

THE TRUE WITNESS

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, BY J. GILLIES
FOR GEORGE B. CLERE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:
Town Subscribers.....\$3 per annum.
Country do.....24
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.
Single Copies, 3d.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor
of the TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post
paid.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1858.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Amongst the most interesting items of British news brought to us by the last steamer, we find an account of a deputation of Orangemen; who waited upon Lord Palmerston for the object of inducing him to revoke the instructions of the Irish Lord Chancellor to the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Down, directing him not to commend any person to be placed on the Magisterial Bench who would not subscribe a declaration to the effect that, so long as he held his commission as Magistrate, he would not connect himself with Orangeism. Lord Palmerston received the deputation most blandly, and snubbed them most unmercifully; telling them in plain words that Orange Societies were an insult to the Government, as though it were unable to protect the persons of its subjects; and that the best thing that the Orangemen could do, would be to go home, and quietly disband themselves—as “there was nothing which would more contribute to the peace of the country, and the obliteration of ancient prejudices.” Giving them this nut to crack, Lord Palmerston most politely bowed the deputation out, who retired no doubt well satisfied with their reception. We would call the attention of M. Loranger to the above facts; and request of him to bear in mind that all that we ask is, that our Canadian Government shall adopt towards Orangeism the same policy, as has been adopted towards it in Ireland—a policy we may add that has been repeatedly and most earnestly enforced upon our Canadian authorities by the Imperial Government. If to ask this be “intolerance,” then must Her Majesty's Protestant Ministerial advisers at home be the most intolerant of men.

The debates in the House of Commons have been exciting. By a large majority, Lord Palmerston has obtained leave to introduce his Bill for the new Government of India. A Bill for abolishing the odious impost of Church Rates was carried by a majority of 53; but on the measure for dealing with conspiracy to murder, Government suffered a defeat. In fact, both inside and outside of the House, there is a strong feeling against making any alterations in the criminal code—no matter how obvious the justice of those alterations—lest it might seem that the “British Lion” was awed by the crowings of the “Gallic Cock.” Now amongst the *fauna* of the political word there is no beast that more piques itself upon its pluck than does the aforesaid “Lion,” and so at the present moment it is lashing its sides with its tail in a manner awful to behold, and roaring most obstreperously. This is to be regretted, for it seriously menaces the “*entente cordiale*,” so advantageous to France and England, and to the cause of European civilisation.

The trial of Father Conway commenced in Dublin on the 16th ult. The case for the prosecution lasted two days, and on Thursday the 18th, Mr. O'Hagan addressed the Jury for the defence. The witnesses examined for the Crown cut but a sorry figure. Having deposed to certain violent expressions of the Rev. Mr. Conway in *Irish*, they were subjected to a rigid cross-examination as to their knowledge of the Irish language, when they were forced to admit their ignorance of that tongue. This created much amusement in Court; whilst the loud cheers of the large bodies of the most respectable citizens of Dublin, who every evening accompanied the reverend gentleman to his lodgings, testified the warm interest that this “Priest Persecution” case has excited in Ireland.

On the Continent all was tranquil. From India the news is favorable, and the proceedings of the British armament at Canton are accepted as highly satisfactory, and as likely to bring the “Celestials” to their senses.

The chief topic of interest in the United States is the great “Revival,” as it is called, that has occurred and is still raging there. Brother Jonathan is of an active restless turn of mind: he must be busy, he must be speculating somewhere, or dabbling in something. So the late financial crisis having put him out of conceit with commercial speculations, he is now turning his attention from Cottons and Missouri Bonds, to religion, and feels like taking a few shares in the kingdom of heaven. All classes have been affected by this strange movement, which breaks out periodically in the United States. Rich and

poor have felt its influence. “Religion,” says the *N. Y. Tribune*, “is to certain degree fashionable, and church-going is taken as an evidence of respectability.” Amongst the poor its effects are still more violent, and in the words of the *Tribune*, it is “spreading like a contagion, and taking like an epidemic.” Placards are posted up in the streets to tell the wayfarer man where his soul can be saved, at the lowest figure and the shortest notice. Employers pray for their clerks, and the clerks bemoan the spiritual darkness of their employers. From all corners nasal supplications are offered up. Men grasp one another by the hand, and eagerly exchange notes as to the state of their respective souls. There is much “sweetness” in Broadway. The numbers of conversions are daily quoted by evangelical brokers in a spiritual “price-current;” whilst in Wall Street, hard-headed men of business discuss the “best means of promoting salvation.” One day it is announced that the cabmen have “had a call,” and that a “great work” is going on amongst the dealers in dry goods; the next, we learn that the firemen have been “took serious,” and that all the old apple-women have “experienced vital religion.” And so the epidemic runs its course, to the no small amusement of the worldling, but the sorrow and scandal of the Christian; who knows how and in what these scenes of morbid excitement must inevitably terminate. When the Spring trade revives, religion—that is “Revival Religion”—will collapse; roguery, and debauchery, and infidelity, will again abound, and the last state of the people will be worse than the first. Thus it ever has been with “Revivals.”

Canada is to have the honor of raising a regiment of Infantry, to consist of 1,000 rank and file, and to be styled the “Prince of Wales Royal Canadian Regiment.” The success of this experiment to recruit the British Army in Canada, where even unskilled labour is at a premium, is we think more than doubtful.

The *Canada* brings important news of a change of Ministry. Lord Palmerston has been succeeded by Lord Derby; Sir E. B. Lytton is at the head of the Colonial department. Orsini, Rudio, and Pierri have been condemned to death, and Gomez to penal servitude for life. Mazzini writes to the *Times* in defence of his colleague Orsini. The British troops were in possession of Canton; from India there is nothing of importance, but Sir Colin Campbell was concentrating his troops for an attack upon Oude, where the final and decisive struggle will take place.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On the 4th inst., M. Cauchon brought before the notice of the Legislative Assembly a question of privilege concerning the Quebec election. After commenting upon the unprecedented frauds which characterised that election, and pointing out that with a population of only 60,000 at the last census, upwards of 15,000 votes had been recorded, the Hon. gentleman moved, that, inasmuch as it would be impossible to enter into a scrutiny of frauds so numerous and so gigantic, “the return be declared null and void, and that the seats of the representatives for the City of Quebec be declared vacant.”

This was opposed as unconstitutional, and contrary to the laws regulating the trial of contested elections, by M. Sicotte, the Attorney-General Macdonald, and the supporters of the Ministry. “There was no legal evidence”—argued the latter—“that a single illegal vote had been given,” and the House could not take action upon mere popular rumor. M. Loranger and others followed on the same side. Mr. Ferres “had looked over the poll-books, but on the face of them could discover no irregularity.”

Mr. J. S. McDonald supported the motion; whilst Mr. Galt proposed in amendment that the poll-books be submitted to a select committee of five members, to inquire whether any facts appear therein requiring the immediate action of the House. This amendment was, on a division, lost; 73 voting against it, and 48 in its favor—majority 25. Mr. J. S. McDonald then moved another amendment, to the effect that it was imperative on the House to cause an immediate enquiry at its Bar to be instituted into the Quebec election frauds, with a view of punishing the guilty parties. This too was negatived on a division by a majority of 19—the numbers being 65 for, and 46 against. The main motion was then proposed, when there appeared—Yeas, 32; Noes, 80; majority against the motion 48.—M. Cauchon's motion having been thus lost, a promise was given by the Ministry that after the evidence had been taken in the ordinary way, the case should be submitted to a select committee to determine how far the privileges of Parliament had been violated, and how far the fraudulent voters were liable to punishment.

On the 5th inst., the House proceeded with the adjourned debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The most striking, if not the most pleasing feature of the evening was a speech from a Mr. Ferguson, M.P.P. for Simcoe. This person who is described in the *New Era* as rowdy-like, and whose speech, according to the correspondent of the *Montreal Herald*, had a certain smack of

“brutality” about it, suggestive of the speaker's origin, education, and early associations—(he boasts of being an Orangeman since he was eleven years old)—declared himself opposed to Mr. George Brown, but in favor of the measures that the latter advocates. With many an endearing allusion to “Dear Brother McDonald,” the Orange Attorney-General, he asserted that several members of the Ministry, amongst them the Attorney-General himself, had approved of those measures; and that he knew that those gentlemen would vote for his Bill for abolishing Separate Schools, and for the rest of the “Clear Grit” platform, whenever they came up. That in this Mr. Ferguson stated the simple truth, we fully believe; and in spite of its “brutality” we accept his speech as a valuable corroboration of the essential identity of Orange and “Clear Grit” principles. Betwixt the holders of those principles there may be, as between Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Brown, certain personal antipathies; but they are all actuated by the same motives, and aim, at the same results, viz Protestant and Anglo-Saxon Ascendancy, and the consequent degradation of the Catholic and French Canadian population of this Province. The only perceptible difference betwixt them consists in this—that a “Clear Grit” is an Orangeman out of office, whilst an Orangeman is a “Clear Grit” place-man.

On the evenings of the 8th, 9th, and 10th, the debate on the Address was continued, and was proceeding up to the time of going to press.

Mr. McGee's speech on the Address is admitted on all sides to have been a splendid display of oratory; and the electors of Montreal have good reasons to feel proud of their representative, and to congratulate themselves upon their choice. The Toronto correspondent of the *Montreal Herald* has the following notice:—

Toronto, March 4, 1858.

The debates in Parliament will occupy all your space, so I need say only two or three words here. Mr. McGee's speech last night was, so far, the speech of the session. It was like Mr. Papin's effort last session, one of those unusually happy efforts which keep members and gallery occupied and amused from the time the speaker rises until he resumes his seat. There was a full concourse of strangers, and the Speaker had to call upon the Sergeant to suppress the tokens of that sentiment which was sympathetically communicated from the lower to the upper part of the building. The speech has since been the subject of conversation everywhere. Mr. Loranger's reply was cheered very enthusiastically by his own side of the House; but outside I hear only one opinion, that the allusion to Mr. McGee's supposed poverty and other misfortunes, whatever may be his faults, was, in the position in which the two men are, low and ungenerous. A gentleman whom I have known for a pretty warm opponent of McGee, in my hearing expressed a very emphatic censure upon the member for Laprairie at the conclusion of the latter's speech. Such attacks will do McGee as much good as his own eloquence. Probably the public will hardly appreciate the power of the speech which they read in the newspapers as delivered *vis a voce*.

Nothing indeed could be in worse taste, or more thoroughly “snobbish,” than M. Loranger's attempted rejoinder to Mr. McGee. It was evidently the production of an ill-bred “parvenu” who piques himself upon his wealth, and “respectability;” whilst his sneers at his opponent's poverty, and at his being a “member for Grifftown,” reflect discredit upon him only who could be ungenerous enough to give utterance to such taunts. They cannot affect Mr. McGee's position, and will certainly not tend to elevate M. Loranger in public opinion.

We regret that we cannot give our Member's speech in its integrity; but we copy from the *Toronto Colonist* that portion wherein he forcibly deprecated the active encouragement given to Orangeism by our Gov.-General, and his Ministerial advisers. It will be seen that the Attorney-General, when pushed to the wall, was forced to admit that he was a member, and an active encourager, of the infamous bloodthirsty organisation which numbers Miller, the murderer of Farrell, amongst its “Dear Brothers.” As the *Toronto Colonist* avails itself of this admission to commend Mr. McDonald to the support of the Orangemen of Canada, we cannot refrain from pointing out to our readers that the man who is an active member and supporter of a secret politico-religious, anti-Catholic Society, which the Protestant Government of Great Britain is obliged to discontinue, cannot be a fit person to be entrusted with the administration of justice betwixt Catholics and Protestants, in a mixed community like ours; and that the same reasons which commend him to the support of Orangemen, point him out as utterly unworthy of the confidence and support of Catholics. The following is an extract from Mr. McGee's speech on the Address:—

Mr. McGee said there was another subject on which he would wish to address the House. It was in relation to a serious imputation against the head of the Government. There was throughout Canada West, in Montreal and in some portions of Canada East an institution upon the merits of which when the matter came up fully before the House, he would be prepared frankly to state his opinion. He alluded to an Institution which would be before the House during the session for an act of incorporation—the Orange Institution. It had been the object of a great deal of debate and legislation. Gentlemen composing the majority of that House might say—as in some of their organs they had said—that this was an old country quarrel, with which they had nothing to do. But he could not think of disposing of the matter thus. And he would respectfully call the attention of the Attorney-General East, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, the Provincial Secretary—the gentleman wielding the Lower Canada majority—to the objections to the head of the government. For, if it were really a serious matter, then these gentlemen giving him the majority to enable him to abuse his

position, were answerable, and they could not wash their hands of the consequences. There were other gentlemen whose individual attention he might call to the matter, but for personal reasons he did not think it would be delicate to do so. Of the merits of this institution he would be willing to hear all that could be said; and of its demerits he would adduce such facts as he believed were worthy the attention of the House when the subject came regularly up. All he would at present say was that it was notorious, and none could deny it—whether the fault lay on the one side or the other, or on both—that this institution had always been the cause of more heart burnings, quarrels, rows and riots—and of more bloodshed also—than almost any one association, secret or public, that ever existed in this province or in the country from whence it was imported, Ireland. That fact was notorious. He would say moreover that it celebrates what all good men desire to be forgotten the anniversary of a battle fought during a civil war. Of all quarrels, family quarrels were said to be the worst. And of all things which ought to be forgotten, surely it ought to be that of civil strife. It was also notorious that one of the greatest occasions which the society celebrated was the anniversary of such a battle. Now, if an association were formed for celebrating the 13th of September, the occasion of the death of Montcalm—if such a day were celebrated, thereby reminding a portion of the inhabitants of the Province of defeat—reminding them that the sceptre had passed away from their house to the house of its present possessors—he would ask those hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, would their Gallic blood stand such an insult? Again, he would ask, suppose the anniversary of the battle of Culloden were paraded as a party triumph, how would some hon. gentlemen in that house feel? Although there was not a Jacobite on the face of the earth, the very fact of the celebration would make them, and call up a feeling of opposition. These facts he would simply indicate as showing that, whether rightly or wrongly, the fact was notorious that at the hour the Orange Association and its celebrations and displays had occasioned ill-feeling, and had caused that turmoil, trouble and collision between the people, which ultimately led to breaches of the peace, special proclamations for murder and such like. And he stood there to accuse the hon. gentlemen at the head of the administration of encouraging that institution in this province.

Hon. John A. Macdonald—I acknowledge the fact. (Laughter.) It is, I would inform the hon. gentleman, an open question. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. McGee said he would take the benefit of the hon. gentleman's acknowledgement to give him the benefit of the evidence in the case. Would the predecessors of the hon. gentleman in this united province have done as he has done. Over his own name and during the administration of the government of the province that hon. gentleman had identified himself with that association, and its members have rejoiced over the fact that he is one of their legal advisers. Now, it would be at once conceded that an act which might be perfectly right for a private person to perform, might be perfectly wrong when performed by the same party as the head of the government. That was the distinction he would draw. He did not intend to judge of any man's right to belong to any association he pleased. But the hon. gentleman was not a private person. Would Mr. Hincks have done as the hon. member whom he charged had done—even though it was requisite in order to form a party or lead a government? Sir Allan McNab was not, he believed, a member of this Association—or, if he were, he did not parade it in public. Would Mr. Baldwin or Mr. Lafontaine have done so?—or would not Mr. Lafontaine on such facts have demanded an explanation. Now it appears as if hereafter the path of honor in Canada was through the lodges of the association. And he would show where the head of the government stood in relation to an institution which a portion of the people fairly considered hostile to their civil and religious liberties. He would read from one of the organs of the government, the *Leader*, under another name, the *Patriot*;—at a festival of Lodge 137—on the 2nd of February, 1858—of which O. R. Gowan, was Grand Master, after the removal of the cloth, a letter was read from the hon. Attorney-General West. It commenced, “Dear Sir and brother,” and in it the Attorney-General expressed his regret that family affliction would prevent him having the pleasure of attending their festival that evening. Now he (Mr. McGee) would say to the gentlemen from Lower Canada, that if they believed this institution to be fairly objectionable to a portion of their fellow subjects, and if that feeling at last grew so strong that no remedial measures could reach it, who was to blame? The head of the government they were supporting. Now he would say that the head of a country like this, bidding for emigration and increase of population, had no right to recognize—or declare himself over his own signature—a member of an association which, before courts of justice, had been proved to be inimical to the rights of a portion of the community, and at all events, the cause of bloodshed. He would give the House this pledge, that when the question came up, he would, if he were allowed, demonstrate that for the last 30 years it had been the desire and settled policy of the empire, to discourage this exclusive sectarian and political association of one class against another, within the empire. And in former times the brightest heads of the province had been made to feel this policy. As he said before he desired to question no individual right. But no man should abuse his high place in order to encourage what was obnoxious to the feelings and convictions of a large portion of those over whom he had been put in trust to administer the government of the country.

“POLITICAL ASSASSINS AND THEIR RELIGION.”—This is the heading of a lengthy article in the *Montreal Witness*, the object of which is to show that the Catholic Church approves of assassination; and that the *Rouges*, infidels, and the other inoffensive Protestants of Italy and Continental Europe generally, are but innocent lambs, “dressed up in wolves' skins by the priests,” in order that the Catholic may have the satisfaction of killing them “with a clear conscience.” As our erudite cotemporary attempts to support his thesis by appeals to history, we will take the liberty of examining a few of the instances by him cited, as corroborative of Rome's approval of assassination; and of the consequent necessity for a “Protestant, or at least a non-sectarian education of the masses” as the only “guarantee against murder and assassination.” Our cotemporary's thesis in short is, that Popery fosters, and that Protestantism is a guarantee against, the crime of assassination.

(1.) “It must be recollected”—says the *Montreal Witness* in support of this thesis—“that two monarchs of France—Henry III and Henry IV.—have fallen under the daggers of assassins acting under the immediate instructions of priests, Jesuits, and even Cardinals.”

(2.) “The St. Bartholomew's assassinations were planned as a vast conspiracy by the priests and religious orders of Paris under advice of the Pope and Cardinals. They were the work of that very clergy from which issue our Canadian clergy, originally sent here from Paris. Moreover the Church of Rome officially sanctioned the massacre, Pope Gregory XIII. having in person celebrated a solemn Mass,

ordered a *Te Deum*, and struck a commemorative medal.”

(3.) “Jean Châtel whose dagger cut Henry IV. in the mouth was not only a Roman Catholic, but a pupil of the Jesuits, and after this tool of the Holy Fathers had been quartered by the executioner, the king reluctantly expelled the whole order from Paris and France on the evidence that they had plotted the assassination, and directed the assassin. Such also were the revolutionists who in 1793 imitated in the streets of Paris, though on a smaller scale, the assassinations of 1572. Even Charlotte Corday, the most worthy of political assassins, was brought up a Romanist.”

The *Witness* cites also the more recent political crimes perpetrated, or attempted, by the European Protesting democrats who have, like Gavazzi, &c., &c., renounced Popery, as additional testimony in support of his position. As we however find therein the very opposite of that which our cotemporary pretends to deduce therefrom, we need only remark thereupon that his “modern instances” are conclusive as to the demoralising tendencies of Protestantism. Gavazzi, Orsini, Mazzini, and the other leaders of European democracy, may have been born, baptized, and brought up in the Catholic Church; but as they have openly renounced their allegiance to that Church, they are now to all intents and purposes sound Protestants—a Protestant signifying merely any baptised person who is not a Catholic. But to return to the more ancient instances cited by our cotemporary, we would observe that:—

1. Neither Jacques Clement, nor Ravallac acted under the authority of the Church or of her Ministers. Of the former, it is sufficient to note, that even Ranke in his libel upon the Sovereign Pontiffs known to the Protestant world as the “*History of the Popes*”—admits that Pope Sixtus “was amazed” when the tidings reached him of the death of Henry III, which would not have been the case had he been privy to the plot against Henry's life; and so generally was the act of his murder condemned, that a work was published by two Dominican Fathers—to whose order Clement belonged—to prove that the assassin of the King was, not Clement, but another person disguised in his dress. With the logic of the Fathers we have no concern; but their indignant repudiation of the murder is a clear proof that that crime was not sanctioned, or approved of, by the Church, or the great body of the Clergy. Again with regard to Ravallac, who was not as was the assassin of Henry III. killed on the spot where he committed his crime, we have the best possible proof—viz the prisoner's solemn asseverations under a severe and long continued application of the most cruel tortures—that he had no accomplices, no instigators; and that the crime which robbed France of her beloved Sovereign was concocted in the recesses of his own diabolical brain, and perpetrated by his own hand, without aid or counsel from any living creature. It is not however for us to establish the innocence, but for her accusers to prove the guilt, of the Catholic Church, in the affairs above mentioned.

2. That the St. Bartholomew's massacre was planned by the priests under advice of the Pope, or that for the horrid crime of the 24th Aug., 1572, the Catholic Church is in any sense more responsible, than is the Church of England for the far more infamous massacre of Glencoe perpetrated by the express commands of one whose “*pious*” memory is celebrated by many Protestants at the present day, is false. Again we cite the avowal of the Protestant historian Ranke, that “it cannot be proved that he”—the Pope, Pius V.—“was privy to the preparations to the massacre of St. Bartholomew;” and we assert that there is no shadow of a proof to show that his successor Gregory had any knowledge of the intended crime. We must remember also that in the XVI century there were no daily newspapers, no electric telegraphs carrying the tidings of every great event from one part of Europe to the other; and that consequently it was very easy for Charles IX in his report to the Sovereign Pontiff, to put the massacre, upon which, now that all the details are known, all men look with horror, in a very different light from that in which we now view it. This is what actually took place. The French King wrote to the Pope representing the massacre as a sanguinary conflict between the Catholic royalists and the Huguenot rebels, in which the latter were routed with great slaughter. Having no means for verifying, and no reasons for doubting, the truth of Charles' report, the Pope celebrated what he believed to be a legitimate victory won on a fair field, against the enemies of the Church, and of the king, with religious ceremonies, and the striking of a medal with a motto commemorative of the defeat of the *rebels* who had long disturbed the peace of France; and who by their innumerable atrocities, their cruel murders, their repeated violations of the most solemn engagements, and their disregard of all laws human and divine, had brought that once flourishing kingdom to the verge of destruction. A victory over such monsters as the Huguenots, if obtained by lawful means, would have been a legitimate subject for congratulation and religious thanksgiving; and no fault can be imputed to Gregory XIII and his Cardinals, because, having no other means of arriving at the truth, they accepted the explanation given them by the French Court of the cir-