

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Persia*, with dates of the 1st, arrived at New York on Tuesday. The European news is void of interest. From India we learn that Jhansi had been captured by the British, after a severe struggle, and with great loss to the mutineers. The British loss was also heavy.

THE ORANGEMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

This is the heading of an editorial of the *Patrie* of Saturday last, criticising severely the conduct of the Ministry generally, and of the Lower Canadian, and Catholic portion of it in particular, for their conduct on the debate upon the Bill for the Incorporation of the Orange Societies of Canada. Of this most interesting and instructive debate, the full details will be found on our fifth page: the editorial of the *Patrie* we give below.

The *Patrie* has always been hitherto inclined to support the present Administration; nor is it possible, even in its well deserved, and strongly pronounced, condemnation of the Ministry, to find grounds for suspecting it of the slightest leaning towards democratic principles, or of any sympathy with the demagogues of the Lower Province, or Clear Grits of the Upper. The article therefore which we translate from our French cotemporary is doubly valuable; valuable as showing the scorn and contempt in which those time-serving "hacks," who, to save their places and salaries, voted for the incorporation of the sworn enemies of their race and creed, are held by all honest French Catholics: valuable as showing that it is possible to be a staunch Conservative, and the uncompromising enemy of modern democracy in all its phases, without being a "Government hack." This premised, we hasten to lay before our readers the article in question:—

(From *La Patrie*, May 8th.)

"Governments as well as individuals are liable to momentary attacks of vertigo, which drive them from their course, and force them to abandon the noble mission of protecting in this world the interests of society, against the assaults of the enemy, the fury of parties, and the machination of traitors. Of this we have to-day, a sad and terrible example. So long as guided by sentiments of justice and moderation, the Ministry had respect for those principles which make a people strong and moral; so long as guided by an instinct of conservatism it knew how to resist the fury of a disorderly opposition, and to preserve itself on a level with its true position, we have always given it the aid of our influence, always have raised our voice to encourage it, so that by equitable measures it might be able to lead the people of Canada onwards towards their proper destiny, and dispel the gloom of the future which looms before us. But the very reasons which have prompted us to support the Ministry when guided by justice, when it invoked truth, and called as witnesses of its acts the wants of our young country—these same motives oblige us to withdraw from it our support, when, breaking with the past, trampling under foot history and the experience of all nations, it descends into the shade, and allies itself, heart and soul, with the mournful array of crimes and iniquities engendered by the Orangemen. We are not like those blind men who, ah! for destruction, and hungering after power, raise rash hands against, and rejoice in the fall of, all Governments. But if we can join with a just and equitable government, with one knowing its duties, we know how also to raise our hands, to seize the avenging scourge, and how to apply the lash to those who for the sake of maintaining a shadow of popularity, and the remains of power, fear not to sacrifice these principles which remain, when all else crumbles away, and which as God is, are eternal."

After this *exordium*, the *Patrie* gives his countrymen a slight sketch of Orangeism, than which it truly says, there does not exist a society more completely given over to "cruel fanaticism and bloody prejudices;" and it is for incorporating this infamous blood-begrimed Society that the Ministry voted! Hereupon the *Patrie* exclaims:—

"In fact, the more we reflect upon the conduct of the Ministry on this most unfortunate occasion, the more are we at a loss to discover the motives which could have urged them to perpetrate such an unparalleled act of iniquity; the more are we astonished, and the more inexplicable appears their conduct.—Did the Ministry fear then, that in voting against the incorporation of the Orangemen, they would lose the alliance of the members for Upper Canada?—or did they hope to win the esteem and confidence of a few fanatics? But M. Loranger has long hated fanaticism under whatsoever garb it presents itself; and has himself taken the trouble to publish the fact to the entire community. But M. Cartier, the fiery champion of universal toleration, who has solemnly pledged himself to watch over the interests of his constituents, has he not often repeated that his principles would always be in harmony with the interests of the people! But M. Sicotte and Mr. Rose, know as well as we that Orangemen are as odious in the eyes of Protestants as of Catholics; and should in consequence have no legal existence in a country like ours, where the faith of the latter, and the opinions of the former, are called to march in concert. Did the Ministry fear, in voting against the Incorporation of the Orangemen, to lose their influence, and to be compelled to abandon their places? But better to fall with honor on the field of battle, than to escape victorious through the gates of infamy."

"Besides, a firm Government, relying upon the principles of justice, needs not they clamors around it; boldly it pursues its course. But when doubts, hesitation, puerile fears, and groundless apprehensions, deeds of reckless daring, and profless apostasy, are the sole guides of a Ministry, the gulf yawns, wherein the social edifice, strained in all its joints, will eternally be swallowed up."

"If it be argued that there is no more injustice in incorporating the Orangemen, than in incorporating any other secret society, Catholic or Protestant, we answer that this is a great error, and betrays a very slight acquaintance with the history of Orangeism. It is a fact, well known to all the world, that from that terrible society nothing useful, nothing honorable, can proceed; that it is hateful alike in its ends,

* The *Patrie* need hardly be reminded that there is not, and that there never can be, any "Catholic secret society;" all secret societies being condemned by the Church, and held in abhorrence by all her children.

and in the means by which it seeks to attain them! So soon as it obtains footing in a country, the empire of discord is set up. These are living facts, and these should, as it seems to us, have forced themselves upon the minds of M. M. Loranger, Cartier, Sicotte, and their colleagues. But when iniquity is at its height, darkness possesses the heart of man, and spite of the feelings of the people who murmur and revolt, he finishes his work and dies!

"Then it remains for those who defend, only to protest, and to espouse the interests of discarded justice."

"For the rest, it is consoling to see that all our friends who usually support the Government separated themselves from it upon the occasion of this Bill, and that Mr. Brown and his partisans went with the Ministry. It is as well that these great crises should occur sometimes; for then the camps divide, and each party learns to know its own soldiers."

With these remarks of the *Patrie*—which are merely what might have been expected from a Catholic, and a French Canadian journalist—we entirely concur, with one exception. We do not in the least participate in his surprise at the conduct of the Ministry; because from their antecedents, we well knew what manner of men we had to deal with. The Upper Canadian section of the Ministry is composed mainly of Orangemen, pledged to do the bidding of the infamous Society, of which they are members—to promote its interests, and to procure for it a recognition from the State. The Lower Canadian section, on the other hand, is made up chiefly of Catholics, who have already shown that they are ready to sacrifice honor, and the interests of their Church and religion, to the exigencies of party, and the emoluments of office; and who to secure the latter, have, on more than one occasion, been guilty of conduct fully as vile and mercenary as that which the *Patrie* so justly, and so forcibly condemns to-day. What regard to truth, honor, or decency—can be expected from men who voted for the "reprobate" "Religious Incorporation Bill?"

The excuses urged by the *Minerve* in behalf of the Ministry, or rather in behalf of the Lower Canadian, and *soi-disant* Catholic portion thereof—to the effect that it would have been discourteous to vote against the first stages of the Orange Bill—and that it is "not customary to reject a Bill on the first reading, unless it be evidently repugnant to good morals"—are but miserable subterfuges; worthless for those whom they are designed to exonerate, and very dishonoring to the heart and to the intelligence of those who have the meanness to urge them. True; it is not "customary" to vote against the first reading of any Bill; but it is the invariable custom of Parliaments to reject sternly and at once, all Bills that are evidently repugnant to good morals, and the welfare of the community. Now we contend that it must be evident to the meanest understanding, that it is repugnant to morality and to the welfare of the community, to give the shadow even of legal sanction to a society which has been proved to be productive of strife and bloodshed. But Orangeism has been arraigned, tried, and condemned as dangerous, before the bar of the highest tribunal of the British Empire. That condemnation is officially on record; and no statesman, or legislator, can be permitted to plead ignorance of its existence; and therefore, if there were no other reasons than those afforded by the "Report of the House of Commons," and the official despatches from British Secretaries of State to our Colonial Governors still preserved amongst our archives—the conduct of those who voted for the first reading of the Orange Bill, would be perfectly inexcusable. But we have another reason to assign in condemnation of the vote for which the *Minerve* apologises.

Orangeism is a "secret politico-religious society;" and as such societies are condemned by the Church, no Catholic is justified under any pretence whatsoever, in giving to them any encouragement, or in helping to obtain for them a legal existence. We are not of those who recognise "two persons" in one Catholic member of Parliament; of whom one may be damned and the other saved; of whom one is bound to walk by the laws of the Church, and the other is at liberty to follow after the traditions of the world. We contend that, in public, as in private life, in the Senate, as in the bosom of his family, the Catholic is always bound to take the Church as his supreme guide; we contend in fact, that there is no difference betwixt public and private morals; and that that which is immoral on the part of the private individual, is equally immoral and therefore unjustifiable, on the part of the statesman. Now if our premises be true—and if it would be immoral on the part of the Catholic in private life, to foster or in anywise countenance any "secret politico-religious" society, whose members are bound by oaths, and known to one another by signs and pass-words—then we maintain that the same conduct on the part of the Catholic statesman is equally wrong, equally unjustifiable. Nor, as we said above, can the *Minerve* urge the plea of ignorance of the nature, and merits or demerits, of Orangeism in behalf of the Ministry. If true, that plea would not be valid, for the statesman cannot be allowed to plead ignorance of official records. But it is not true, for there is not a man amongst them who was ignorant of the condemnation of Orangeism by the House of Commons, and by the leading statesmen of all parties in Great Britain in their despatches to the Colonial authorities; or who was not aware

that Orangeism has been in Canada, and within the last few years—as it has always been in Ireland—the source of crime, strife and brutal murders. Why! the blood of Tierney, O'Farrell, and Sheedy, the victims of Orange brutality, still cries to Heaven for vengeance on the very Society to which M. M. Cartier, Loranger, and Alleyn proposed to give a legal existence, and Parliamentary sanction.

Neither can it be pleaded that, as the Ministry were in ignorance of the details of the Bill until it was before the House, so they could not be bound to vote against its introduction. It is not to the details of the Bill that we chiefly object—though it does commence with a solemn lie, and a hypocritical pretence which will impose upon no one, that the Orangemen—the heroes of Rathcormac, of Dolly's Brae, the blood stained murderers of the widow and the orphan—are a "charitable" association forsooth; wholly given up to labors of love, with hearts full of charity and good will. It is not, we say, to the details of the Act of Incorporation that we object, but to the Act itself, because such Act implies the recognition by the Legislature of Orangeism, and the giving to a "secret politico-religious" society a legal existence. It is against the principle of such an Act, rather than its details, that the true Catholic statesman should direct his attack. Our Ministry, on the contrary, sanctioned the principle of the Bill, reserving to themselves, we admit, the right to oppose it in detail; and by so doing they have done their best to carry out the views of the worst enemies of their race and creed. To a certain extent, the Orangemen, by, for an instant, obtaining a hearing from the Legislature for their Bill—which should have been ignominiously kicked out the moment it was presented—have succeeded in obtaining their object; in another session they will succeed entirely.

That object simply is to obtain for their detestable society a formal recognition from the State. This is what they have been aiming at these many years; and this, through the gross misconduct of our present Governor-General, and the venality of Catholic "place-holders" in Parliament, they have nearly succeeded in obtaining. What do Orangemen care about having power "to sue and be sued?"—or what, save the desire to exert a more direct and powerful influence upon the political and social destinies of this country, would have prompted them to come before the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation? To be able to insult their Popish fellow-citizens with impunity, or rather with the sanction of the State—to reduce us to the condition of an "inferior race," by establishing Protestant Ascendancy in Canada, on the firm basis of law and Act of Parliament—these are their objects; and to these objects, so eminently anti-Catholic, so essentially anti-Canadian, did men like Cartier, Loranger, and Alleyn lend themselves, when, to save their Government situations, and curry favor with their foes, they like recreants, voted for incorporating the Orangemen of Canada.

The *Toronto Citizen* complains of the *True Witness* for saying that he (the *Citizen*) "called for an armed organisation on the part of Catholics against Orangemen." This is not strictly the case; but after a careful perusal of our article alluded to, we admit that it is susceptible of an interpretation which would in some manner justify the *Citizen's* complaint, and we therefore avail ourselves of the first opportunity of doing him justice. He never did, to our knowledge, call for an armed organisation against Orangemen; and our remarks about such organisations were applicable to the *Mirror* of Toronto alone.

At the same time, from the fact that the *Citizen* gave no signs of approving of constitutional petitioning against the recognition of secret politico-religious societies by the Legislature—and that he did exhort his readers in most inflammatory language, "to stand in the deadly breach—the Orangeman who insults you, let it be in peril, the Orangeman who assaults you let it be for death"—we naturally concluded that he did approve of physical and armed resistance to Orangeism, in preference to the mode advocated by the *True Witness*; and putting this natural interpretation upon his words, we did not see much, if any, important difference betwixt him and the *Mirror*, with whose policy, in all other respects, the *Citizen* so entirely coincides. The *Mirror* boldly avowed designs which, as it seemed to us, the other more cautiously insinuated; but as the *Citizen* disclaims all intentions of inciting to "armed organisations," by his somewhat bombastic allusions to the "deadly breach," to "peril" and "death," we hasten to give him the full benefit of that disclaimer, and to acknowledge our entire ignorance of his real meaning.

Having done justice to the *Citizen*, we would ask him when and where the *True Witness* has ever made "common cause," or attempted to persuade others to make "common cause," with the Brownites, Clear Grits, or with "the revilers of our clergy?" On the contrary, if we have ever spoken of "opposition" to a Ministry,

composed partly of rabid Orangemen, and partly of turn-coat Catholics, we have always spoken of an "independent opposition"—i.e., an opposition unconnected with any party in the State; and one refusing therefore to make common cause with any set of men, either in or out of office. What we have done our best to advocate, has been the formation amongst Catholics, of an independent Catholic party—of a party indifferent to all questions of "Ins" or "Outs;" of a party whose opposition would be, not factious, but "constitutional," and which would therefore vote upon every question that presented itself, on its intrinsic merits, and without the slightest regard to the effects of that vote, either upon the "Ins" or upon the "Outs." Such an independent and constitutional opposition—judging of the merits of every question from an exclusively Catholic stand-point—seeking no favors, no appointments of any kind from any party in the State, and scorning to accept them if offered—would, if true to its principles, even though but small in numbers, soon make its influence felt on our Legislature; would render the continuance in power of any administration hostile to our just demands, impossible; and would enforce a settlement of those, to Catholics, vitally important problems, which we may be sure will never be settled favorably for us, if we trust either to the liberality of a Protestant majority, or the honesty of "place-hunting" and "place-accepting" Catholics. Such only is the opposition that we have advocated, for with none other would we ally ourselves; and the only valid objection that can be urged against our policy is this—that it requires a greater amount of disinterestedness, of zeal and honesty than is to be found in Canada. There is force in this objection we admit; for our policy presupposes amongst Catholics, a total abnegation of self, a formal renunciation of all the emoluments of "Government situations," and the abandonment, now and for ever, of all jobbing and "place-begging."

Tastes differ; "what is one man's meat, is another man's poison," says the proverb; and we are not such fools as to provoke a dispute with the *Montreal Witness* about his likings, or dislikings. But we contend that he should abstain from all attempts to force his tastes upon us.

He don't like monks; he thinks them "of most repulsive aspect; who from their appearance one would judge to be capable of any crime." Two Franciscan Fathers, who during a short visit to Montreal have attracted our cotemporary's notice by appearing in the streets in the peculiar garb of their Order, are in particular held up to public odium, as two "as coarse and repulsive looking men as can well be;" and having delivered himself of his gentlemanly and charitable mission, our cotemporary, who no doubt piques himself upon his chaste, refined and attractive appearance, fancies that he has dealt a severe blow to Popery, and done something towards establishing and exalting the Holy Protestant Faith.

Now suppose we were to tell our saintly cotemporary, that the two Franciscans of whom he, knowing nothing, speaks in the above insulting manner, are, in spite of their quaint garb and voluntary poverty, gentlemen every way his superiors in birth, education, and manners; and that to compare them even, in any one point, with one of those sleek demure looking gentry who arrogate to themselves the title of evangelical ministers, would be to do the reverend Fathers a foul wrong,—we should be merely uttering the simple truth. But if we were further to add that in our opinion there were amongst the evangelical Ministers of Montreal—yea, amongst the elect of the French Canadian Missionary Society, and amongst those whom our cotemporary doth chiefly delight to honor—men as coarse, sensual and repulsive looking, as men can well be: if we—substituting the words "Protestant preachers" for "monks"—were to express our sentiments about—"those lazy, dirty, sensual looking creatures—men of the most repulsive looking aspect, who from their appearance one would judge to be capable of any crime, and who, yet, by virtue of their ecclesiastical character find entrance into any society?"—we might perhaps be still confining ourselves to the literal truth; though we should most deservedly lay ourselves open to the reproach of being wanting in common courtesy, and in Christian charity. Now—and this is the point we are aiming at—why should it be lawful on the part of Protestants, to employ language when speaking of Catholic "monks," which every one would pronounce, and justly pronounce, highly reprehensible if applied by a Catholic to Protestant clergymen? There may be "coarse" looking men amongst monks and priests; but may not the same be said, and with equal truth, of evangelical ministers? Is every one who "breaks the bread of life" in Our Zion a model of grace and elegance? are there no greasy, thick-lipped, sensual looking men of God to be found in the sanctuary of the Little Bethel?—Nay, is the editor of the *Montreal Witness* himself, such a very Adonis, that he has a right

to cast injurious reflections upon the personal appearance of others not so happily endowed by nature? Without meaning anything disrespectful to his good looks, to that brow of his whereon grace is seated, to that front of Jove, to that eye like Mars', to those Hyperion's curls, to that nose, like—what the mischief is it like? or, to be brief, to any part whatsoever of the outward man of our cotemporary, surely we may be permitted to take as much pleasure in the appearance of a Franciscan Monk, as in that of the elegant and attractive editor of the *Montreal Witness*; and if the objects which strike him most unfavorably in Italy are, the "dirty, lazy, sensual looking Monks," he surely has no right to find fault with us, if our disgust is excited by the swarm of Exeter Hall emissaries, who with a corrupt bible in one hand, and a dagger in the other, are ever striving to excite the people of the Italian Peninsula, and Continental Europe generally, to cut the throats of their legitimate Sovereigns. Tastes differ, and we will not dispute about them.

As to the Franciscan Fathers themselves, whose appearance in our streets has so much disturbed the peace of mind of poor old Mrs. Harris of the *Montreal Witness* office, we have little to say. Aesthetically, their garb may be indefensible, but morally its appearance in our public places has its uses, or the Church would not sanction it. It is for instance a startling reproach to the grovelling materialism of the day, which teaches man to look for happiness in the gratification of his senses, and the indulgence of his animal appetites. It is as the voice of one clothed in a garment of camel's hair, and with a leathern girdle about his loins, crying in the wilderness, to prepare the way of the Lord, and to make straight His paths; it is a reproof of the effeminacy and luxury of the children of this age, who are clad in purple and fine linen; and, to take lower ground, it is a proof that even in this dollar hunting land, there are still some who hang not their heads for honest poverty, and who, in spite of the sneers of wealthy and respectable people, still dare be poor. The soldier is proud of his medals, his decorations, his Victoria Cross; why then should the soldier of Christ be ashamed publicly to wear the uniform of his Master, and to appear abroad bearing the insignia of his more glorious profession?

A GOOD JOKE.—The *Christian Guardian* of the 5th inst. contains an amusing correspondence betwixt a Mr. Davidson, and Dr. Barker, the editor of the *British Whig*, of Kingston.—It would appear that the former has been attending some of the recent "revival meetings" in Upper Canada; and that—more lucky than a friend of ours, who, in reply to the question, whether he had "got religion?" answered us with a groan, "No; I've got nothing but rheumatism"—the said Mr. Davidson got happy, and went through the regular course of the "new birth." Being a remarkably fine "babe of grace," he thought it incumbent on him to make the whole world acquainted with the fact; and so, in his own words, "sent his religious experiences—(paying postage as usual)—to the *Daily British Whig*"—the well known Dr. Barker. Now this gentleman is what is vulgarly called a "hard case;" one who would have been better pleased at receiving, freight paid, a box of good cigars, than Mr. Davidson's post paid "religious experiences." So that gentleman's "astonishment and vexation," Dr. Barker returned Mr. Davidson's "religious experiences," accompanied with the following curt epistle—evidently the production of an "unregenerate vessel," and doomed to perdition:—

"Sir—I return your letter to me of to-day. I look upon it as a gratuitous piece of impertinence for a man of your character to address me at all, particularly in the offensive manner you have done. Attend to your situation: keep yourself sober, and show by the humility of your life that you have truly repented of your misdeeds.—I am yours, &c.,
Ed. JOHN BARKER."

From the above well deserved rebuff to poor Mr. Davidson, we fancy that not many will be tempted in future to trouble the editor of the *British Whig* with their "religious experiences."

"One of the dogmas of Romanism"—writes the *Christian Guardian* of the 28th ult.—"is, that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics.'" We deny the fact, and we call upon our cotemporary for proof.

"If by 'Romanism' the *Christian Guardian* means, as we have no doubt he does, the Roman Catholic Church, nothing can be easier for him than to prove his assertion. The dogmas of that Church are not hidden in a corner, but are embodied in the decrees of her Councils, and the authoritative decisions of the Holy See. Tell us then, we say to the *Christian Guardian*, where, and in what terms is couched the doctrine that "no faith is to be kept with heretics." As our cotemporary places these words betwixt inverted commas, it is evident that his object is to make his readers believe that they are a quotation; and of course a quotation from some work recognised by "Romanists" as an authoritative exposition of their doctrines. Now from what "Romanist" work has our cotemporary quoted the sentence—"no faith is to be kept with heretics?"

We deny that such is the doctrine of the Ro-