

## THE TRUE WITNESS

## CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY J. GILLIES  
FOR GEORGE H. CLARK, 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, JUNE 4, 1858.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Indian* brings dates to the 19th ult. The debate on Mr. Cardwell's motion of censure on the Ministry had not concluded when she sailed. The news from the Continent is unimportant. The Neapolitan Government had positively refused indemnity in the case of the English engineers. In India nothing decisive had occurred.

We are happy to have it in our power to announce the arrival in the *Indian*, of His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto. The news of the safe return of their beloved Prelate, will we are sure, be hailed with joy by the Catholics of his own Diocese in particular, and by all the faithful throughout the country.

**ECCLESIASTICAL.**—The following Parochial changes have lately been made in the Diocese of Montreal, in consequence of the deaths of the Reverend M. Archambault, V.G., and Cure of Vaudreuil, and of the Reverend M. Filiot, Cure of L'Isle du Pads:—

The Rev. M. Brassard has been removed from the Parish of Coteau du Lac, to that of Vaudreuil.

The Rev. M. Dufour has been transferred from the Parish of St. Zotique, to that of Coteau du Lac.

The Rev. M. Lasnier, from the Parish of Ste. Anne du Bout de L'Isle to St. Zotique.

The Rev. M. Chevreuil from the Diocese of St. Hyacinthe, to the Parish of Ste. Anne.

The Rev. M. Archambault from the Parish of St. Janvier, to that of L'Isle du Pads.

The Rev. M. Penault from the Vicariat of Vaudreuil, to the Parish of St. Janvier.

On Saturday last, His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, conferred in the Chapel attached to the Bishopric, Orders on the undermentioned ecclesiastics:—

Deacon's Orders were conferred upon M. M. Joseph N. Lamarque—Louis Casabon, and Thomas Dagenais—all of the Diocese of Montreal. The following were ordained Sub-Deacons:—

M. M. Alex. Gravel, Jos. T. Parent, S. E. Duprat, of the Diocese of Montreal; James Quinn, of Burlington, and James O'Donohoe, of Toronto. The following were admitted to Minor Orders:—

M. M. P. Dequire, L. A. Dequoy, I. S. L'Heureux, J. A. Vinet, M. Lavallee, I. O. Remillard, P. E. Lussier, G. Jannotte, P. Mazurette, G. E. Viger, of Montreal, and G. Leclair, of Kingston. The following received the Tonsure:—

M. M. F. Martin, J. Saune, H. Germain, J. Bonnician, of Montreal; C. G. Levermann, of Hamilton; and N. T. Bannan, of Boston.

**DIED.**—At the Providence Convent, on Sunday, the 30th ult., Sister Laurent, deeply regretted by all the members of the Community. The poor to whom she ministered will pray for the repose of her soul.

## PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.**—On Thursday the 27th ult., the House was taken up with the frauds practised at the late elections. Mr. Cameron brought forward a petition from numerous electors at Essex, calling for enquiry into the conduct of certain Deputy Returning Officers. M. McKellar saw no reason why the Quebec election frauds should not be investigated. Mr. Foley remarked that every case of fraud established at the Bar of the House had been in the case of Ministerial members, and attacked the government for not having the Quebec election investigated at the Bar. Attorney General McDonald asserted that there was no petition before the House alleging specific acts of fraud in the Quebec election, and that there was no fraud apparent on the face of the poll book. Mr. Alley objected to continual allusions to his election matters, and said that 5,000 names recorded in the poll book were not included in the summing up by the returning officer. Finally it was agreed that several of the deputy returning officers be ordered to attend at the Bar of the House. The Russell and Montreal elections were then discussed amidst much tumult, and with many appeals against the Speaker's decisions. Mr. Fellowes was ordered to attend in his place in the House on Tuesday, 1st June.

On Friday the 28th, Mr. Dorion expressed his desire for an investigation of the election frauds, which he had already brought under the notice of the Legislative Assembly. It could be proved that the Government candidates at Montreal went to the officers of the Custom House, and

told them that they had a right to vote; and that the same influence was brought to bear upon the workmen of the Grand Trunk Railway, though those men, for the most part, resided out of the city. In more than one-third of the Lower Canada elections, frauds had been practised which should cause them to be set aside. Mr. Loranger here broke in with "that's a nice compliment." Mr. Dorion continued, "It's true though, and you shirk inquiry." Mr. Loranger denied the prevalence of the frauds; these Mr. Dorion re-affirmed, and moved that the petition of W. Bristow, Esq., against the return of John Rose, Esq., for Montreal—which petition had been rejected by the Speaker because of some informality—be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. This was opposed by Attorney General McDonald, and an animated, not to say violent debate, ensued. The words of Mr. McGee having been quoted by Mr. Rose in proof of the good order that characterized the last Montreal election, the former gentleman rose to explain. He was rather surprised, he said, at having been cited as an authority, and expressed his desire for investigation, for which he would give all the facilities in his power. With regard to undue Ministerial influence he adduced some facts.—We quote from the report in the *Toronto Colonist*:—

It was felt that it was no trifle, and that, were the allegations established, two men on the treasury benches would be found unfit for their positions. A more serious charge could not have been adduced against any individuals. If justice was vindicated in the person of a poor devil like the late member for Lotbiniere, surely it was necessary in the case of men holding the highest places in the land. Such men were not to be allowed to escape on mere technicalities. If the vice of corruption was to be eradicated, take the men of mark, and inflict upon them the most condign punishment. Don't let them take the miserable creature, without means and without friends. No word of indignation had been uttered on the other side at the charge of corruption. The charge of violence alone had been repudiated, and perhaps, as he had already said, with truth. But bribery and corruption, he believed, could be proved. He believed, also, that the charge of employing bullies, and of removing persons from their offices could be established. ("Name.") There was Butler, of the canal office.—

Solicitor General ROSE—This is the first time I ever heard of it. When was he removed? Mr. McGEE—Immediately before the Easter recess. Then there was Mr. Devlin, a rising young lawyer, removed from some office which he held in connection with the prosecution of persons guilty of breaches of the excise law. The indignation of the highest legal officer in Lower Canada also fell on the head of a poor fellow employed in carrying the letters from one place to another in the county of Vercheres. In conclusion, he expressed his willingness to have the fullest investigation into his conduct at the election.

The facts alleged by Mr. McGee were not contradicted; and Mr. Galt then proposed an amendment to Mr. Dorion's motion, whereupon the debate was resumed with renewed acrimony, during which the following passage of arms occurred between Mr. Loranger and Mr. McGee. We again copy from the *Colonist*:—

Mr. LORANGER, referring to the contemptible manner in which Mr. McGee had spoken of the late sitting member for Lotbiniere, remarked that he saw no difference between that poor "devil" and the poor "devil" known as the junior member for Montreal. The honorable member, ever since he had been in the House—where he was, not, he would not say, by the grace of God, but by the grace of the long purse of a rich friend—had availed himself of every opportunity of attacking his colleagues.

Mr. McGEE said he was not there from any such cause. No rich or poor friend had paid one single sixpence of a bill of his. Countrymen of his own might have interested themselves for him, but they had not liquidated any of his bills.

Mr. LORANGER understood this perfectly. His (Mr. McGee's) friends had not paid any of his bills, for he had not had any to foot; but nevertheless, those friends had defrayed the cost of his election. They had run up bills—and pretty heavy ones, too—and had paid them to secure the hon. member's return. The member for Montreal had argued that the Speaker had given a bad decision. But admitting, for the sake of argument, the decision was not sound, had the hon. gentleman shown that the law gave any appeal? No, and he knew there was no appeal. Was the House, then, to take the irregular course proposed, because the hon. member, notwithstanding his sixteen years experience as a lawyer, had committed a mistake which was fatal to the interests of his client?

Mr. McKenzie then alluded to the "Howard" correspondence which excited so much attention during the late Montreal election. This called out Mr. Cartier, "You don't know all about that; you'll know presently." Mr. McKenzie replied that the Ministry were afraid of having the matter referred to a committee. He wished to know "all about it;" and what was meant by the expression, "offer him—that is Mr. McGee—a place in the country." M. Cartier spoke at length, giving himself the highest character for integrity, honesty, and the possession of all manner of "bon principes;" he was opposed to referring the petition against his Ministerial colleague to the select Committee, and deprecated all further inquiry into the alleged frauds of the Montreal election. After a few more speeches the House divided, when by a majority of 57 against 47 Mr. Galt's amendment was rejected; and a majority of 58 against 46 dealt in a similar manner with M. Dorion's original motion.

**THE RYERSON FRAUDS.**—The *Toronto Colonist* (Ministerial) gives the following explanation of the Rev. Mr. Ryerson's "Bank Account":—

"Dr. Ryerson has laid before the Committee of Accounts a reply to the charge that he has received £1500, or other large sum, in the form of interest upon bank deposits of public money belonging to the Educational Department. The reverend gentleman's defence is characteristically verbose, and relates rather to generalities than specific facts. He admits, however, that he received £1375 19s 9d—we give the

figures, to a penny—of the sum allowed by the Bank of Upper Canada; but attempts to justify the proceeding by the analogy upon the business-like accuracy of his departmental accounts, and the economy he has displayed in the execution of his departmental duties. He pleads unacquaintance with this matter of interest on public deposits until introduced to it, during a foreign tour, 'to restore sinking energies,' by his deputy, Hodgins; but afterwards justifies it on the ground that, after many years the Government underpaid him for his services, and that he is really entitled to a better reward than Canada has accorded to him. For evidence as to his monetary punctuality and precision he refers to his auditor-clerk, and finally appeals to the Earl of Elgin in proof of the 'crown and glory' which he—the reverend superintendent—has succeeded in placing upon 'our institutions.'"

It will thus be seen that the reverend gentleman admits the fact, that he has been in the habit of appropriating—or to use a more elegant expression "of conveying"—to his own use the interest upon sums of public monies entrusted to his charge as Chief Superintendent of Education; but he excuses this mode of "conveyancing" upon the plea that his services to the State have been great, and his legal remuneration but small. How far a merchant would allow this plea on the part of a clerk in his store, convicted of having helped himself to a portion of the contents of the till, we cannot say; but we do not think that it would be admitted as valid.

Such too seems to be the opinion of the Protestant press—both Ministerial and Anti-Ministerialist—and of both sections of the Province, whose unanimity upon the "Ryerson Frauds" is indeed wonderful. Ministerialists, as the *Toronto Colonist*, and *Montreal Gazette*, Anti-Ministerialists like the *Globe* and *Montreal Herald*, unite cordially in condemning the conduct of the Reverend Superintendent, as a disgrace to our country, and a scandal to that religion of which the government official calls himself a Minister. The *Globe* more than insinuates—with how much of truth we pretend not to decide—that the Ministry have been for some time cognizant of the Chief Superintendent's frauds, and that an "Order in Council" was passed requiring restitution of the money" by him dishonestly appropriated to his own uses. This "Order in Council" was, however, never put in force; but, according to the *Globe*, was probably "held over him"—the Rev. Mr. Ryerson—"as a means of influencing his course in political matters; for we find that, some time last fall, immediately before the elections took place, Dr. Ryerson had communication with two members of the government, who promised, as we are told he alleges, that he should be permitted to keep the money as an extra allowance for services rendered. The election took place soon afterwards, and Dr. Ryerson publicly exerted his influence on behalf of at least one member of the Government, and probably for others, in which his hand was not so distinctly seen. The case we refer to was that of Mr. Morrison in South Ontario. A letter in behalf of that gentleman was actually printed for general circulation, and Dr. Ryerson wrote specially to an influential gentleman in Pickering with the same object in view." The *Globe* thus sums up:—

"We add no more to the picture which these facts present. We have come to a frightful pass in Canada when such things take place, and we only trust that the grievous spectacle of a Christian Minister, and a high official, appropriating to his own use that which manifestly belongs to the public, and the sanction given to his conduct by the Executive, will awake the people of Canada to a sense of the danger in which they stand."—*Globe*, 29th ult.

The *Montreal Herald* of Tuesday last, in like manner, criticises the Reverend Superintendent's conduct, and thus tears to pieces the paltry defence by that worthy set up, for his knavish appropriation of public monies:—

**THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—THE RYERSON APPROPRIATIONS AND THE BANK PAYMENTS.**—We publish this morning two documents laid before the Committee on Public Accounts, to which we would invite the attention of our readers. The first of these is Dr. Ryerson's reply to the charge of his having received and appropriated to his own private purposes, some £1500 of interest, from time to time accruing on balances of the public money, belonging to the Educational Department, and left in deposit at the credit of that Department, in the Upper Canada Bank. In mentioning this charge, some few days ago, we expressed our regret that it had been made, and our hope that—as he said he could—the Rev. official would, in the explanation he promised, satisfy the public that it arose from some misapprehension; and that he had kept his hands free, as the catechism has it, from any such sordid infringement of the spirit, if not of the letter, of the eighth commandment. Our disappointment, then, we need not say, is proportionately great to find that in his promised reply, when denuded of the mass of irrelevant and wordy special-pleadings in which he has thought proper to surround it, we have not only a confession of Dr. Ryerson's guilt, but which we cannot help designating as an impudent attempt to over-ride one of the first principles of morality, and to justify his "picking and stealing," first on the ground of the inadequacy of his salary, of £500 a year, to provide for the support of his family, in those times of "increased and unprecedented dearth of living;" and secondly, on the plea that, in the performance of his duties, as head of the Educational Department, he had "established and matured a system that has already saved the country many thousands of pounds." It is, indeed, painful and melancholy to contemplate such a man, not only yielding to temptation, but perverting attempting to justify a plain and palpable peculation of the public funds, intrusted to him as the head of a public department. The charge brought against Dr. Ryerson was not that he had neglected to perform the duties of his office; and, therefore, apart from the extreme bad taste of his own self-laudations, his plea of his zeal and efficiency in the performance of those duties, cannot be accepted as any excuse, or even palliation of his guilt. Then, as to his salary; if £500 a year was insufficient—and we are inclined to think it was—he should have applied for an increase, which we have reason to believe would not have been denied him; but for a man with £500 a year—and that man a clergyman—to plead necessity as a justification of dishonesty, is presuming upon the charity—we might say the gullibility—of the public

to an extent unexampled at least in our experience. Had Dr. Ryerson frankly owned his error, and repaid the money, which he had so improperly abstracted from the public purse, the country, we feel satisfied, would have gladly forgiven him; and would have attributed that error to a want of consideration and judgment, and not of principle and morality, on his part. As it is, we take it for granted he has made up his mind to follow Mr. Anderson's example; and the sooner he does so, the better do we consider it will be for the Educational Department in Upper Canada.—*Montreal Herald*.

The *Montreal Gazette* follows in a similar strain:—

**DOCTOR RYERSON AND THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.**—We publish to-day Dr. Ryerson's answer to the Committee of Public Accounts; and we do so with very deep regret. We could not have believed that Dr. Ryerson could have been guilty of such an act as he admits; and still less that he could have defended it by such language as many readers will be pained to find in other columns.

Dr. Ryerson, as is his custom, states his case with very tedious amplification; but the short of it is that he took, between the years 1851 and 1855, the sum of £1,375 19s 9d, which had accrued as interest on public moneys which he had in charge, and which he placed in the Bank of Canada. He had no title whatever to that interest any more than he had to the principal, or any other property of his neighbor, and his taking it was nothing more or less than a breach of public trust and an act of embezzlement.

It is painful to write in this strain of a man in the position of the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, of a man whose services have been of great public benefit,—of a man whose character we had thought was beyond reproach; but our duty as public journalists compels us to speak the truth.

His long defence, that he was underpaid for his services, and was entitled to more than the amount of this interest money, is an aggravation of his serious offence. If he were underpaid for his services, and we do not wish to question his statement in this particular, he ought to have demanded increase of salary; and if he could not have obtained that, he was not bound to have retained his office. Here is a specimen of doctrine which he lays down:—

"Though I did not only official cheques for public school moneys but a distinct form of official cheque for each branch of the School Fund which I had to pay out, yet as distinction was made in the deposits between public and private moneys; and I felt myself no more obliged to account for any allowance the Bank was pleased to make on such deposits than to account for any other private money; and I felt not a little surprised when, in 1856, several months after the bank had ceased making me any allowance on balances of money at my credit, I was called upon to account for such allowance, which I regarded as my own."

One feels astounded at reading such doctrine from a man in the position of Dr. Ryerson. He would be insulted if we attributed it to gross ignorance, yet that is the most charitable account to which it can be placed. He once delivered a lecture on public education, in which he dilated on the ignorance of a portion of the press, saying it was melancholy that men should undertake to teach others who were not themselves instructed. Per contra, we will venture to say that among the whole class of editors he would find it difficult to discover one not possessing a better appreciation of *meum* and *tuum* than the above extract displays; and let us hope a more honest appreciation, when a question should arise of lining their own pockets with money not belonging to them.

There is no better established principle of right and law than that a man may not, who is in a fiduciary position, on any pretence whatever, make any private profit whatever from the trust committed to him; and so jealous is the law in this particular that it would not be allowed, even if the trust were to benefit from the operation, as numerous cases in the books prove. If the contrary of this doctrine were to prevail, great injustice has been done to Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Boves could not be asked to disgorge the ten thousand pounds in the Toronto debenture job. The land in fine would become full of speculation and jobbing, and men occupying the position of Finance Minister, or otherwise having to handle the public moneys, might in a few years, or even in one year, become rich from making use of their position, or obtaining interest from sums placed in their hands. If the principle were once admitted, there would be no end of the extent to which jobbing might be carried on.

The only circumstance in Dr. Ryerson's case, which at the first sight might seem to go in mitigation, is his statement in the paragraph of his defence which he numbers 3. He says he applied to the Inspector General in December, 1856, to ask him whether he was not justly entitled to the £1,375 19s 9d. allowed by the Bank, as accruing at the same time that he "would rather sustain any loss than receive directly or indirectly a penny which was not in accordance with law as well as with justice." This is all very well, but unfortunately for him the statement was made one year after he had taken the money which did not belong to him; and we should fancy from the manner in which it was made, in an attempt to bring about a recurrence of the good times. It is all very well to become virtuous after the act. That is a phase of character often witnessed by the habits of courts, but it is not a mitigation of offence. And Dr. Ryerson, when he made his statement, had actually disgraced himself, as well as merited dismissal, and ought to have been immediately made to disgorge.

He says he received no answer to his letter. In that case the Inspector General was guilty of great neglect. But an order of Council is spoken of by the Committee, which we understand was passed, ordering him to refund. That he alleges he did not receive, and this point needs further elucidation. Dr. Ryerson's statement is not free from inconsistency. He says in the extract which we quote above he "was called to account for such allowance." How or by whom? Was it by the Government?

The Government may have considered that simply ordering him to refund was sufficient in view of the particular circumstances of the case and the great services which he has undoubtedly rendered to the country; but then we require to have explained why the order in Council was kept back, if Dr. Ryerson's statement is true. We should have no objection to his receiving the fullest value for his services; but we have resolved that we will sternly do our duty in denouncing and putting down jobbing and undue use of official position for private gain, wherever they appear. At all costs, or whoever is sacrificed, the public departments must be kept pure; and if the Rev. Chief Superintendent of Schools for Upper Canada, thinks that he has had administered to him in these remarks, a too severe measure of justice, we can simply say that we can never consent to punish or expose the offences of an Anderson or a Boves, and let a Ryerson go.—*Montreal Gazette*.

It now remains only to see what action the Government will take in the premises, and whether the surmises of the *Globe* be true, that the Executive give their sanction to the gross frauds lately laid before the public. Of the fact—the appropriation to his own use of monies, the property of the public—there can be no doubt; for overwhelmed by the mass of testimony, the peccant official himself admits it. Of the validity of his plea—that he considered himself underpaid for his services, and so helped himself out of the public purse, to the sum to which he considered himself entitled—the meanest intelligence is ca-

pable of judging. And in a few weeks the country will know whether this man, guilty of such frauds, is to remain at the head of a department charged with the education of the youth of Upper Canada.

The *Catholic Citizen* of Toronto of the 27th ult. defines his position, and the position that he would fain see his Catholic fellow-citizens occupy, in the following terms:—

"Our position must be one of accommodation, neither too high-toned nor too exclusive. If we assume a stand of uncompromising exactness—meeting with little outside sympathy, we should be compelled to degenerate to faction, bound by no tie with the interests of any other class in the community. This position would be deplorable. Our interests are to merge into the mass of the community—to make their interests ours—and, conversely ours theirs. But to isolate ourselves as a class—to have no individually with the interests of the country, to be an *imperium in imperio*, is a doctrine which is written in the degradation and degeneracy of thousands of our countrymen in the United States. Then it is self-evident, that to burst this isolation we must identify ourselves with some party—on a common platform of mutual concession. This union to be honorable and politic must be one of principle—principle in that extension in which it is possible for exclusively Catholic interests to meet endurance and support. But, as Catholics, we cannot find in the country that party which will assimilate itself to us, in all our views and politics. There then remains only for us the alternative of becoming an alien faction, having no sympathy with the social interests of the country; or a partisanship of compromise and concession—to endure and tolerate as we hope to be endured and tolerated—if we would hold a firm grasp with principle on the one hand, to be prepared to relax a little our prejudices on the other. Such is the political relation in which we stand to the country at this moment."

Divested of the verbiage in which our cotemporary delights to envelop his meaning, his advice amounts to this—That, since as unfortunately we can find no party with whom, as Catholics, we can unite, we must abandon a portion of our Catholicity, in order that we may "identify ourselves with some party;" and that we may be endured and tolerated. What, or how much of our distinctive Catholicity, we are to throw overboard, our cotemporary does not deign to inform us.

With this advice we need scarcely add that we dissent *in toto*. In the first place, we can conceive nothing more injurious to the highest interests of Catholicity—nothing more dishonorable to Catholics themselves—than for Catholics to "identify themselves with any party." In the second place, we cannot admit that on those great questions whereon Catholics are unfortunately at issue with their Protestant fellow-citizens, the former are justifiable in making any compromise—no matter for what object—which involves a sacrifice of principle; and thirdly, we protest against the covert insinuation of the *Citizen*, that it is "our prejudices," as much as our Catholic "principles," that tend to keep the Catholic body in a state of isolation from the Protestant portion of the community.

By "identifying themselves with any party" in the State, Catholics would make themselves, and consequently their Church, responsible for all the errors and faults committed by that party with which they had identified themselves. Now there never was, there is not, and there never will be, any political party, either immaculate or unfallible; there cannot therefore be any party with which it would be either prudent or honorable for Catholics "to identify themselves." The Church, in a word, is Catholic; and her children therefore cannot—without ceasing to be as their mother, Catholic—identify themselves with a "party;" for party is the opposite, or contradictory, of Catholic. This truth seems so self-evident that we are almost ashamed to insist upon it with our readers.

And again, those questions whereon Catholics are at issue with their Protestant fellow-citizens, are questions, not of "prejudices," not of details merely, but of "principle." But when a principle is at stake—no matter what the consequences—no matter what the immediate results of "uncompromising exactness"—no true-hearted Catholic, no honorable man, will for a moment entertain the idea of compromise or concession. Man has nothing to do with the "consequences" of a rigid and inflexible adherence to true principles. Consequences are in the hands of God; all that man has to do is to perform strictly his duty, where God has placed him, come what may. It was but a slight thing, a mere insignificant concession or compromise, that was demanded of the early Christians. To throw a grain or two of incense upon the coals before the statue of an Emperor; or some trifle of a similar nature. This done, they might "merge into the mass of the community;" and practise all the rites of their religion without interference from the Roman authorities. But had the early Christians been animated with the spirit that speaks by the mouth of the *Toronto Citizen*, where now would be the noble army of martyrs?

No! as citizens, we ask nothing but what we have the right to ask; nothing but what as loyal children of the Catholic Church it is our bounden duty to insist upon. We can therefore make no compromise, no concession; for we have no right to abandon our duties.

No! as Catholics we should above all things prize the honor of our spiritual mother; and as her children, we cannot therefore "identify ourselves" with any political party in Canada. Not with the *Rouges*, "Clear Grits," or "Our" party certainly; for they, in many instances, pro-