he is keen-sighted enough to perceive that, in the present temper of the Upper Canadian rabble, the "No-Popery" business is likely to yield a very handsome return for the capital therein expended. Were a corresponding change to come over public sentiment, we should see him humbly going down on his knees in the mud, to crave a blessing from the hands of a Popish Bishop; or perhaps, after cheerfully submitting to the requisite surgical operations, we should hear him shouting with the most fervent professors of Islam—"There is no God but Allah, and Mahomet is the prophet of God." For in anything that does not touch his purse or his pocket, we do not believe that there is a more liberal man in Canada, than is Mr. Geo. Brown.

A sense of justice towards a political opponent, wrongfully taxed with "bigotry and fanaticism," compels us to put forward the above vindication of Mr. Brown's political career, and the motives of his hostility towards the Catholic clergy, and our Catholic charitable institutions. We are pained, we confess, at seeing the epithets "bigot and fanatic" applied by our cotemporaries to one who is so little deserving of them as is Mr. George Brown; and we feel it our duty to protest against imputing to that personage any qualities whatsoever, which imply in the slightest degree, sincerity, conscientiousness, or integrity of purpose. The man is a "time-server" and nothing more or less; he is a shrewd "canny" Scot; one—we may say, the type—of a class of Scotchmen who are sure to succeed in this world, because not overburdened with scruples of conscience, or fantastical notions of honor. Ready, either to bully the weak, or to crouch before the strong—adepts equally at blustering and at "boozing and scraping"—these men of whom our Canadian "No Popery" hero may be looked upon as the type, are sure to succeed, sure to rise to the surface in a community like ours in Canada, where such qualities are the surest passport to wealth and station. Let us then be just to the possessors of these valuable qualities, frankly acknowledge their merits, and pay due homage to their virtues. Sycophants, hypocrites, and "time-servers," they may be; but in the name of common sense, do not tax them with "bigotry or fanaticism."

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.—On the 12th inst., the first order of the day, for Mr. O'Farrell to attend in his place, was read; but that amiable gentleman was not present. Mr. Cartier then moved Mr. O'Farrell's expulsion from the House, which was seconded by Mr. Atty-General McDonald, and carried unanimously. Mr. Cartier then gave notice that the Government would issue no new writ until a Bill had been introduced for disfranchising the parishes in the County where the Lotbiniere election frauds had been committed. Mr. Drummond was of opinion that great caution should be exercised, as such a measure might lead to the disfranchisement of other places. On the same day, the House went into Committee on the Bill to authorize the Sisters of Charity of the General Hospital of Montreal to alienate certain portions of their property. Mr. Dorion insisted upon the advantages conferred upon society by the admirable institution in question; and pointed out that the Seigneurie of Chateauguy was purchased with funds furnished by a charitable lady in 1752. A desultory debate ensued, in the course of which Mr. McGee took Mr. Mackenzie to task for his impertinence towards the Ladies of Charity. The several clauses were then carried, with the understanding that, on the third reading, several amendments would be proposed.

On the 14th Mr. Alley moved the second reading of the Bill relating to emigrants, and designed to remedy various abuses in the present system, and to protect emigrants against the fraudulent machinations of the low boarding-house keepers, and runners who prey upon the unfortunates newly landed on our shores. Mr. McGee announced his intention of proposing some amendments in committee, and the Bill was read a second time. On the same day Mr. McDougall took his seat amidst the cheers of his friends, and laughter of the Ministerialists.—The House went into Committee and it was resolved that, after the first of January next, there should be imposed one uniform tax of five shillings upon all emigrants.

On the 17th, the Report of the Committee on the Lotbiniere election was presented; declaring that the election of Mr. O'Farrell was null and void, that the petition against him was neither frivolous nor vexatious, but that the defence of

the member, petitioned against, was frivolous and vexatious. This will impose the payment of costs upon Mr. Farrell's securities. M. Dorion moved the concurrence of the House with the report of the Committee on the Bill for enabling the Sisters of the General Hospital to dispose of certain landed property. Mr. Brown moved in amendment that the Bill be sent back to Committee, with instructions to amend the Bill by the insertion of a clause prohibiting the Sisters from investing the money obtained by the sale, in the purchase of real estate. On a division, Mr. Brown's amendment was negatived by a majority of 54 against 35. An amendment by Mr. Hartman, to prevent the Sisters from acquiring land in Upper Canada, was rejected by a similar majority, and ultimately the Bill passed in spite of the opposition of the "Liberals" of the Upper Province. On the 18th, Mr. Ferguson moved the second reading of his Bill for abolishing separate schools; after a weary debate, the House adjourned without a division. The speeches delivered on the occasion are scarce worth noticing, as on both sides of the House, members took good care to shirk the real merits of the question at issue—i.e., the right of the parent to educate the child, without let or hindrance from the State. We shall however give an analysis of the debate in our next, as a specimen of the anile twaddle that passes for argument amongst our Parliamentary Solons.

(From an occasional Correspondent.)

Toronto, May 10th, 1858.

The division on the Orange Incorporation Bill displays some peculiarities, to which you may feel it your duty to call public attention. There were, as you are aware, two distinct votes taken—first, whether the Bill should be read a first time; second, on "the six months' hoist," which was carried. When the Bill was declared on the first division, Mr. Speaker Smith voted in favor of the introduction of the Bill; but this I must observe is no proof of the Speaker's personal bearings in the case. The Parliamentary rule—as I understand it—is, that, unless in certain specific cases, the Speaker always so rules, as to enable the House to resume the discussion at a future stage. I mention this in justice to the Speaker, who is no Orangeman, though his grey horse does figure in the Kingston celebrations of the Battle of the Boyne.

In analysing the yeas and nays, it is a very agreeable duty to notice that Mr. Drummond, who has just arrived here, voted, and spoke against the introduction of the Bill, and voted for the six months' hoist. Of the Lower Canada Members, Mr. Dorion, of Montreal, was the most active and efficient opponent of the measure. He first stated the bold, broad ground of opposition to the measure, and at the close he had risen to move the six months' hoist, when Mr. Cauchon forestalled him by catching the Speaker's eye first. The zeal of the Hon. Member for Montmorenci did him honor; but as the senior Member for Montreal had led the discussion, and had received the greater number of blows from the advocates of Orangeism, it was perhaps due to him not to take the concluding motion out of his hands.—However, it was well and promptly done; and if Mr. Dorion had not been on his feet at the moment, our thanks to M. Cauchon would have been unqualified. The spirited conduct of Mr. Turcotte, an invariable Ministerial supporter, in voting both times against the measure, was also much to his honor.—He usually follows his leaders like a shadow; but on this occasion he showed himself for once a man of courage and substance. Major Campbell, Mr. Terrill, and Mr. Pope, stood firmly against the measure; and Mr. Galt made a few straightforward and emphatic remarks, heartily condemning all such societies, and scolding the very idea of entertaining the application. Mr. Dunkin also spoke heartily and well in the same vein; whilst Richard Scott, of Ottawa, though generally going with the Government, in a few manly and emphatic words, expressed his astonishment at Mr. Alley's line of remark, and his total dissent from the course taken by that gentleman. It gives me pleasure to bear testimony to this upright conduct of so many Protestant gentlemen from Lower Canada, and to call your notice to the contrast it furnishes, with the subserviency of "Brother" McDonald's quasi-Catholic colleagues—the Cartiers, the Alleyns, and the Lorangers. Or, what is still stranger, here were Biggar, Burwell, Christie, Foley, McKenzie, McCann, Nottman, and William Scott, Upper Canada Protestants—some of them with Orange constitutions—voting fearlessly against the Act of Incorporation; with Alley, Cartier, Loranger and Scitotte, with Bale, Simard, Lacoste, and Tett, voted on one or both divisions with the Orangemen! If these gentlemen are to escape uncensured, and unpunished, how can we hope to make, or have friends in public life, or in Parliament? Who will respect us, if we do not respect ourselves? The answer I leave to yourself.

From the reports of the Toronto papers, readers at a distance can have but a faint impression of the interest excited by this Orange debate. It commenced at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and ended at midnight. It was a day not ill spent; but the Bill ought to have been thrown out by a majority of, at least, 20. Had there been that number, the applicants would not have attempted it again. But now with only 8 of a majority to overcome, it is to be feared that the Order will be encouraged to make an electioneering test of their application, and will thus be able to diminish still further the number of their liberal representatives. Their wiser course would perhaps be to abstain from future attempts of this kind; but when did ever that wretched faction learn wisdom from experience?

Yours truly,

X

MIXED SCHOOLS.—As a proof—if proof were needed—of the demoralising effects of the school system of Upper Canada, and of the herding together of the sexes of the age of puberty in schools under the control of male teachers, we may be permitted to allude to a recent disgusting case tried before Judge Haggerty, and reported in the columns of the *Globe*. The particulars are too beastly for insertion in the TRUE WITNESS. Suffice it to say, that the plaintiff was the father of a young girl, who had been seduced and ruined by her school teacher, a young man under whose care she had been placed. In fact, the schools of Upper Canada can be nothing better than dens of vice, and hot beds of prostitution, so long as the present revolting system of allowing the sexes to mingle promiscuously together, under the charge of male teachers continues. For the sake of asserting their "ascendancy" over the Catholic minority, a tyrannical Protestant majority may uphold the present system for a few years. But as seduction cases like that just tried before Judge Haggerty become more numerous—as no doubt they will—even Protestants will find that the pleasure of robbing and persecuting Papists has its drawbacks; and that the present system, though admirably devised for the perversion of Papists, is at least equally fatal to the chastity of their own sons, and the purity of their daughters.