

## 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.

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

## 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 in advance, 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, price 3¢, can be had at this Office; Pickney's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dutton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 3, 1860.

**PERSONAL.**—In consequence of the absence of the Editor of this journal, it is requested that all communications intended for his private perusal, may be marked "Private."

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

**THE Prince Albert** arrived at St. Johns, N.F., on the 1st inst. Her news is of little importance. Matters in Syria are unchanged; and France is preparing for a powerful intervention, and had given notice to that effect to other Governments, in order to have a concert of action. Russia, it is reported, had expressed a desire to act in harmony with France and England.

By a telegram received in London on the 24th ult., it is stated that Garibaldi announces his intention of annexing Sicily to Sardinia.

Hong Kong dates of the 7th June, mention that hostilities were about to commence.

The Prince of Wales arrived at Halifax at nine o'clock on Monday morning, and was warmly received. He leaves on Thursday morning, 2nd August.

**MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING.**—A lively controversy has been waged by the Kingston press as to the comparative loyalty of Catholics and Protestants. It originated with a letter in the *British Whig*, wherein the writer, over the signature *Catholicus*, quoted, and held up to censure, the comments of a certain Alderman Loan, a notorious Orangeman of Kingston, upon a motion in the City Council for appropriating a sum of seven hundred and fifty pounds for the reception of the Prince of Wales. This motion the Orange Alderman opposed in the following terms:—

"Seven hundred and fifty pounds to see one man! Why, sir, it is astonishing that the time of day has come that we have to worship idols. (Loud laughter) And he is only seventeen years of age! What will be when he is twenty-five years of age and so much more a man? Why, when he comes to that age he may be a rebel. (Loud explosions.) Ask seven hundred and fifty pounds to see a single man! Why, was there ever heard of such idolatry?" &c. (Repeated laughter and sensation.)

"Who now are the disloyal?" exclaimed *Catholicus*; and in a letter addressed to the *British Whig*, he administered a not unmerited castigation to those who assume that loyalty is the especial attribute of Protestants, and of Orangemen *par excellence*, and that Catholics are necessarily disloyal subjects. Hereupon the Orangemen rushed to the rescue, and favor us with long disputations upon loyalty in general, and Orange loyalty in particular.

Unfortunately—the end of controversy is a thing to be desired—unfortunately the champions of Orangism do not define what they mean by the term "loyalty"; but we think that, without any imputation on the loyalty of Catholics, it may be admitted that, in Ireland, the Protestant minority have always been more faithful adherents to the existing political order, and more in favor of the "Act of Settlement," than have been the Catholic majority. So also, without admitting anything derogatory to the teachings of Christianity in general, it may be conceded that, in Turkey, the Moslem population of Turkey have been more loyal subjects to the Sublime Porte, than have been its Christian subjects.—The present political order, both in Ireland and in Turkey was forced upon the Irish Catholic nation, and the Greek Christians respectively, by foreigners, and at the point of the bayonet; that they are not warmly attached to that order, which has been to them a source of innumerable sufferings, is one of the most natural things in the world.

On the other hand, nothing more natural than that the alien Protestant garrison established by foreign bayonets in Ireland, should be, for the most part, well satisfied with an order of things which places the majority at their mercy, and which has conferred upon them the landed estates of the old Irish Catholic gentry. If loyal, they are as little entitled to credit for their loyalty, as Irish Catholics, or Greek Christians, are to be blamed for their aversion, the one to their alien Catholic, the others to their alien Moslem, masters. The loyalty of the Orangemen is based upon identically the same principle as the loyalty of Sicilian *stirri* to the Neapolitan Bourbons; it proceeds from the same grovelling motives, and, as a principle of action, is entitled to no higher respect from honest and intelligent persons.

Now, if the question had been stated by the Kingston opponents of *Catholicus* in these its true terms, we should have found occasion to contest their conclusions. We would at once have said to them—"Yes! it is perfectly true that, neither the Catholics of Poland, nor the Catholics of Ireland, are, or have any cause to be, ardent in their loyalty to Russia, or to England." But when, not content with this, they assume that disloyalty is a characteristic feature of Catholicity, we must take the liberty of recalling to their memories a few facts which would seem to indicate that the reproach is one to which Protestants at all times, and in all countries, have been especially obnoxious; whilst, on the other hand, obedience to lawfully constituted

authorities has been the prominent characteristic of Papists, whether the subjects of Catholic, or of Non-Catholic Governments.

The "*Great Rebellion*," for instance, (one of the most notable events in the History of Great Britain) was the work of Protestants exclusively; the "*traitorous, heady and high-minded men*"—as the Prayer Book of the Church of England calls them—"cruel men, sons of Belial"—were sound Protestants to a man; whilst the Catholics of England freely shed their blood on many a hard-fought field for a Prince from whom they had received no favors, and whose family were notoriously ungrateful for services rendered.

Turn to France again in the latter end of the succeeding century, and the same phenomenon presents itself. We find that the most faithful to their religion amongst Catholics, were always the most loyal to their Prince; whilst, on the other hand, it was the Non-Catholic section of the community, or the ultra-Protestant party in France by whom the King was brought to the scaffold, and the blood of so many hundreds of thousands of victims was shed. The fact that the first tury of the Jacobin demagogues is always directed against the priest, is a convincing proof of the latter's loyalty, and of the tendency of the principles which his religion inculcates. Read the history of the War in *La Vendee*, would we say to the impugnors of Catholic loyalty.

And in Ireland even—where the Catholic Church, her Pastors, and her people, have ever been the victims of British injustice and Protestant intolerance—we find that same principle of loyalty at work, and greatly suppressing, or modifying the natural tendencies of the oppressed and persecuted to take up arms against their persecutors. We have before our eyes the Letters of John Mitchell, lately published in the *Dublin Irishman*, wherein that Protestant loyalist professes to give a history of the events of '47 and '48. What is the constant complaint of this Protestant writer against the Catholic Bishops and Clergy of Ireland? Why this: that, as a body, they discountenanced all rebellion, and exhorted their people to peace. And in '98, it is most false to pretend that the Irish Hierarchy—whatever may have been the case with individual priests—gave any encouragement to the insurrection, or to French invasion.

The leaders of that rebellion, the chief actors therein, were Protestants. Bagenal Harvey, *Generalissimo* of the Forces, the Sheers, Wolf Tone, the chiefs of the Directory were all Protestants; though of the rank and file, the majority were Catholics. But this was so, because the uprising of Ireland in '98 was partly a national movement against a foreign Government, and the great majority of the Irish were Catholics. It is most unjust however for Orange writers to cite the cruel massacre of Scullabogue, without also mentioning the fact—admitted even by the Orangeman Sir Jonah Barrington, that that deed of blood was in retaliation of a still more hideous crime perpetrated a short time previously by the Orangemen; who, in the Court House at Ennis, deliberately and in cold blood, burned "above eighty" of their wounded opponents to death. [See *Personal Memoirs*.]—God forbid that we should seek to palliate the atrocities of either party; but in justice to the Irish rebels it must be admitted that the cruelties of which they were undoubtedly guilty, were provoked by, and in retaliation of, the nameless atrocities of their Orange enemies.

But a truce to these disputes about "loyalty" which are as endless, and as unprofitable as controversies about "Race." The truth is that both Catholics and Protestants have taken up arms against their respective governments; but that since the XVI century, Catholics have generally, indeed almost always, been Conservatives, or anti-Jacobins, and on the side of authority; whilst non-Catholics, whether of the Puritan or Oliver Cromwell stamp, or of the Danton, and Robespierre stripe, have generally been the partisans of rebellion, and the armed champions of Demagoguism. It is thus, because it is from interest, not on principle, that the Protestants are ever loyal; and because the obligation which they assert as binding on Irish Papists in behalf of a Protestant government, they will not admit as binding upon the Catholic subjects of a Catholic government. The most ultra-Conservatives when their own interests are menaced, they are the most noisy applauders of ultra-demagoguism; or radicalism, when their neighbors' rights are in question; and whilst subscribing to the support of rebellion in Italy, they have the impudence to boast of their loyalty at home. How can Catholics descend even to vindicate their loyalty with these double-faced hypocrites—with these lineal descendants of "Praise-God-Barebones" and his canting crew!

We trust, we pray, that day may never come when the value of Protestant professions of loyalty shall be put to a test in Canada; but should that day come without pretending to the gift of prophecy, we think we may venture to assert that it will be from the ranks of the extreme Protestant party, from amongst the most rabid opponents of Popery, that the cry for dissolution of the Imperial tie, and for annexation to the United States, will proceed. We do not recognize, we would scorn to admit, the existence of any semblance even of spiritual or ecclesiastical authority in Queen or in any layman; but in things temporal, we may boast that Victoria has no more loyal subjects than are to be found amongst the Papists of Canada: loyal, because their loyalty is founded upon principle and is a direct corollary from the spiritual teachings of their Church. Citizens of the United States, Catholics are prominent for their loyalty to the Constitution under which they live; subjects of Queen Victoria they pray God to bless her, to give her the victory over her enemies, and to grant her a long, happy and peaceful reign; and if in any country or under any circumstances, nominal Catholics are to be seen on the side of demagoguism or Jacobinism it will invariably be found that they are men notorious for their disregard of their religious duties, and their contempt for the authority of their Spiritual Mother. In short the tenets or dogmas of Popery are incompatible with Jacobinical political principles.

## EXAMINATION AT THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS SCHOOLS.

The regular semi-annual examination of the pupils of the Christian Schools, took place during the course of last, and this week. Circumstances prevented us from being present at all the examinations, in the various schools; but we had the pleasure and satisfaction of assisting at those held at St. Lawrence, Quebec Suburbs, and the College. The examinations were held in large class-rooms which were crowded to excess by the parents and relatives of the boys, and friends of the Brothers; many of the Rev. Sulpician Fathers were also present, by whom the examinations were occasionally conducted. We would suggest that, in future, spacious halls be provided for the examinations, in order to accommodate the hundreds that had to return home for want of seats.

To speak of each examination at each school, would require more time and space than we can at present afford; we will then confine ourselves to the subjects of study for the more advanced pupils.

The programmes contained examinations in Grammar, History, Arithmetic (mental and written), Book-keeping (by double-entry), Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Mensuration (superfices and solids), the elements of Astronomy and Music, interspersed with amusing dialogues, the different characters being well represented; select pieces of elocution, and music, which served to relieve the tedium and dryness of often prolonged examinations, and to add pleasure and variety to the scene. The exercises began at half-past one, and continued until near six o'clock, P.M.; and during all that time the admiring audience remained to witness the progress of the pupils and to cheer them on, by well-merited plaudits, in their intellectual warfare.

The results of the examinations were very satisfactory, the pupils showing themselves well acquainted with the various branches in which they were examined. We were particularly struck with the rapidity with which nearly all the boys solved difficult problems in arithmetic, and that, too, mentally. Scarcely had the problems been proposed, when all hands were up, indicating that they had the answers. This wonderful proficiency of the scholars, seemed to be doubted by some of the auditors, and hence they questioned and tested, and the results were still more satisfactory. The examinations of the Classes in book-keeping claim particular attention. The pupils were asked very useful and intricate questions; how to journalize and post difficult entries; and how to close the most important accounts in the ledger, to all these correct answers were given, evincing a good knowledge and excellent training in that very useful art. The answering in written arithmetic, algebra, geometry, mensuration, and trigonometry, showed a very careful preparation and study, the pupils solving difficult problems without hesitation; the problems were not elementary, but of a nature to test the capacity of even more advanced students. The boys of Griffintown will long recollect the gentleman that examined in Algebra, as, in our estimation, he was too severe, or anxious to put them down, but they proved themselves a match for him.

We have assisted at many examinations, and we confess that those of which we are now writing were inferior to none, but superior to many of them, in a great many respects. The Christian Schools are not behind the spirit and intelligence of the age, nor are they governed by a mere system of routine, as can be observed by any one who attends at their examinations; but they are governed by a sufficiently well-tested system which, we believe, in a free intellectual conflict, would prove itself superior to any other school system, and that, without losing sight of the spirit of religion, or sacrificing that solidity of acquisitions which is the traditional feature of Catholic education.

The great benefits arising from Public Examinations are now manifest and recognised by the best educators; and hence the schools whose pupils can, at the termination of the year, go before the public and submit to severe tests satisfactorily, deserve the largest claim of public patronage. And, judging from the number of respectable ladies and gentlemen that were present at the examination, the many Christian Schools now in the city, and the four thousand five hundred boys in daily attendance [according to our informant,] we must evidently conclude that the Schools of the Christian Brothers are held in high estimation by our citizens, and that public favor has been extended to them with a liberal hand.

After the examinations, a few complimentary remarks were addressed to the pupils of St. Lawrence and Quebec suburbs schools by the Rev. Mr. O'Farrell, congratulating them on their proficiency and success in their studies during the year. He spoke of the satisfaction such examinations afforded himself and their dear parents—of the merits of the School system of the Christian Brothers, who, he remarked, do not only give the best secular instruction, but impart an Education as much superior to mere human learning, as heaven to earth—an Education that makes the sociable and intelligent citizen, the virtuous and humble man.

There is nothing perhaps that more perfectly proves the utter fashood of the charges brought by bigotry against the Papal Government than the nature of the accusations themselves. That there is any amount of abuse heaped upon the devoted head of the Holy Father in particular, and Priestcraft in general, is true; but scurrility is a gift enjoyed alike by Protestant bigots, and "Billingsgate fishwives," and passes current for authentic proofs amongst none but their own peculiar fraternity. That the *Times* has essayed to produce some few instances of Priestcraft and oppression as proofs of the "unutterable tyranny" of the Papal rule, must be admitted; but after the celebrated Gallenga affair, its claims of credibility are small enough. Besides, the India dodge became in the end rather too transparent even for John Bull's proverbial blindness and gullibility, and is rather too recent an affair to be as yet quite forgotten. At the breaking out of the Indian mutiny—"the cry of

oppressed nationality" it would be called, if aught but India, the Ionian Islands, and Ireland were in question)—there were in the Imperial Parliament two very inconvenient parties—the Peace party, and the anti-Red-tape-routine-and-circumlocution-Office party. These were making it their business to pry rather too closely to suit Ministers, into the various expenditures and malpractices of the imbecile Horse Guards and Admiralty-boards, and had aroused John Bull by their revelations to such a pitch of exertions, that he had absolutely tied a knot upon his purse-strings, and buttoned up his fob, and declared with a strong expression—(John, when roused, is peculiarly prone to strong expressions)—"That he'd see them somewhere first, before they should have another farthing." This was rather an inconvenient mood to find the Purseholder in, when he was wanted to "come down with the dust," as his fast sons call it. India was about to be lost—by England's abominable tyranny and misrule it is true; but, no matter how, she must be lost, unless John will consent to increased expenditure, and a consequently higher rate of an already exorbitant Income-tax. What then were Ministers to do? John was determined, and had he not declared it on oath, and that with any Christian man ought to be sufficient. What then was to be done?—Some proposed slight imbrication—(John is known to be inclined to tipple)—and as a mellowing of the soul; but then this was not a Catholic affair, and therefore there was no anti-Catholic spirit wherewith to intoxicate him. "His sympathies must be aroused through the press."—Happy thought! Accordingly, next day there came across the sea, tidings of dreadful massacres by cruel Sepoys of unoffending women and children. Women, who never existed except in the *Times* newspaper, are massacred and worse by barbarous soldiers; whilst women and (to draw his sympathy the surer, for John is an admirer of aristocracy and beauty) beautiful ladies too, who did exist, are put to death in pica and Roman capitals, to come to life again in a convenient season. Such was the way that cunning tricksters played upon the feelings of the simple, good old man, until his purse-strings vibrated in sympathetic harmony with his heart's best cords, and poured out a golden melody to the tune of a few millions of an Indian Bill. And so it is in Italy. Savoy and Nice have been grasped by France; and England must have her lion's share of the boot(y) too. So to cloak her designs, and to make John Bull's almost empty purse, bleed once more, there come tidings again across the sea "of the wailings of oppressed nationalities," until his heart is opened, and so eager is he to pay, that without waiting for the tax-gatherer—through whom he does all his charity—he runs open-handed to pour in his contributions to a Garibaldi fund. Here is the key to the Sicilian mystery. England must have her counterpoise in Continental Europe, for Nice and Savoy, and she finds it most conveniently in Sicily; Garibaldi is her tool, and will be her Viceroy if Europe is insane enough to allow him; but money must be got out of John's pocket to do the thing; and hence these tales of tyranny and Papal oppression to draw out the sympathy of the dear old man. Not that we would deny that the King of Naples has been guilty of sore oppression; but has not that oppression been forced upon him in self-defence by British intrigue and British gold? And are there not tales of oppression, too, far better authenticated, in a certain other island much nearer home, that ought to arouse his sympathy? Nor will it do to believe all, nor, perhaps, one hundredth part of what is placed at the Bourbons' door. We have seen too much hashing-up accounts and atrocities to serve a purpose; and that by journals that ought to be respectable, to be taken in a second time with chaff. The British press is even more easily welded than its enslaved Napoleon across the Channel. What Louis Napoleon does by warnings and suppression, England's Premier does by milder, but no less efficient, means. Knowing John Bull's character to a dot, he dares not meddle with him by force; but, like the donkey-driver, holds out before his nose—just near enough to be unattainable—a bunch of inviting carrots, or a savory whisp of hay, and thus leads him—poor foolish ass!—whithersoever he wills. Pull the wires of the *Times*, and get up a "furore," and the thing is done. Let the *Times* bark and bark, and from one end of the country to the other—like village curs on a calm summer's night—the canine chorus of Provincial newspapers answers in responsive notes, without knowing, or caring to know, the why or wherefore.

"The cry of oppressed nationalities," forsooth, is a superlative humbug. It is the case of the poor, foolish frogs over again. What have these oppressed nationalities obtained from sympathetic Europe, think you? *King stork for king log*. Nice and Savoy have cried for bread, and have been given a stone; they asked for liberty and independence, and have received French tyranny, and a French police. The Duchies and the Romagna have exchanged a paternal rule for Sardinian extortion, and a national bankruptcy, for the privilege of helping to pay Sardinia's debts; and Catholic Sicily—if Europe will allow it—is reserved for English rule—to experience at her hands no doubt the same paternal government under which poor Catholic Ireland has suffered a superhuman tyranny for so many centuries. God help poor Italy! Her skies are bright and clear—her soil is rich—and like an unprotected beauty, her comeliness has roused her neighbors' lust, and will encompass her ruin. In looking over the accusations brought against the Papal sway, nothing but the blindest bigot can fail to discover that they are composed of nought but frothy declamation, without one single attempt at proof. No instance, perhaps, proves this so strongly on this Continent as the action of the New York *Times*—the Thunderer's puny cousin—upon Archbishop Hughes' powerful vindication of the Papal rule. This vindication, of course, had "raised the Yankee dander," and one would naturally expect that, if he did attack it at all, he would not leave one single proof unused in its annihilation. But what is the fact? In a column and a half of the

fiercest denunciations in small pica, of priestcraft and Papacy—the only accusation that the worthy Editor could find to hurl at the Archbishop's devoted head, was that the Papal Government had a *monopoly of salt*. Bless the poor, crazy man, we could find more tyranny and monopoly in his own dear spotless Republic in one minute, than his crazy head could comprehend after a month of study.

SACERDOS.

## DR. RYERSON'S DARK AGES.

Turn we now to the secular learning of the Methodist Doctor's "Dark Ages." And in very sooth when we have such authorities as Tordin, and Robertson in his history of Charles the Fifth asserting the ignorance of the Middle Ages, it is not to be wondered at (on the principle of monkey aping ape) that we have such minor lights as the Chief Superintendent of the Educational department of Upper Canada, and a certain judicial personage following in their wake. But though it be not to be wondered at, they are nevertheless to be pitied, because it proves that whatever those ages may be in themselves, they are undoubtedly *Dark* to them. Besides, it shows a want of accuracy of mind and judgment, and any amount of bigotry in them to receive so gulpingly all that is affirmed, unsupported by proof of these Catholic ages.—As a sample of these writers' inaccuracy, not to say utter ignorance, of the Middle Ages, we will instance Robertson's assertion in his "Views of the Progress of Society," that "many of the clergy of that period" (from the seventh to the eleventh century mind you) "did not understand the *Breviary* which they were obliged 'daily to recite; some of them could scarcely read it.'" Now here is an assertion which the generality of readers, and the Methodist Doctor doubtless amongst the rest, would not care to test by reference to the historical fact, especially as that fact is a Popish one; and yet it is not surely so much to be wondered at that many of the clergy did not understand, whilst some could scarcely read a book which at that period had no existence! It was not until the extreme end of the eleventh century that the *Breviary* was compiled. It is surely rather too exacting to expect men to be able to read a book which did not exist, and had not existed. This however, except for the sake of accuracy, is an unimportant affair after all; for although the illustration was an unfortunate one, and will make us doubt his historical accuracy henceforth, still his main point was to assert the general ignorance and particular inability of the clergy, and a portion of the laity, of the period to read. "Persons of the highest rank, and in the most eminent stations, could not read and write." Now, fortunately for the cause of truth, and unfortunately for his reputation as an accurate reasoner, he again essays a proof of this sweeping and general proposition, by which we can test his accuracy. In a note appended to this assertion—for he appears to have had some slight qualms of conscience at allowing so broad an assertion to go without some appearance of proof—he says—"Innumerable proofs of this might be produced. Many charters granted by persons of the highest rank are preserved, from which it appears that they could not subscribe their names. It was usual for persons who could not write to make the sign of the cross in confirmation of a charter. Several of these remain, where kings and persons of great eminence affix the sign of the cross on account of their ignorance of letters." Now, a superficial reader (is the Methodist Doctor one of these?) would immediately exclaim, on reading this—What damning proofs of ignorance! But let us analyse the matter a little, and we shall see. In the first place then, if *innumerable proofs* might be adduced, why, in all conscience, are they not? If many charters are preserved, in which kings and eminent persons have written themselves down asses, pray where are they? Their production would certainly place the question beyond all reasonable doubt for all future generations, especially if they were placed in the Upper Canada College Museum; it is unfortunate therefore that they are not forthcoming. Besides, they would form such splendid materials for snubbing such future "Padre Bruyeres" who might be so indiscreet as to talk of Catholic education, that we would advise the worthy Doctor to look them up. It is true that we have examples of charters signed by eminent persons with the sign of the cross on account of their inability to write; but how many are they? *Four all told*. From the 5th to the 12th century, we have on record only four examples—an Englishman, or rather an Anglo-Saxon! (Withred, King of Kent);—a Dutchman (Tassilo of Bavaria); a Frenchman (Heribaud, Comte du Palais, under Lewis II); and an Italian (Gui Guerra, Count of Tuscan). Now Robertson having settled the case in his own mind, may deem four cases spread over six hundred years as "innumerable proofs," and "many cases;" and the Methodist Doctor, the next time he writes about the lethargy and enslavement of the Dark Ages may endorse his statements, but they will find no sane man at least to accept their paper. When such men as Mabilion, Toussaint, and Tassin can produce only four cases amongst them, we may, we think, safely conclude that there are no more on record. But with reference to this custom herein mentioned of affixing the sign of the cross to the signature, and from the prevalence of which Robertson appears to draw an argument of the inability of those who did so to write, we must say a few words. When Catholic Bishops at the present day in signing their names, prefix thereto, as is their custom, the holy sign of man's redemption, are they to be considered therefore as unable to write, let alone to read? And should some future Chief Superintendent of Education take it into his head to enlighten the Canadian public upon the lethargy and enslavement of Canadian Dark Ages, can he legitimately prove therefrom the utter ignorance of the Catholic clergy of this period? Mabilion has given three reasons why charters were frequently signed by proxy. 1.—*The inability of the parties to write*, as in the four cases mentioned, of which, by-the-bye, he only mentions three.—