

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS, GEORGE E. CLERK AND JOHN GILLIES, At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.

TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not 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 Pickups' News Depot.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, G. E. CLERK.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 16, 1859.

"WHICH FULLY ACCOUNTS FOR THE MILK IN THE COCOA NUT."—There is one peculiarity in the logic of writers of the Evangelical school which can scarcely have escaped the notice of those whose fortune, or whose fate it may have been, to read their lucubrations.—The peculiarity to which we allude is the total absence of all connection betwixt their conclusions and their premises.

Of this peculiarity our evangelical friend of the *Montreal Witness* gives us, in a late issue, a most ludicrous example. His thesis is, that "Romanism is demoralising;" his premises are that Irish Catholics, whether in their native land, or abroad, are actuated by a spirit of hostility towards Protestant England, whilst Irish Protestants "make few, if any, complaints of English misrule." He concludes—"the spirit of Irish Catholics towards England is another proof of the demoralising tendency of Romanism."

It is a poor rule that won't work both ways, and our cotemporary's logic, if valid against Romanism in Ireland, may be used with equal justice and efficacy against Presbyterianism, and in favor of Episcopacy, in Scotland. As thus:—

There was a time, and not many centuries ago, when the position of the Scotch Presbyterian towards the Episcopalian was very analogous to that of the Irish Catholic of the present day towards Protestantism. The Episcopalian was one of the favored, the rigid Presbyterian of an oppressed, class; the former was favorable, the other bitterly hostile to, and often in arms against, the Government under which both lived. Thence we might conclude "the spirit of the Covenanters of Scotland is another proof of the demoralising tendency of Presbyterianism."

This however is not our mode of reasoning; and without the slightest partiality towards the doctrinal Calvinism, and ecclesiastical theories of the men whom Claverhouse hunted down; and cognizant of the fact that it was their armed rebellion against the civil magistrate, rather than their assertion of the independence of the church, that brought down upon them the persecution of the former—we cannot but see much to admire in the stubborn valor of the old Scotch Covenanters. We admire their pluck; as Catholics, we recognise the great truth, which, in spite of their Protestantism, they adhered to—viz., that the Civil Magistrate has no rightful jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical—an essentially Ultra-Montane and Popish doctrine—and our respect for the laws of logic prevents us from deducing from the simple fact of their hostility towards the Anglican model of Church Government, the conclusion that the tendency of the doctrines of the Covenanters was demoralising.

So applying the same principle to the Irish Papist, we must confess our inability to detect the connecting links betwixt the fact of the Irish Catholics' hostility to English rule, and the deduction that the tendency of Romanism is demoralising. Could the *Witness* show that the Catholic people of Ireland were habitually more impure, greater drunkards, and less mindful of the rights of property, than their Protestant neighbors, there would be a presumption in favor of the truth of his conclusion. But the contrary is the case. The chastity and purity of the Irish Catholics have been dwelt upon with astonishment by Protestant writers; statistics show that in proportion to its population Protestant Scotland consumes far more whiskey than Popish Ireland; and, deduction made of these offences which are the result of national and political antipathies, we hesitate not to say that there is no part of the British Empire more free from crimes against person and property, than in Popish Ireland. Owing to the peculiar and unhappy relations subsisting in the latter country, betwixt the legal owners, and the actual cultivators of the soil, betwixt the Celtic Catholic tenant, and his Anglo-Norman or Anglo-Saxon Protestant Landlord, there is in Ireland a class of crimes, to which England and Scotland are almost strangers. The superficial observer may attribute this to the tendencies of Romanism; the impartial student of human nature sees therein only the natural and inevitable result of long years of oppression and misrule, and of the operation of those causes owing to which hap-

pens that in Ireland, the legal owner, and the cultivator of the soil, are generally "aliens to one another in blood, in language, and religion."

That the Irish Protestant does not complain of British misrule, is not to be wondered at; seeing that it was for his sake, and for his profit, that the Catholics of Ireland have been misgoverned, oppressed and plundered. It would be strange indeed, if he should murmur at a system of government inaugurated to secure his political and social ascendancy! it would indeed be a marvellous thing if he did not quietly acquiesce in a state of things which secured for him the right to treat his Popish neighbor as a helot!

Not in the "demoralising tendencies of Romanism," but in the Penal Laws of Protestant Great Britain, and in her efforts to impose by law a hated form of religion and of church-government upon a reluctant people, do we find the secret of Irish hostility to England. Would the people of Scotland be what they are to-day in their relations with England, if the latter had persisted, and succeeded in imposing Episcopacy upon them? and if the Presbyterians of Scotland had been treated as the Papists of Ireland were treated during the XVIII century? No, assuredly. They would have been as bitter in their hatred of England as are the Irish; and we doubt much if they would have been so patient and long suffering under oppression. But of this we are certain, that had any one under such circumstances attributed their hostility to England to the demoralising tendencies of Presbyterianism, he would have been met with the reply, "Tut! the chap's a fool."

Why the editor of the *Toronto Leader* should be at such pains to write himself down an ass—why, if he be a nincompoop, he should proclaim it to the world from the house-top—we cannot for the life of us conceive. Why will the unfortunate man persist then in writing upon subjects connected with the ecclesiastical discipline of the Catholic Church?—of whose doctrines, practices, and rules, he is as ignorant as the beasts that eat grass.

Our addle-headed cotemporary gravely informs his readers—many of whom are, we daresay, as thick-headed as the editor of the *Leader*—that, according to the ethical system of the Catholic Church, homicide is a less serious offence than an unwillingness to pay tithes; and that absolution for the sin of murder is more easily and expeditiously obtained, than for the crime of making a false return of the proceeds of one's cereal crop. In support of this marvellous balderdash, the good man of the *Leader* adduces certain regulations formerly existing, but now obsolete, and repealed by the First Council of Quebec—according to which disputes as to the tithe betwixt the priest and any of his parishioners, were reserved to the Bishop; whilst no such reservation exists in the case of a penitent accusing himself in the confessional of the crime of murder—the priest having jurisdiction in all such cases as to give or withhold absolution.

The *Leader's* reasoning is beautiful. When the murderer deems that he can obtain the pardon of heaven, as soon as he shall have obtained absolution from the priest, he will cease to look upon himself as a criminal. This, whilst in substance is the *Leader's* argument against the confessional, we attribute rather to the silly creature's ignorance of the doctrines of the Church, than to a deliberate design to misrepresent those doctrines. For the benefit of the poor creature therefore, and to ease his much perturbed spirit, we would inform him, that there is not in the Catholic Church a man, woman, or child, of an age to distinguish betwixt good and evil, who does not know, that no absolution pronounced by the priest can have any effect whatsoever in delivering him, or her, from the eternal wrath of an offended God, without, on his, or her, part, a hearty abhorrence of all sin, a sincere regret for having sinned, and a firm purpose, not only never to sin again, but also to make amends to all whom he or she may have injured. The humble and contrite heart—which we are told that God Himself does not despise—is the one thing needful on the part of the penitent—the one thing indispensable, and without which the priest's absolution can but add to the sinner's guilt, and the weight of his condemnation. How then, if this be so,—if this be the substance of the Church's teachings—and were it not so would we not be a convicted liar before all our Catholic readers, who must know what they themselves have been taught from their youth upwards—how can the absolved murderer cease to look upon his crime with intense horror? how can society be injured by the sinner's confession to the priest, and the absolution which in God's name, and in virtue of the authority left by Jesus Christ to his ministers, the latter pronounces over the truly penitent?—It is almost an insult to our Catholic readers to notice the silly twaddle of the *Leader* about the moral effects of the Confessional. But then Protestants are, upon all matters connected with Catholicity, so stupid, so inconceivably pig-headed, that we must—if it be possible—speak down to them, down to the level of their very low intelligence. Our readers must remember that, in addressing ourselves to Protestants on subjects in

the supernatural order, and connected with Christianity, we are speaking to an inferior and degraded race, in so far as these topics are concerned; and that in charity to them, as towards our fallen fellow-creatures, we are bound to adopt our language to their very imperfect and limited capacities. This is why we are obliged, when arguing with Protestants, to insist upon truths, with which every little Catholic child that plays in the streets is familiar.

The *Leader* is not content with parading his ignorance with regard to the doctrine of the Church, but he must needs make another display of his folly with regard to her discipline; and reaches the climax of absurdity in an article upon the appointment of the Chief Pastors of the Catholic Church; who, he more than hints, ought to be named, if not consecrated, by a Colonial Secretary, or other Imperial official, especially designated for that purpose.

What makes the folly of the *Leader* the more glaring, is the comical result of the last Whig Penal Act of the Imperial Legislature, known as the "Ecclesiastical Titles Act," and designed as a blow against the Catholic Hierarchy of Great Britain and Ireland. Not only is this Act of Parliament a dead letter which no Ministry could enforce, even if it would, or would dare to enforce, even if it had the wish and the power to do so; but it is a mockery, a standing joke amongst Papists, and a subject of inexhaustible amusement to them. Its only effect has been to bring British legislation into disrepute, to make "Acts of Parliament" contemptible, and to show what fools Protestant statesmen make of themselves when they undertake to legislate for the Catholic Church. Is it really possible then, that now, in the latter part of the XIX. century, the *Leader* can believe, or that its readers can believe, that the Catholic Church could be affected by Acts of Parliament, or that her discipline could be controlled by a Secretary of State!—Why! even Protestants sects have in many instances—particularly in the case of "The Free Kirk" of Scotland—shown how futile are all attempts on the part of the State, to impose Ministers upon reluctant churches; and can the *Leader* seriously imagine for one moment that we, Catholics, would condescend to accept a Bishop from the hands of the civil magistrate?—And yet, if we may judge by the tone of a late article in the *Leader*, and copied, apparently approvingly, by the *Montreal Herald*, the proposition that the appointment of our Prelates, and spiritual rulers, should be transferred from Rome, to Downing-street—from the successor of St. Peter, to the British Government—is once more about to be entertained seriously.

And this proposition is supported by one who, if our memory fails not, upheld the principle now embodied in our Canadian Statute Book, that it is desirable to abolish all semblance even of connection betwixt Church and State!!!

But suppose the suggestion of the *Leader* acted upon, and the appointment of Catholic Bishops in Canada, vested by Act of Parliament in the hands of the Colonial Secretary: what would be the result? how far towards the attainment of its object, would, under such circumstances, the *Leader* have progressed?

A British Act of Parliament would not be binding on the Pope. He therefore would still, as if no such precious Act existed, continue to exercise his heaven-derived right of governing the Catholic Church; and as if in mockery of Protestant legislation would still name whom he pleased as our Bishops and Pastors. These would still, and in spite of Acts of Parliament, be received by us as our sole legitimate spiritual authorities, to whose exhortations alone would we listen, and from whose hands alone would we receive, our Clergy. Still would they continue to be our Bishops; just as His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman is, and in spite of all Acts of Parliament to the contrary, will continue to be, the Archbishop of Westminster, and Primate of England; whilst the Government nominees—if indeed there should happen to be found amongst Catholics, wretches vile enough to accept ecclesiastical appointments from the civil magistrates—would be treated by all honest Catholics with every mark of scorn and contempt; and would be looked upon as thoroughly shams as a Government Archbishop of Canterbury, or a Government Bishop of Exeter. An Act of Parliament could give any scoundrel the title of Bishop of Montreal; but it would not secure for him the respect or obedience—or the pecuniary support of the Catholics of the Diocese; and seeing that our Bishops, as it is, are supported solely by the voluntary contributions of the latter, and as their property is the fruit of private donations—we much doubt if there would be found many to covet the empty and un lucrative situation of a Government Bishop.

But if the Civil magistrate seriously entertains the project hinted at in the *Leader*, we should advise him to try his "prentice hand" at ecclesiastical appointments, whom some of the minor Protestant sects, and see how they will submit to such interference with their spiritual officers.—Before undertaking to furnish the Catholic Church with Bishops, "Jack-in-Office," who inspires the *Leader*, would do well to test the experiment of appointing a few Ministers to some of the Protestant congregations in Toronto. If he succeed there, we shall then be prepared to discuss the question of allowing him a voice in the appointment of Bishops for the Church.

THE PROTESTANT REFORM PRESS.—The following is not a bad specimen of that particular form of bombast known amongst our Yankee neighbours as "highfalutin"; it is taken from the *Bowmanville Statesman*—which, together with the *Globe*, is a leading organ of the "Protestant Reform" party of Upper Canada:—

HIGHFALUTIN.—"Papist Bishop may impose a censorship on the menials who conduct their journals; but on a free and enlightened Protestant press they never will; for free speech and free thought are the birth right of a Protestant in a Protestant country, while the Catholics must think by a certain rule, and articulate as the Bishop's decrees."

Not bad; but the following is better, and may be taken as a fair specimen of the feelings towards Papists prevalent amongst the "Protestant Reform" of Upper Canada, and of the language habitually indulged in by the followers of George Brown against Romanists:—

PROTESTANT LIBERALITY.—"First came the abduction of Miss Starr, followed by burst of indignation at the treachery and base villainy of the Romish hierarchy; and many there were who qualified their declamation by saying—if it is true that Bishop Charbonnel did so, and so, we are done with Romish Catholics. We spoke of the matter as a part of the system we had been describing, and our only wonder was that the accused Papal system—with its Monks, Friars, Nuns, Jesuits, Priests, Cardinals, Bishops, Curés, Popes, Nunneries and Inquisitions were so little understood, and that there were protestants who could for a moment doubt the guilt of the Papal Police—for the officers of the Roman Catholic Church are not one whit better, or more honorable than the spies of Napoleon and the Emperor of Russia."—*Bowmanville Statesman*.

The propriety and honorable consistency of an alliance betwixt Catholics and the "Protestant Reform" party, of which the journal publishing the above is a prominent organ, must be conspicuous to all men. There is a frankness about the *Bowmanville Statesman* that we admire; whilst its admissions, as to the objects of which its patrons have in view, in advocating "Representation by Population," entitle it to a respectful hearing. The *Bowmanville Statesman* is too honest to deny the injustice that would be inflicted by that measure upon Lower Canada—seeing that Upper Canada repudiated it for itself when its population was less than that of the Catholic section of the Province. It does not therefore attempt to argue; it makes no appeals to reason; and very creditably to itself, deals in no canting trash about "checks, guarantees" and "integrity of the institutions of Lower Canada." It tells us plainly, that, when the population of the Upper or Protestant section of the Province was the less numerous, Upper Canada insisted upon, and obtained "Equality of Representation;" because that equality was necessary to prevent "Popish Ascendancy;" and now, when the relative conditions of the two sections of the Province are said to be reversed, and when the population of the Protestant section is supposed to be the more numerous—that the Protestants of Upper Canada insist upon "Representation by Population," in order that they may put down Popery, and revel, as in Ireland, in the luxuries which flow from "Protestant Ascendancy." There is such a cool unblushing rascality about our cotemporary, such a total want of all moral sense, and such an utter disregard of justice and fair play, that we could take off our hats to the man in admiration of his accomplishments. Thus he tells us without any circumlocution that:—

"It is urged by the Catholics that Upper Canadians cannot in justice demand Representation by Population, because that at the time of the formation of the Union between the two Canadas, the Lower Canadians had the majority of population, but had only the same number of Representatives in Parliament as Upper Canada. We grant that they had such a majority; but we do not concede to the Catholics, in the two Canadas at that time, a majority over the Protestants. Indeed the Union was formed for the very purpose of taking away from the Catholic majority of Lower Canada the power to insult and oppress the Protestant British who dwelt there; and by uniting both Canadas together, it was sought to give Protestantism the ascendancy. This it did for some time; and that ascendancy would still exist were it not that many Upper Canadians have been bribed and bought by the Catholic hierarchy to legislate in their favor, and to grant special privileges."

"Had Representation based on Population been granted to us four years ago, we would not now require to advocate a 'dissolution of the Union;' but the time has gone by, when Protestants can with any degree of honor ally themselves with the papists. It is impossible to play with fire and not be burnt; and it is just as impossible for any government to receive aid from the Catholics, without giving live privileges for every one the Protestants get. That religious system, whose Bishops and clergy come out publicly and enjoin on all their followers a certain political creed, is one which must not be tolerated in Canada. Its presence in our midst is equal to a black frost in the month of June; and if Protestants wish to retain the privileges granted them by a Protestant Queen, they must unite to crush out the Papal system. Protestants must now prepare themselves for united action; for the Papacy must be humbled. It is clearly the duty of all Protestants to unite in opposing a system fraught with so many dangers to the political, social and moral well being of this colony. To-morrow may be too late to offer opposition; and we hope that all Protestants, in whatever position to occupy, will at once strike for Protestant supremacy."

In the above we find a complete vindication—if vindication be needed—of the wisdom of the Catholic Hierarchy in giving public expression to their views on the question of "Representation by Population." That question is not, as its advocates, pretend purely a secular question, and one therefore with which the Minister of religion has no business to interfere. It is a politico-religious question, or question in which the interests of religion and of the Catholic Church are, by the showing of its warmest advocates, deeply interested. And shall we then bear to be told that, with a question so affecting religion, the ministers of religion have no right to meddle? that the Catholic Church has no right to resist

the attempt to impose upon her "Protestant Ascendancy?"

For this is the avowed object, the ultimate aim of all the present political agitation, inaugurated by the *Globe*, and the *Clear Grit* organs—and in which, we blush as we write the words, even some Catholics have been found to take an active part. There is no attempt at disguise; "Protestant Ascendancy" is the end; "Representation by Population," the certain means to that end.

And in that it is so, we contend that we are fully justified in treating as false, and as rank hypocrisy, Protestant professions of attachment to "civil and religious liberty." Equality for all denominations, as before the State—perfect equality for the Catholic, as compared with the Protestant—is the essential, indispensable condition of civil and religious liberty. But where there is "Ascendancy" of one denomination over another, there cannot be perfect equality betwixt them; therefore in aiming at the establishment of "Protestant Ascendancy," the Protestant Reformer approves himself the enemy of "civil and religious liberty."

And history proves that he is so; for we say it without fear of contradiction—Religious liberty is unknown, is indeed impossible, in any country where Protestantism is in the ascendancy; and just in proportion as that ascendancy has been successfully resisted, and overthrown, precisely in the same degree have the principles of civil and religious liberty been advanced. The sum of the matter therefore is this: that the advocates of "Representation by Population" are the advocates of "Protestant Ascendancy;" whilst the *True Witness* in opposing the former, is contending for religious equality as well as for "Equality of Representation;" and is therefore fighting in the cause of civil and religious liberty in both sections of the Province.

STATE-SCHOOLISM IN NEW YORK.—We gather from the New York journals some important facts relative to the State Schools. The *N. Y. Freeman's Journal*, of the 10th inst., has the following details:—

THE STATE SCHOOLS.—"The reopening of these unsatisfactory establishments in this City, on Monday last, has been the occasion of renewing the old dispute about reading the Bible in them. The Trustees in some of the Wards have ordered the teachers to make no alterations in regard to their way of opening the Schools. On the other hand, the School Commissioners have, by a majority vote, ordered the Bible to be read in all the Schools, and passed a resolution not to pay the salaries of any teachers not complying with their order."

Hence a pretty row betwixt the State School authorities—a row which must tend to weaken the system of State-Schoolism, and may in time lead to its total overthrow. Such too is the hope of our New York cotemporary:—

"Both sides right, and both wrong! The one side right in insisting that education cannot be separated from dogmatic instruction in religion. The other side right in saying that Public Schools, being State institutions, have nothing to do with religious teachings. The true and only issue from this perplexity is to leave education where it belongs—to parents, to voluntary associations, private endowments, and independent corporations. Education is not a function of the State. The State makes a bad job of material speculations—like the canals—but a worse one where she assumes the proper duties of parents, and of private, social, or religious benevolence."

"Happy day for the interests of education, when the State ceases to meddle with it, or to conduct it! Happy reform, also, for the tax-payers, when they are left to spend this portion of their money for themselves, instead of paying the State to spend it."—*N. Y. Freeman*.

This is the shortest, and the most practicable, even if it be not the best conceivable solution of the School Question. Leave the care of education, like the care of religion—the charge of the School, as of the Church—to the individual efforts of the community; allow every man to feed, and physic, to clothe, and educate, his own children, and to give them their rhubarb and castor oil in due season. As well might the State assume the right to control the bowels of the child, as to direct its education; and prescribe what it should eat, and what aperients should, in its intestine troubles, be administered to it, as to exercise authority over the training of its intellectual faculties. Education, in short, as the *N. Y. Freeman* truly says—(and herein is summed up the entire School Question)—Education is not a legitimate function of the State; for it belongs exclusively to the individual parent and the Family. Until this first great truth be recognised, and acted upon, there can be no true "civil and religious liberty."

There is something more, we can assure the *Montreal Herald*,—(who notices this dispute)—than "a part of honor" involved in this dispute betwixt the School Teachers, and School Commissioners of New York; and though the reading of the Bible, is the immediate question at issue, yet in that question is contained the other question—"To whom does the education of the child belong? To the State or to its parents?"—This is the question, and it cannot be disposed of by a sneer in a leading article, or ignored by a Canadian public. It is a question that will come up, that must come up, that will—however "Jack-in-office" may detest the very name of it—that will make itself heard, and will insist upon an answer. The contest may be prolonged betwixt "State Schoolism" and "Freedom of Education;" but we firmly believe, as well as fondly hope, that the latter will yet be triumphant. The *Herald* may imagine it but a small thing