

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 696 Craig Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLBERG, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country Subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies 3d.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his subscription from that date.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1869.

ECCLIESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

APRIL—1869.

Friday, 9—St. Vincent Ferrer, C.
Saturday, 10—Of the Immaculate Conception.
Sunday, 11—Second after Easter.
Monday, 12—St. Leo P. O. D.
Tuesday, 13—St. Hermenegild, M.
Wednesday, 14—St. Tiburtius and Comp., MM.
Thursday, 15—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

We have nothing this week to report as to the progress of Mr. Gladstone's Irish measure.—From the Continent of Europe there is little of interest to record.

Winter still holds its own, and gives the lie to the Almanac, which tells us that we are now well on in the month of April—though to judge from the thermometer, and the aspect of the country, one would think that we were in the middle of January. Still even a Canadian winter must come to an end; and we may hope therefore that in a few weeks more it shall have yielded to the breath of Spring.

EASY LESSONS IN IRISH HISTORY,
FOR THE USE OF THE "MONTREAL WITNESS."

In our last we showed on Protestant authority, that down to 1641 the Catholic Irish had been guilty of no acts which can be qualified as "massacres;" that though for nigh a century they had been crushed beneath a cruel Penal Code, which made the exercise of their religion a capital crime, they had done nothing but what in the opinion of Hallam, they had a natural right to do: nothing but what upon far less provocation English and Scotch Protestants have done: and that the rebellion of 1641, with all its horrors, was the "consequence" of the cruel penal laws, and the tyrannical spoliation exercised upon the ancient landed proprietors of Ireland, by the English government.

In 1641, the Irish could bear it no longer.—England was ripe for revolt: Scotland was taking up arms against its king: and it seemed that the day of Ireland's opportunity had at last dawned. With grievances far more serious than those of either the English or the Scotch, the Irish rose in arms against the aliens who had robbed them of their lands, and imposed on them a religion which they hated. The great rebellion of 1641 broke out; and as Hallam says, its primary "cause"—mind that word Mr. Editor of the *Witness*—are to be found:—

"In the penal laws as to religion which pressed on almost the whole people, and in the systematic iniquity which despoiled them of their possessions. They could not be expected to miss such an occasion of revolt."

This revolt broke out with a furious onslaught on the Scots and English, in Ulster, in which a large number of these intruders, and despoilers of the Irish, were, so it is said, put to the sword. The numbers so slain in a moment of fury, by a long persecuted race are very uncertain. According to the Protestant historian Warner, quoted by Hallam as one "who may perhaps, upon the whole, be reckoned the best modern authority," twelve thousand Protestants are the "almost" that can have lost their lives during the first two years of the rebellion, except losses in war—and of these "only one third," or say four thousand, by murder or massacre. Catholic writers contest the truth of Warner's statistics: and contend that though there may have been, and probably were isolated acts of bloodshed, there was no massacre, properly so called at all: but it may readily be admitted—that in the hour of their power the long persecuted, and dispossessed Irish Catholics of Ulster may have in some measure retaliated upon their Protestant persecutors and alien spoilers, and given the latter to taste of the bitter chalice which for nigh a century had been forced down their throats. But without hazarding any opinion of our own on the disputed point—whether there were any massacres properly so called; and for the sake of argument admitting that in the first two years of the rebellion some 4,000 Scots and English who had dispossessed the Irish of Ulster of their property, were murdered or massacred—we contend that it was not the work of Catholics generally; and that the inciting cause was not religious fanaticism, but the firm determination of desper-

ate men, made landless and homeless by alien adventurers, to recover possession, at any cost, of the property which rightfully belonged to them and of which they had been wrongfully dispossessed.

The massacre was not general. It was confined to Ulster, and to those other districts in which the legitimate proprietors had been dispossessed of their lands, and driven forth to starve. For remember; that in some parts, "the native Irish were not to be admitted as tenants" even upon the lands belonging to them, and to their fathers before them. It was, to use a slang phrase of the day, an agrarian, rather than a religious crime, and was loudly condemned by the body of the Irish Catholic population. Again we quote from Hallam:—

"It was certainly not the crime of the Catholics generally: nor perhaps in the other provinces of Ireland are they chargeable with more cruelty than their opponents."—Hallam's *Const. Hist.*

For Leland, quoted by Hallam, refers to original depositions in Trinity College, Dublin, whence it appears that the Scotch soldiers "in garrison in Carrickfergus sallied out in January, when the rebellion was at its height, and slaughtered a few families of unoffending natives in Lale Magee."

And again in the foot notes to the chapter of the *Const. Hist.* from which we are quoting we are told on the authority of Leland and of Warner, both Protestants, that:—

"The Catholic confederates spoke with abhorrence of the Ulster massacre."

And that:—
"They—the Irish—behaved in many parts with humanity; nor indeed do we find frequent instances of violence except in those counties where the proprietors had been dispossessed."

This is the testimony of their enemies, and fully establishes our thesis that the "massacre" of 1641, was not a Catholic crime: that it was not general all over Ireland, but was limited to Ulster and the other districts in which the rightful proprietors had been lately dispossessed of their lands; that it was condemned by the Catholic body: and that it must therefore be classed under the category of agrarian, rather than of religious crimes.

And this too, is the solitary crime, with which after a century of Penal Laws, the Catholics of Ireland can be reproached even by their most embittered enemies. The annals of no other oppressed nation, of no other persecuted people are so pure, or so free from bloody reprisals against their oppressors.

But it is not our object to defend, or palliate the rebellion, and the so called massacre of 1641. Our thesis is—that this, the one massacre which preceded the cruel legislation of the post revolutionary period, was itself not the cause, but the consequence of the still more ancient Penal Laws; and cannot therefore be urged by any one except a dunce, or a knave, as an excuse for their imposition. For, in the words of Hallam, the rebellion of 1641, in which the Ulster massacre was an episode, was the consequence of,—
"the penal laws as to religion, which pressed on almost the whole people, and the systematic iniquity which despoiled them of their possessions."—*Const. Hist.*, c. 18.

The atrocities of Cromwell are of course apologized for by the English on the grounds of the great rebellion of 1641, and its concomitants. But no such plea can be urged, or ever was urged by statesmen, for the Penal Laws of the post revolutionary period, and which were enacted subsequent to the conquest of Ireland by the Anglo-Dutch, and to the Treaty of Limerick: laws which it would be a waste of time to abuse, and of which Hallam speaks in these terms:—

"To have exterminated the Catholics by the sword, or expelled them like the Moriscos of Spain would have been little more repugnant to justice and humanity, but incomparably more politic."

The only excuse that could have been urged for this cruel code, for the violation of the express stipulations of the Treaty of Limerick, would be that the Irish Catholics themselves had first violated its provisions: or had, by their acts of violence towards Protestants, absolved the latter from the obligations it imposed on them as towards Catholics, and furnished valid grounds for a rigorous course of legislative repression. But this excuse cannot be urged; for from the day of the signing of the Treaty down to the rebellion of '98, the Irish never furnished the slightest pretext even for the cruel legislation of the eighteenth century. This in the most emphatic language Macaulay asserts:—

"A rising of the Irishry against the Englishry was no more to be apprehended than a rising of the women and children against the men."—C. 17, vol. 4 *Hist. of England*.

To this in a foot note is appended the testimony to the same effect of Swift, writing at the very time when the Penal Code was in force, and was daily receiving additional articles. "If we" the Protestant clergy, so wrote Swift in 1708 on the Sacramental Tests—"were under any real fear of the Papists in this kingdom—*Ireland*—it would be hard to think us so stupid as not to be equally apprehensive with others, since we are likely to be the greater and more immediate sufferers; but on the contrary, we look upon them to be altogether as inconsiderable as the women and children."

Not only, therefore, is it evident that from the

* That the Treaty was violated Macaulay admits in a note to c. 18, 4th vol. of his *History of England*.

Revolution to the latter end of the XVIII. century there was no real danger of a rising of Irish Papists; but it is also evident that amongst Protestants in Ireland, and even amongst those who by their peculiar position as members of the dominant church were most clearly marked out as the objects of Papist hostility, no dread even, no apprehension of any massacre, rising or rebellion of the Irish Papists was ever entertained. It is therefore manifestly false to pretend, as does the *Witness*, that the Penal Laws of the eighteenth century were imposed in dread of a repetition of the sanguinary events of the first half of the seventeenth century.

The *Witness* will please notice that in replying to his attempted palliation of the Penal Laws we have advanced nothing of our own: but have contented ourselves with quoting verbatim from Protestant historians—relying on whose testimony, we contend, without fear of refutation—1st. That the Penal Laws preceded—and were the cause of any acts of retaliation of which the Irish may have been guilty against their oppressors in the seventeenth century: and 2nd, that the Penal Laws imposed on Catholics in the eighteenth century, were not so imposed as a measure of protection to Protestants, or from any fear or apprehension of a rising, or massacre of Protestants by Irish Papists—for no such fears or apprehensions existed even amongst the Protestant clergy in Ireland.

The *Montreal Witness* of the 1st inst., alluding to the emigration from Lower Canada to the United States, asks, "What do the clergy think it is that their people are fleeing from?"

How any one can ask such a question who has eyes in his head, and knows how to use them—who will look around him on our snow-covered fields, on our ice-bound rivers and streams, in this month of April, when the earth should be clad in verdure, and the air redolent of the sweet perfumes of flowers—is to us incomprehensible. From what is it that in all ages men have fled, when they have streamed from the cold inhospitable regions of the North, to the more fertile and genial plains of the South? From what did the Norsemen flee, who long centuries ago, descended from their fields of almost eternal ice, and snow, to the garden lands of Europe?

It is a law of nature, which in vain can we hope to resist or to repeal, that the tide of emigration will flow from the cold to the warm climes; from North to South in the Northern Hemisphere, and from East to West on the Continent of America—where, as they recede from the Atlantic, the isothermal lines steadily advance to a higher latitude. It is from the long winter, from the desolation of ice and snow, that Canadians flee to more favored lands; where the winters are shorter, the summer longer, where spring opens earlier, and where the cruel blasts of an Arctic winter are not felt till later in the autumn. This is what, most reluctantly, French Canadians are fleeing from; for they for the most part dearly love their native land, and above all its social and religious institutions.

But alas! the daily increasing difficulty of earning therein their daily bread, a difficulty which is the result of Canada's unfortunate climatic conditions—compels the sons of the soil to abandon the homes of their youth, their fathers graves, and the parish church, the sound of whose bells they so dearly love—to seek in lands to the south and west of them, the means of sustenance. Nor is this process of emigration peculiar to Lower Canada. It is at work in the North Eastern States of the Union, from which for years past, there has poured a steady stream of emigration towards the more favored districts of the West. This emigration does not attract so much attention as does that from Canada, because it does not involve such a rupture of national, social and religious ties, as does that of the emigration of the Catholic French Canadian to the Protestant United States; but it is none the less real for all that, and already its effects are noticeable in the diminution of the native Yankee population.

Besides, in Lower Canada, where the practice of feticide has not been raised to the dignity of a national institution, as it has been in the United States, the population increases in a far greater ratio than it does amongst the Yankees. Canadians marry earlier than do the latter, and their unions are also more prolific; and in consequence, on the already too minutely subdivided soil of Lower Canada, there is no place for this natural increase of their numbers. Agriculture as a rule, is but a poorly remunerative occupation in such a climate as ours; and of other industries or manufactures we have but few, because, owing to the exclusive tariff of our neighbors, there is no market for their products.

In these, our physical conditions which no legislation can modify, and in these alone, are to be found the causes of the emigration from Lower Canada; for our moral conditions, wherein they differ from those of the United States, are far superior to those of the latter. Life, and property, and the liberty of the individual have here stronger guarantees. Judge Lynch has not yet, thank God! deposed the ministers of justice appointed by our Queen; and though we have amongst us crime enough to

make us huddle as before God, yet when we contrast our moral condition with that of the United States, we have abundant reasons to be thankful that we are not as our neighbors are, and to be loyal to our institutions. The physical advantages of the United States we admit: their moral advantages we altogether deny.

What is sauce for the goose is not always, according to Protestant philosophy, sauce for the gander. Godless education, or education in which all distinctively Christian doctrine is ignored, is a bad sauce for the Hindoo, but a first rate one for the Papist.

Godless education is bad for the Hindoo; so at least we find it stated in an article copied by the *Montreal Witness* from another Protestant paper, the *Christian Advocate*, in which the following passage occurs:—

Some thirty years ago the Indian Government, under the auspices of Lord Ellenborough, established a series of godless institutions, in which young men were thoroughly educated and in which Christianity was entirely ignored. Their minds were gifted and logical; they could speak English with elegance and precision; they sent to Europe for the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, Bolingbroke, and Hume, and imbibed their principles, and became propagandists of their infernal doctrines. Seldom in the world's history has it ever read such a lesson of the effects of godless education as in the recent history of India. That incarnate fiend, that Satanic hero of the massacre of Gwalpore, Neka Sahib war, upon the best authority, educated upon this principle. He had all the refinements of the most finished and elegant gentleman, but he had the heart of a demon; and to-day the blood of women and innocents cries out from the dust of India's palmy plain against the dread folly of divorcing intellect from conscience.—[*Christian Advocate*.]

On the other hand, Godless education, or education in which the distinctive doctrines of Christianity are ignored, is just the thing for Ireland and Canada, where there is a mixed population of Catholics and Protestants. That which in India is loudly denounced as the "dread folly of divorcing intellect from conscience," is in the case of the first named countries extolled as the noblest product of modern philosophy.

Why this contradiction? Why should that be desirable in Canada, which has produced such fatal effects in India? How shall we account for this strange inconsistency in the utterances of our Protestant contemporaries?

The inconsistency is rather apparent than real; the solution of the enigma is this.

Whilst in India, the object of the Government is to give such education to its Hindoo subjects as shall make them docile British subjects, the great object of the promoters of State education, whether in Ireland or in Canada, is to pervert Catholics. But to make the Hindoo a docile British subject, it is necessary to convert him to Christianity, and therefore in his case education should be religious. On the other hand, it is enough if the Catholic be so trained as to throw off his faith, though of course infidelity, or the total rejection of Christianity, is the inevitable consequence; and therefore Godless education, which generally leaves its subjects infidels, is an admirable sauce for cooking the Catholic gander without, though it by no means suits the Hindoo goose.

As the devil is popularly held to be able to quote Scripture for his purpose, so can Protestants imitate very closely the language of the Catholic Church, when their interests are at stake. Betwixt the denunciation by the *Christian Advocate*, as quoted by the *Montreal Witness*, of "Godless education;" of "the dread folly of divorcing intellect from conscience"—and the condemnation by the Catholic Church of the same educational system, as "altogether dangerous to faith and morals," there is no substantial difference. The evangelical editor is in theory, at one with the Pope, and Romish Bishops as to the effects of such an education, of such a divorce: and if in the case of mixed communities such as those of Ireland, and of Canada, he refuse to carry his theories into practice, and insist upon the adoption of the Godless system, of a system "in which Christianity is entirely ignored," it is not from any intellectual defect on his part; not from any doubts as to the consequences of such "divorcing intellect from conscience;" but simply because the consequences which in the case of Hindoos he deprecates, are those which he aims at in the case of Romanists. Proselytism, no matter what its advocates assert to the contrary, is the great object of all Protestant supporters of State Schoolism; and if in India their object is to make Hindoos Christians, it is enough for their purpose if in Canada they can transform Papists into infidels.

The Education Bill for L. Canada has passed. Whether its authors have not been a trifle too liberal? is a question that presents itself to many of our contemporaries; but as we have no wish to offer opposition to our local government, which, if not perfect, is better probably than any government that would replace it—we simply accept the measure in the hopes that it may work well; that it may remove any jealousy of the majority, that the minority of Lower Canada may have hitherto entertained: and that it may promote and perpetuate peace and good will betwixt Protestants and Catholics. Should it accomplish this, we shall readily overlook its other defects.

We do not expect however that the great liberality of a Catholic majority towards a Protestant minority in this Province, will have the least effect in Upper Canada, or that it will in any manner tend to induce the Protestant majority in that section to act with liberality, or justice towards the Catholic minority. In this opinion Protestant members of our own local legislature coincide with us; for we see that the Hon Mr. Ross, in his remarks upon the motion for the second reading of the Bill, expressly asserted that:—All knew that in Upper Canada the Roman Catholics were not treated with the same liberality as Protestants in this Province.

Still, because the Protestants of Upper Canada are illiberal and unjust, that it is no reason why we, Catholics of Lower Canada, should refrain from doing what is right. This, and perhaps a trifle more, M. Chauveau has done; and hoping that our Protestant fellow-subjects will accept the measure in the same liberal spirit as that in which it was conceived, we flatter ourselves that all causes of discord betwixt the several elements of our mixed community are now, and for ever removed.

The *Daily News* is eloquently indignant with Mr. Gladstone's Bill for disendowing the Irish Protestant Church, and asserts in the most unqualified terms the sanctity of ecclesiastical endowments. This would come with a better grace from our Protestant contemporary if he had shown himself equally indignant at the spoliation perpetrated upon the Church in Italy by the Piedmontese government, and by the revolutionists of Spain upon the convents and religious establishments of the last named country. Disendowment in the eyes of the *Montreal Daily News* appears wrong only when directed against Protestant ecclesiastical property: and though by no eloquence "can it be made to appear that the British Government have any moral right to divert to other purposes the proceeds of property bequeathed for the maintenance of the Church," no argument at all appears necessary to prove the right of the revolutionary government of Spain to divert to secular purposes the religious endowments of that country.

The *Daily News* seems to forget that the rights of private property are recognised by Mr. Gladstone, in dealing with the property of the Irish Protestant Church. Not only does he propose to leave it in undisturbed possession of the fabrics—the churches and cathedrals built by Catholics—and much of the property which was iniquitously bestowed upon it by the State out of the plunder of the Catholic Church: but he leaves it in possession of all that it has since certainly acquired by private endowments. Of the property accruing from the latter source, actually held by the Establishment, there are reasonable doubts as to the purport of the donors: and therefore, as it was necessary to lay down some fixed rule for the application of his principle.—Mr. Gladstone has assumed that all private endowments since the date of the Restoration of Charles II. were undoubtedly designed for the support of the existing Protestant church. Of all these endowments therefore he proposes to leave it in undisturbed possession: and only in those cases in which the intentions of the original donors are obscure, does he propose to secularise any portion of the Protestant ecclesiastical property accruing from private endowments. How wide the difference betwixt the tender treatment of the Irish Protestant church which the *Daily News* so fiercely denounces—though the greater part of its property was stolen from the Catholic Church: and the spoliation of the Church in Italy and Spain by the Liberals whose acts however, the *Daily News* contemplates with bland approval.

What about the latest born of England's Penal Laws against Catholics—the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill? In the analysis of Mr. Gladstone's measures for establishing religious liberty and religious equality in Ireland, we have not seen any allusion to this very important question.—And yet it is evident that it must be dealt with in one way or another. As usual three courses or modes of dealing with it present themselves. Mr. Gladstone may retain the law on the Statute Book as it stands: or as a second course he may extend its penal provisions so as to make them applicable to all Protestant ecclesiastics assuming territorial titles—as for instance "Archbishop of Dublin," or "Bishop of Cork." Or as his third course he may repeal the law in the case of Ireland, in which case he will be soon obliged to repeal it in the case of England.

No doubt the question will be discussed when Mr. Gladstone's Bill is before the Committee; and no doubt all the Catholic members of the House will insist that as before the Law, Catholic Bishops in Ireland shall in every respect, be put on an equal footing with the Protestant Bishops: that if the State tolerate, or recognise the assumption of territorial titles in the case of the latter, it shall tolerate and recognise in its official acts the assumption of similar titles by the former, or Catholic Bishops. If this be not granted, Mr. Gladstone's Bill will be but a delusion, a mockery, and a snare: Protestant As-