

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES,
FOR GEORGE B. OLBER, 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, 35 King 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, FEB. 25, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Africa brings us but little prospects of the maintenance of peace in Europe. "The torch of War," says the London Times, "has once more been lighted;" and it concludes a remarkable article with these ominous words, "Italy must be free." What is meant by Italian freedom, we all know. It means the overthrow of all the Governments existing in that Peninsula; it means the spoliation of the Pontifical States, and the triumph of Red Republicanism; it means in short, the establishment of a miniature hell upon earth. And yet it does not seem probable, in spite of the sonorous words of the Times, that the British Government will lend its aid to France and Sardinia to despoil Austria of its Italian Provinces. All however is uncertain; peace or war depends upon the will of one man, and that man is Louis Napoleon, who is the standing enigma of Europe.

We have been kindly permitted to publish the following letter of His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, which was read from the pulpit of St. Patrick's Church of this City on Sunday last. It is not for us to allude to the very flattering terms in which the humble labors of the TRUE WITNESS are therein spoken of; but we may be permitted to say that it shall ever be our object, and our highest ambition, to merit the confidence of our ecclesiastical superiors:—

"As certain rumors have been in circulation, to the effect, that the TRUE WITNESS does not enjoy the confidence of the Church, His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal authorises us to declare here, that these rumors are ill founded. Those who in the Church, and in the interests of religion, should watch over the doctrines of that Catholic sheet, cannot but recognize that it fulfills with great talent the mission for which it was established; and that it successfully vindicates the Church, whenever she is attacked in her rights, her principles, or her practice.

"It is also strict justice to say that the TRUE WITNESS is free from all reproach of having been actuated by human, or material interests, and that its disinterestedness is highly worthy of praise.

"In authorising you to say this, the Church nevertheless, leaves to the layman, the editor of the TRUE WITNESS, the sole responsibility of all that appears in its columns, whether it treats of persons or of things.

"As it was at the solicitation of the Irish population—and with the object of defending, in the English language, their holy religion against all that might menace it, that the journal was established—His Lordship would appeal to their Catholicity, and exhort them cordially to unite, to support a paper that has always defended, with such good intentions, that of their interests which should be dearest to them—the interest of their Faith.

"May they have the good sense to admit that, if some reject that paper for one motive, whilst others reject it from another, and quite contrary, motive, it will be impossible to sustain a journal for the common defence of those interests which, the most essentially, are common to Catholics. His Lordship hopes therefore, that private or party views may not endanger for the future all prospects of a Catholic journal in Montreal."

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Ferguson's Orange motion for leave to introduce a Bill for the repeal of the several Acts providing for the establishment and support of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, was brought forward in the Legislative Assembly on the 16th inst., and the second reading of the Bill was ordered for the 23rd. On the same day in the other House, the Hon. Col. Prince presented a petition from John McLean of Toronto, praying for a Bill of Divorce from his wife—or in plain English—praying for a Legislative sanction to an act of Bigamy.

In the Lower House, the omission of the name of Mr. Brown from the Committee of Public Accounts gave rise to a warm discussion; but upon a division the omission was approved of, by a majority of 60 to 43.—In answer to an enquiry from Mr. Cimon, whether it was the intention of the Ministry to amend the School Acts of Lower Canada, so as to provide a Model School for each local Municipality, M. Cartier replied that it was not the intention of the Ministry to alter the existing law.

A petition from the Rev. Mr. McCaul, and 2,000 others, Catholics, praying for an alteration in the existing School laws was presented by Dr. Dorland, on the 18th inst. On the same day Mr. Gowan—Orangeman—obtained leave to intro-

duce an infamous and demoralising Bill for the establishment of a Court of Divorce in Matrimonial causes. We shall watch with some interest the treatment that this measure receives from the hands of the friends of good principles—"bons principes"—and will publish the division list thereupon.

The proceedings in the Assembly on the 21st were of little interest. On the motion of Mr. Bellingham, a Special Committee was appointed for the purpose of taking into consideration, and reporting upon, the best means of employing convict labor; so as on the one hand to secure the moral reformation of the individual convict, whilst making his labor remunerative—and on the other, to prevent undue interference with the profits of the honest and industrious artisan. The problem here proposed to our Legislators is a difficult one, and one which has hitherto baffled all attempts to solve it. We have known several efforts made for that end in Van Dieman's Land, New South Wales, and in Norfolk Island; but they all invariably resulted in miserable failures. It is impossible in fact to employ the convict upon remunerative work in-doors, without interfering with the labor market, and putting a premium upon crime; and if convicts are employed in road gangs—in opening up new lines of communication through a new country, as was the case in New South Wales—it requires a large military force to guard them; the work done is badly done, and at an enormous cost; and in spite of all precautions, the convicts are continually making their escape. Under certain conditions, in garrisons, and naval arsenals, convict labor may perhaps be profitably employed upon public works; but the question of secondary punishments will we fear long remain one of the most difficult social questions of the age. In Catholic countries, convicts are often reformed, and return to society as good and useful members thereof; under all Protestant systems that have as yet been adopted, they have been only brutalised, and made still more unfit, either to live or die.

On the 22nd, several private Bills were introduced in the Lower House; amongst others, one by Mr. Allyn for the incorporation of St. Bridget's Asylum at Quebec. We hope that our Catholic friends in the Legislature will see to it, that it be not encumbered with the degrading restrictions inserted in the several Acts passed last session, for the Incorporation of our Ecclesiastical institutions.

What—we have been asked—is the policy of Mr. Brown that the TRUE WITNESS should oppose it? Has not Mr. Brown himself given strong and satisfactory proofs of his repentance; and of his design to adopt towards Lower Canada in general, and Catholics especially, a very different policy from that which he has hitherto pursued, and which has provoked against him the hostility of Lower Canada and the Catholic body?

We answer to these queries that, in so far as we have been able to discover—and we have watched the man narrowly—there is no essential difference betwixt Mr. Brown's policy of February 1859, and that of February 1858. He himself tells us that he is unchanged, and that he has abandoned none of his former principles.—From the enunciation of his intended policy on the School Question, had he been allowed to retain office, we learn that the main feature of that policy was the establishment of a "common" or "mixed" system of education for all the children of Upper Canada—a system which the Catholic Church has expressly condemned, and one therefore which no honest and intelligent Catholic can for one moment sanction. And finally, we have the express declaration of the Toronto Globe, Mr. Brown's own organ, as to the latter's policy, and his adherence to all his former views. We copy for instance from the Globe of the 19th inst.; and respectfully request our readers to weigh well the terms in which that journal gives to the world its political confession of faith, and of course the political confession of faith of its responsible editors:—

"THE GLOBE WILL CONTINUE TO ADVOCATE"—we are told:—

1. "The adoption of Population without regard to locality as the Basis of Parliamentary Representation."

In other words, Mr. Brown is still the advocate of Representation by Population, *par et simple*; a measure that by investing Upper Canada with an overwhelming preponderance in the Legislature, would inevitably prove fatal to the peculiar national and religious institutions of Lower Canada. The Upper Province is essentially "Orange;" and to give to it a larger representation than that enjoyed by the Lower and Catholic section of the Province, would be but to place ourselves, and our religious institutions, our schools, Colleges and Convents, at the mercy of the hateful faction that has long oppressed Catholicity in the Old World, and that is intent upon pursuing the same course of robbery, insult, and persecution towards us in the New. How then can any Catholic—no matter of what origin—lend his aid to such a suicidal measure as "Representation by Population?" Whether Irish, or French Canadian, Catholics, whether resident in

the Upper or Lower Province, we are all, in that we are Catholics, directly interested in resisting to the death the policy of the Globe, which is also the policy of Mr. Brown; and which, if successful, would be the triumph of our worst and most dangerous enemies—the Orangemen of Upper Canada. Of these gentry we have but too many in Parliament already; God forbid that we should be such fools, or such ardent knaves, as to give our aid to increase their number! Let us now examine another plank of Mr. Brown's political platform. We still copy from the Globe of the 19th inst.

"The Globe will continue to advocate," in the second place—

"The Entire Separation of Church and State; the abolition of all Appropriations of Public money for Sectarian purposes; the Restraint of Ecclesiastical and other Corporations from Locking-up land in Mortmain, except for use and occupation."

Here again we invite our Catholic readers to pause, and with the aid of the Protestant Glossary, to endeavor to get at the full significance of the above paragraph. In fact, to its right understanding, it is only necessary to bear in mind that the term "sectarian" is by Protestants applied to all Catholic institutions, and Catholic schools.

Translated therefore into plain English, the above paragraph means that the Globe, and therefore Mr. Brown, will continue to advocate the withdrawal of all aid from the State to the Church—in other words, that it will advocate the abolition of tithes in Lower Canada; for therein only does there now remain any semblance of connection between Church and State. Are Catholics of any origin prepared to support Mr. Brown in this policy? Again we say—God forbid!

And again, when through the Globe he tells us that he "will continue to advocate the abolition of all Appropriations of public money for Sectarian purposes"—and when we bear in mind that the term "sectarian" is by him applied to all Catholic institutions—Mr. Brown in fact proclaims his intention to agitate for the withdrawal of all State assistance to Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada—or in other words, for the abolition of separate schools. Mr. Brown's policy is in fact, in so far as our Catholic schools are concerned, identical with that of the Orangemen, as announced by Gowan and Ferguson;—how then can Catholics support it, or ally themselves with the man who avows it?

And so when Mr. Brown proclaims his policy with regard to our "Ecclesiastical and other Corporations," we find him again making common cause against Popery, with the Orangemen; whose feelings towards those same Corporations were displayed in the Orange Resolutions which we published in our last; whilst the insulting restrictions that he seeks to impose upon our religious, charitable, and educational institutions, are identical with those proposed by Mr. Drummond some years ago, and subsequently adopted by our present Ministry. Shall we then, who here condemned the anti-Catholic policy of that Ministry in adopting and imposing upon us those restrictions, give our sanction to the same policy when pursued by Mr. Brown? Again we say—God forbid! again we declare our determination to oppose any man, or any party that shall impose unjust and dishonoring "restrictions upon our Ecclesiastical and other Corporations." Let us however proceed with our analysis of Mr. Brown's actual policy. He "will continue to advocate" in the third place:—

"National Education, Common Schools, Grammar Schools, and Collegiate—Free from Sectarianism, and open to all on equal terms."

Here, in no ambiguous words, he proclaims himself the champion of "State-Schoolism" in its most odious form; and shall we hesitate to proclaim ourselves the irreconcilable enemy of "Common" Schools, and of every man, or party in the State, that seeks to inflict them upon us? And these "Common" Schools, these educational institutions that Mr. Brown "will still continue to advocate," are to be "free from Sectarianism;" that is, no Catholic doctrine is to be taught therein; never within their walls shall the words of divine truth be heard; religion shall be prohibited as if it were an unclean thing, and the Romish Priest excluded as one infected with the plague. Catholics of Canada, are these the Schools you desire for your children? If they are—but upon that condition only—can you ally yourselves with, or give your political support to him, or to those who seek to impose them on you. It is the policy of the Orangemen, it is the policy of late adopted by our rulers, as it is the policy of Mr. Brown to impose these Schools upon you; but, if true to your Church, and mindful of what you owe to your children, it can never be your policy, or the policy of your true friends.

Finally Mr. Brown tells us through the Globe that he "will continue to advocate":—

"Uniform Legislation for both Sections of the Province."

In other words, it is his design, through the instrumentality of the Orange Legislature, which the adoption of the system of Representation by Population would infallibly secure to him, to impose upon Lower Canada the anti-Catholic policy of the Upper or Orange Section of the Province; to impart to us the blessings of a Godless system of State-Schoolism; to remodel our ecclesiastical institutions according to the

approved Puritanical pattern; and to cut down the revenues of our Religious Corporations to more moderate dimensions, by way of diminishing, and in time destroying entirely, the dangerous influence of Popery. This in substance is the policy that Mr. Brown has always advocated; and which through the columns of the Globe of the 19th instant, he tells us it is his determination still to advocate. If he speaks truly, every honest Catholic must be his enemy; if falsely, he is a liar, and no honest man should trust him.

What then—it may be asked—is the policy of the TRUE WITNESS, if it repudiates an alliance with George Brown, and the "Clear Grits" who adopt his politico-religious opinions, and if at the same time it will not take service beneath the Ministerial banners? To this question we reply, as we have replied before. Our policy is that of independent and constitutional opposition to every Ministry, to every party, that will not adopt "Justice to Catholics"—justice to them on the School Question, on the Orange Question, and all questions connected with our Ecclesiastical Corporations—as a plank of its political platform; a constant opposition to every party, whether "Ins" or "Outs," that seeks to do away with separate schools, or refuses those reforms in the school law necessary for its more extended application to the Catholics of Upper Canada; that encourages in any way any "Secret politico-religious organisation;" that will not oppose all attempts to give to Upper Canada a political supremacy over the Lower Province; and that does not strenuously resist all attempts to interfere with our Ecclesiastical institutions, or to impose restrictions upon our Religious Corporations similar in spirit to those passed during the course of the last session. This is our policy; independent and constitutional opposition to every party in the State that will not do us justice; independent, because we will not identify ourselves, or make common cause, with either the "Rouges" or the "Clear Grits;" and constitutional, because we repudiate all factious opposition, and would not oppose a good measure even when emanating from a bad Ministry.

This is our policy, and ever has been since the TRUE WITNESS started. We do not propound it as a policy likely to be personally profitable to those who adopt it. It will lead no man to a seat in the Cabinet, and holds out no prospects of a Government situation to its followers. To the place-hunter, it can have no charms; for to him it has nothing in the shape of place, salary, or fat Government contracts, or jobs of any kind, to offer. But after mature reflection we are convinced that it is the only policy that it becomes the sincere Catholic to adopt; and that by steadily and undeviatingly pursuing it, he will best consult his own honor, and the interests of his religion. Consequences are in the hands of God. It is enough for us to endeavor to ascertain our duty; and having ascertained it, to endeavor to perform it faithfully, reckless of consequences.

A NEW MOVE IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.

—It is with much satisfaction that, under the caption, "The Toronto Police Force—Members of Secret Societies Excluded"—we find the following notice in our Upper Canada exchanges:—

"On Wednesday the newly appointed members of the Toronto Police Force were sworn in at the City Hall, before the Board of Commissioners. Before the men were sworn in, those of them who had belonged to secret societies were required to hand in certificates to the effect that their connection with such societies was severed. This action was in accordance with the determination previously arrived at by the Commissioners, to permit no person to become a member of the force who belonged to a secret association of any kind."

This is as it should be; and the authorities of Toronto have adopted a line of policy which is worthy of all recommendation, and which it is the duty of every friend of order, and lover of equal justice, to enforce upon the heads of every public department in the Province. That a member of any "secret politico-religious society" is *ipso facto* unworthy of being entrusted with any office connected, directly or indirectly, with the administration of justice, is a truth so self-evident, that it would be almost an insult to the honesty and good sense of the community to attempt to prove it. Of the evil effects of allowing a different policy to obtain, we have of late had flagrant and frequent examples. Crimes of the deepest dye have been perpetrated against the lives and property of Catholics; and thanks to the connivance of Orange jurymen, the perpetrators have been hitherto screened from punishment. In vain the blood of murdered Papists, ruthlessly slain by Orange hands, cries aloud to heaven for vengeance; the cry is unheeded by the "dear brothers" of the criminals; they to whom have been entrusted the pursuit and prosecution of the blood-stained Orange ruffians, are themselves in a manner accomplices after the fact, of the guilty parties; and Orange Magistrates exert the authority with which the laws of the land have invested them, not to execute justice, and to maintain truth, but to protect their vile associates, the members of an infamous organisation, from the punishment due to their crimes. Thus is justice trampled under foot; and thus by the culpable apathy of its officers, is

the administration of the law brought into odium and contempt amongst a large class of Her Majesty's loyal subjects. Thus too are hot-headed and imprudent men goaded to seek in illegal and infamous combinations, in counter "secret" associations, that protection against the outrages of the Orange ruffians, which the laws of the land as at present administered, deny to them. For these crying evils, evils that menace the very existence of social order, there is but one remedy; the remedy adopted by the Police Commissioners of Toronto; and one which, if our Ministers and Legislators were either wise or just—if they had either the heads of statesmen or the hearts of Christians—would be adopted in every branch of the Government. In one word, that remedy consists in the absolute exclusion from every office, high or low, directly or indirectly connected with the administration of justice, of every person in any manner connected with any "secret politico-religious society," whether it call itself "Ribbon" or "Orange;" for both are alike infamous, incompatible with good order, and a standing reproach to the vaunted civilisation of the XIX century.

No honest man, no friend of Canada—above all, no Catholic—will venture to contest the truth of our assertion. The man who becomes a member of a "secret society" is guilty of a moral suicide; he thereby, and in the very act of taking the slavish oaths by which he consents to bind himself, makes abnegation of his manhood, renounces his freedom of will, and becomes to all intents and purposes, civilly dead. As defunct then he should be treated by the State; as one morally, if not physically a corpse, that is as one no longer capable of any vital action. He can move only as others please to twist him; will of his own, or power over his own actions he has none; but must think, speak, and act according to the dictates of an unseen, irresponsible tribunal. To such an abyss of moral degradation, no—(we do not say Catholic, but)—honest man, no brave man would willingly and knowingly consign himself. The "Ribbonman," therefore, and the "Orangeman" are always, we may be sure, knaves and cowards at heart; for if they had the honesty or pluck of men about them, they would seek their objects openly and in the face of day, and would scorn to sneak beneath the shade of their respective infamous organisations.

We would, therefore, urge upon all honest men of all creeds, the duty of discouraging and discountenancing all "secret politico-religious societies" without distinction. But more especially is this duty incumbent upon Catholics; who from the inspired teachings of their Church, as well as from the dictates of reason, have learned how vile and odious, how contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and how hostile to the best interests of society, are all "secret politico-religious" organisations. For Catholics upon any pretence whatsoever, to countenance, or even to permit themselves to appear before the world as for one moment countenancing, such organisations, is unpardonable; and however they may seek in motives of political expediency, for excuses to palliate their unworthy conduct, they will never succeed in deceiving either their fellow-citizens or themselves as to their motives. The latter will still hold them in well merited contempt; their own consciences will still reproach them with their base countenance, and criminal compliance towards those infamous associations, which God and man—which the voice of Revelation and the voice of reason—alike condemn.

AN INJURIOUS IMPUTATION.—In the Toronto Colonist of the 18th inst., we find it stated, that before the arrival of Mr. McGe, "Orangemen and Roman Catholics were on terms of comparative friendship." This statement we look upon as untrue, and certainly, as dishonoring to the Catholics of Upper Canada; of whom, we should be sorry indeed, could it be said with truth, that they were on terms of anything resembling friendship with men sworn to oppose their faith, and bound by oath to seek the extirpation of their religion. Such friendship would be dishonoring in the highest degree to Catholics; for it would imply that they were the enemies of their God.

Our religion teaches us to forgive our enemies, to do good to them that hate us, to pray for them that persecute us, and despitefully use us. But Christian charity no where requires of us that we should hold friendly intercourse with those who are united in unholy league to seek that debasement and humiliation of our religion that is implied by the words "Protestant Ascendancy;" or that we should be on familiar terms with men whom, as members of a "secret politico-religious" society, our Church denounces as excommunicated, and cut off from all fellowship with the faithful. For such men we should pray, as for all heathens and heretics, but with them we should hold as little intercourse as possible; nor can we conceive how a Catholic, who respects himself, and loves his religion, can consent to assume the semblance even of friendship towards such men; to sit at table, to break bread, or as they say in the East, to "eat salt" with one whom he knows to be an Orangeman.