

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIE,
FOR GEORGE H. OLIVER, 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; and at Flynn's, St. Gill Street.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 18, 1859.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *America* brings European dates to the 19th ult. The war panic has not subsided, and great agitation is reported as existing in Austria, Poland, and Hungary; whilst it is added that 80,000 troops have been concentrated on the frontier of Galicia. A pamphlet, however, that under the title "*Aurons Nous La Guerre*," and which has had an extensive circulation, has created much sensation by its strong arguments in support of a pacific solution of the difficulty. France is no longer, it contends, as under the first Empire, organised for war; but on the contrary, owing to the extension of its internal and external commerce, and the industrial occupations of its citizens, is now organised for peace; and, therefore, will repudiate the policy of the first Empire, in favor of the pacific policy which is the necessity of the second.

Of other news there is little of note. The Princess Royal of Prussia has been safely delivered of a son; and the King of Naples is not dead, but slowly recovering. Russia is said to be cultivating friendship with Austria; and in India nothing is doing of any consequence. Extensive frauds, in the shape of forged Bills of Exchange, supposed to be of New York manufacture, but sent to London for circulation, had been detected, and had excited much commotion in the commercial world.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday evening the debate upon M. Sicotte's amendment to the Address was terminated by a division in a very full House, which gave the Ministry a majority of five. It may, therefore, be looked upon as settled that Ottawa is to be the political capital of Canada.

In the several speeches delivered on the occasion we find little of note. M. Cartier volunteered a long, but lame apology for Orangemen, whom he would fain have us look upon as our best friends, and the supporters of our Separate Schools and Conventual institutions. Unfortunately for the honorable member's eloquence, however, it is on record in the Journals of the House that all the recent attacks against these institutions have proceeded from the Orangemen; that it was an Orangeman, Mr. Ferguson, who moved last session for the abolition of all separate schools; and that Mr. Gowan, the author of another motion this session for their abolition, is also an Orangeman, and a prominent member of the Orange organisation. Upon the whole, the spectacle of a French Canadian by birth, and a Catholic by profession, undertaking the office of apologist of a "serret politico-religious" organisation, was very painful and humiliating to all who love their Church, and who desire that the name of French Canadian should be respected by strangers.

Mr. Brown also delivered himself of a speech of monster dimensions, which leaves, however, our opinion of the man and his merits, or rather demerits, unchanged. If he is to be credited, he still adheres to his former policy; and what that policy was, we have but too good reasons to know. Of our separate schools he has ever been the hottest opponent; of Orangemen he has ever been the most active supporter. Not only did he last session vote against Separate Schools and for Orange Incorporation; but as a journalist he has done more to swell the ranks of that Society, and to excite the passions of its members against Catholics, than any other public man in the Province. We have not forgotten, nor are we disposed to forgive, his savage appeals to Protestant fanaticism at the time his friend, and natural ally, the infamous Garazzi, was denouncing our Clergy as the priests of the devil and as murderers; and stigmatising our Religious, as she-devils and as prostitutes. In his speech, he, Mr. Brown, admitted that "he had used strong words at times of the Roman Catholics, because he wished to press matters to a close;" but now, when he has need of our services, he would fain have us forgive and forget. To be sure for years he has been in the habit of treating Irish Catholics as dogs, and as the sons of dogs; heaping upon them every term of abuse and invective that malice could suggest. To be sure he has never publicly retracted, or expressed contrition for his malignant slanders! But what of that? We are a meek people, very meek; fulfilling to the letter

the evangelic precept of turning the other cheek to the smiter, and humbly content to kiss the foot of him who kicks us. Such at least is the estimate that Mr. Brown seems inclined to form of us, but we trust that he shall yet find himself mistaken; that he shall yet discover to his cost that miserable priest-ridden "*Dogans*" though we be, we have feelings, passions, and affections as other men have; that if tickled, we laugh; that if pricked, we bleed; and that if wronged, we will be avenged. Yes! it may suit the purposes of Mr. Brown and his friends at one time to denounce Catholic convents "*as no better than houses of ill-fame*"—we quote the *ipsissima verba* of one of Brown's friends of the name of Gould; and at another to fawn and cringe before us, seeking our aid to further their mercenary objects; but surely Catholics will not allow themselves to be made the dupes and tools of such a fellow! surely they respect themselves too much, not to reject his advances with the same contempt as that with which they have hitherto treated his mendacious slanders and his impotent hatred. Yes Mr. Brown! we remember your "*strong words*;" we have garnered them up in our inmost herets; and you shall yet find to your cost, that our memories are tenacious, and that we extend our forgiveness to those who only take pains to earn it, by a sincere contrition, by a public confession, and by giving satisfactory proofs of their purpose to lead a new life.

M. Sicotte's amendment having been disposed of, the debate continued on an amendment from Mr. Macdougall; to the effect that the seat of Government should be transferred from Toronto to Ottawa, so soon as the necessary arrangements should have been completed. After an animated discussion, this amendment was negatived by a vote of 75 against 38.

The next amendment was proposed by M. Bureau and seconded by Mr. McGee, to the effect:—

"That this House feels gratified for the interest which Her Most Gracious Majesty has shown towards her Canadian people by acting upon the address relative to the Seat of Government question; but while bowing with due respect to the decision of Her Majesty, this House will consider it their duty at an early period again to approach Her Majesty, respectfully to represent that the circumstances under which the address was voted no longer exists; and that, in the present state of the finances of the country, Her Majesty would best promote the interests of the inhabitants of this Province by summoning Her Canadian Parliament to meet at Toronto until arrangements can be completed to convene it at Montreal."

To this amendment, another amendment was moved by M. Dorion, couched in the following terms:—

"That this House feels gratified for the interest displayed by Her Most Gracious Majesty, in acting on the address of this House on the Seat of Government question; but while bowing with all due respect to that decision, this House considers it a duty to early approach Her Majesty with the assurance that the circumstances under which that vote was given no longer exist, and that in the present state of the public finances it is the opinion of this House that Her Majesty would best consult the interests of her Canadian people by summoning her Parliament to meet at Montreal as soon as the arrangements are completed for that purpose."

After an animated debate, presenting, however, no features of special interest, M. Dorion's amendment was negatived by a majority of 73 to 29; as was also that of M. Bureau on a subsequent division. The other clauses of the Address were then discussed and carried; and thus the first great contest of the session has, after a protracted struggle, terminated in favor of the Ministry.

TORONTO FEB. 16.—A number of petitions were presented, including one from the Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada, asking for a change in their Act of incorporation. Two for a prohibitory Liquor Law, and one by Mr. McGee from the inhabitants of Glengary praying, as the hon. gentleman said, that the separate school privileges may be extended to the Roman Catholic population of Upper Canada, and also that the House will take measures to protect them from the baneful influences of Orangemen.

AN EXPLANATION.

In our respected cotemporary, the *Toronto Canadian Freeman*, we find the following paragraph:—

"AN EXTRAORDINARY STATEMENT FROM AN EXTRAORDINARY QUARTER.—M. Cartier in his speech on Tuesday night, made the surprising statement, that 'he was AUTHORIZED to say that the *True Witness* was not the organ of the clergy of Montreal.'"

"Coming from such a quarter, this is certainly an extraordinary statement; and we put it on record, in order that the *True Witness* may know what has been stated of it, in the Parliament of Canada, by the Lower Canada Premier."

With reference to the above statement, we think that our cotemporary, the *Freeman*, has been deceived as to what M. Cartier actually said with respect to the *TRUE WITNESS*, on the occasion alluded to. Indeed, not only is M. Cartier not represented in any of the public journals as having made use of the language imputed to him by the *Freeman*—a remarkable omission, seeing how correct generally are their reports of the debates in Parliament; but we have it upon the very best authority that he did not use the said language; and that, though he may have asserted truly that the *TRUE WITNESS* was "*not the organ of the Clergy of Montreal*," he certainly did not pretend even that he "*WAS AUTHORIZED*" to make that assertion.

And we are also permitted to say more.—For as there is but one person authorized to speak—or to give authority to others to speak—in the name "*of the Clergy of Montreal*," so also we are AUTHORIZED to state publicly that no such authority was ever given to M. Cartier

or to any one else; and that the Clergy of Montreal have not withdrawn their confidence from the *TRUE WITNESS*.

At the same time, in justice to ourselves, and to our respected Clergy, we would observe that the *TRUE WITNESS* never has pretended to be their organ; and that its lay editor has always assumed, and still assumes, the sole and undivided responsibility for every word that appears in the columns of the *TRUE WITNESS*. An "*organ of the Clergy*," properly speaking, no secular journal can pretend to be; but it should ever be the ambition of the Catholic journalist to submit himself in all things to the wishes of his legitimate ecclesiastical superiors; and to merit their confidence and approbation, by a firm undeviating adherence to those great principles which the Church inculcates, and which it is incumbent upon all her children to adopt as the rule of all their actions.

And whilst speaking of "*organs*" we may be permitted to add that, if no lay Catholic journalist has the right to assume the tone of an "*organ of the Clergy*," still less can he, if faithful to his high and honorable mission, condescend to be the organ of any man, or of any party in the State. He cannot, without dereliction of principle—we say—submit to be the "*organ*" either of a Ministry or of an Opposition; he cannot put on the badge, or wear the livery of any political party whatsoever. Independence of all influences save the influence of his spiritual mother, is the essential condition of his existence; independence of Ministerial influences on the one hand, and of popular influences on the other. His duty it is to speak the words of truth, fully and fearlessly, without regard to those whom he may please, or whom he may offend by so doing. This course, if faithfully pursued, will no doubt gain him but few friends, and will inevitably raise up against him many enemies; yet if he cannot, or if he will not, pursue it steadily and consistently—better, far better, for his own honor, and for the interests of religion, that he should at once lay down his pen, and make over his functions to abler hands, and stouter hearts. A servile Catholic press—that is a press that will submit to the degradation of being the tool, or "*organ*," of any man, or of any party—is the greatest curse and disgrace that can be inflicted upon a Catholic community.

THE "*CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN*" AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS.—It is certainly satisfactory to see that the bitterest opponents of "Freedom of Education," and the warmest advocates of State-Schoolism, are unable either to deny the truth of our premises; or to impugn the legitimacy of the conclusions which we thence deduce, in favor of "Freedom of Education"—or in other words, of the right of the individual parent, *as against the State*, to the exclusive control over the education of his own children. The arguments of Catholics are, it is admitted, unanswerable; but then urge the Protestants—"We are the majority; and therefore the more powerful; therefore your rights must succumb to our mights."

So in substance argues the *Christian Guardian* of Toronto, in reply to the statement of Catholic claims on the School Question, as put forth a few weeks ago in the columns of this journal. "We claim"—we then said—"we claim—and in these few words may be comprised all that we ask on the School Question—for the individual parent the right, *as against the State*, of educating his children as he pleases, and of determining for himself '*what, by whom, and with whom*,' they shall be taught. And as the consequence of this first claim, we claim in the second place, that no man, be he Catholic or be he Protestant, be compelled to support either Church or School to which he is conscientiously opposed." How does the *Christian Guardian* treat these our claims?—with what argument does he attempt to invalidate them? Thus:—

He starts with the concession that "of course no man of sense or conscience with his hand on his heart would for a moment gainsay the doctrine here avowed;" and having made this admission, he undertakes to show that true though the doctrine undoubtedly be in general, it is not applicable to Catholics, "seeing that it is so diametrically opposed to the course which the Church the *Chronicle* labors so hard to sustain, it is wont to pursue;" and because the "doctrine of our cotemporary is not maintained at Rome."—*Christian Guardian*, 9th inst.

Now, whether the doctrine of the "right of the individual parent *as against the State*," as propounded by the *TRUE WITNESS*, be opposed to the doctrines of the Church, and to the practice of Rome, are matters with which the *Christian Guardian* has no concern, and upon which he is incompetent to form an opinion. Suffice it, that by his own admission, the doctrine is true, and that "no man of sense or conscience can gainsay it;" and its applicability to the Catholics of Upper Canada is, we should think, fully established. Even were we, for the sake of argument, to admit that the doctrines of the Church were erroneous, and the Government of Rome oppressive, we should not thence be compelled to admit that the Legislature of Canada was justified in refusing to the Catholics of the Province, rights which no honest man, no "man of sense or

conscience" would dare to impugn. Two wrongs do not make a right; nor would an act of injustice in the City of Rome authorise, or establish a valid precedent for, the perpetration of another act of injustice towards the Catholics of Toronto.

But where and when, would we ask our cotemporary, has the Church ever taught a doctrine respecting the rights of parents over the education of their children, contrary to that laid down by the *TRUE WITNESS*, and the truth of it is admitted by the *Christian Guardian*? The right that we assert as inherent in the individual parent, "*because held immediately from God*," is but another form of expressing the duties of the parent towards Him of Whom alone perfect or absolute right can be predicated. As against Creator, creature can have no rights; but the duties of the latter towards the former may and often do imply rights as against creature. And in this sense, but in this sense only, do we assert the right of the parent "*as against the State*;" because it is in the assertion of that right that we assert the duty of the parent to bring up his children in conformity with the revealed will of the Creator. In its simplest form our thesis is—"that it is better to obey God than man;" and the will of God, we learn, not from Acts of Parliament, or the fallible dictates of our own fancies, but from the Church, the organ of God upon earth, the divinely appointed medium through which He has communicated to us His holy will. The *Christian Guardian* will, from these explanations, be able, we trust, to distinguish betwixt the "*rights*" that we assert "*as against the State*;" and the "*duties*" which we owe and cheerfully yield to God and His Church.

With regard to the utterly irrelevant matter which the *Christian Guardian* has been pleased to mix up with the "School Question" of Canada—such as the "*Mortara Case*" in the XIX. century—the executions of Huss and Jerome of Prague in the XV.—of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley in the XVI.—we have already given an answer to our Toronto Methodistical cotemporary; nor has he hitherto so much as attempted to refute our arguments, or to impugn the historical truth of our statements. We have shown that the "*Mortara Case*" was the result of the disregard by the Jewish parents of laws expressly framed by the Roman Government for the protection of Jews against the indiscreet zeal of Christian servants; and that therefore the said parents have no one to blame but themselves for the consequences of their own negligence; and we have consistently maintained the doctrine that the baptised, and, therefore, Christian child has the right as against its non-Christian parents to profess and practice the religion of Jesus, into whose body, the Church, it has been engrafted by baptism; because though the parent may have rights as against the State, he has and can have none against God and His Church. We have shown also, in a series of articles to which the *Christian Guardian* was unable to reply, that the Council of Constance gave no pledge or Safe-conduct to Huss; and that therefore having contracted no engagements, it could have broken no faith, with him. We have shown, and by Protestant testimony, that his death, and the death of his disciple Jerome of Prague, was the acts, not of the Council or Church, but of the Emperor and the Civil Power; whose laws the above named heresiarchs had violated; whose peace they had disturbed; and within whose dominions they had raised the standard of insurrection, which after their death was borne aloft by their worthy followers, John Ziska and his army of Taborites, the Protestant Reformers of the XV. century.

To Jerome of Prague the Council did it is true send a Safe-conduct, or travelling passport; guaranteeing to him protection whilst on his road to Constance; but *expressly stipulating* that it was not intended to interfere with his trial, or to oppose any obstacle to his conviction and punishment, if found guilty of the offences laid to his charge. And even this cautiously worded document did not reach Jerome till after his arrest; and cannot therefore be cited as the pledge upon the faith of which he appeared before the Council; which in the words of the Protestant Hallam, "*possessed no temporal power—and therefore could not have sentenced him*" (or Huss) "*to death—but had a right to decide upon the question of heresy*;" and which therefore broke no faith with either Huss or Jerome, in condemning their doctrines as heretical, in excommunicating them, and in degrading the former from the priestly office. For their death the Emperor—who enforced against them the ancient laws of the Empire—laws which the Church did not enact, and over whose execution she had no control—is alone responsible; and considering the many civil crimes of which the wretched men had been guilty, their bloody outrages, and seditious preachings, we have no hesitation in confessing our belief that their doom was well merited.

And so also with the Cramers, the Ridelys and Latimers, whom—availing themselves of the arbitrary laws enacted by the first Protestant King of England—the Government of Mary put to death. These men by their crimes, and many

reasons against their rightful Sovereign, had richly earned the felon's doom; and though we may not approve of the process by which they were made amenable to the law, we must remember that these laws were the work of a Protestant King and a Protestant Parliament; framed for the express purpose of extirpating Catholicity; and that to apply the term martyr to the traitorous accomplices of Lady Jane Grey is as absurd—as Macaulay observes in his well known and admirable analysis of the character of Cranmer—as it would be to call Dr. Dodd, who was hung for forgery in the reign of George III., a "martyr." The *Christian Guardian* should remember also, that for the acts of the English Government during the reign of Queen Mary, the Catholic Church is by no means responsible; seeing that that Government was strongly anti-Papal; and that the chief agents in the severities which have obtained an unenviable notoriety for the reign of Mary Tudor were the former servile tools of her Protestant father—in the words of Hallam, the "wicked counsellors, renegades of every faith, and ministers of every tyranny."—*Const. Hist.* c. 1.

But, after all, what have the acts of the Council of Constance, or of Queen Mary's Government, to do with the School Question of Canada? Does not the *Christian Guardian* see that by raising these side issues, he is virtually admitting the rottenness of the cause which he undertakes to defend? It is not because—as Hallam himself confesses—"persecution is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches; that which cools every man's zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive;" it is not because Calvin burnt Servetus, and Cranmer worried Jean Boucher to death; it is not because of any of these things that we demand to be left at liberty by the State to educate our own children in our own way;—but because our right to do so is a right that we hold from God Himself; because it is a right that we cannot abandon without dereliction of duty towards Him Who will one day demand of us a strict account of the immortal souls of those children whom He has entrusted to us; and because by asserting it, we are promoting, not the interests of Catholics alone, but the best and dearest interests of all classes of our mixed community.

EMIGRATION.—Amongst the notices of intended motions in the Legislative Assembly, we find one from T. D'Arcy McGee, Esq., for an "Address to His Excellency for the appointment of Emigrant Agents, to reside at Liverpool, Havre, and Hamburg, for the purpose of conveying to intended emigrants from Europe authentic information in relation to the resources of Canada, and the advantages it presents to actual settlers; as well as to prevent an unproductive, as to encourage a profitable emigration."

The subject to which the junior member for Montreal here directs the attention of the House, is one of great importance to the country, and will, we hope, receive from the Legislature that degree of attention that its importance demands. How, or by whom, the requisite information to emigrants should be conveyed, we cannot presume to determine; but it is certainly highly desirable that intending emigrants should, from some quarter or another, be able to receive the to them, all important information respecting the resources of their future home; and should be duly instructed as to the many material advantages offered to them by the selection of Canada as that home. Mr. McGee it is well known has given much consideration to the subject of emigration; and we sincerely hope that his experience may enable him to suggest some scheme that shall prove of practical benefit both to this country, and to the poorer classes of European emigrants.

SMITH O'BRIEN.—It will be seen by referring to our Irish intelligence, that this distinguished individual proposes during the coming summer, to visit the shores of this Continent; and that in all probability he will extend his trip to Canada. Of the soundness of his views on some political questions, there may be differences of opinion.—But no one we think will deny to him the merits of being, in the best sense of the word, a thorough gentleman, and a disinterested patriot; one in short whom any country might feel proud to number amongst her children. We entertain therefore no doubt that, if Mr. Smith O'Brien does favor us with a visit, he will be received by his countrymen of all denominations with all the honor due to one who has never disgraced himself by a mean or dirty action; and whose whole political career, even by the admission of his political opponents, has been dictated by an ardent devotion to Ireland, the land of his birth.

ORANGEMEN.—The following declaration of the sentiments entertained by the Orangemen towards Catholic conventual institutions, is taken from the report of the meeting of the County Orange Lodge, published in the *Peterboro Review*; and is, we think, an ample refutation of the shallow artifices of those who seek to represent the Orangemen as, in general, friendly to Catholics, and Catholic institutions. The first resolution of the Lodge reads as follows:—

1st. That the members of the Loyal Orange Association have invariably opposed the incorporation of Romish Societies, and are still of opinion that such incorporations are highly injurious to the liberties of our country, and detrimental to the moral and religious improvement of our fellow countrymen of the Romish Church, we therefore cannot think for one moment of giving up our great "Vantage Ground" of opposition to them, by asking an act of incorporation for ourselves.