

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

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

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1858.

We would remind our readers that the Bazaar of the Sisters of Providence Convent is still open, but will close to-night. They have therefore no time to lose, but should go at once, if they wish to be partakers in a good work.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The news by *Europa* from Liverpool, 8th instant, would seem to indicate that the Indian difficulty is as far from a settlement as ever.—Twenty-five thousand fresh troops are to be sent out to India without delay, to fill the vacancies already caused by casualties in the field, and disease. And yet the real work of the campaign can hardly be said to have commenced. The "Right of Search" question had been discussed in the House of Commons, and orders had been sent out to the officers in command on the West India Station to exercise the greatest caution with regard to vessels showing the colors of the United States. Fresh riots of a serious nature had occurred at Belfast. The Atlantic Telegraph squadron was expected to sail on, or about, the 10th inst. The Continental news is unimportant; only it would seem that the late duel in France has caused a great irritation betwixt the *bourgeoisie* and the army. The weather was favourable, and the prospects of the coming harvest flattering. Breadstuffs reported dull.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday, 10th inst., M. Cartier moved for leave to introduce a Bill for disfranchising St. Sylvester, Ste. Agathe, and St. Antoine, on account of their share in the Lotbiniere election frauds. M. Turcotte thought the punishment too severe, even if the disfranchisement were to last only during the present Parliament. The Parish of St. Antoine he knew to be orderly, though he admitted that St. Sylvester was the reverse. After a few words from M. Dorion, leave was given to introduce the Bill. Mr. McGee hoped that when the Bill came up for its second reading, the Government would be able to show that those who had committed the frauds were habitual residents of the parishes in question. On Friday 11th, the discussion on the Lower Canada Judicature Bill was proceeded with; and the Ottawa Election Committee reported that the sitting member was duly elected, and that the petition of Mr. Ball was frivolous and vexatious. The Lower Canada Judicature Bill was read a third time on Saturday, 12th, and the House proceeded to hear evidence in the case of the Essex election frauds. The Norfolk Shrievally sale has been again warmly discussed, and was concluded by a majority of ten in favor of the Ministry.

REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.

This is a question in which we are all deeply interested; and one on which the Catholics of Lower Canada, without distinction of origin, should make up their minds to act vigorously as one man.

The argument adduced by the friends of the measure is a specious one; for it cannot be denied that "representation by population," or a representative system based upon numbers, is in strict accordance with the principles of our constitution, as applied to any one country of homogeneous population. But Upper and Lower Canada are not one country, but two countries—no matter what Acts of Parliament may say to the contrary. "Jack-in-Office" may proclaim them to be one; but God has declared them to be two, and two they will remain, until one be destroyed or absorbed by the other, in spite of all that legions of "Red-Tapists" may swear to the contrary. As France and England are essentially two, as Russia and Germany are two, so are Upper Canada and Lower Canada essentially two—aliens to one another in blood in language and in religion. Whom God hath in His wisdom pleased to make two, "Jack-in-Office," with his paltry Acts of Parliament, need not expect to make one.

And it is because the Upper and Lower Provinces compose respectively two essentially distinct countries, that the wise politician will refuse to apply to them a principle which would be true if Canada were one, morally as well as geographically; one country, and inhabited by one homogeneous population. The present Union was forced upon the people of Lower Canada, greatly

to their disadvantage, and altogether to the profit of the people of the Upper Province. If the latter like not the terms of the bargain, if they are desirous, now that they are in a majority, to repudiate the principle of "equality of representation"—of which principle, when they were far inferior in numbers to the Lower Canadians, they gladly availed themselves, and on the justice of which they then most eloquently insisted—the remedy is in their own hands. Let them dissolve Partnership, and apply for a Repeal of a Union which was unjustly forced upon the people of Lower Canada: a Union to which the latter have no motives to feel strongly attached, and of which they have certainly no reasons to feel proud.

Yet that the measure of "representation by population" will be strongly pressed, we feel no doubt; and even its miscarriage for the present, will not discourage its promoters from bringing it forward in another Session. It should therefore, amongst all Lower Canada constituencies, be made a test question; and no man—no matter what his past services, or his promises for the future—should ever again receive a vote from a Catholic of Lower Canada, who has not during the present Session boldly and unequivocally declared himself against a system of representation, which, if enforced, would be destructive of Lower Canadian nationality, and seriously injurious to the interests of the Catholic Church.

For the question of "representation by population" has a religious, as well as a national side; and it is as Catholics, as much as inhabitants of Lower Canada, that we are bound to oppose it. If it be intended to augment the influence of the Anglo-Saxon element in politics, by giving to Anglo-Saxon, or rather Yankee Upper Canada, a preponderance in the Legislature, it is no less the design of the promoters of the measure, to augment the influence of the Protestant, or Anti-Catholic element, by securing the lion's share in legislation to Protestant, or Anti-Catholic Upper Canada. It is a measure as much directed against the Irish Papist, as against the French Canadian—against our religion, as against the laws, language, and nationality of our fellow-citizens of French descent. Papists then of all origins are equally interested in resisting it; and for the sake of their common religion, should lay aside all merely national jealousies, in order more effectually to oppose a formidable front to their common enemies; and in the term "enemies" we include every man, who is disposed to shew the slightest favor to, or coquet with, a measure so fraught with peril to our religion, and with dishonor to Lower Canada, as that which is now being agitated under the name of "Representation by Population."

Attaching then as we do so much importance to this question, our readers will understand why we earnestly commend to their attention the debate thereupon in the Legislative Assembly, when it was brought forward by Mr. Cameron, a Ministerial member of the House. It will be seen that, of the French Canadians several, from whom we have had to record our dissent pretty strongly upon other questions, spoke well and warmly in opposition to the measure; whether their acts and votes will correspond to their speeches—whether, when the time comes, they will shew themselves as stout in deed as in word—we of course are not prepared to say. But in justice to M. Loranger, M. Chapais, and others, we must admit that they "uttered as brave words at the *pridge*, as you shall see in a *summer's day*;" and though we do not pretend that any action of the Legislature would justify an appeal to physical force, yet this we say—that if such an appeal could, under any circumstances, be justifiable, it would be in the case of an attempt by the Yankee Protestants of Upper Canada, to treat the Catholics of Lower Canada as an "inferior race," and as a conquered people; by imposing on them a system of government which would inevitably prove the ruin of their Church, and their nationality, and subversive of their laws, their language, and their religion.

The *Montreal Witness*, whose theological attainments are but small, and whose acquaintance with Catholic theology in particular, is even less, will pardon us if we take the liberty of correcting an error into which an evangelical Protestant very naturally falls, when treating of a subject upon which he evidently knows nothing.

"Roman Catholics," says the *Witness*, "hold that the wafer is Christ, and therefore God, because it has been blessed by the priests after the example of the Saviour, who took bread and blessed it, and said, 'take, eat this, this is my body.' If Christ did not bless the bread there was no transubstantiation, and therefore the whole strength of the text of which so much is made lies in the little word 'it.'"

If the *Witness* was aware that the authoritative version of the Holy Scriptures amongst Catholics was the Latin *Vulgate*, and if his acquaintance with that Latin version and its authorized translations, was a little more extensive, the poor man would be able to see the absurdity of his argument. The little word "it" does not occur in the Latin version, neither is it to be found in the translation of the Gospels which the Church puts into the hands of her children; and

again the "little word it," upon which our cotemporary lays so great stress, half insinuating that it is a corrupt addition to the text, which is not to be found in the Roman Catholic translations of the New Testament into the vulgar tongue, is to be found in the authorized Protestant version:—

REHEM TESTAMENT.
St. Matt. xxvi. 26.—
And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his disciples; and said: Take ye and eat; This is my body.
St. Mark xiv. 22.—
And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said: Take ye, This is my body.
St. Luke xxii. 19.—
And taking bread, he gave thanks, and broke, and gave to them, saying: This is my body, &c.
1 Cor. ii. 23, 24.—
The Lord Jesus the night in which he was betrayed, took bread,
And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye and eat; This is my body, &c.

Thus it appears that the interpolation of the little word "it" with which the *Witness* taxes us, is an interpolation of the Protestant translators exclusively; and that it is not to be found in any one of those passages of the Catholic version of the New Testament wherein the institution of the Eucharist is narrated. It must therefore be obvious to the meanest understanding—yea! even to the intellect of an editor of the *Montreal Witness*—that Roman Catholics cannot rest their belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation upon a "little word" which is not once to be found in their version of the Scriptures, though it invariably occurs in the version of their adversaries.

Not that we attach much importance to the presence or absence of the "little word it," because Protestants as well as Catholics admit that, which our Lord, after having "blessed," broke, and gave to his disciples, saying this is "my body"—was the bread which he took during supper. For Catholics to dispute with Protestants about the words themselves which Our Lord used, would be absurd. Because, in the first place, the language spoken by Our Lord was neither Greek nor Latin, and it is only in Greek and Latin that we find his words recorded; and secondly, because the faith of Catholics depends, not upon verbal criticisms and rules of grammar, but upon the teaching of an infallible, because divinely appointed Church, or body of teachers.—This body was in existence before one word of the Christian Scriptures had been committed to writing; and it is from this body—as the only means by Christ Himself appointed for propagating and perpetuating amongst all nations, the knowledge of His teachings—and not from a book, to which Our Lord never once made the most remote allusion, and which did not even begin to exist until long after the Church had been established—that we Catholics, take our doctrines, and derive our knowledge of the real meaning of Our Lord's words.

What our erudite cotemporary means by the Church of Rome "making nothing of that part of the ordinance" which relates to "the cup," because the word "it" is not added therunto, we confess ourselves at a loss to understand. Is it possible that the *Montreal Witness* is ignorant that it has ever been the doctrine of the Catholic Church that the wine, as well as the bread, is the subject of consecration, and therefore of transubstantiation? Why will the poor man persist in writing upon subjects of which he is in a state of such profound ignorance?

On another point we must also venture to set our cotemporary right. The annual procession in honor of the B. Sacrament is not "the supreme act of worship," of the Catholic Church: the said "supreme act" consisting now, as it did in the days of the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, of sacrifice. The only difference betwixt the ancient and modern sacrifice, consists in this: that we Catholics have the substance in our sacrifice, of that whereof the ancients had but the shadow.

We would also hint to our evangelical friend that the blind superstition with which they regard a mass of paper made from old rags, leather, and paste board, which they call the Bible, and which has been well stigmatised as "Bibliolatry"—affords as good grounds for taxing Protestants with idolatry, and "Fetich" worship, as does the respect which Catholics pay to a picture or image of the Blessed Mother of God, for the taunts of idolatry which the *Montreal Witness* urges against us.

The *Minerve* has much mistaken the policy of the TRUE WITNESS if she supposes that we have ever advocated an alliance of any kind with Mr. George Brown, or any of his "Clear Grit" followers; to whom we are as heartily opposed as is our venerable cotemporary herself, and perhaps a little more. The *Minerve* however, poor old lady, is getting silly and weak in her brain, the effect of vapors no doubt, vulgarly known as "des vents," to which elderly females are often subject. Hence the mistake into which the *Min-*

erve falls with respect to the TRUE WITNESS.

We want then to set the old lady right.—Our opposition to the members of the present Ministry proceeds, not from any desire to see Mr. George Brown or his friends in power, but from this; that as Catholics we can neither forget nor forgive their votes upon the Separate School Question, the Religious Incorporations' Bill, the Orange Bill, and other important questions, wherein the honor and interests of religion and morality were deeply concerned. Their conduct upon these questions has, we say, justly merited for them the scorn of every honest Catholic, who is attached to his religion, and feels jealous of the honor of his Church; and we see not therefore how any Catholic can give them a hearty support, or refrain from expressing his thorough contempt for them, even though for the moment he is willing to tolerate them in office, lest a worse thing should happen to him.

If then the *Minerve* would put her support of the Ministry on these grounds—"that, of two evils, we must choose the less," we should understand her position, even if in all respects we might not approve of it. The argument is good no doubt. If, unfortunately, we had no choice betwixt sleeping in a bed swarming with bugs, or in a bed infested with centipedes—if we were compelled to accept one or other of the above alternatives—we should select the bed with the bugs, in preference to that with the centipedes. Not that we like bugs, for they are nasty stinking things; but after all, the bite and stench of a bug, is not so bad as the bite of a centipede, which may result in loss of limb, and even in loss of life.

And so with regard to the Cartier-Alleyn-Loranger administration, as compared with a probable George Brown Cabinet. If compelled to choose between them, if unfortunately we had no other alternative—we should select the former; not because we like them, any more than we like bugs; but because they are, after all, but poor puny things: venomous indeed, but still not so dangerous as the ultra-Rouges, or "Clear Grits." If the *Minerve* would put her defence of her Ministerial patrons upon these grounds, we should understand her; though even then we might be prepared to show that we were not yet reduced to the miserable alternative of bugs or centipedes—of George Cartier or George Brown.

We hope the *Minerve* will give us the benefit of our explanation, by ceasing to represent us as in any sense an admirer of the Opposition party of which G. Brown is the recognised organ.—And in the mean time we would recommend the old lady to take care of herself, and to try the effect of peppermint lozenges, which are said to be of great service in the complaint with which she is troubled, if taken in the morning upon an empty stomach.

"Where then?" asks the *Pilot* with ludicrous imbecility—"is the extraordinary impropriety of a leading politician being an Orangeman?" The *Pilot* should know, and does know, that this is not the question between the opponents, and the servile supporters of an Orange administration. That an Orangeman may be a "leading politician" without any gross impropriety we admit; but the case is different when he becomes a "leading" member of the Executive Government, and entrusted with the administration of justice betwixt different classes of Her Majesty's subjects. For a man in such an important official position, and receiving the wages of the State, to be a member of a secret-oath-bound-politico-religious society, is an impropriety so monstrous, that only in a community lost to all sense of decency would it be tolerated—only by the most unscrupulous and venal of "Government hacks" would it be defended.

The avowed object of Orangism is "Protestant Ascendancy." Protestant Ascendancy is incompatible with the civil equality of Catholics and Protestants; therefore Orangism is incompatible with civil and religious liberty, whose essence consists in the perfect equality of all denominations. This is why a member of a secret politico-religious society, organized for the express purpose of maintaining Protestant Ascendancy, or religious inequality, is altogether out of his place—not as a "politician"—but, as a member of the Executive. Such a man, cannot, if true to his oaths, be impartial in the execution of his functions; and thus it is that, of the countless outrages perpetrated of late by Orangemen upon the Catholics of Upper Canada, not one has been avenged by the sword of justice. An Orange Attorney General is not the man to administer impartial justice betwixt Catholics and Protestants; and the former have, in consequence, lost all confidence in the administration of justice in Upper Canada, nor can that confidence ever be restored so long as the sworn enemy of their creed, and their political rights, is one of the highest legal authorities in the State. A "Ribbon" Judge upon the Bench, would not be a greater outrage than an Orange Attorney General in the Executive Council. The *Pilot* may attempt to blarney the Irish by calling himself their friend; but they know him for what he is—a servile "government hack," and the apologist of Orangemen, their worst enemies.

ANGLIANS AND "SEPARATE SCHOOLS."—We stated some weeks ago, that we had "allies in the Protestant camp," from whom we might reasonably expect assistance in our battle for "Freedom of Education." The desire for separate schools, is not confined, as the Rev. Mr. Ryerson falsely and impudently pretends, to the Catholic clergy; but is felt and expressed by our Anglican fellow-citizens, amongst whom the Godless and tyrannical system of "State-Schoolism" is as unpopular as it is amongst Catholics. This fact was brought clearly to light at a meeting or Synod of the Anglican church held at Toronto on the 10th inst., and attended by a large and most respectable body of Anglican ministers. Amongst other matters discussed, was that of "Education;" when the Rev. Dr. Bovell presented the following Report upon the subject, embodying we may presume the sentiments of the great majority of his brethren:—

Dr. Bovell, from the committee to whom it had been referred, brought up the following report:—
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

"At the close of the last Synod a committee was appointed to enquire as to what modifications could be made in the school act, to render education under that act more acceptable to the church than it is at present. The committee have the honor to report that, on entering on the duties assigned to them, they have constantly kept before their minds the duty they owe to their heavenly Master, and that which desires them to live in dutiful obedience to their lawful rulers. Diving themselves, therefore, of all factious or unnecessary opposition to the law of the land, they have endeavored to discover the opinions of others, not only in Canada but in England and America, with reference to general education; and aided by such light, as well as by that which has been diffused by the discussion of the question amongst ourselves, your committee has arrived at the conclusion, that the time has now come when an united effort should be made to secure to the Church of England and Ireland in Canada the liberty to educate her youth, whenever that church has made provision for instruction, either in her capacity as a diocesan church, or in the more limited sphere of parochial organization. As long as the church advocates separate schools, without giving evidence of her sincerity by making provision therefor, the question of their being exempt from common school taxation, or of their quota of the educational tax being handed back for their separate management, was plainly one of no small difficulty; but now that, in many instances, the members of that church have taxed themselves for the erection of buildings and machinery, and are actually carrying out a system of education based on Christian doctrine and discipline, your committee feel that it is not too much to hope that the justice of the cause will commend itself, and the requisite relief be granted.

Your committee, therefore, beg leave to recommend that a respectful memorial be presented to the proper authorities, praying them so to amend the common school act as to enable the Church of England and Ireland, whenever schools are erected and established for common school education by her several congregations, to have the quota of common school tax which they pay assigned over to their schools for the sole purpose of education.

Your committee further recommend, that it be distinctly stated that no opposition would be offered to a Government inspection of such schools, with a view to ensuring the authorities that the education given was in secular branches efficient and good.

All which is most respectfully submitted.

Dr. BOVELL then gave notice that he would move that the following memorial be taken into consideration to-morrow:—

"DRAFT OF MEMORIAL ON EDUCATION.
The memorial of the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop (Protestant) of Toronto, and the members of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, in Diocesan Synod assembled."

"RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:
That your memorialists believe that a very large proportion of the Common School tax is contributed by members of the United Churches of England and Ireland.

"That your memorialists represent that they have for many years loyally and patiently submitted to the operation of the Common School tax, notwithstanding their conviction that they were entitled to relief as hereinafter mentioned, and deserved to be placed in no other position than that enjoyed by the members of a communion who have for some time been blessed with the very estimable privilege which your memorialists have sought hitherto in vain.

"That several congregations, notwithstanding the erection in their several parishes or districts of school buildings, and that education as taught in them is offered free of charge, have been ready to tax themselves, and have taxed themselves, to build and provide substantial parochial school houses, capable of accommodating a very large number of children—as in the city of Toronto upwards of one thousand—with the conscientious desire of carrying out the teaching of the Gospel of Christ by regular Sunday and week day training; and have further provided, and are about to provide to a still further extent, teachers and all the necessary machinery for imparting a solid secular and Christian education to the children of the Church of England.

"Your memorialists, therefore, pray that their conscientious objections to a merely secular system of education, may be so far respected as to cause the School Act to be so amended as to enable the schools established by the Church aforesaid, to receive the quota of taxes paid by the resident tax-payers who are members of the Church of England in the district or parish in which such school is erected."

Mr. J. H. CAMERON suggested that the notice of the report alone should be moved, as it might be found that the school act now in force would permit without alteration of the desired object.

From this it would appear that our Anglican fellow-citizens are determined to secure to themselves the right to control the education of their own children, in which we heartily wish them God speed. If in this their laudable object they should find it necessary to apply to Parliament for relief from the odious shackles of State-Schoolism, we do trust that our Catholic members will be at their posts, and will actively exert themselves to enforce the reasonable demands of their Protestant brethren.

THE REV. MR. RYERSON.—We learn that the case of this unhappy man, has attracted the serious attention of the conference of his brethren, the Methodist Ministers lately assembled from all parts of the Province, in this city. The *Montreal Witness* says that it is "happy to learn" that the Church to which he, Mr. Ryerson, "belongs is about to deal with him," and that "its dealing will be thorough." At this we are not surprised; for the Rev. Mr. Ryerson does not reflect much credit upon the denomination to which he at present belongs.