

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES
FOR GEORGE E. CLARK, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

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
paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by car-
riers, 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 this Office;
at Egan's, McGill Street; and at Pickups News
Depot.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Arabia* with dates to the 18th instant arrived at Halifax on Tuesday. The news from the Seat of War is of little interest; we learn however that another great battle was daily expected, in which the combatants would probably put forth their utmost energies. From Great Britain we learn that the Derby Ministry had been succeeded by a Palmerstonian coalition Cabinet; of which Lord John Russell, Lord Elgin, and Mr. Cobden form part. Lord Palmerston is known to be hostile to Austria, an enemy of the Pope, and to have been an underground fomenter of revolution in Italy; it is therefore pretty certain that his Ministry will cultivate friendly relations with France and Sardinia, who are playing his game, and carrying out his foreign policy.

ANTICIPATED DISTURBANCES.—We regret to learn from the Toronto *Freeman* that disturbances are anticipated in Upper Canada, on the 12th of July, from the Orange ruffians of that section of the Province. "We have learned," says our Toronto cotemporary, "that it is the intention of the Church-burners in certain localities, to make their offensive and peculiarly Christian (!) demonstration on the 12th proximo. It has even been intimated that serious threats have been made, by individuals connected with that association, of injury to the lives and Church-property of Catholics."

Under these circumstances the *Freeman* advises his Catholic readers to be on their guard; to apply in the first instance, for protection against Orange violence to the legally constituted authorities of their several districts; and if that protection be refused, to arm themselves for the defence of their churches, their lives, and their property.

That such advice should be necessary we regret; but that it is necessary, we have no doubt from the fact that the *Freeman* feels it his duty to tender it. It is however another proof, if proof were needed, of the increasing audacity of Orangism in Upper Canada; and of the falsity of the assertion that the Brown-McGee alliance had tended to check the curse of secret societies.

Men cast not out devils by means of devils; nor can Orangism be put down by George Brown, the Prince of Orangism. Who like George Brown has contributed to the growth of Orangism? who has done more than he has, to arouse the passions of the Protestants of Upper Canada against Catholics, and to excite them to deeds of brutal violence? If not the actual introducer of Orangism into Canada, the foul plant would have withered and died away, but for the tending, but for the watchful culture, that it has received at his hands. Ogle Gowan may have planted; but it is George Brown who has watered; whilst it is the devil himself, the Father of Orangism, who has given the increase.

And yet it is this man, this same Geo. Brown, who has the impudence to take us to task for what he calls our "Sectarian Intolerance;" and who lauds Mr. McGee for the valuable services he has rendered "in his endeavours to break down the wall of bigotry"—a wall of which Mr. George Brown himself is the prominent builder, and his organ the *Globe* is, as it were, the corner stone! Yes! this same George Brown whose mission it has been to provoke his Protestant auditory to deeds of violence against their Catholic brethren; who more than any other man, except the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, has distinguished himself by opposition to our just demands for "Freedom of Education;" whose voice has ever been loudest in denouncing our Clergy, and in insulting his Irish Catholic fellow-citizens—now lauds Mr. McGee for his efforts to "break down the wall of bigotry"—to heal differences that never should have existed,—and to secure for those with whom he is associated?—the Irish Papists we suppose are here alluded to—"their due political influence." Comment is here surely unnecessary. When George Brown denounces bigotry, and smiles approvingly on efforts made to secure for the "Dogs" their due political influence, excessive surprise at the man's superhuman impudence compels us to hold our peace.

Yet though we blame Mr. Brown above all men for the present state of parties in Upper

Canada, and the daily increasing audacity of Orangism, we cannot but condemn the countenance given to that foul pest, by our Governor-General and his Ministerial advisers. The outrage upon decency and political morality of which the former was guilty, when on the 12th of July, 1856, he received in his official capacity, and as Her Majesty's Representative graciously replied to an Address from, a deputation of the Orange Society, is an offence which we can never forgive, never forget; whilst the indifference of the latter to the numerous deeds of Orange violence, of which Catholic laity and Catholic priests are the victims, is scarce a whit less reprehensible than the active encouragement given to Orangism by Sir Edmund Head.

Of this indifference of the Executive to injuries inflicted by Orangemen upon mere Papists, we have a signal and melancholy proof in the case of the Reverend M. Frachon. Several months have now elapsed since that gentleman was attacked, and his life endangered by a savage mob; and yet though full details of this atrocious affair have been laid before the Government, not one step has hitherto been taken by the Executive to bring the offenders to justice; not a penny reward has been offered for the apprehension of the would-be murderers; not an effort made to arrest the burners of Catholic churches, and the gallant "brethren" who raise their hands against Popish priests.

Had it been a valuable horse that had been shot, or a favorite dog that had been maimed, there would have been no lack of energy on the part of the Magistracy, and Executive generally, to detect and bring to trial the offenders. But alas! for Canadian justice—it was but a Frenchman, a mere Popish Priest, who had been stabbed, and a Popish Mass House that had been burned down. Upon such mere trifles as these our rulers deem it not worth while to bestow their attention; or rather, awed by, and completely subject to Orange influences, they dare not do their duty; they dare not stand between the Orange assassin and his intended victim;—they dare not assert the supremacy of the law; and their God-like mission upon earth, to execute justice, and to maintain truth, is by them clean forgotten.

And so in this vaunted era of civilisation, progress, and enlightened toleration, the Catholic journalist, despairing of protection from the laws of the land, and placing no reliance on the honesty of the Executive, feels it his duty to call upon his coreligionists to arm, and gather together in their own defence; to protect their lives and properties, the persons of their clergy, and their sacred edifices, from the Orange assassin's knife, and the torch of the Orange incendiary!—Alas! that it should be so; yet so it is. And if this sad state of things be, as is the case, chiefly due to the infernal appeals of Mr. George Brown to the worst passions of the mob, it is also true that it is in a great measure owing to the culpable indifference, and criminal apathy of those to whom all Her Majesty's loyal subjects, no matter of what creed or origin, have the right to look for protection. This we assert in no spirit of factious opposition, but in melancholy earnest; and in justification of that attitude of "Independent Opposition" which we have always advocated as the sole prudent, and sole honorable attitude in politics that Catholics can assume; so long as Canada is governed as she is at present governed, and so long as the political opponents of the Ministry are headed by such a one as Mr. George Brown. With the latter, no Catholic, imbued with the spirit of his religion, or possessed of the feelings of a gentleman, would ever seek to contract any political alliance; from every Ministry, from every party, which refuses, or hesitates, to do full justice to Catholic demands on the School and Orange questions, he must in like manner hold himself aloof.

The following communication appeared in the *Montreal Herald* of Monday last:—

To the Editor of the *Montreal Herald*.
220 St. ANTOINE STREET,
June 25th, 1859.

SIR,—Although most unwilling to trouble you with any matter, not of general interest, may I ask you to allow me to notice through your columns a statement which was made at the period of the election of 1857, by the Ministerial press, and then explicitly contradicted by me, both on the hustings and through the press,—a statement which I find repeated in the following terms in the *Montreal True Witness* of yesterday:—

"That, previous to the last general election some eighteen months ago, Mr. McGee did his best to be admitted into the ranks of the Ministerial party; that with that object in view he entered into negotiations with the Attorney General for Canada West, whom he has since denounced as an Orangeman; and that, day after day, and until his object overtures to enter into political life on the Ministerial interest had been spurned with contumely by those to whom they were addressed, he waited humbly in Ministerial ante-chambers for a reply to his degrading offers."

This statement, I am to presume, Mr. Editor, is made on the authority of the Attorney General West, or some one for him. I have no knowledge that the Editor of the *True Witness* holds officially the position of representing Mr. McDonald, nor can I permit him to interpose himself between the principal in such an assault and the principal in defence—myself. His suppression of my explanations to my constituents, his repeated suppressions of similar matters of fact, of interest to his readers, and suggestions of what is untrue, in relation to myself, make it impossible for me to take him up, as the Attorney General for the Attorney-General. But if that gentleman, a member of the same house as myself, and one whom I have never spared, or any

one now a Minister, or who was a Minister previous to the general election in 1857, will state over his own name substantially, the same charge as the *True Witness* has reproduced from the Ministerial press, I will hold myself bound at once to deal with it, as it deserves and as I did on its first circulation in 1857.

Your most obedient servant,

THOS. D'ARCY MCGEE.

In justice to Mr. McGee, and in justice to ourselves, we publish the above. In justice to Mr. McGee—in order that the readers of the *True Witness* may see what he has to say for himself; in justice to ourselves—in order that they may see how he meets our challenge, to deny that, at the last general election, he had by himself, or others, intrigued to be admitted into the Ministerial ranks.

Our readers, by a careful perusal of Mr. McGee's reply will perceive that he does not so much as attempt to deny our statements. On the contrary, he shrinks from the contest; and sheltering himself behind the dignity of a newly fledged M.P., he declines "to take up" one so humble as the editor of the *True Witness*, and who has neither a handle, nor a tail to his name. If in this we cannot admire Mr. McGee's delicate sense of honor, we can at least recognize that prudence, that love of self, which have ever marked his political career; and under whose inspirations he has been ever prompt to shrink from the post of danger, and to seek safety in flight. Seriously, however, we can see nothing in the relative position of Mr. McGee—M.P. though he be—and our humble selves, to justify the very impertinent, or, in other words, "snobbish" airs assumed by the former; yet if he declines to accept the challenge by us thrown to him; if he cannot stoop from his high estate as a Member of the Colonial Legislature to pick up the gauntlet we have cast at his feet, we need not trouble ourselves about the matter. He is the guardian of his own honor, and we wish him joy of the sinecure.

Neither now, nor in 1857, has Mr. McGee dared to deny that he, personally, or through "go-betweens" had intrigued to be enrolled on the "Ministerial ticket;" as will be seen from the subjoined extracts from the report given in Mr. McGee's own organ, the *New Era* of December 15th, 1857, of that gentleman's "explanations to his constituents:—

Mr. McGEE, before proceeding to address the electors, would ask a question to set himself right with a large part of the people of this city? The gentlemen of the Ministerial party had taken credit for not using personalities. He thought neither Mr. Rose or Mr. Starnes had stooped to that last resort of a disreputable cause and a vulgar disposition; but they had done the same thing in another manner.—They had employed, and taken into their favor, and petted, and patronized one or two most scandalous writers, who disgraced the press. But each of these papers, the *Gazette*, the *Transcript*, and the *Commercial Advertiser*, have said that I have been engaged in certain Ministerial negotiations. Now, I call on Mr. Rose, and ask him to consult with Mr. Workman, and say here and now if I am at liberty to depart from that secrecy which necessarily exists in the intercourse of society, and whether I may make known the propositions which were made to me from Ministerial quarters, together with the names of those who were the bearers of them.

Mr. ROSE was understood to say that he knew of no propositions communicated to Mr. McGee by the government.

Mr. MCGEE—Then there is no objection to my making the statement.

Mr. ROSE—Mr. McGee may state anything he pleases on his own responsibility.

Mr. MCGEE—Well, then, I have to state that after my Committee was formed, and the same day as the first batch of signatures to my requisition was published, my proposer, Dr. Howard, received a proposition from the proposer of Mr. Rose, Mr. Workman, and again that a gentleman, now I believe in this crowd—one who has not been made use of as was intended that he should be—Mr. Bartley, brought a subsequent proposition, to the effect that if I would consent to retire from my canvass in this city, a county would be provided for me, all my expenses paid, and that the ministry would otherwise handsomely consider me.

Mr. WORKMAN made some statement which our reporter could not hear very distinctly; but the purport of it was, that he had no authority from anybody to make this proposition, and that he did so merely as a suggestion of his own.

Mr. MCGEE—Let Dr. Howard say whether he did not ask Mr. Workman whether he came from any other persons, or whether what he proposed was only from himself.

Dr. HOWARD said Mr. Workman stated most distinctly that he was charged by other persons to make these propositions; but that Mr. Workman refused to give the names of those persons.

Mr. MCGEE—Well it was plain that a gentleman who had been chosen by one of the Ministerial candidates for his proposer, one who must, therefore, have represented that gentleman's principles, and have been very much in his confidence, made the propositions he spoke of.

All that is clear from the above "explanations" is—that there were intrigues of some kind; and that, whilst Mr. McGee did not venture to deny his having been a party to those intrigues, he retorted upon the Ministry that they too had intrigued with him; but we find no allusion to a positive statement which has reached our ears very recently, to the effect that, so far had those disgraceful intrigues proceeded, and so completely was Mr. McGee a party to them, that his Address, or rather a document intended for an Address, to the Electors of Montreal, was, with Mr. McGee's consent, actually submitted to the inspection and censorship of the proposer of one of the Ministerial candidates. Will Mr. McGee venture to deny this? *Nous verrons*.—If he does, we shall know how to deal with him; if he does not, the public will know what to think of him, and his pretensions to political integrity, and consistency of principle.

From a Rawdon correspondent we learn that Mr. McGee was to lecture in that township on the 30th ult.; the proceeds of the lecture to be given in aid of the funds of the Rawdon Catholic Academy.

THE METHODISTS AND FREEDOM OF EDUCATION.—It is beautiful and interesting to observe how quickly and how loudly our Methodist friends can sing out, when they find their withers galled by the saddle which for long years they have been doing their best to keep on the backs of their Catholic neighbors. When the latter protested against the injustice and cruelty of "State Schoolism," none were more prompt to rebuke their murmurs than the *Christian Guardian*; when State Schoolism was an evil of which Papists alone complained, the Methodists, with the Rev. Mr. Ryerson at their head, were the foremost and loudest in denouncing the "sectarian" prejudices of Roman Catholics, and in urging the Legislature not to lighten, but to increase our burdens. To-day, however, our Methodist friends find that "State Schoolism" is a two-edged sword; that the cry "no-sectarianism" may be as logically and powerfully raised against the frequenters of the conventicle, as against the children of the Church; and that the very arguments which they have hitherto triumphantly urged against our Catholic separate schools, can to-day be as effectively urged against a State endowment for a Methodist College. With the measure with which they, and their *Magnus Apollo*, the reverend Mr. Ryerson, have measured out to us, is it now meted back to them again.

The state of the case as betwixt the Methodists and their opponents is this. The former have a denominational institution in which their own peculiar "isms" are inculcated, known as the Victoria College. At a recent meeting or Conference of the Methodist body, it was determined to apply to government for a grant in aid of this institution, on the plea that other educational bodies are in receipt of similar State assistance. To this demand the *Leader*, the *Globe*, and the other champions of "State Schoolism" reply as they have always replied to the demands of Catholics for separate schools. Thus the *Leader* says:—

"The equity of the case is very plain. The State, as the patron of learning, provides a spring undefiled by sectarian bitterness, at which all may drink. If there be some who prefer to slake at other and special fountains that thirst for knowledge which, when satisfied, makes a man all he is, they may be allowed to exercise the preference; but they must not expect the public to pay for it. If they do, we beg to assure them in advance, speaking from our knowledge of Upper Canada feeling, that they are destined to be disappointed."

This our Catholic readers will not fail to perceive, is the identical argument with which the Reverend Mr. Ryerson and the *Christian Guardian* have always met our demands for separate schools. The State, they say in substance, has furnished non-sectarian schools which are open to all. If Romanists prefer sectarian schools of their own persuasion, they may be allowed to exercise the preference; but if they do, they must not expect a share of the public funds to support these schools. This we say is, in substance, the reply of Methodists to Catholics, and of the *Leader* to the Methodists. If good in the one case, it is equally so in the other.

But how does our Methodist cotemporary treat it?—how deals the *Christian Guardian*, the inveterate opponent of "Freedom of Education" for Catholics, with the *Leader* when opposing the demands of the Methodist Conference? Let us listen to him; for he discourses most eloquently in behalf of our principles:—

"The resolutions adopted at the late session of our Conference, expressive of what we believe to be the sentiment and feeling of a large portion of the people of Upper Canada, appear to have caused considerable consternation and alarm in certain quarters, and with the usual amount of dictatorial authority, the *Leader* of last Wednesday honors them with his special attention. The care he has taken to avoid meddling with the statement of the fact upon which the resolutions are based, very forcibly reminds us of the reply of a person who was told by his opponent in argument, that 'facts were against him';—'then,' said he, 'so much the worse for the facts.'—So with the *Leader*; he does not attempt to deny that there is a prevailing sentiment amongst the people of Canada in favor of Colleges under the management of religious denominations. This he knows is demonstrated by the existence of the denominational Colleges which have been established, and are maintained principally by the denominations to which they respectively belong. All this, however, is of no consequence to a journal which feels itself so secure of the reward of its work as to set public sentiment at defiance; and with the tyranny which is always characteristic of the rank infidelity by which that paper is controlled, insists that all religious and moral considerations and interests must be discarded in those educational institutions which receive any portion of the public funds appropriated for the support of collegiate education.

Without attempting to follow the *Leader* in his surmises and insinuations, we notice particularly the dictatorial deliverance with which he concludes his article.

[Here comes the passage from the *Leader* given above.]

"The grand mistake which the tone of this extract, as well as the entire article involves, is that the *Leader* has magnified himself into the 'State,' and attached to his own theory the importance and authority of the confirmed decisions of that august institution. The State, he says, has done so and so: and who is the State but the people? and the fact that those who are appointed to manage the affairs of the State, may for the time fail to be the true representatives of the wishes of the people, is not to be taken as a confirmation of any and every policy which for the time may be adopted. It is perfectly natural for the *Leader*, who has no religious creed, to talk of the 'State' providing a spring undefiled by sectarian bitterness, at which all may drink;" but the practically expressed sentiment of a large portion of the people of Canada, declares that the ignoring of all religion in our educational institutions, is much greater evil than even the *Leader's* idea of "sectarian bitterness;" and notwithstanding his confident 'assurance in advance,' it is a sentiment that will sooner or later exert a more salutary and powerful influence than has been felt or heeded of late in the management of public affairs. And if the *Leader* lays the flattering unction to his soul, that he is the exponent of Upper Canada feeling, we 'beg

to assure him in advance" that he is destined to a grievous disappointment. We trust there is still enough of sound Protestantism and correct religious feeling, to counteract the *Leader's* infidel theory of political economy."

Substituting the word "Schools" for that of "Colleges" in the above, there is not a term but what the Catholic might employ when arguing against Methodists—the right of Papists to separate schools; and indeed when we remember that, if the religious element is of importance in collegiate or secondary education, it is of far higher importance in primary or elementary school education, the Catholic's position would be far stronger than that of the *Christian Guardian*. The former might urge, that earliest impressions have their roots deepest, and are the most permanent; that in childhood above all, must the elements of religious instruction be given; and that therefore religion is far more necessary in the child's school than in the young man's college.—But then, to be sure, logic and justice are of no avail when urged by Papists against Protestant Ascendancy.

Yet now that Protestants are themselves the sufferers; now that the rule they have so often and so long applied to us, is in a modified manner applied to them, we may hope to win from their impatience of wrong, that which in vain we have demanded from their love of right. The principles urged by the *Christian Guardian* against the *Leader* are in the main true; therefore irreconcilable with, and fatal to, any "mixed," "common," or "non-Sectarian" system of education. This is the great fact; and one which, if properly handled, will no doubt help to subvert the monstrous tyranny of "State-Schoolism."

UXORIOUS BISHOPS.—Our Protestant cotemporaries on both sides of the Atlantic are much and sorely exercised in spirit by the excessive indulgence in connubial propensities of the Rev. Dr. Terrot, Protestant Bishop of Edinburgh.—The apostolic man, being as it appears now in the 70th year of his age, and the 18th of his episcopate, has, for the second time, fallen a victim to the little blind god's shafts; and in spite of his grey hairs, and Apostolic (!) succession has lately figured in the columns of a profane press, as having taken unto himself a second wife, and for the second time given a Bishopess to the Church over which he presides. Hereupon much quotation from the Fathers; and many and fierce appeals to ecclesiastical history; and no end of "pounding" of St. Paul's advice to his correspondents, Timothy and Titus.

Our City cotemporary, the *Montreal Herald* has discussed this knotty question with much good sense and moderation; and in reply to those who explain the words of the Apostle 1. Tim. c. iii, v. 2.—"It behoveth, therefore, a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife"—as restricting Bishops to one wife at a time, and, therefore, by implication, sanctioning polygamy amongst the Christian laity. But when he treats of the discipline of the Catholic Church with regard to the celibacy of her Ministers, he approaches the subject too much in the spirit of an orthodox Protestant, and is neither moderate nor sensible. Thus he says:—

"We need scarcely add that the Church of Rome gets rid of all difficulty by superseding the Apostle's authority altogether, and enforcing the doctrine and practice of celibacy upon her Clergy of every degree."

This reproach is based upon the assumption that the Apostle requires, in the text above quoted, as an indispensable condition of admission to Episcopal Orders, that the candidate shall be the husband of a wife; whereas the text is susceptible of another and quite different interpretation—the one which the church adopts, viz.—that no one shall be consecrated Bishop who has been twice married. Now that St. Paul did not look upon marriage as an essential qualification for the sacred Ministry is evident from his own practice, as a confirmed celibate; and therefore, the presumption is strong, that his words were solely designed to discountenance the admission to Holy Orders of persons who had been twice married. If this were his meaning, the Church of Rome has not superseded the Apostle's authority; for she still insists upon all that he insisted upon as essential in the condition of her Ministers; and as evidently St. Paul did not intend to imply that celibacy was incompatible with the exercise of sacerdotal functions, so neither does the Church, by insisting upon the celibacy of the Clergy, set aside the authority of the Apostle.

But, moved by the Holy Ghost, and remembering the words of St. Paul, that "he that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God;" and that "he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and is divided."—1 Cor., VII. c. 32, 33—the Catholic Church, who desires that her Priests and Bishops should not be divided betwixt the things of heaven and the things of earth, but should be solicitous only for the things that belong to the Lord—exact a solemn pledge of celibacy from all those whom she admits to the higher offices in her Ministry. Herein the Church manifests her reverence for every word that fell from the lips of those who of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; for, from the above quoted passage it is evident that