

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES FOR GEORGE B. OLBRE, 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 this Office; at Flynn's, McGill Street; and at Pickup's News Depot.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

By the steamer *New York* we have news from England to the 22d ult. Still the uncertainty as to whether Peace or War was to be the order of the day prevailed; but the rumor that the Great Powers had consented to a Congress to settle the affairs of Europe had caused a slight rise in the funds. Military preparations were still, however, being continued on a large scale; and again Cardinal Antonelli had requested the immediate evacuation of Rome by the French troops.

From England we learn that the new Reform Bill was meeting with considerable opposition from the working classes. The Neapolitan exiles had arrived at Bristol, where they were received with great demonstrations of sympathy. Apropos of these interesting exiles, we would direct attention to a letter from George Bowyer on our 7th page; in which is given an ample contradiction to the exaggerated reports as to the hardships inflicted upon them. They had been engaged in a treasonable conspiracy against the King of Naples; who again has the reputation of being a sincere and faithful Papist; and hence the sympathy that is manifested towards them by British Protestantism. The story about chains, and dungeons is evidently all a lie.

The *Muskat*—the first steamer of the season—arrived from Boucherville on Monday last.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On Wednesday 30th ult. in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Orange Ferguson brought forward his motion against Freedom of Education, and for depriving Catholics of their Separate Schools; in order that their children might be subjected to the same brutal ill-usage as that under which the unhappy Catholics of the United States now groan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cameron.

Mr. McCann moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. McMicken, that the Orange Bill be not read a second time; but that a committee of nine members be appointed to enquire into the working of the School Laws in both sections of the Province, and to suggest such amendments as to them might seem requisite.

Mr. McGee—whose speech has evidently been but poorly reported in the Protestant journals, and to whom but scant justice has been administered by the reporters for that section of the press—then addressed the House. We give his speech as we find it reported in the *Toronto Colonist*:

Mr. McGee rose to say that a number of petitions had been presented, praying for reforms in the school law, and he thought it his duty to express his views, briefly, on the bill and on the amendment. No subject had been more agitated throughout the country, and if every member had his mind made up, it would be as well to give a silent vote. But, either there had been a vast amount of simulated orthodoxy on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their organs, or they would be ready to take into consideration the means of remedying existing evils. If the present law were a finality; if there were no justice in any of the petitions presented; if unreal grievances and trumped up charges had been brought to the House, hon. gentlemen should sit still; but although he thought many of these petitions were overdrawn, nevertheless he cordially concurred in their general tenor, and thought the argument of the Superintendent of Schools should be shown false; that he granted separate schools as a sort of blow-pipe, a safety valve, not for the sake of education, but of preventing agitation. The duty of Parliament was to inquire into what means could best be adopted to relieve existing injustice. In the population of the country Catholics were at least one in five; although only represented by one in twenty members. It was, perhaps, not to be wondered at that he had taken an interest in the grievances of the Upper Canadian Catholics. The motion of the hon. member for Prescott, however, entirely removed any diffidence which he might have had. In reference to the motion, he might however say, that there was no difficulty in the working of the school system in Lower Canada, with but one exception. However, if the motion referred to Lower Canada only, he would vote for it; for, if the Protestant community in Lower Canada were not dissatisfied, why could we not take a lesson from them? Why need we go to Ireland or to Belgium to see how it worked there?

Mr. Allison—What difference is there between the law in Lower and Upper Canada?
Mr. McGee—It did not suit his purpose to tell. [Oh! oh!] There had never yet been a Parliamentary Committee of enquiry; we had allowed our own servants to tell us the story, and give us their own version of it. Yet this was a most important subject, costing very much indeed, and it was wrong to depend on external information only. [Hear, and oh!] Since 1831, in England, hardly a session had passed without the granting of committees of enquiry into the British School system, by both Houses or by one or other of them, and the best men had been glad to serve. During the present session of the Imperial Parliament, the Lords had granted a committee. The Imperial Government had very able employes and very able reports; they had Sir James K. Shuttleworth at the head of the Board, yet they had not been content to legislate on the mere suggestions

of any of their own subalterns. He thought that, perhaps, during the present session little could be done in the matter, but an opportunity could be afforded of giving all parties and persons of all creeds the privilege of stating their views. Much might be done to remove this subject from the arena of party politics, and this would be a valuable result. For his part he would say that he thought the parental right to educate children as they might think fit was undoubted, and a separate school should be allowed to be supported by any class, however small. But let parents be examined before the Committee, let them, the principals be heard. One of the local superintendants who were, of course, more agents—56 from the were clergymen, mostly of the one denomination, the Wesleyan. These were not in a position to give a fair and broad report of the condition of the whole community any more than 56 doctors or 56 lawyers would be. He was quite willing to admit that no secular system was perfect, that much could be borrowed by every country from others, but this made for his view. Within the last century, many systems of public education had been in vogue in most countries, which had fallen and given way to others. So that any man who thought he had invented a perfect system, would be blessed with a wonderful amount of self-complacency. Dogmatizers were generally found the unsafe of the good; and in spite of all that had been said about the perfection of our system, he thought there was much for a committee to do. He might say, as a Catholic member, that it was the duty of the century—most onerous and most glorious—to spread education to the widest possible limit, and none would co-operate in this design more willingly than himself. The hon. member for Toronto had said, last session, that all Churches had been deficient in their endeavours to educate. He (Mr. McGee) disagreed with this. He thought even the hon. gentleman's own Church had done its utmost to educate the people. All Churches had been good educators. But this was the only age in which general education had been possible. The steam press had first made it possible. And, to aid it, he proposed to vote that a committee should be appointed. Surely, neither the gentlemen on one side, nor those on the other, were ready to vote down enquiry on this subject.

Mr. Simard, seconded by Mr. Patrick then moved the adjournment of the House which was carried.

Our readers will not fail to observe, and to bear in mind, that all the attacks upon our Catholic institutions—our Schools, Convents, and Asylums—proceed from the leading Orangemen, and not from the party usually designated "Clear Grits;" from Gowan, Ferguson, and other members of that "secret" organization, for whose incorporation our Catholic Ministerialists deemed it their duty to vote. Not that we would insinuate even that the "Clear Grits" are favourably disposed towards us; for, if they are less obtrusive in their hostility than are the Orangemen, it is not because they love us more. But we allude to the circumstance as an ample refutation of the statement, that the Orangemen are less dangerous allies for Catholics, than are the followers of George Brown. The truth is that with neither can the honest Catholic form any kind of connection; and that if both—"Clear Grits" and Orangemen—are equally hostile towards us, the latter are by far the more dangerous; both because of their compact organization, which enables them to act with greater precision; and because of their occasional hypocritical profession of good will and liberality, by which some silly persons have allowed themselves to be duped. To dispel their hallucinations however upon this point, it should be sufficient to remind them that all the attacks upon our Catholic institutions during the present Session have proceeded from the Orangemen; acting of course under the orders of the chiefs of their infamous, because secret and oath-bound, Society. The Bill for the Incorporation of another secret society—*The Good Templars*—was rejected by a majority of 59 against 17, on the 1st instant. This Society has we believe no political character whatever.

FACTS AND FIGURES ver. FANCIES AND FICTIONS.

As we expected, the *British Whig* does not attempt an answer to the questions propounded to him by the TRUE WITNESS of the 18th ult.; wherein we asked of our Protestant cotemporary, how we were to reconcile the theory that Protestantism tends to promote purity of morals, with the fact, established by Protestant statistics, that in the most Protestant country in Europe, "nearly every tenth Scotsman is a bastard?" Instead of attempting to reconcile that theory, with these facts, the *Whig* boldly asserts—without adducing however a shadow of evidence in support of his assertions—that "the most unchaste of woman-kind are the females of South America, and those of Spain, Portugal and Italy do not stand much higher in the scale of chastity; while the women of Greece, and of the Greek Islands especially, are proverbial for purity of life. Is it?" asks the *Whig*—"because the former are all Catholics, and the latter all Schismatics?"

Before attempting an explanation of the phenomenon, we must have proof of the truth of the facts as stated by the *Whig*; a proof of the same order as those which we have adduced in evidence of the moral condition of Protestant Scotland. The facts in the latter case are supported not by Catholic, but by Protestant testimony; not by hearsay, or a report of the casual impressions of Catholic tourists, but by the official statistics of a Protestant Government.—We require therefore, proof of precisely the same order and the same strength as to the morality of the Catholics of South America, Spain, Portugal and Italy, before we will condescend even to take the question propounded to us by the *Whig* into consideration. When these proofs, when the official statistics of the last named countries shall be before us, then, but not before, will we attempt to give an explanation of the moral phenomena, which the *Whig*

calls upon us to account for, but in whose existence we do not at present believe. It is for him however to prove his allegations against Catholic morality; and by proofs of the same nature and force as those by us adduced in support of our allegations against Protestant morality. We have adduced official and exclusively Protestant proofs in support of our statements; and we demand therefore from the *Whig* that he shall in like manner give us official and exclusively Catholic testimony—i.e., the testimony of Catholic writers and Catholic Governments—in support of his assertions.

We have the more right to insist upon this in the case of remote communities like those of South America, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, because we have it in our power to prove the unscrupulous mendacity of the Protestant press of Canada, when treating of the same subject—viz., the comparative morality of Catholic and Protestant communities—at home, and at their very doors. Thus last week we noticed a statement that appeared in the *Montreal Witness*, and has been reproduced by the *British Whig* and other Kingston journals; to the effect that, since the 1st of January, 1859, to the month of March, there had been born within the Lying-in Wards of the Kingston Hospital, Seventy-seven—77—illegitimate children of Catholic mothers, against Twenty-one—21—illegitimate births during the same period amongst the Protestant inmates of the above named Asylum.

This statement has elicited from a gentleman of Kingston, who sends us his name, the following statistics of the Kingston Hospital; statistics which give the lie to the calumnies of the anonymous writer in the *Montreal Witness*; and which should warn us against ever placing any confidence in statements coming from mere Protestant sources. However, the letter of our Kingston correspondent will speak for itself; and we therefore invite our readers' careful attention to its contents:—

"FACTS AND FIGURES."

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Kingston, 4th April, 1859.

Sir—Last week there appeared a communication in the *Daily News* and *Daily British Whig*, taken from the *Montreal Witness*, and signed "M. D.," written for the purpose of casting aspersions on the Catholic population of this city. I cannot however allow it to pass without exposing the misstatements with which it abounds. It is said that Dr. Horatio Yates is the author of the production; but it is indeed difficult to understand how it is that a member of a respectable profession could possibly lend himself to the perpetration of so ungenerous and unwarrantable an attack on the chastity of Catholic women. The Doctor has the reputation of being a zealous and devout Protestant; it is for the public to judge what claim "M. D." has to the character of a gentleman and a man of honor.

The following is an extract alleged by him to be taken from the Books of the Kingston Hospital, as an evidence of the immorality of the Catholic, as compared with that of the Protestant women of Kingston:—

EXTRACT.—No. of illegitimate births in the Lying-in Wards of the Kingston Hospital, from January 1859, to March 1859, with the mother's religion:—

Church of Rome.....	77
England.....	13
Methodist.....	5
Presbyterian.....	2
Baptist.....	1

Upon reading the above pretended extract, and feeling convinced of its utter falsity, I at once applied to a respectable Physician of this city for a statement of the whole number of births by Catholic mothers—legitimate and illegitimate—in the Lying-in Wards of the Kingston Hospital, from the first day of January, 1856, to the present date; the following is the result:—

EXTRACT.—No. of Catholic women confined in the Lying-in Wards of the Kingston Hospital, from 1st January, 1856, to 2nd April, 1859, with their places of residence:—

	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	Total.
City of Kingston.....	3	3	9	3	18
Other places in Upper Canada.....	6	5	5	3	19
Lower Canada.....	0	2	2	0	4
United States.....	2	0	1	0	3
Total.....					44

Making the total number *Forty-four*, extending over a period of THREE YEARS and THREE MONTHS; and of this number only *SIXTEEN* were residents of Kingston, seven of the latter number being inmates of the House of Industry!

Now, Sir, take this statement and compare it with that of Doctor Horatio Yates, which places the number of births of illegitimate children by Catholic mothers at *Seventy-seven* for *three months*, and you will at once see the unfairness of Dr. Horatio Yates' statement. Nor does it rest here; for I find on referring to the Books of the Hospital that no record, entry, statement, or classification of the illegitimate births in the Lying-in Wards, is made! Only the names, residences and religion of the patients are given. Judging from the names of the persons confined, and from a strict enquiry which I caused to be instituted, more than half of these Catholic women were married and their husbands alive, at the time of their accouchement! These are facts which cannot be gainsayed, and if necessary can be substantiated under oath. I enclose my card in the event of further proofs being required.

VERITAS.

Here we have a plain statement of facts; which, if impugned, can be easily and speedily verified by application to the authorities of Kingston Hospital. We call therefore upon the writers in the *Witness*, the *Whig*, and *Daily News*, to meet these facts if they dare; or by their silence to admit, that they have been convicted as liars and slanderers. M. D., whose

real name our correspondent states to be Dr. Horatio Yates, of Kingston, is particularly interested in this matter; and in order that he may not plead ignorance of the serious imputations cast upon his honor and veracity, by our correspondent *Veritas*, we have taken the precaution of forwarding him a copy of this week's TRUE WITNESS.

To another writer in the *British Whig*, of the 4th instant, over the signature of "An Indignant Englishman," but whose proper title is "A Mendacious Slanderer of Irishwomen," we have two or three words to say respecting the superior morality of his brother and sister Protestants. In the first place, we would direct his attention to the abominable and immoral advertisements which disfigure the first and fourth pages of the selfsame Protestant journal as that in which his communication appears; advertisements which no editor, unless at heart a pimp or an agent for a brothel, would allow into his paper; and whose presence but too clearly indicates the very depraved tastes and practices of those to whom the paper in which they appear is addressed. Did we need any additional proof of the immorality of, and of the prevalence of child-murder amongst, a large portion of our Protestant fellow citizens, we should find it in the infamous advertisements which fill the columns of so many of our Protestant cotemporaries; and in the alacrity with which, for a pecuniary consideration, the *British Whig* and others of his stamp, give their aid to circulate the vilest literature of the brothel.

And in the second place, we would call "An Indignant Englishman's" attention to a speech lately reported in the *London Times*, as having been delivered at one of the meetings of the "National Association of Social Science," held during the autumn of last year. The speaker was a Protestant clergyman—the Rev. T. P. Kirkman; and he asserted, as of his own knowledge, and as a fact of which he had had repeated experience, that, in the several districts of England with which he was familiar, "unmarried mothers" were not only not looked upon as degraded, but were actually in demand as wives. Here are his very words, as reported by the *London Times*:—

"So much was this the case, that if a young woman happened to have had one or two children before marriage, it was actually an advantage to her in securing a match among many of the practical husbands of that district of Lancashire."

This is the testimony of an Englishman, a Protestant and a clergyman; and so hideous, so inconceivably beastly is the state of the morals amongst the laboring classes in Protestant England therein revealed, that we cannot presume to add one word thereunto. We would content ourselves by commending it to the serious attention of "An Indignant Englishman," when next he shall feel inclined to institute a comparison betwixt the morals of Protestant England, and those of Popish Ireland.

With this we shall take our leave of the writers in the *Whig*, the *Daily News* and the *Montreal Witness* for the present; reminding them, however, that we have not yet done with the Kingston Hospital statistics; and that they are now bound, either to make good the truth of their assertions with respect to the number of illegitimate births in that institution since the first of January of the present year; or else to submit patiently to be publicly branded as convicted liars and slanderers.

DIVORCE.—A few weeks ago the *Toronto Leader*—a Ministerial journal of Upper Canada—threw out strong hints as to the probability of a change in the laws affecting the sexual unions of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada; and in a late issue of the *Montreal Pilot*, likewise a Ministerial organ, we find the same subject treated of again, with reference to the Bill now pending for legalising adultery in the case of Mr. John McLean:—

"We shall watch"—says the *Pilot*—"with much interest, the progress of the McLean Bill, as tending to use it as a first step to lead our readers up to an extended consideration of the general question of Divorce."—*Pilot*, 26th ult.

This Bill is, in short, to form a precedent;—and is intended to be used "as a first step" towards the introduction of the same anti-Christian system of legislation, as that which has long obtained in the United States, and which unfortunately of late years has been established in Great Britain. And in that it is so intended to be used, the *Pilot* should see a sufficient reason for the opposition offered by "Messrs. Cimon, Langevin, McGee and others" to the particular Divorce Bill now before Parliament. As citizens they have the right, and as Catholics it is their duty, to oppose the very "first step" in the downward career which our Ministerial cotemporary seems so anxious to urge upon us. This much in explanation of the active interference of Catholic members in, what the *Pilot* pretends "is a matter of Protestant concernment only."—*Pilot*, 26th ult.

The *Pilot* goes on to say however, that he does not know in what light the heads of the Catholic Church view Protestant marriages; but—"if we may judge from the scoffs of the *True Witness*"—he concludes that:—"Our marital relationships are by too many Ca-

tholics looked upon as no better than so many forms of law-sanctioned concubinage."

Here our cotemporary is in error. The Catholic Church looks upon the marriages of Protestants as indissoluble unions; as indissoluble, because Christian unions; and as Christian, and therefore as holy, because contracted betwixt baptised persons, in obedience to the laws of God. In that we contend for the indissolubility of those unions, we assert them to be valid and truly Christian marriages; for it is of that union of the sexes only, which God Himself instituted, which Christ Himself raised to the dignity of a Sacrament, and which the Church calls marriage, that the condition of indissolubility can be predicated. Marriage and concubinage differ from one another in this—That marriage is essentially indissoluble, and that the other is not.—A sexual union that upon any pretence whatever can be dissolved, is not Christian matrimony, but concubinage. Now we contend that the marriages of Protestants are indissoluble, no matter what Courts of Law, Acts of Parliament, Police Magistrates, or Bun-bailiffs may say to the contrary; we therefore cannot be justly accused of either scoffing at the "marital relationships" of our Protestant fellow-citizens, or of treating those unions as "so many forms of law-sanctioned concubinage."

No! it is not the TRUE WITNESS, but the *Pilot* who thus treats Protestant marriages; who seeks to degrade them to the level of mere civil contracts; and who by making complete elimination of the divine or spiritual element therein, does his utmost to deprive them of that which alone distinguishes them from the sexual unions of the heathen—of that which alone renders them more worthy of respect than a contract for the delivery of a specified amount of dry goods or molasses. Thus the *Pilot* says in its article under review:—

"Among Catholics marriage is a Sacrament; with Protestants it is a civil contract, and nothing more."—*Pilot*.

Now a bargain for the delivery of so many barrels of Pork (Mess) is a civil contract; but with Protestants, marriage "is a civil contract, and nothing more;" therefore, in Protestant marriages there is nothing more holy, or consequently with more claims upon our reverence, than there is in a bargain for the delivery of so much Pork. How then, if the premises laid down by the *Pilot*, be true—(which we deny)—can he expect that we should entertain any respect for Protestant marriages?

But it is not true as a general rule—and we thank God, and respect Protestants for it—that with them marriage "is a civil contract, and nothing more." With almost all the sects it is esteemed something more; and that "something more" is a divine or spiritual, and not a mere human or civil, element. There are still, we say, many Protestants who hold that in marriage the contracting parties are united by God; and that, as He has united them, so He only can put them asunder. What for instance—says the Church of England?—one certainly of the most numerous and respectable of the Protestant sects:—

"Oh God!"—says the Anglican Liturgy—"who did appoint that out of man, woman should take her beginning; and, knitting them together, didst teach that it should never be lawful to put asunder those whom by Matrimony thou hast made one: Oh God who has consecrated the State of Matrimony to such an excellent mystery that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church: Look mercifully, &c., &c."

There are the words in which the Anglican minister invokes God's blessing upon the newly married couple before him; and from these words we may gather three things as to the doctrines of the Protestant Church of England as to Matrimony:—

1. That it holds that matrimony is a divine, and not a mere civil, contract; and that it is God, and not man, who joins husband and wife together.

2. That it holds, with the Catholic Church, that matrimony so instituted and contracted is, by the express teachings of God Himself, indissoluble.

3. That in substance, if not in name, it holds Matrimony to be a Christian Sacrament, or an outward and sensible sign of an inward and super-sensible grace—i.e.—of Christ's mystical and spiritual union with His Church. With what face then does the *Pilot* assert that, "with Protestants, marriage is a civil contract and nothing more?" This much in our own defence; and in refutation of the charge of scoffing at, and speaking disrespectfully of the "marital relationships" of Protestants, "as no better than so many forms of law-sanctioned concubinage."

The truth is, that it is the *Pilot* who treats those unions with disrespect; it is the *Pilot* who brands them as concubinage—as indeed they would be, were it not for the divine or spiritual element therein, and which raises them above the level of mere civil contracts; whilst it is the TRUE WITNESS who respects those unions; who treats them as true and holy Marriages, and, therefore, as indissoluble, because made, not by man alone, but by God; and who would wish to exalt them in the opinion of the Protestant world, by impressing on it the divine command, "whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." From