

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

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

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, three pence; can be had at Messrs. Sullivan's Book Store, Notre Dame Street—Flynn's, McGill Street.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 24, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE insulting, almost menacing tone of the British press towards France, her ruler, and her institutions, in its comments upon the Montalembert trial, and the revolutionary spirit that is again rife as ever in Italy, which ever has been the battle ground of Europe—would seem to indicate the approach of a season of general hostilities in the Old World; whilst on this Continent the interference of the British naval authorities with the filibustering or piratical designs of our Yankee neighbors upon Cuba and Central America, may also lead to an interruption of friendly intercourse, if not to actual war, betwixt Great Britain and the United States. If indeed peace can be preserved for another year, it will be little less than a miracle; and our diplomatists will well deserve the name of *thaumaturge*, or wonder-workers. From India the tidings are of no great moment, but upon the whole satisfactory.

The lovers of fun may expect a rich treat shortly from the proceedings in the case of the Rev. Mr. Poole, late of St. Barnabas, and poor dear Dr. Sumner, who, as Government Archbishop of Canterbury has taken upon himself to cancel the license of the former, upon the grounds of his (Mr. Poole's) Romanising tendencies.—Mr. Poole has applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for redress; and the Court has granted a *writ* which will have the effect of compelling the Archbishop to hear the case over again, and of allowing Mr. Poole to justify his practices by an appeal to the Liturgy and Rubrics of his sect. The result cannot be but most damaging to Anglicanism, and therefore favorable to the cause of truth.

In Ireland the Lord Lieutenant, alarmed at the reported increase of Ribbonism, has issued a stringent proclamation against "Secret Societies." It is to be hoped, though it can scarcely be expected, that the laws against those dangerous organisations will be strictly and impartially enforced; against Orangeism as well as against Ribbonism—which hateful though it be to Catholics, is but the natural, indeed inevitable concomitant and consequence of Orangeism. The former is essentially an organisation for defensive purposes, and for obtaining that security against the wanton outrages of the latter, which the law refuses to give. To put down Ribbonism, therefore, it is first necessary to put down Orangeism; for no one but a fool can expect that, whilst the latter is fostered or tolerated, the former shall not also thrive and extend itself amongst the victims of Orange brutality. This is a fact, or rather truism, which our Canadian legislators who call themselves Catholics would do well to bear in mind, when again called upon to do the Orangeman's dirty work, by voting for the incorporation of a secret "anti-Papal" organisation.

WHERE WILL IT END?—The friend of law and lover of peace will ask himself this question, as he peruses in the columns of the Upper Canada press, the hideous and ever accumulating details of Orange ruffianism, and of Catholic endurance. The reign of law, in so far as Catholics are concerned, is at an end in the Upper Province; the victims of Orange lawlessness, they have lost all confidence in the administration of justice, and can no longer look to the legal tribunals for redress and protection. Orange murderers, whose guilt is known of all men, go forth to their daily crimes in broad day light, with full assurance of impunity; for Orange Magistrates, and Orange jurymen are leagued together to protect them. Meanwhile the question forces itself upon us,—“Where will it end?”

No very difficult question to answer; for it is pretty evident what must be the melancholy result of the present system, if persisted in in Upper Canada. The Catholics of that section of the Province, unprotected by the law—nay, knowing law only as an instrument employed by Orangeism for their oppression—will take its administration into their own hands; will redress their own wrongs without going through the farce of appealing to the legal tribunals; and will themselves, with their own right arms execute a wild justice upon the Orange ruffians who defy both God's law and man's law. Social anarchy, hideous anarchy, will be the result; and we shall be doomed to witness on this side of the Atlantic

the same scenes of violence and bloodshed and hellish retaliation, as those which, occurring on the other side, make our ears tingle as we hear of them through the British press.

All history teaches us that there where men have lost confidence in the impartial administration of the laws, they will soon proceed to avenge their real, or fancied wrongs by brute force. Now we know that the Catholics of Upper Canada have only too good reason for believing that for them there are no hopes of justice from the ordinary tribunals; and that in so far as they are concerned, Magistrates and Jurymen, being for the most part Orangemen, are but the ministers of iniquity, and the agents of an infamous oppression.

Our Judges seem as yet to be uninfected with the Orange virus; but who can tell how long this shall be the case, when we reflect upon the aggressive spirit of Orangeism; and when we consider the open encouragement given to it in the highest quarters? To his honor be it mentioned that, at a late trial of a gang of Orangemen whose guilt was established as clear as the sun at noon-day, but whom an Orange jury, of course, acquitted, the presiding Judge—Chief Justice Robinson—indignantly rebuked the perjured miscreants before him, and expressed his reluctance to register their infamous verdict. And whilst we have such men as a Robinson for our Judges, we may still hope that perjury and rascality shall never be allowed to pass altogether unrebuked.—But who can assure us that we shall always have such men on the Bench of Justice? What security have we, under the present system, that we may not have a notorious and oath-bound Orangeman, raised to the high office of a Judge; and called upon to concur with Orange juries, in acquitting Orange criminals, and convicting innocent Catholics?

Never, even in the darkest days of "Protestant Ascendancy" in unhappy Ireland, did Orangeism manifest more audacity, more contempt for law, or more bitter malignity towards Papists, than it does at the present day in Upper Canada. Never have we heard of its being received as an honored guest in Vice-Regal ante-chambers in Dublin, or of its daring to insult and degrade the Courts of the British Legislature with its infamous insignia. These insults it can inflict upon Papists only in Toronto; this indignity has been reserved for a Canadian Parliament; and when we see it thus triumphant, in the Court and in the Senate, we have but too good reasons to dread that ere long its baneful influence shall be extended to the Palace of Justice; and that, like our Governor and our Legislators, our very Judges shall become its docile tools, and give their aid to execute its savage behests. Surely it is time to ask—"Where will it end?"—and to take some measures to repress the monster evil of Canada.

It is not that we would invoke any legal action against Orangeism, as if the evil complained of could be remedied by statute. We know how utterly useless are all Acts of Parliament against "Secret Societies," how futile the agency of the police for their repression. But we would invoke a healthy public feeling against all Secret Societies, as unbecoming the honest man, the brave man, and the Christian; but we would demand of the Government to refrain from countenancing Orangeism, and to exclude all known members of either "Ribbon" or "Orange" Lodges—for both are alike infamous—from all situations connected with the administration of justice. How reasonable these demands are, and how necessary the application of the principle therein contained—if we would have law respected in Upper Canada—may be seen from the following extract from the Toronto Freeman of the 26th ult.:

"A number of Orange ruffians, assembled in the village of Arthur, on the 16th of last February, and fired several volleys into the Catholic Church of that place. Twenty-six balls were found to have passed through the building. The sacrilegious gang next proceeded to the house of Mr. Cornelius O'Callaghan, into which they fired several shots, one of which passed close to his son's head. The Catholic clergyman who attends that mission was at the time in the house, a fact which was, without doubt, known to the Orangemen.

Bench warrants were granted at the Spring Assizes, by Judge Hagarty, for their arrest. Nearly twenty of the scoundrels were identified and arrested, and remanded till the late term at Guelph, when they were put upon their trial. The evidence was so clear, strong, and irrefragable, that Chief Justice Robinson told the jury that they could not help bringing in a verdict against the miscreants in the dock. The District Attorney, too,—Mr. Kingsmill,—discharged his duty well and honorably, in eliciting testimony which left not a shadow of doubt as to the prisoners' guilt. Yet, will it be credited, these villains, whose guilt was made so manifest, were allowed to go forth from the dock unscathed? So outrageous was the verdict, that it called forth a burst of indignation from the Chief Justice. That functionary exclaimed, "I never recorded a verdict with more reluctance in the whole course of my life," or words to the same effect. What a rebuke to the twelve men who rendered such a verdict to have a judge virtually say, "you are perjurers!" The language made use of by the learned Chief Justice will bear no other interpretation.

Hereupon our cotemporary exclaims:—"Seriously, how long more is the endurance of the Catholics in this section of country to be trampled upon? Is there no redress? Must they at last take the law into their own hands, and inflict summary chastisement upon any or all who in future may molest or injure them? For fear to counsel such a course; but we are apprehensive that the culpable apathy which the Government evinces, will, at no very distant day, produce a fearful reaction in this as well as in other sections, when 'life for life, and an eye for an eye,' will be the *cri de guerre*." God forbid! that it should come to this; and yet to this must it come, if the friends of justice

and order do not bestir themselves; and availing themselves of their constitutional privileges, enforce upon their representatives in Parliament, and in the Ministry, the duty of discouraging all secret politico-religious associations. In this Protestants are interested, but above all is this the duty of all Catholics: for there is the danger, imminent danger, lest oppressed by Orangeism, unprotected by law, and their bitter cries unheeded by their happier co-religionists in the Lower Province, the Catholics of Upper Canada, goaded to desperation, seek in Rabbonism, or other illegal secret organizations forbidden by the Church, that defence against the violence of their implacable enemies, which the laws refuse them. Yes! where Orangeism is dominant, there in spite of all that the Priest can say or do, there will counter secret societies spring up; and he who looks on unmoved at the growth of Orangeism is—no matter whether he be Catholic or Protestant—doing his best to foster Ribbonism.

MR. GEORGE BROWN AND THE REV. MR. RYERSON.—There is an old saw to the effect, that when a certain class fall out, "honest men are likely to come by their own." If this saying be true, a brighter day for Catholics, and for the cause of "Freedom of Education," is about to dawn; because Mr. George Brown and the Rev. Chief Superintendent of Education are most undeniably at loggerheads.

The *casus belli*, or immediate cause of hostilities in this case is the "Report" lately published by the Rev. Mr. Ryerson on the Upper Canada School system; wherein that official appears, strangely enough at first sight, as the defender of "Separate Schools;" and which has provoked a rejoinder from the *Globe*, and another over the signature of Mr. G. Brown, wherein the said "separate" system is denounced, and the advantages of a common or uniform system of State-Schoolism are warmly insisted upon. In this the *Globe* is perfectly consistent; for it, and its reputed editors are, as they always have been, the openly-avowed enemies of "Freedom of Education;" but the action of the Rev. Mr. Ryerson—who *au fond* is as hostile to the claims of Catholic parents to superintend and have sole and absolute control over the education of their own children, as is the veriest No-Popery brawler in Upper Canada—may appear at first sight somewhat paradoxical, and requires, therefore, a few words of explanation. It will be seen, however, that although he may have slightly varied his formula, the Reverend Superintendent is still perfectly consistent with his anti-Catholic antecedents; and that he is as little friendly to Freedom of Education as he was five years ago.

We should premise that we have not as yet seen the Report itself; and that all our knowledge of its contents is derived from extracts given in the *Globe*, the *Toronto Colonist* and other journals. This confession, shall we hope, suffice to exonerate us from any suspicion of a design to suppress any portion of the arguments employed by the respective combatants: whilst at the same time, we have every reason for believing that our several cotemporaries have published all that is of chief importance upon both sides of the question. Those arguments we shall endeavor to reproduce; because therein we find a full corroboration of all that we have ever advanced as to the inconsistency, the injustice, and the worthlessness of the existing "Separate School Law" for Upper Canada; and as to the duty and interests of the Catholics of that section of the Province to arouse themselves from their long slumbers, and to compel their rulers to do them tardy justice.

The Rev. Mr. Ryerson then appears as the advocate of the Separate School law; but, and herein lies the clue to the apparent anomaly—of that *law as it is*. Mr. George Brown, on the other hand, over his own signature, and—if we may say so without breach of editorial etiquette—through the columns of the *Globe*, denounces that law as inconsistent with, and destructive of, the common or uniform system of State-Schoolism, which he advocates, and whose advantages his opponent admits; and he argues with much force, from the Chief Superintendent's own premises, that either the said Separate School law should be totally repealed, or that its provisions should be greatly extended. The *law as it is*, is, as the *Globe* clearly shows, an absurdity and an injustice.

The former supports the separate school law as it is, because it is virtually useless; because whilst, in theory, recognising the claims of the parent, as against the State, to superintend and control the education of the child, it almost entirely deprives him of the exercise of that right. But, adds the Reverend official, were the said law, from a formula to become a reality; were it to be so modified as in practice, as well as in theory, to leave the education of the Catholic child under the control of the Catholic parent—then would it be time to repeal it altogether, and to assert "State-Schoolism" in all its naked deformity. So long however as the law remains a formula, a sham, a "snare and a mockery" of justice, as it has been well called, so long is the

Chief Superintendent of Education content to maintain the existing arrangement. This position the Rev. Mr. Ryerson supports with the same sleek casuistry as that with which he attempted to palliate the pecuniary frauds in which he was detected during the last session of the Legislature, but in spite of which he was compelled to disgorge a portion at least of his plunder. The holy and methodical official, keenly alive to the advantages of his Government situation, and of his value as a model of Christian integrity to the benighted Papists of British North America, thus, with much uncton, and "great sweetness," delivers himself upon the subject:—

"The second condition which would justify the abolition of the separate school provisions of the law, would be their injury to the general interests of the public schools."

Now as every separate school is injurious to the interests of the common schools, it is evident that were the separate system to be extended, or were it capable of being extended, the Rev. Mr. Ryerson would be in favor of its repeal. But so carefully is the separate school law worded, so numerous, so iniquitous, so ingeniously contrived, and almost insurmountable are the obstacles thereby opposed to the extension of the separate system, and the establishment of separate schools, that the reverend Superintendent sees clearly that the law may, without injury to the common system, be left as it is. And thus shall the Government, without in reality conceding anything, enjoy amongst fools great reputation for its liberality to Catholics; and be greatly extolled by all liberal *Katholics* of the place-hunting stamp.

Mr. George Brown, on the contrary, argues—with at least equal justice and regard for the parental rights of Catholics, and certainly with much more of logic—that the advocates of separate schools have already obtained either a great deal too much, or not one-half enough.—That if Catholic parents have a right to separate schools at all, they have a right to demand that the obstructions opposed by the "law as it is" to the establishment of such schools should be at once and thoroughly removed; and that if the Government allow a separate system of education for Catholics, that system should, in proportion to the numbers of Catholics, be as effectually aided by the State, as is the system of which Protestants avail themselves. He shows that, whilst out of a sum of about £311,131, Protestants receive for their schools to the tune of £303,039, Catholics who number ONE-FIFTH of the whole people of Upper Canada, and who as the poorer class stand the more in need of State aid towards the education of their children, receive the magnificent sum of £8,092, or about ONE-FORTIETH of the whole sum appropriated to educational purposes in Upper Canada. Now it is precisely this system, this monster injustice towards our Catholic brethren in the Upper Province, that the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, our Canadian Ministry, and their supporters in both sections of the Province, are doing their best to uphold and perpetuate; whilst for so doing, a servile Ministerial press challenges for them the respect and gratitude of the Catholic community.

"No one" adds the *Globe*, and here we agree with our cotemporary, "no one knows better than Dr. Ryerson does that the present Separate School arrangements make no adequate provisions for the education of Roman Catholics."—Therefore argues the *Globe*—and here we differ altogether from the Brown clique—those arrangements should be abolished, and the separate school law repealed. Either, says the *Globe* make the separate system effectual for the education of those for whom it was designed—or abrogate it altogether. The *Globe* logically but unjustly, adopts the latter alternative; Catholics and all friends of Freedom of Education logically and justly adopt the former; whilst the Reverend Mr. Ryerson, all place-holders, place-hunters, and hungry hangers on after Custom House appointments, destitute both of logic and justice, take their stand upon the ridiculous *via media* of "the law as it is."

Some other remarks upon the Ryerson Pastoral, and the contrivances thence arising betwixt the government official, and the *Magnus Apollo* of the "Ours" we have to offer; but these from want of space, and lest we should weary our readers, we must postpone until next week.

The Montreal *Pilot* of the 18th instant is amusingly angry with, and vehemently abusive against, the TRUE WITNESS, because of the latter's condemnation of the apology put forward by the former, for a supposed act of apostasy on the part of a Canadian Catholic official; and the TRUE WITNESS is pronounced to be "dangerously *daft*" and an "APOSTATE IN RELIGION." All this fire and fury, however, prove—not that the TRUE WITNESS was wrong, but—merely that the *Pilot*, conscious that the cause he advocates is a bad one, naturally relies for victory upon abuse, rather than upon argument. Could he convict us of error he would do so; since he cannot, he hurls harsh epithets at our heads, and strives to crush us beneath a load of unsavory words.

He admits however that he "may be wrong" in his doctrine, that, for a Catholic to participate,

or "allow" himself to appear to the world even as participating, in any act of Protestant worship, is not a dishonorable and impious act; but he appeals from the judgment of the TRUE WITNESS to that of a more competent tribunal:—

"If any casuists," he says—"not out of their right mind"—were to take up the case, and determine that we have judged wrongly, so be it; we should bow in all due humility to their decision."

To that decision we also with confidence appeal; and if the *Pilot* can find, we do not say one "casuist," but a single honest Protestant of average intelligence, who will uphold the thesis—that it is not an infamous and impious act on the part of a Catholic to join, for worldly motives, even outwardly or in appearance only, in any act of Protestant worship, or take part in the religious exercises of those whom the Church anathematizes as heretics,—we shall be prepared to confess that we have greatly over-estimated both the intelligence and the honesty of our separated brethren.

Let us by way of illustration suppose a case perfectly in point. What would Protestants think of a poor Irish Roman Catholic tenant, who to ingratiate himself with his Protestant landlord, and thereby secure a renewal of his lease, should at the request of the latter, attend the services of the Anglican Church, instead of going to Chapel to hear Mass as in duty bound? and who should thus join in worship and spiritual communion with those who openly denounce the said Mass as a "damnable idolatry," and who profess to believe that all Papists are idolaters. (see *Homilies of Church of England*). Would not, we ask the *Pilot*, would not all intelligent and honest Protestants from their hearts despise the poor humble Roman Catholic peasant of Ireland, who for such motives, should be guilty of such an act of apostasy, in base compliance with the request of an earthly superior? Would they not look upon him as a craven abject hound, "a contemner of the Divine Majesty," as the scandal of his religion, and as a disgrace to his country? Of course they would; and yet it is impossible for the *Pilot* to point out wherein the conduct of the illiterate Popish peasant of Ireland in the case above assumed, is more unworthy of the Christian, and the honest man, than that imputed by the Quebec *Herald*—(whether truly or falsely we presume not to determine)—to a wealthy and well educated Canadian official.—Now "*daft*" though we may be, we are not so silly as to believe that there is one law of right and wrong for the rich, influential, and well educated, and another for the poor, and illiterate.

Or again, let us suppose another case, also quite analogous to that whose merits are in dispute. An eminent personage, a member of the Royal Family, a British subject and a professing Protestant, is now making a tour over the Continent of Europe; in the course of which it is very probable that he may visit Rome, and even reside for some days or weeks in the capital city of Christendom. Now suppose that that illustrious visitor, were, at the request of the Pope—who like the Queen of Great Britain, is both a Sovereign Prince, and Head upon earth of the Church established in his dominions—to attend Mass, and to take part publicly in some act of "devout worship," in honor of the Blessed Virgin, instead of assisting at the religious exercises of his Protestant fellow-countrymen: what we ask the *Pilot*, would be the language of the British press? what the sentiments of the British Protestant world upon hearing of such an outrage upon the Holy Protestant Faith? Would they not, with one heart, and with one voice exclaim, that the illustrious personage so offending, had approved himself false to the faith for which a Cranmer died, and a Titus Oates was whipt at the cart's tail? Would they not endeavor to impress upon his mind, in pretty forcible language, the fact, that by his apparent apostasy to Romanism, he had renounced the principles in virtue of which his mother was seated upon the throne of the British Empire; and that he had in consequence forfeited his right to succeed to the British Crown? Of course they would; and yet it is equally certain that it is as wrong, as infamous a thing, for a Catholic to participate, even in appearance, in any act of Protestant worship, as it would be for a Protestant to unite with Catholics, in essentially "Romanish" acts of "devout worship."

As we said last week, so we say now, that we do not pretend to affirm the truth of the report published in the Quebec *Herald*; and which by calling forth the *Pilot's* apology for an act of apostasy, provoked the comments of the TRUE WITNESS. We hope for the honor of Canada and for the honor of our religion, that that report is utterly destitute of foundation; and most cheerfully shall we, when authorized to do so, give the aid of our columns to its refutation. In the mean time we content ourselves with recording our indignant protest against the servile and impious doctrine laid down by the *Pilot*—as to the propriety of a Catholic's participation in acts of Protestant "worship" at the call of an earthly sovereign; and appeal to the words of Him, who shall one day come in great majesty to judge the earth, and Who has Himself left us as a legacy this ever memorable warning—to which we direct the attention of the Protestant *Pilot*:—