

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1857.

TO OUR CITY SUBSCRIBERS.

Subscribers changing their residence are respectfully requested to give notice to that effect at this office, in order that our "Carrier Boys" may know where to leave their papers.

THE LADIES OF LORETTO, AND THE GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF CANADA.

OUR Provincial Legislators have just furnished us with another admirable specimen of their liberality, and disposition to act honestly towards Catholics. As the subject is one in which our interests as citizens are deeply involved, and as it is important that, when next called upon to exercise their political rights, the Catholic electors of Canada should know in what manner the confidence reposed by them in their representatives has been justified by the conduct of the latter, we intend laying before our readers a brief account of the debate on Thursday of last week, upon the question of incorporating the "Sisters of Our Lady of Loretto" of the Diocese of Toronto.

The Sisters of this Order compose a body of charitable ladies, whose sole object is to impart gratuitous education to the poor, and orphan members of their Church. In order to enable them to accomplish this charitable—and, to society, this eminently useful—work, they came before the Legislature, with the request, that, in so far as they were concerned, the law might be so modified as to enable them to hold such property as the liberality of the faithful might bestow upon them; but not a penny did they ask from the public funds, or assistance of any kind from the State. Their demand simply resolves itself into this—that they might be allowed, without molestation from the State, to hold private property given to them by charitable individuals; which of course includes the demand, that the Legislature recognise the right of the individual to do what he will with his own—so long as he does not exercise that right to the detriment of his neighbor. For to deny the right of holding property given, is to deny the right of the giver to give.

On Thursday of last week, it was accordingly moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill to Incorporate the said "Sisters of Loretto"; which motion was the signal for a general outburst of calumny, insult, and mendacious attacks upon the Catholic Church, to which it would be difficult to find a parallel outside of the walls of Exeter Hall, or the meeting-house wherein do congregate the members of a "Canadian Missionary," or "Apostate Priests' Protection Society." Indeed, during the entire debate, the hall of our Provincial Legislature presented far more the appearance of a rabid No-Popery Meeting, than of an assemblage of statesmen, Christians, and gentlemen. It was as if old "Praise God Barbones," and his ribald crew, had been suddenly raised from the dead, and convened as a Canadian Parliament.

The honor of opening the ball belongs to Mr. McKenzie, a person of not very enviable or reputable antecedents; and who, in the course of his remarks, had the impudence to assign as his reason for opposing the Bill under discussion, that:—

"The Catholic Church was essentially intolerant, and that an extension of its powers was dangerous to the liberties of the public."

Hereupon, Mr. McKenzie must pardon us if we plainly tell him a piece of our mind, with respect to his ungentlemanly language, in which it is not easy to say whether his ignorance of history, or his disregard of truth and common courtesy, is the more conspicuous. We tell him then, plainly and frankly, that if he and his colleagues forget what is due to truth, and the feelings of their Catholic fellow-citizens, he, and they, need not be surprised if we fail to pay them that respect, to which their position—(not their personal merits)—entitles them; and which, as Catholics, our religion teaches us to yield to all in authority.—We would remind him, and them, that they have grossly mistaken their position and ours, in presuming thus to insult and calumniate us and our Church; that if they are members of the Provincial Parliament, they are our servants, and not our masters; that the high wages which we pay them for their services do not entitle them to be insolent; that they are sent to Parliament to represent, and not to misrepresent us—to watch over the interests of all, and not to malign or outrage the feelings of any; and that by dealing in offensive vituperation of what one half of their fellow-citizens do most love and venerate upon earth, they bring, not only themselves—but the important body to which they belong, into justly merited odium and contempt. We would also take this opportunity of reminding him and them, that of all "Junkenism," the "Junkenism" of him who avails himself of his official position to offer insults to which he would not dare give utterance as a private individual, is, to every honorable mind, the most disgusting.

One word in conclusion as to the real motives which led to the rejection of the simple request of the "Sisters of Loretto." These motives were of course not assigned during the debate; for, for the credit of the intellectual progress of the XIX. century, we would not believe that the veriest old woman in the conventicle is weak enough or silly enough, to attach any importance to Mr. Brown's miserable twaddle about "mortmain," and the evils of celibacy. The real cause of the hostility to the Sisters' Institution was, that it was looked upon as a formidable rival to the proselytising "common schools" of the Upper Province; as likely to withdraw destitute Catholic children from these demoralising establishments, those hot-beds of vice and infidelity; and, in short, as an infraction of the fundamental principle of "State-Schoolism"—which is, that the State, and not the Church, or the individual, should have the supreme control of the education of the poor. Viewing it in this light, the action of the Legislature towards a Catholic Institution, the result of whose labors, if successful, would be the overthrow of the darling and deep-laid schemes of the State for the gradual extinction of Popery by means of "common schools," is

"Set a beggar on horseback," however—as the old saw says—and "he will ride to the"—the great father of all Protestantism; and so, though we may be pained, and for the honor of our Canada, ashamed, at the language of too many of our legislators, we can scarce feel surprised at it. Nevertheless, as Catholics, we feel ourselves called upon to exercise our rights as freemen to denounce it, and the scarce disguised appeals to violence against "Romish institutions," made by some of the other speakers upon the occasion.

A Mr. Sidney Smith, for instance, had the impertinence to tell us that "ecclesiastical corporations were not wanted in Upper Canada"—a fact of which the Catholics of that section of the Province are the sole competent judges; and warming with the subject, the same speaker continued:—

"And if they are forced upon the people of Upper Canada by means of Lower Canada votes, he would tell gentlemen from Lower Canada, that some day a stop will be put to those institutions in a manner which will not be pleasant to those gentlemen."

Now, what would be the feelings of Protestants in Upper Canada if—the Parliament being held in Quebec—a Lower Canadian Catholic member were to hold such language with regard to the ecclesiastical, educational, or charitable institutions of Protestants in the Lower Province? What if he were to proclaim that these institutions were not wanted; and that if they were forced upon us down here, "a stop would be put to them, in a manner which would not be pleasant to Protestants." Such language would be indignantly, but justly denounced by the entire Protestant, and we will add—by the entire Catholic press of the Province—as insulting in the highest degree, as an unwarrantable attempt to dictate to Protestants how they should manage their own private affairs; and, worse than all, as a direct appeal to a fanatical rabble to repeat in Canada the Protestant outrages which have left an indelible blot upon the name of Boston and Bunker's Hill. Mr. Smith may disclaim any such intentions; but every one who can appreciate the force of words, will know what credit to attach to such a disclaimer.

Mr. G. Brown was perhaps a trifle less abusive, but certainly more stupid and prosy than is customary with that evangelical individual. He habbled about "mortmain," and talked an insufferable deal of nonsense about "locking up land," and "vows of celibacy," which "many members hold to be a wrong to the State." Mr. Brown's speech was in short merely a miserable rechauffe of some of the most stupid passages of Gavazzi's worst lectures against Popery; seasoned with a little of his own peculiar fustian, but upon the whole as rapid as a second hand "chaw" of tobacco. The patience of the audience during the infliction of the nauseous compound was most exemplary.

With such stuff, however, was the House regaled during we know not how many mortal hours. Had it been a question of incorporating some swindling "Rail-Road" or Banking Company, or of conferring new and extraordinary powers upon a handful of unprincipled speculators, the job would have been done at once, and without a division. But alas! it was none of these things that the House was asked to do; and so the modest request of the "Sisters of Loretto" to be allowed to hold property given to them for the purpose of educating poor and destitute children of their own persuasion, was rejected by a majority of 40 to 35. We publish the list of the division, as given by the *Montreal Herald*, in the hopes, that it will be closely studied by our Catholic readers; and that at the next election they will carefully abstain from giving their support to any candidate—no matter what his other claims—who, being in the present Parliament, voted against—or who without having a valid excuse for his absence, did not vote in favor of—the "Sisters of Loretto." It is only by exercising this strict surveillance over our representatives, that we can ever expect them to do their duty.

One word in conclusion as to the real motives which led to the rejection of the simple request of the "Sisters of Loretto." These motives were of course not assigned during the debate; for, for the credit of the intellectual progress of the XIX. century, we would not believe that the veriest old woman in the conventicle is weak enough or silly enough, to attach any importance to Mr. Brown's miserable twaddle about "mortmain," and the evils of celibacy. The real cause of the hostility to the Sisters' Institution was, that it was looked upon as a formidable rival to the proselytising "common schools" of the Upper Province; as likely to withdraw destitute Catholic children from these demoralising establishments, those hot-beds of vice and infidelity; and, in short, as an infraction of the fundamental principle of "State-Schoolism"—which is, that the State, and not the Church, or the individual, should have the supreme control of the education of the poor. Viewing it in this light, the action of the Legislature towards a Catholic Institution, the result of whose labors, if successful, would be the overthrow of the darling and deep-laid schemes of the State for the gradual extinction of Popery by means of "common schools," is

plain; and as easily intelligible as was the hint given by Mr. Smith about "putting a stop to Popish institutions in a manner not pleasant." Not only, if "State-Schoolism" be sound in theory, should attendance upon "common schools" be made obligatory upon all, but all other schools or places of education whatsoever—all colleges, and asylums for the poor and destitute—should be prohibited and abolished; as utterly repugnant to, and destructive of the principle upon which alone compulsory taxation for "common school" purposes can be logically defended. To admit the right of a religious society, like that of the Sisters of St. Joseph, supported entirely by voluntary offerings, and not subject to the control of the State, to open schools and to receive pupils, would be tantamount to admitting the whole principle contended for by the friends of "Freedom of Education." It was of this then, and not of mortmain, of "lands locked up," or the "evils of celibacy," that the gentlemen of our Provincial Parliament were afraid when they recorded their votes against the "Ladies of Loretto." Such Institutions, as savoring of "Freedom of Education," "are not wanted in Upper Canada," as Mr. Smith says.

We subjoin the names of the members who voted for, and against Mr. Hartman's amendment to prohibit the Sisters from holding real property. By looking over the list of the minority, it will be seen that a good many *soi-disant* Catholics abstained from voting. We trust that their constituents will call them to a strict account for their—to say the least—strange conduct:—

YEAS—Messrs. Bell, Biggar, Brodeur, Cameron, Cayley, Christie, Cook, Daly, Chas. Daoust, Darche, J. B. E. Dorion, A. A. Dorion, Ferguson, Ferris, Flint, Foley, Fraser, Freeman, Gamble, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Lumsden, McDonald, Mathewson, Mattice, A. Morrison, Munro, Papiu, Powell, Robinson, Sanborn, Solicitor General Smith, S. Smith, Somerville, Spence, Terrill, Turcotte, and Wright,—40.

NAYS—Messrs. Baby, Bowes, Bureau, Attorney General Cartier, Cassault, Canchon, Chaffers, Chapais, Clarke, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dufresne, Evanturel, T. Fortier, O. C. Fortier, Fournier, Guereux, Huot, Labelle, Lemieux, Loranger, R. McDonald, McCann, Marchildon, Masson, Mongenais, Pouliot, Prevost, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Solicitor General Ross, Simard, and Thibaudeau,—35.

OUR NEW CATHEDRAL.—Below we give an extract from a letter, lately received by His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, from His Grace the Archbishop of Halifax, N.S., upon the project of the former of erecting a Cathedral, worthy of this wealthy Diocese; and which shall attest to future generations the piety and liberality of their Catholic forefathers. His Grace also, as will be seen, testifies his sympathy with his brethren and spiritual children in Canada, by a generous donation to the work in hand; and an act of charity which we are sure the Catholics of the Diocese of Montreal will not fail to appreciate. Thus encouraged on all sides, it would be a sin for us to be niggardly in our contributions; or to doubt for one moment of the complete success of the great enterprise which our beloved Bishop has commenced, which has the prayers of the faithful for its completion, and which God himself, for the honor of Whose name it has been undertaken, will assuredly bless His Grace writes:—

"I cannot tell you with what unfeigned pleasure I heard of your magnificent idea respecting the new Cathedral. It will be a glorious souvenir of the Eternal City in the New World, and an imperishable monument of the faith and devotion of a city that is ennobled by its august title, and its association with the endearing name of the Immaculate Mother of God.

"It will be a hallowed sanctuary, to which not only your faithful Canadians, but Catholics from every part of America, will repair, in future times, to admire the beauties of Catholic art, and the triumphs of Catholic piety; whilst each and all, it will serve as a connecting link to bind them more closely in holy communion with the indestructible Chair of Peter, and the vivifying spiritual authority of his successors.

"In such a work, my Lord, and with such a people, you must succeed. The benediction of Heaven, and the prayers of all good men on earth, will assist you.

"As I, too, desire to participate, however humbly, in a work that must be dear to the heart of every Catholic Prelate, I pray your acceptance of the small sum enclosed; and beg you will consider this mite as a very inadequate proof of the extent of my wishes for the success of your holy undertaking."

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity to tender our sincere thanks to the Rev. Mr. Maloy of Ottawa City, and the Messrs. P. Devine, and J. Dwyer, for the very kind assistance furnished by them to our friend Mr. Monagan, now travelling through Upper Canada, as General Agent for the TRUE WITNESS. We regret that we cannot express, as we would wish, our sense of the obligation the above named gentlemen of Ottawa have conferred upon us. Our thanks are also tendered to those of our subscribers who have taken advantage of Mr. Monagan's visit to settle their accounts with this office. Acknowledgments shall appear in our next.

We wish that we could add that our "Delinquent Subscribers"—of whom Ottawa furnishes us with but too many—had upon the same occasion manifested a disposition to act honestly towards us, by discharging some portion, at least, of their indebtedness to this office. Some, who

have been taking our paper for years, without paying one copper, seem to think themselves harshly dealt with, and grumble, when called upon for a settlement of their long-outstanding accounts. Now, as with all our patience and forbearance, we hardly can stand being swindled out of our money; we take this occasion of publicly requesting the undermentioned Ottawa Delinquents—to whose names we attach the sums by their owing to us, but which they refuse to pay—to remit the amounts which they are charged respectively, in order to avoid putting us to the trouble of taking other means to enforce attention to our just claims:—

Messrs. J. McDonnell, . . . 3 2 6
E. Cunningham, . . . £2 2 6
David Burgeois, . . . 2 16 3

We would also beg leave respectfully to inform the St. Patrick's Society of Ottawa, that, henceforward, a free copy of the TRUE WITNESS shall be duly forwarded to them, so long as they are pleased to accept it; and that this would have been done long ago, had we ever heard from them to the effect that they were desirous of placing our paper on the table of their reading-room.

Mr. Monagan purposes visiting Kingston and Prescott immediately; where we trust that he may be favorably received, and meet with fewer dishonest "Delinquents" than in the City of Ottawa.

From the following letter from His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, to the Rev. M. Bruyere, which has been publicly read in all churches, and chapels within the Diocese, will be seen the high opinion that is entertained of M. Bruyere's exertions in the holy cause of "Freedom of Education," not only by his immediate ecclesiastical superior, but by the common father of the faithful—the Sovereign Pontiff himself. Such a splendid acknowledgment of his services, must be highly gratifying to the Rev. M. Bruyere, and will, no doubt, prove a rich source of blessings to the Catholics of the Diocese of Toronto, so long deprived of their Chief Pastor; and for whose safe and speedy return to Canada we all devoutly pray:—

LETTER OF HIS LORDSHIP THE BISHOP OF TORONTO TO THE VERY REVEREND J. M. BRUYERE.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR—In consideration of all your services, particularly in the cause of Catholic education; or rather to speak a more Apostolic language, in order that you may more effectually serve the Church—be pleased to accept by the presents, the titles of Vicar-General of the Diocese of Toronto, and of Administrator of the same in case of death, with all the faculties which, for the due performance of those two-fold duties, and by the authority of the Holy See, we can and do confer upon you.

This letter will be read, after its reception, in all the churches and stations of the Diocese of Toronto, Given, near Rome, under our hand and seal on Easter Monday, 13th of April, 1857.

ARMANDUS FR. M.A.,
Bishop of Toronto.

We have to announce the death of His Lordship, the Right Rev. Bishop Gaulin, of Kingston, who expired on the 8th instant, at St. Philomena, Seignory of Chateauguy, in the seventieth year of his age. May his soul, through the mercy of God, repose in peace.

Mgr. Gaulin was born in Quebec in 1787; and having at an early age manifested great natural talents, and most excellent dispositions, was induced by the representations of Mgr. Pleassis to enter the ecclesiastical state. In consequence, he changed the direction of his studies, and, in due time, was admitted to Holy Orders, and raised to the Priesthood in the month of October 1811. Immediately afterwards, he was appointed *Vicair* to the late Mgr. Alexander McDonnell—who was subsequently raised to the dignity of Bishop of Kingston, being the first Prelate of that Diocese. For many years the Rev. M. Gaulin labored in his vocation, with great honor to himself, and much profit to the Church, sometimes in one parish, and sometimes in another; but always distinguishing himself by his zeal and indefatigable energy.

In 1841, upon the death of Mgr. McDonnell, the Rev. M. Gaulin was named to the Diocese of Kingston, then comprising a far more extended field of labor than it does at present; and which, at his earnest request, was diminished by the erection of Toronto into a separate Episcopal See. In the year 1843, Mgr. Phelan was given to him as a Co-Adjutor, and was consecrated at Montreal in the month of August 1845.

In those days the Catholics of Kingston were in a very different situation from what they are at present. The Diocese was in want of every thing. Churches had to be built, schools had to be established, and hospitals founded. Nothing daunted, Mgr. Gaulin set about the work in earnest; and in a short time had the satisfaction of seeing springing up in all directions, those noble institutions which everywhere mark the progress of our holy religion. His health however began to give way under the incessant toil imposed upon him; and the care of the Diocese of Kingston was entrusted to the hands of his venerable Co-Adjutor. In 1848, Mgr. Gaulin was still well enough to assist at the consecration of Mgr. Guiges of Bytown; but in the year following a paralytic stroke compelled him to desist from the exercise of his episcopal functions. From that time, to the commencement of the present year, he lived in retirement at Kingston. About the beginning of 1857, he took up his residence in the parish of St. Philomena, for whose *Cure*, the Rev. M. Poulin, he felt a warm esteem; and in whose arms he breathed his last, on Friday of last week.

The body of the deceased Prelate was brought into town on Saturday, and placed in the chapel attached to the Episcopal Palace. On Monday, it was escorted by the Bishop of Montreal and his clergy, accompanied by a large concourse of our citizens, to the Railroad station, where it was placed upon the cars for conveyance to Kingston; in order that the mortal remains of the deceased may repose beneath the shade of the splendid Cathedral of his own Episcopal City, whilst awaiting that great day when the grave shall give up its dead, and the just shall come forth to life everlasting.

TWO LECTURES DELIVERED BY L. S. IVES, LL.D.—Dr. Ives, whose conversion to the Catholic faith must still be fresh in the memories of our readers, has done well in yielding to the solicitations of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in New York, by publishing his lectures, lately delivered before that Society: and in which, in a masterly manner, he contrasts the effects of "Church and State Charities;" and ably discusses the question, whether it be preferable for the interest of society and of the individual, that the great work of charity should be entrusted to the secular Government, or the Church?

Since the great apostasy of the XVI century, this question has been warmly debated; but now in the middle of XIX century, and with the experience of near three hundred years, we should arrive at a determinate conclusion thereupon.—For nigh three hundred years, in every Protestant State, the secular arm has had absolute control over the spiritual. Convents and monasteries have been razed to the ground, their inmates dispersed, and their property confiscated to the use of the State—which in assuming the administration thereof, assumed likewise the charge of providing for the wants, moral and physical, of those for whose especial relief the said confiscated property had been originally intended.—How the State, or secular government, has performed this great work, the utterly degraded condition of the poor in every country in Europe—England especially—can tell. The Devil himself never devised anything more cruel than a Protestant Poor Law; which, whilst it treats the pauper more harshly than the criminal Law does the felon, puts a premium upon crime, and debases both physically and morally all classes of the community. From history, and from the pauper and criminal statistics of the different countries of Europe, Dr. Ives proves indisputably that, as an independent agent in the great work of charity, the State is, not only always impotent for good, but is always and everywhere actively injurious.

And whilst this holds true of those cases wherein the State undertakes to relieve only the physical or bodily wants of its citizens, it is still more evident when the State presumes to interfere with their intellectual and spiritual ailments. If the State is unfit to manage the "Soup Kitchen" or to administer victuals to the belly, far less is it qualified to control the school, or to take charge of the education of its youth. This is the point, which Dr. Ives, in his lectures before us, endeavors principally to establish; and from the discussion of the question—To whom should the work of charity in general be entrusted?—he proceeds to discuss the particular question—"Whether God or the State shall direct man's thoughts, and exercise dominion over his conscience and will?"—p. 10.

That "secular education," or to use the common cant of the day "unsectarian education," inevitably leads to infidelity and immorality, the lecturer proves by the testimony of Protestant travellers in these Protestant countries of Europe where State-Schoolism is most firmly established. He cites for instances Mr. Laing as to the moral and religious condition of Protestant Prussia:—

"If it is to be thought necessary to support the reasoning by facts, the present demoralized and irreligious state of Protestant Prussia will furnish an abundant and melancholy supply. Mr. Laing the famous Presbyterian traveller and writer, shall be my authority. But before introducing his words, I would, by way of preface, remind you of the following facts.

"It is now about forty years since the government of Prussia attempted, by her national system, to produce uniformity of religion among the Protestant sects, the two principal of which were the Lutherans and Calvinists. The special measure by which she attempted this, was the appointment of a new and common form of worship, from which all sectarian views were professedly excluded. The essential benefits of this effort were expected to result from its influence upon the rising generation in the national schools.

The old generation has passed away, and we are now brought to a period in which we may test the value of the system—many judge of the tree by its fruits. Let us listen to what the Scotch Presbyterian, Mr. Laing, says about these. And (1) he speaks of the *tree*—speaks of the principle of accommodation, by which what are subt out, and men are made to run side by side in a middle course. He says that the philosophers who have extolled the State system of Prussian education in letters and words, seem to have made a fatal misapplication of weak minds that seeks a middle way between, in religion, in morals, in politics, as in mathematics, *in via media* is a nonentity. Morally and intellectually, there is no middle point between true and false, right and wrong; and practically, no attainment between hit and miss. There is no neutral ground in religion, none in morals, and none in sound politics. When governments attempt to extend their power beyond the legitimate object for which government is established in society, and which would embrace the intellectual, moral, and religious concerns, as well as the material interests of the subject, they are obliged to adopt a middle course between the extreme power they would usurp, and the innate principle in the human mind, of resistance to power over intellectual action. This middle course, founded on no principle but the evasion of applying principle to action, has, for the last half century, been the line of policy of Prussia, in which she has signally failed."

And now for the particulars of the failure. Under this system, he says, "the mind of the great mass of the people had nothing Christian to hold by, nothing in religion venerated as dogmas, or practices of worship from former times, from respected associations with the sufferings or deeds of their forefathers. Infidelity, Deism, Straussism, and all the other forms and shapes which unbelief can assume in the speculative, dreaming German mind, had had free play. Protestantism as a Church being virtually abolished

* Six dollars a head, per diem; a precious sight more than they are worth.