

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on—
 The Union Bank of London, London.
 The Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
 The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
 By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
 St. Sacrament Street.

Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
 To Country do. \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1855.

TO OUR UPPER CANADA SUBSCRIBERS.—We recommend to the good offices of our friends in the Upper Province, our newly appointed agent, Mr. Hillyard, who has been highly recommended to us, and in whom we place the fullest confidence. He is now on a tour for the purpose of collecting and canvassing for the TRUE WITNESS; and is authorised to receive, and give receipts for, all sums due to this office. We beg of our friends who are in arrears, to settle their accounts without delay.

"UNSECTARIAN STATE-SCHOOLISM."

Words are the last resource of those who have no arguments to offer, and who, unable to give reasons, are content to get up a popular "cry." Thus are the words, "sectarian, unsectarian," made to perform strange service in the Anti-Catholic ranks; and the bigot cry, "no sectarian schools," is the only answer given to our simple, and self-evidently just, request that, as Catholics, we be not forced to support a school system of which we cannot conscientiously avail ourselves for the education of our children.—Our demands for justice are silenced by the answer—"no sectarianism in education."

This is the logic of the *Globe*, the *Montreal Witness*, and the other organs of "Liberal Protestantism;" and they do well to confine themselves to it, for such logic is indeed unanswerable. And yet it is susceptible of an application of which our opponents do not seem to dream. For, if "sectarianism" be so great an evil in education, it must be at least as bad in religion; and every objection which can feasibly be urged against "sectarian schools," must, to say the least, tell as strongly against "sectarian churches." Why then do not the opponents of "separate schools" for Catholics in Upper Canada, advocate, as well the establishment by law of a "Common Church" system, to which all should be obliged to contribute, no matter what their religion, or their conscientious scruples? If the State has the right to establish the one—"Common Schools"—it has, most assuredly, as good a right to establish the other—"Common Churches;" and to tax the whole community, indiscriminately, for their support.

We may be told that, by "unsectarian schools," are meant schools of no distinctive religious character; schools in which all religious instruction is thoroughly and impartially prohibited; and which, therefore, are equally favorable to all denominations. Such schools, we reply, would be simply anti-Christian, or infidel; and therefore not worth paying for by a Christian community. Such schools moreover would be "sectarian" in the strict sense of the word, because "cut off" from the Christian Church. They would, could they be established, be merely "Protestant, or Non-Catholic schools;" and therefore worthless to the Catholic, or Non-Protesting portion of the community.

It was by means of precisely such schools, and though the influence of such a system of "unsectarian State-Schoolism," that the Apostate Julian hoped to overcome the obstinacy of the Christians of the IV. century; for it is a fact, which Catholics would do well to remember, that the "Common School system" is essentially a Pagan, and anti-Christian institution. Thus Gibbon, the Protestant historian and panegyrist of Julian, tells us that, under that anti-Christian Emperor:—

"In all the cities of the Roman world the education of the youth was entrusted to masters of grammar and rhetoric, who were elected by the magistrates, and sustained at the public expense."—*Decline and Fall*, c. 23.

Nothing, in short, could be more "unsectarian," than the Roman "Common Schools" in the days of the Pagan Julian; and it was through their powerful influence on the minds of the Roman youth, that he hoped to effect what all the sanguinary persecutions of his predecessors had been unable to accomplish.—His policy—as Gibbon describes it—was, to deprive the Christians of all the temporal honors which rendered them respectable in the eyes of the world; he excluded them from all offices of trust and emolument; and, anticipating Mr. Putnam and the New York Legislature, he seized upon the revenues of the Bishops, and disallowed all gifts, or bequests of property to the Christian Clergy. Evidently Julian was the father of the "Know-Nothings"—and of all such as swear by the name of Mister George Brown.

But the master stroke of his "Liberal" policy was, as we said above, the establishment throughout the empire of a system of "unsectarian State-Schoolism;" a system which it is the glory of modern Protestant legislators to servilely imitate in their "Common Schools." Having, by an Imperial edict, closed

all Christian, or "sectarian" schools, Gibbon informs us that:—

"Julian invited the rising generation to resort with freedom to the Public Schools, in a just confidence that their tender minds would receive the impressions of literature and idolatry. If the greatest part of the Christian youth should be deterred by their own scruples, or by those of their parents, from accepting this dangerous mode of instruction, they must, at the same time, relinquish the benefits of a liberal education."—*Decline and Fall*, c. 23.

Allowing for the difference betwixt our social and political institutions in Canada at the present day, and those of the Roman Empire in the IV. century, almost the same means—"Public schools"—are now employed by "Liberal Protestants" to extirpate Catholicity, as were then resorted to by the Pagan Emperor for that purpose. Catholics indeed, are not positively prohibited from holding, or teaching schools; but, as they are heavily taxed for the support of "public schools" of which they cannot conscientiously avail themselves, and as they are, for the most part, too poor to be able to bear the burthen of paying—first, for a school which they can not use; and, secondly, for another to which they can send their children with a safe conscience—they are as effectually, though indirectly, deprived of the enjoyment of their rights as freemen, as were the Christians of the IV. century by the cruel edict of Julian; an edict which even the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus finds himself obliged to condemn.* The effect of this "unsectarian" policy is thus summed up by our author:—

"The Christians were directly forbid to teach; they were indirectly forbid to learn, since they would not frequent the schools of the Pagans."

In the same way are Catholics on this Continent—who can no more frequent the "unsectarian schools of the Protestants," than could their predecessors in the faith, "the schools of the Pagans"—indirectly prohibited from either teaching or learning. Because, unable to support two schools, and being by an iniquitous law compelled to pay for schools which they can not frequent, they are thus effectually debarred from the privilege of maintaining such schools, and such teachers, as alone they can approve of. And thus—as did the Pagan Julian with his Protestant subjects—do "Liberal Protestants" deal with their Catholic fellow-citizens. The latter must either expose the "tender minds of the rising generation to the impressions of literature and heresy;" or "if deterred by their own scruples, or by those of their parents from accepting this dangerous mode of instruction, they must, at the same time, relinquish the benefits of a liberal education." It is impossible to avoid being struck with the resemblance betwixt old Paganism, and modern Protestantism!

The only argument that Protestants can urge in excuse of their tyrannical behaviour towards Catholics, is—that the latter have no right to entertain scruples against sending their children to "public schools" frequented by Protestants, and conducted upon Protestant principles. St. Augustine, however, and other Fathers and Doctors of the Church, are of a different opinion; holding—"hereticos esse peiores quam Ethnicos."—*St. Aug. De Bapt. Contr. Donat.*, l. vi.—*De Civ. Dei*, l. xxi.; and that, consequently, it must be more dangerous for the tender Catholic mind to receive its first impressions from the Protestant, than from the Pagan, schools. Thus the scruples of the Christians of the days of Julian against his "PUBLIC SCHOOLS," were not better founded, nor a bit more reasonable, than are those of Catholics of the XIX. century against our modern "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." But, admitting that they were—granting, for the sake of argument, that our conscientious scruples against the "Common schools" are founded on error and misconception, we still contend that the State is bound to respect them; because, in matters of conscience, the State has no jurisdiction whatsoever. The Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Unitarians, the Baptists, the Mormons, and other Protestant denominations, may be most unreasonable in their conscientious scruples against the "Church as by Law Established." Their objections to the book of "Common Prayer" may be as unfounded as are our objections to the "Common Schools." But, whether reasonable or unreasonable—well or ill founded—so long as these scruples exist, and are conscientiously entertained—Methodists, Mormons, Baptists, &c., have the right to urge them as a valid plea against being compelled to pay for the support of places of worship which they cannot frequent; and against being taxed to defray the salaries of teachers from whose ministry they can derive no profit. Now, any argument that is good against compulsory State-Churchism, is just as good against compulsory State-Schoolism.

The two systems are identical in principle, and must stand or fall together. As Catholics—repudiating the maxim, that betwixt State and Church—religion and politics—there should be no connection—we recognise the duty of the State to make material provision for the support, both of Church and School, of education and religion. But we insist that, in making that material provision, the State is bound so to do it, as to do equal justice to all its subjects, and so as to offer violence to the conscientious scruples of none.

* Inclementes.....perenni obruendum silentio.—*Amm. Marc.*

BLOWING THE COALS.

"Blessed are the peace makers," said our Lord; Blessed are they who cause strife, and provoke to blood—is the interpretation put upon His words by certain of our cotemporaries, to whom every drunken brawl, if the combatants happen to be professors of different creeds, furnishes occasion for enforcing their eminently Protestant doctrines. Thus, a drunken row having occurred a few days ago at Brockville, in which

one of the brawlers, a Protestant named Bradford, was brutally stabbed by a ruffian named Moses Boulger—who is said to be a Catholic—the *Commercial Advertiser* of Montreal "improves the occasion" in the following Christian style:—

"All accounts concur in stating that this new victim to religious fanaticism gave no other provocation to his assassin than that of being a Protestant..... It is idle to disguise the fact that the result of such deeds is to provoke retaliation, and to produce a condition of things disgraceful to civilisation."

That the author of the above paragraph in the *Commercial Advertiser* was aware that, in writing that, "all accounts concurred in stating that the victim gave no other provocation to his assassin than that of being a Protestant"—he was giving utterance to a deliberate falsehood, is evident from this—that, on the same page he published the account of the whole affair, as given by a Protestant paper, the *Brockville Monitor*, of May 8th, and as sworn to before a Coroner's Jury. From this official account it appears that, not only the said jury did not attribute the death of Bradford to religious animosity, but did not even find a verdict of "murder" or even "manslaughter," against the man who killed him; so clear was it that the crime was the result of a drunken brawl, betwixt a parcel of rowdy blackguards—a lot of Orangemen on the one hand, and two bad Catholics, Boulger and Hannahan, on the other. In support of this view of the case, we appeal to the evidence elicited on the Coroner's Jury, from the different witnesses examined—all of whom were friends of the deceased, and more or less implicated in the row, of which therefore they were naturally very careful to conceal the origin. However we will let them speak for themselves.

The first witness examined was a man named Jas. Noble. He deposed that on Monday the 14th inst., about midnight, immediately before the murder he had been fighting with the prisoner Hannahan—(it will presently be seen that this was not the first fight that had occurred)—that the deceased, in company with another man, Michael Murphy, came up, behind the combatants—that Hannahan turned round and grasped one of the new comers, Bradford, round the waist—that Boulger then came up and struck a blow at Bradford—that with the assistance of Michael Murphy, the witness Noble dragged the deceased away, who exclaimed "I'm murdered amongst you"—that the blood was pouring down his legs on the side walk, and that shortly after he expired from the effects of a wound inflicted by a "dirt knife."

Michael Murphy was next examined. From him it was elicited that, at some previous period during the same evening, there had been a fight, in which Noble, prisoners, and several others had taken part—that the Rev. Mr. Kelly, Catholic clergyman near whose house the row took place, came out, and with much trouble separated the combatants. In the words of the *Brockville Monitor*:—

"He endeavoured by all means in his power to prevent a collision, and to quell the feelings which the criminals appeared to possess. Previous to the murder he remonstrated with Boulger and Hannahan, who were fighting—why or with whom the *Monitor* does not tell us—and making night hideous with oaths and cheering."

From this it is evident, that, the crime of which the men Boulger and Hannahan were subsequently guilty was caused, not by their being Catholics, not because they were docile and obedient to their clergy—but because they were not Catholics; because they were Protestants in practice; and because they refused to listen to, and protested against, the remonstrances of their spiritual adviser. However, to continue the evidence of Michael Murphy:—

He deposed that the fighting having been put an end to, and the combatants separated for the time, by the exertions of the priest, he, in company with deceased and several others, went away to get some more liquor—"We went round another street to avoid Mr. Kelly's house, fearing that he might suppose they were trying to get up another fight." Somehow or another however, by one of those coincidences which will occur in drunken rows, it so happened that in a few minutes they came upon Noble and the prisoner fighting again. The deceased—who had sharp ears for a fight—said he thought they were fighting; and proposed to witness to go over with him to the scene of operations. They did so; when Hannahan turning round, seized the deceased round the waist, and then the tragedy as described by the former witness, took place.

Other witnesses were examined, but nothing important was elicited from them; and after a consultation of twenty minutes, the Jury returned a verdict.—"We find that the late Bradford came to his death by wounds inflicted by some sharp instrument in the hands of Moses Boulger, assisted by Gilbert Hannahan."

We may add that, according to the *Brockville Monitor*, Hannahan, one of the prisoners, had evidently been brutally ill used during the night's fighting—"his face presenting a mutilated appearance, being all swelled, scratched, and cut."

That the stabbing of the deceased was a brutal cowardly act—that the ruffian who did it deserves to be made an example of—we admit. But, in the name of common sense, and common humanity, we deprecate the attempt of the *Commercial Advertiser* to make a religious quarrel betwixt Catholics and Protestants, because, in a blackguard drunken row, one of the latter was stabbed by the former. Who were the aggressors, we know not—nor how the fight, which the Rev. Mr. Kelly interrupted, but which was again renewed betwixt Noble and Hannahan, originated. It would not indeed be easy to tell; for when men are drinking, who can explain the origin of a fight? And that they were drinking—that they had been drinking, and were going to drink again—is established by the evidence of the witness Murphy.—

All that can be made out of it is this—that two Catholics, Boulger and Hannahan, were engaged in a row with at least double the number of Protestants—Noble, Murphy, deceased, and the "one or two others," who, after the priest had for the time quelled the fighting, started with the deceased and Murphy for more liquor. They met, and commenced fighting again; Hannahan seems to have been severely punished; and then his companion, Moses Boulger, who, if not a Yankee, as we suspect from his name, indulged in the cowardly and thoroughly Yankee practice of carrying deadly weapons concealed about his person, rushed up and stabbed one of the men with whom his comrade, Hannahan, was struggling—a murderous, ruffianly act indeed; but one which none but a stupid bigot, or an unscrupulous slanderer, would ever dream of attributing to religious prejudices.

Far more honest and rational are the conclusions to which the *Sun* comes upon this sad business.—"Whether," he says, "religion had anything to do with the murder or not, it is very evident that whiskey had;" for it is certain that the deceased and his friends were on their way to get more liquor when the second row, which terminated fatally for Bradford, occurred. These circumstances do not indeed offer any excuse for the brutal act of Boulger; but they suffice to show how unfounded, how malignant is the insinuation of the *Commercial Advertiser*, that Bradford was stabbed because he was a Protestant;—whilst the truth is, he was killed because he would interfere in a drunken row.

The excitement consequent upon the sad tragedy of June, 1853, has almost subsided. Catholics and Protestants, we would fain believe, no longer cherish feelings of revenge or hostility towards one another; but alike deplore the angry passions to which, the visit of the infamous Garazzi to Canada, and the inexcusable violence of a handful of Catholics who would not listen to the dictates of their religion, the exhortations of their Clergy, and the remonstrances of their fellow-countrymen, gave rise. Only the voice of the *Commercial Advertiser* is still for war; and, as fortunately there exists no real cause why Catholics and Protestants in Canada should cut one another's throats, he does his best to invent one—converting a drunken brawl betwixt a parcel of blackguards, into a religious quarrel; and holding up the unfortunate deceased to the sympathy of the Protestant public as a martyr for the holy Protestant faith!—We trust however that the majority of our Protestant cotemporaries will discountenance the *Commercial Advertiser* in this unprincipled attempt to rekindle the expiring embers of religious strife; and that his scarcely disguised hint of the expediency of "retaliation" for the blood of the unfortunate man Bradford, will meet with the reprobation that it deserves.

The man who is accused of stabbing will, of course, be put upon his trial for the offence. If proved guilty, all men will concur in the propriety of inflicting upon him severe chastisement for his offence; and one that shall have the effect of putting a stop to the dastardly, and thoroughly Yankee practice of carrying "bowie-knives" and other deadly weapons concealed about the person. We cannot indeed expect to escape altogether the demoralising and degrading influences of the model republic. Our Lower Canadian population, from differences of language and religion, have long and successfully withstood the contamination; but in Upper Canada we fear that it is but too evident that Yankee principles and Yankee morality are very prevalent amongst a great portion of the people, and bring forth fruit in rowdy ruffianism, and midnight stabbings. We trust therefore that, if found guilty, the stabber of Bradford may be treated with the utmost severity of the law; and that so the half Yankeeified population of Upper Canada may learn the salutary lesson, that "bowie-knifing, eye-gouging, stabbing, and shooting," and other amiable Yankee tricks, are very dangerous amusements to indulge in in Canada.

The *Boston Pilot* "requests distinct answers to his questions respecting the future of emigrants from the States to Canada." He asks:—

1. "Are not the Orangemen of Upper Canada quite as provoking and mischievous as are the 'Know-Nothings' here?"
2. "When Catholics are chosen to office, how many of them are Irishmen?—how many are Canadians, or of English and Scotch extraction?"

To the first question, we unhesitatingly reply, that the Orangemen of Upper Canada, though individually as malicious and as bitter enemies of Catholicity, are not so "provoking nor so mischievous," as are the "Know-Nothings" of the United States; and, for the simple reason, that, in Canada, there does not obtain the same disproportion betwixt the numbers of Catholics and Protestants, as obtains in the other country. Were the Protestants as superior in numbers to the Catholics, in this Province, as they are in the neighboring republic, religious liberty would, no doubt, soon be at an end here, as it is there. As it is, however, the Orangemen are not sufficiently numerous to be very provoking or very mischievous; and that they may never become so, is one reason why, as Canadian Catholics, we desire to see a large influx of Irish Catholic immigrants into Canada.

To the second question—as to the numbers of Irishmen appointed to government situations in Canada—we reply, that it is perfectly irrelevant to the present controversy. Our thesis is, that, for the Catholic, who desires to save his soul, and to transmit unimpaired to his children the heritage of the faith, Canada presents advantages which are not to be found in the United States; and that, in Canada, the Irish Catholic immigrant will be free from the persecution and corrupting influences to which he is exposed as an American citizen. In support of our assertion, we appeal to the numerous, to the fearfully numerous, defections from their religion which occur in the States amongst the Irish Catholics settled in that