

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 21 "

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

Single Copies, 3d.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 2, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The tidings from India which reach us by the steamer *Jwa*, are more cheering than any received since the outbreak of the Sepoy mutiny. The British troops, under General Havelock, had encountered large bodies of the mutineers, and defeated them in several engagements, taking a large number of prisoners, and capturing their guns. The following is from the *Cork Constitution* of the 17th of last month:—

"Gen. Havelock's force for the reconquest of Cawnpore had in eight days marched 125 miles and fought four actions with Nena Sahib's army against overwhelming odds in point of numbers, and had taken twenty-four guns of light calibre; and that too in the month of July, in India. On the morning of the 17th of July the force marched into Cawnpore. The soul-harrowing spectacle which there presented itself to them beggars description. A whole sale massacre had been perpetrated by the fiend Nena Sahib. Eight officers and ninety men of H. M. 84th Regiment, seventy ladies and one hundred and twenty-one children of H. M. Thirty-second Foot, and the whole European and Christian population of the place, including civilians, merchants, pensioners and their families to the number of four hundred persons, were the victims of this Satan.

The court-yard in front of the Assembly Rooms in which Nena Sahib had fixed his head-quarters, and in which the women had been imprisoned was swimming in blood. A large number of women and children, who had been cruelly spared after the capitulation for a worse fate than instant death, had been barbarously slaughtered on the previous morning; the former had been stripped naked, and then beheaded and thrown into a well, and the latter having been hurled down alive upon their butchered mothers, whose blood reeked on their mangled bodies. Only four escaped—the wife of a merchant and three others.

Gen. Havelock, in a despatch to the Governor-General, says that "Nena Sahib has drowned himself with his family. He had an intention of going to Lucknow, but when he got as far as the river, the cavalry and infantry deserted him. They are all gone off after destroying their arms, to their different homes. Cawnpore is now as quiet as Allahabad."

That Nena Sahib has contrived to cheat the gallows of its legitimate prey, is, no doubt, to be regretted; but, upon the whole, the news from India is reassuring. Sir Colin Campbell is reported as having assumed the command of the army, and the capture of Delhi within a fortnight from the end of July was expected. This however is perhaps premature, for we do not think it probable that that stronghold of the mutineers will be stormed before the arrival of the reinforcements, which can scarcely be expected before the end of September. At Bombay, all was quiet, the panic having entirely subsided.

We have no intention to take part in the political controversy waging betwixt *La Patrie* and *Le Pays*. With the politics of the latter, we, as Catholics, have but little sympathy; and for the other, we entertain a high respect as the advocate of sound Catholic principles. If then we appear to interfere in the wordy warfare which for some time has been carried on in the columns of our cotemporaries, it is because we have, in a certain sense, been appealed to, and indeed quoted by *Le Pays* as favoring his peculiar political principles. We would desire therefore to set ourselves right with both; and with this object only, do we offer to *La Patrie* the following suggestions.

The TRUE WITNESS aims at being essentially a Catholic paper, and eschews all party, or purely secular politics. If it discusses any of the political questions of the day, it does so from a Catholic stand point, and considers them solely in reference to their effects upon the interests of religion, education, and morality. From the paltry squabbles of "office-holders," and "expectant office-holders," it keeps aloof, and is profoundly indifferent to the miserable intrigues of the rival claimants of place and salary. If it condemns certain acts of the present Ministry, it most certainly has never sympathized with the views of those whom *La Patrie* calls *Rouges*; and believing that the interests of the Church are of more importance than those of any political party, it has always endeavored to discountenance the fallacy that it was the first duty of Catholics to support a Ministry which has never missed an occasion to insult and outrage their beloved Mother; and which has constantly refused to do justice to our brethren in Upper Canada, in the matter of separate schools.

*La Patrie* will not, we suppose, offer any excuse for the support given by the members of the present Ministry to the insulting clauses of Mr. Drummond's "Religious Corporations' Bill." By his silence, he will admit that that conduct was inexcusable; worthy therefore of the reprobation of all Catholics; and that in denouncing it, the TRUE WITNESS has but done its duty.

On the subject of the official sanction given by the present Ministry to Orangeism—the sworn

foe, not of the Irish Catholic alone, but of the Catholic Church throughout the world—*La Patrie* is less discreet; and though he would fain shirk the real question at issue, it is clear that, in so far as he dares, he attempts to defend the official reception given by the Governor-General—acting of course by the advice of his Ministers—to the Orangemen of Upper Canada on the 12th of July, 1856. For this purpose, our cotemporary propounds two questions, to both of which we will endeavor to reply. Addressing himself to *Le Pays*, he asks:—

"How should the Governor-General have treated an Orange deputation claiming an audience with His Excellency?" and:

"What steps would the friends of liberty desire that the Ministry, or the public, should take against Orangeism? What mode of repression do they invoke?"

To the first question, we reply by reminding *La Patrie* that the Governor-General of Canada is, or ought to be, the representative of the Queen; and has therefore no right to receive in Canada any deputation which, from high motives of state, would not, in England, be admitted into the presence of his Royal Mistress.

We would remind him—that Orangemen are members of a political society—and of a secret political society—that is of a society whose members are bound by secret oaths, and are known to one another by secret signs and watchwords; that all such societies are alien to the spirit of the British Constitution, and held in abhorrence by the Catholic Church; and that no Ministry in England would dare—we say it advisedly—to recommend their Sovereign to receive officially a deputation from any such society—upon the broad principle that the Queen is the Sovereign of all her people, without distinction of parties.

We would also remind *La Patrie* that so well is this principle understood and acted upon on the other side of the Atlantic—yes, even in misgoverned Ireland—that only a few years ago, gentlemen of high standing in society were by the Lord Lieutenant dismissed from the Commission of the Peace, for having received on another 12th of July, at their private residences, and as private citizens, deputations from the same societies which the Governor-General of Canada received at his official residence, and in his official capacity as Her Majesty's representative.

If our cotemporary has digested the above facts which we have respectfully offered for his consideration, he will not be at a loss for an answer to his first question. He will see that, upon a deputation of Orangemen presenting themselves before him, and demanding an official reception and recognition from the head of the State, the Governor-General of Canada—if mindful of his high position, and the duty which he owed, to her whom he had been chosen to represent, and to those to whom he had been sent as the representative of the fountain of justice—would have replied in some such terms as these:—

"Gentlemen, although I will always be most happy to receive any, or every one of you, as Her Majesty's loyal subjects desiring to testify through me your attachment to her, I cannot receive you when you present yourselves before me as members of an association unknown to the State, and which has therefore no legal status. Put off your Orange insignia, divest yourself of your party character, and as simple British subjects, you shall be made heartily welcome."—This would have been the language of the gentleman, and the British statesman.

"How," asks *La Patrie*—"should the Governor-General have received a deputation of Orangemen?" We reply—that he should have received them as he would have received a deputation of Ribbonmen, or of any other secret political society; that he should have received them as a similar deputation would be received at St. James, or at the Castle in Dublin; and this he, no doubt, would have done, if it had not been for the treacherous counsels of his responsible advisers; who anxious at any price to make a little political capital amongst the rabid Protestants of the Upper Province, hesitated not to offer to the whole Catholic community the grossest of insults—an insult which no Catholic, with the feelings of a gentleman, or the slightest regard for the honor of his Church, will ever forgive or forget.

To the other question—as to "what mode of repression we would invoke against Orangeism?"—we reply, as we have already replied, that we invoke none whatever. We ask no legislative action against it; we demand not even that its members should be discouraged by the State, or that any civil or political disabilities should follow the profession of Orangeism. But this we demand—and we have the right to demand it—that as betwixt Orangeism and Catholicity our rulers shall remain neutral; that if they do not discourage, so neither shall they encourage Orangeism by their favor, or give to it an official sanction which has been refused to it by the legislators and statesmen of Great Britain. We demand finally, that henceforward no Governor-General be permitted to degrade his high office, and to bring the Sovereign whom he represents into contempt, by pursuing a line of policy which in Ireland has been held to disqualify a country gentleman from acting as a simple

magistrate; and we insist that the Ministers who, to subserve their own dirty ends, have not hesitated to offer a wanton and unparalleled insult to Catholics generally, and to Irish Catholics in particular—are not deserving of the confidence and support of any Catholic who respects himself, and loves his Church.

We have now answered the questions put by *La Patrie*; will, our esteemed cotemporary be so kind as to do us a similar favor, by replying to three questions which we put to him:—

1. Are not all secret political societies dangerous to the peace and welfare of the community?

2. Should it not therefore be the duty of every good citizen, and especially of the statesman and legislator, to abstain from giving any encouragement, or official sanction to such dangerous societies?

3. Has not the present Ministry, by counselling the Governor-General, to receive officially a deputation of Orangemen, given a decided encouragement and official sanction to Orangeism—a secret political society—in Canada?

We pause for a reply.

A STRANGE SENTENCE.—We find in the *Montreal Herald* of the 16th ult., the following report of a "Special Sessions of the Peace" held at the Parish of *Pointe aux Trembles* on Saturday the 12th ult.:

"SPECIAL SESSIONS OF THE PEACE." Held at the Parish of Pointe aux Trembles, on Saturday, the 12th Sept. 1857.

Before Messrs. Laporte and Beaudry, Justices. Sophie Marion, wife of Jean Ble, Archambault, farmer, of Pointe aux Trembles, was charged with having, on the 7th inst., assaulted Mr. J. E. Cornu, corporeur connected with the Swiss Mission, by striking him with a pair of iron tongs, and burning a copy of the new Testament which he had offered her for sale. Defendant pleaded that she struck the prosecutor after giving him timely notice to quit, and upon his refusal to do so. Trial being had, defendant was convicted and sentenced to a fine of 1s. and costs, and in default of payment eight days imprisonment.

Emilie Marion, wife of Joseph Desroches, farmer, of the same place, was likewise charged with having assaulted Mr. Cornu on the same day and under similar circumstances, and pleaded guilty of a common assault. Defendant was sentenced to a similar penalty and costs, and in default of payment, eight days imprisonment.

Mr. Bovey, attorney for the prosecutor. In these cases it appeared by the evidence that the prosecutor, in his capacity as corporeur and missionary, had gone to the residence of defendants with the view to sell copies of the New Testament; and that defendants, who were Roman Catholics, not liking the object of his visit, adopted the above measures for testifying their disapprobation.

If the above be a correct report, and we have no reason to doubt its substantial accuracy, or to suspect that the *Protestant Herald* has so distorted facts as to improve the case of the Popish defendants, we can only say that we must have some precious nincompoops amongst our Lower Canada Magistrates; for assuredly no two intelligent and honest men would, under the circumstances detailed above, have hesitated one moment about giving judgment in favor of the defendants.

In spite however of this iniquitous sentence of the Magistrates, we contend that the defendants were not only innocent of any crime, but that they did no more than their duty, in kicking out of doors any dirty tract-peddler who had the impertinence to thrust himself and his filthy wares into their houses. A father of a family, a modest woman, should treat these pedlars of the Swiss Missionary Societies as they would a vendor of obscene books, or an agent from a brothel—that is, they should first give him warning to quit the premises at once, which request, if not immediately complied with, should be followed up by a writ of forcible ejection, served in the shape of a boot skillfully directed, or a vigorous application of the tongs and poker. At least this is the way we would treat any blackguard, who should presume to force his way into our house against our will, or who should refuse to leave it, after our having "given him timely notice to quit."

According to the law as interpreted by those brilliant lights of the Bench,—Laporte and Beaudry—it would seem that any blackguard has the right to obtrude himself upon your presence, to violate the sanctities of domestic life, and to thrust his blasphemous, obscene or irreligious trash upon your wife and children; and that, if after "giving him timely notice to quit," he still refuses to leave the house, and you, as *Pater-familias*, in consequence apply the toe of your boot to the sitting part, or the thick end of the broomstick to the head, of the impertinent intruder, you make yourself liable to fine and imprisonment. This seems a strange interpretation of the boast of Englishmen that "a man's house is his castle."

It is possible that the *Montreal Herald* in its report of the case has not done justice to the magistrates before whom it was tried; and, if so, we trust for the honour of our Canadian magistracy that the mistake may be rectified. As it appears at present, a gross injustice has been committed upon the defendants, who were perfectly justified in using force to compel this fellow Cornu to leave their house after his refusal to pay attention to the "timely notice given to him to quit;" and who have therefore been most unjustly condemned and sentenced to fine or imprisonment. This iniquitous sentence we can attribute only to the gross stupidity of

the magistrates before whom the case was tried; for we would not willingly believe them capable of prostituting their important functions, with the view of making a little capital amongst the canting *Mawworms* of the French Canadian Missionary Society. We shall wait however to see what explanation they give of their as yet incomprehensible verdict.

We read in our esteemed cotemporary, the *Courrier du Canada*, the following comments upon the decision of the Upper Canada magistrates, in the case of Mr. Hespeler, fined for drawing in his hay of a Sunday. The *Courrier* thus notices this arbitrary proceeding:—

"That full liberty of conscience for which English Protestantism clamors so energetically in the case of Tuscany, or the Kingdom of Naples, seems out of favor when it turns to the profit of Catholics.—Freedom for ourselves, coercion for those who differ from us—this is the Protestant definition of liberty of conscience. Upper Canada has the happiness of possessing quite a number of those sanctified men, who declaim incessantly against Catholic intolerance in Lower Canada, whilst they themselves relish intensely the privilege of imposing their own religious opinions and practices upon those who have no desire to follow them. The *Gall Reformer* quotes a Magisterial decision well fitted to show the amount of liberty which would fall to the share of Catholics, were these 'vessels of election' once in possession of supreme power."

Our Quebec cotemporary contains likewise an article over the signature "J. C. T.," in which it is stated that M. Tache voted in favor of Mr. Felton's motion relative to the Separate schools of Upper Canada, and which forcibly condemns "Orangeism, and all secret societies, as anti-Christian, anti-social," and subversive of the best interests of humanity. Holding such opinions, the *Courrier* cannot but coincide with us in condemning the action of the Governor-General in officially sanctioning, by a public reception, one of these same "anti-Christian and anti-social" secret societies.

The evil thereby inflicted upon society cannot be exaggerated, and cannot even be estimated at its proper value. Upon the principle "that the receiver of stolen goods is as bad as the thief," so the receiver of a deputation from a secret political society is, morally, as bad as any of its members, and as unfit to be trusted with the management of public affairs. This is the doctrine of the TRUE WITNESS, and we see not how the *Courrier* can dissent therefrom, unless he pretends that it is laudable conduct on the part of the civil magistrate to countenance societies which are "anti-Christian and anti-social." Either, we repeat, the *Courrier* must undertake to defend this monstrous paradox; or, with the TRUE WITNESS, he must admit that the Governor-General, and his responsible ministerial advisers who counseled, or connived at, the official sanction by him given to Orangeism, are unworthy of the support and confidence of a Catholic public.

SANDWICH ISLAND MISSIONS.—In a Report of the sayings and doings at a late meeting of American Missionaries, the *Montreal Witness* has the following notice on the Protestant mission to the Sandwich Islands:—

"The blessing of God on this mission has from the first been remarkable. The islands have been thoroughly Christianised—raised to an independent Government. Forty thousand persons have been introduced to Church fellowship, of whom sixteen thousand have died in the faith."

Our cotemporary forgets however to add that, of these "sixteen thousand who have died in the faith," the majority have died of syphilis, and other loathsome diseases, the results of the disgusting impurity of the converted Hawaiians.—"The natives are dying off fast, rotten with disease," says a Protestant clergyman writing on the Sandwich Islands; and it is this state of things which the *Witness* accepts as a sign of "the blessing of God."

A few figures, borrowed from exclusively Protestant sources, will place this matter in a clearer light, and enable us to estimate, at its proper value, the "blessing" of which the *Montreal Witness* boasts, as having crowned the labors of the Protestant missionaries in the Sandwich Islands.

He tells that the "churches there, to which 1,169 converts were added last year, have now 21,943 members."

But from a work published a few years ago by H. T. Cheever, who tells us in his preface that—"though not a missionary, he was a missionary's friend"—we learn that, in 1849, there were "in regular standing" as members of the Protestant churches, no less than 22,831 persons.

So that, if arithmetic lies not, there was in 1856, and in spite of an addition of 1,169 converts during the previous year—a positive decrease of no less than 888 church members, as compared with 1849.

The same extraordinary "blessing" seems to have attended the "schools" of the missionaries, as that which has been poured forth abundantly upon their churches. For instance:—

We learn from the *Montreal Witness* that the "schools of all grades embrace now nearly 12,000 pupils."

But turning again to Mr. Cheever's statistics for 1849, we find that in that year there were in the different schools, and seminaries, under the supervision of the missionaries, no less than 12,012 pupils; thus showing that there has been of late years an actual decrease in the numbers of scholars as well as of church members.

ANTI-CATHOLIC LEGISLATION.—Protestants in the United States are beginning to find out that the luxury of persecuting Papists, and defrauding them of their property, is likely to cost them dear. Persecution is in short a double edged sword, very sharp, very dangerous to meddle with, and quite as likely to cut the fingers of friend as of foe.

Thus the *Banner*, a Protestant organ, is now complaining of the effects of an iniquitous law passed with the intent of preventing Catholics from bequeathing of their private property for charitable or religious purposes; but which is now found to press heavily upon Protestants, and is therefore now for the first time discovered to be "an unjust law."

"In looking over the last Report of the 'Missionary Association for the West'" says the *Protestant Banner* "we find that a legacy from a member of the Church in Pennsylvania, was lost to that Association in consequence of the death of the testator within thirty days of the date of the bequest. This is surely a most unjust law, and all proper efforts should be made by the friends of the Church to obtain its repeal. This law, which is of very recent date, and was obtained by a Philadelphia senator, makes void any bequest to religious or charitable institutions, made within thirty days of the death of the testator. The injustice of such a law seems to us most manifest. Why a man in the full possession of his faculties may not dispose of his property to charitable and religious uses, within thirty days of his death, as well as to distribute it among his heirs, or make bequests for other purposes, is hard to imagine upon any principles of justice or common sense. In the case of the late lamented Mr. Dupont, his bequests to the Church would all be lost if such a law as this was in existence in the State of Delaware. We hope those friends of charitable and religious institutions who have influence in our Legislature will interest themselves to obtain the repeal of this unjust statute."

This "unjust statute" he it remarked, being identical with that which Mr. Drummond, M. Cauchon, and our Liberal Ministry, did their best to impose upon us in Canada, with the view of heaping discredit upon, and of diminishing the influence of, the Catholic Church. The experience, however, that Protestants have had of this iniquitous legislation, and its effects upon themselves, will do more towards obtaining its repeal, than any quantity of argument directed against its injustice. To persecute Papists, to rob the dead, and to cheat the living, are no doubt agreeable and essentially Protestant pastimes; but as it is possible to "pay too dear for one's whistle" so even Protestants are beginning to discover that "worrying Romanists" is a very expensive amusement.

WHAT ARE WE TO CALL THEM?—The term Yankee, as applied to a native born or naturalized citizen of the United States, has been objected to; but as the objectors have not as yet succeeded in finding out any other and more appropriate designation, we see no reason why we should not adhere to the old one, for want of a better. We have the words Spaniard, Frenchman, Greek, Dutchman, Englishman, Canadian, &c.; to denote a native of Spain, France, Greece, Holland, England, and Canada; but, at present, there is unfortunately no other word except Yankee, to denote a citizen of the United States of North America.

You cannot call him a "Republican," for that is a political rather than a "national" expression, and there are many other republicans in the world. Still more absurd would it be to call him an "American" as if the United States were America *par excellence*. He is an American no doubt, but so is the Mexican, the Canadian, the Brazilian, and every other native of this Continent. He is an "American" no doubt, in the same sense that an Englishman is a European; and just as it would be a monstrous piece of impertinence for the latter to claim that title, and an incredible piece of folly for a Frenchman to accord it to him—as if England were Europe *par excellence*—so would it be absurd to speak of native born or naturalized citizens of the United States, as if they alone, or in some special manner, were Americans. Of such an illogical absurdity the TRUE WITNESS will never be guilty; though we should be well pleased to know what term to employ, which shall at once properly designate our republican neighbors, and at the same time be as inoffensive as the terms Scotchman, Irishman, Frenchman, or Canadian.

The *Montreal Herald* is at liberty to believe, or disbelieve, the account of the miraculous appearance of the Blessed Virgin to the shepherds of La Salette, since even amongst Catholics the reality of the miracle is not an article of faith—the Church having as yet pronounced no decision thereupon. But our Protestant cotemporary has no right to say that the view taken by him is the "same as that which many unimpeachable Catholics have openly published in stronger language;" for this simple reason, that no "unimpeachable Catholic" has as yet pronounced the said miracle of La Salette to be an "imposture." The Catholicity of the man who should presume so to express himself upon a subject on which individual Bishops, after a careful examination of the evidences in its favor, and mature deliberation of all the circumstances, have given a very different opinion, would be something more than "impeachable."

Into the merits of the question, we do not propose to enter; neither do we intend, at