

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT No. 210, St. James Street, by J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERE, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE: To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscribers Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. PATTERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 22, 1873.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

AUGUST—1873.

Friday, 22—Octave of the Assumption. Saturday, 23—Vigil. St. Philip Beniti, C. Sunday, 24—Twelfth after Pentecost. Monday, 25—St. Louis, C. Tuesday, 26—Finding of St. Stephen. Wednesday, 27—St. Joseph Calasanctius, C. Thursday, 28—St. Augustine, B. C.

OUR TWENTY-FOURTH VOLUME.

To-day we have the honor of presenting our readers with the first number of the 24th Volume of the TRUE WITNESS. We avail ourselves of the occasion, to return our hearty thanks to our many friends for their good will and kind offices, trusting that they may never have cause to regret these or change their opinion of the TRUE WITNESS.

Encouraged by their approbation we continue the publication of the paper. In the future it will be as in the past it has been a non-political paper, and treating editorially those topics only in which the interests of the Church are concerned: and on these as it is our duty to be guided by the voice of the Church, so it will always be our object to submit ourselves unreservedly to her instructions. She alone is competent to determine her legitimate sphere of action, to say with infallible certainty what matters fall beneath her jurisdiction, and what belong to the State or secular authority. The Church never encroaches on the rightful domain of Caesar, though the latter is ever trespassing within the sacred inclosures of the Church. To denounce and urge resistance to these encroachments is the first duty of the Catholic journalist, and in the discharge of this duty, we pray that we may not be remiss. With politics, except in this sense, the TRUE WITNESS will not interfere.

We also avail ourselves of the first issue of our New Volume to invite those of our subscribers who may be in arrears to discharge their indebtedness to the office as soon as possible. We hope that it will be enough to remind them of their obligations to ensure the payment of the very large sums due to us.

With these remarks we respectfully solicit the patronage and support of the Catholic public of Canada.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Rumours are again current in Paris of negotiations for a fusion between the Legitimists and Orleanists, with a view to a combined effort next session to re-establish the monarchy in France. Special significance is attached to the journey of the Orleans Princes to Austria. The Orleanist journals are beginning to agitate the question of the monarchy, and much attention has been attracted by an article in the Journal de Paris, which has been taken as a declaration that the Orleans Princes are prepared to waive their claims in favour of the Legitimists. The article lays down that the Republic has had a fair trial and has been found wanting, and that nothing remains practicable but the re-establishment of a hereditary monarchy.

The Versailles Council has resolved not to convoke the Assembly until the Prussian army of occupation has quitted Verdun.

It is announced that the Prussian Government has just given an earnest of its intention to proceed with vigour with the persecution of the Catholic bishops, by at once withdrawing the State allowance of 4,000 thalers hitherto made to the priests' seminary at Fulda, and by ordering that the episcopal boys' seminary be closed on the 1st of October next. A telegram from Posen states that Archbishop Ledochowski has been summoned before the criminal section of the district court to offer a justification of the disciplinary proceedings taken by him against the priest Arndt.

We learn that the Asiatic cholera is spreading in Berlin, and the number of fatal cases are rapidly increasing. The disease is of the most virulent type. The authorities are enforcing the most stringent sanitary measures to prevent it spreading.

A Berlin letter says one of the events for which it is well to be prepared, is the death of the German Emperor.

Herald Cable, Carlist Head Quarters, Sanque, Aug. 18.—The French Government has taken an initiatory step towards recognizing the Carlists as belligerent, having issued orders permitting the transit of arms and ammunition of war between the two Custom House lines in the South of France. A decree, dated in March, 1865, which prohibited such transportation on the borders is now rescinded by Paris. The Government border authorities have been notified by circular, thus enabling the Carlists to dispense with the use of a steamer, and the risk of her capture.

The motion which Mr. Butt is to submit to the English House of Commons next Session is to the effect, that the system of Government and administration at present existing in Ireland is in many respects opposed to the principles and spirit of the English Constitution, and inconsistent with the right to participate in English liberty, to which the people of Ireland became entitled on the first introduction of English law; that, resting as it does on measures of coercion and restriction of popular privileges, it has failed to secure to Ireland a Government in accordance with the wants and wishes of the country; and that Parliament is bound to find a remedy for this state of things.

The Pall Mall Gazette says during the disturbance in Pernambuco, growing out of measures taken by the Brazilian Bishops against the Freemasons, the Jesuit College was broken into, sacred pictures destroyed, confessionals shattered and four of the reverend fathers beaten, one of whom, who was ill, is dying from blows received.

Cholera is prevailing extensively in Gerrard County, Kentucky.

MR. FROUDE'S ATTACK ON IRELAND.

(Continued from our last.)

According to promise we continue our extracts from the British Quarterly Review. The subject immediately under his notice is the Great Rebellion of 1641, and the apocryphal massacre, on which Mr. Froude so strongly insists as a justification of the cruelties perpetrated by Cromwell upon Ireland:—

"That the enormities of the Irish Government provoked the rising of 1641 has been admitted long ago by the best authorities; we need only refer to Burke and Hallam to see what history has said on the subject. The 'rebellion' was doubtless bloody and cruel, but in many particulars Mr. Froude's account is unjust and one-sided in the extreme. In the first place, he quietly suppresses the immediate provocation of the outbreak—the rapacity of the two Lords Justices who, it has been truly said, 'were a pair of scoundrels who did not scruple to goad the Irish into rebellion in order to get a good crop of forfeitures.' In the second place, he describes the rising as the crime of the whole Irish race, especially of the Irish Catholics, whereas it was the act of the Ulster Irish alone, whose leaders beyond question had no other object than to regain lands iniquitously torn from them. In the third place, he says hardly a word of the atrocities of the colonists at bay though the deeds of Coote and St. Leger were simply execrable; and the crimes they perpetrated far outside Ulster aroused deep indignation in men like Ormond and the high-souled and loyal Clanciarde. And lastly, and most important of all, he gives a most undue prominence to the 'massacre,' and represents what really was a mere episode in a long drama of hatred, as a portentous outburst of savagery and bloodshed which has ever disgraced the Irish name. The result is, that his picture of the 'rebellion' is essentially unfair; it places events in a false light; and this is the more to be blamed because, according to the political faith of Mr. Froude, the Irish had a perfect right to rebel, as at this crisis they were very 'strong,' and had a reasonable prospect of success. One or two passages from Mr. Froude's own works will show how unjust it is to dwell on the 'massacre,' as an isolated fact, without reference to preceding events in which the Irish race were the victims. Here is Mr. Froude's high-wrought sketch of the effects of the rising:—

"Savage creatures of both sexes, yelling in chorus, and brandishing their staves; boys practising their young hands in stabbing and torturing the English children—these were scenes which were witnessed daily through all parts of Ulster. The fury extended to the farm-stock, and sheep and oxen were slaughtered, not for food, but in the blindness of rage. The distinction between Scots and English soon vanished. Religion was made the new dividing-line, and the only crime was to be a Protestant. The escorts formed in most cases but gangs of assassins. In the wildest of remembered winters the shivering fugitives were gazed along the highways stark naked and footless. If some, happier than the rest, found a few rags to cover them, they were torn instantly away. If others, in natural modesty, twisted straw rags round their waists, the straw was set on fire. Many were buried alive. Those who died first were never buried, but were left to be devoured by dogs, and rats, and swine. Some were driven into rivers and drowned, some hanged, some mutilated, some ripped with knives. The insurgents swore in their madness they would not leave English man, woman, or child, alive in Ireland."

"This, no doubt, is terrible enough; but let us hear Mr. Froude narrating, in his 'History of England,' some of the deeds which marked the progress of conquest in Ireland, and of which the 'massacre' was the fearful requital:—

"The patience of Sidney and the patience of England generally was worn out; the Irish were no longer looked upon as subjects of the Crown, to be reclaimed with severity or tenderness, but as having themselves lost their rights as citizens by their turbulence, and as deserving only to be hunted down and destroyed. . . . Carew set upon Sir Edward Butler's house, and massacred every man, woman, and child that he found within the walls, not sparing even a little boy of three years old. It was the beginning of the general extermination which was contemplated in the scheme of settlement. . . . A party of soldiers made their way to the Barony of Shillelagh, whence the report says, 'they burned Garrald's house, with sixteen towns, and hamlets, took a prisoner or two, and forty-five head of cattle, and had other killing.' The revelling was protracted late into the night before Sir Brian and his wife retired to their lodging outside the walls. As soon as they were supposed to be asleep, a company of soldiers surrounded the house, and prepared to break the door. The O'Neils flew to arms. The cry rang through the village, and they swarmed

out to defend their chief; but surprised, half armed and outnumbered, they were overpowered and cut to pieces. Two hundred men were killed. The Four Masters add that women were killed. . . . Two hundred were killed in the castle. It was then discovered that several hundred more, chiefly mothers and little children, were hidden in the caves about the shore. There was no remorse, not even the faintest shadow of perception that the occasion called for it. They were hunted out as if they were seals and otters, and all destroyed. . . . Backwards and forwards the tide of havoc swayed, and at last so wretched, so desolate became Munster, that the howling of a cow, or the voice of a ploughman was not to be heard that year, from Dingle to the Rock of Cashel. To kill an Irishman in that province was thought no more than to kill a mad dog."

"We oppose Mr. Froude to Mr. Froude, and if, in the affairs of mankind, wrong, as a general rule, is avenged by wrong, assuredly the 'massacre' of 1641 was a phenomenon naturally to be expected. . . . Setting aside artistic descriptions of horrors, in which the Irish of 1641 are made to appear wild beasts of prey, and the colonists meek and inoffending sufferers, contemporary documents conclusively show that atrocities were committed on both sides; and probably the deeds of the dominant race, as usually happens on such occasions, were, in the long run, most cruel and remorseless. Lord Castlereagh—a trustworthy witness—says:—

"All this while parties were sent out by the Lords Justices and Council from Dublin, and most garrisons throughout the kingdom, to kill and destroy the rebels; but officers and soldiers took little occasion to distinguish between rebels and subjects, but killed in many places promiscuously men, women, and children. . . . It is very certain that there have been great cruelties committed upon the English, though I believe not one-twentieth part of what is given by report. But the truth is they were very bloody men on both sides; although some will throw all the blame on the Irish, yet it is well known who they were that gave orders to their parties . . . to spare neither man, woman, nor child."

"Another eye-witness, probably a Protestant, says:—

"Doubtless the Irish did in many places kill men resisting them in their pillaging; but the report of their killing women or men desiring quarter, and such like inhumanities, were inventions to draw contributions, and make the enemy odious. But sure am I that there was no such thing while I was there in Ireland about six months after these stories began. . . . And though married men, women, and children were killed in thousands by command of the Lords Justices, the Irish sent multitudes of our people, as well officers and soldiers as women and children, carefully to the seaports and other places of safety; so let us call them what we will—bloody inhuman traitors or barbarous rebels—we have suffered ourselves to be much excelled by them in charity, humanity, and honour."

"We have dwelt on the massacre of 1641 because Mr. Froude endeavours to make it a justification of the misrule which ensued, and because, for this purpose, he has described it in a singularly unfair and deceptive manner."

It will thus be seen that the writer in the British Quarterly rejects as apocryphal the story of a wholesale massacre by the Irish insurgents of 1641 and though no doubt many ruthless acts must have been committed during these terrible days: on both sides, the candid Protestant is compelled to admit that in the qualities of 'charity, humanity and honor,' the Irish Catholic insurgents far excelled their Anglo-Protestant opponents.

Over the subsequent events of Irish history, the Reviewer passes swiftly and lightly. The conquest of Ireland by the English under Cromwell was followed by the 'Act of Settlement' at the Restoration, which of course made another war in Ireland inevitable; and the great fault on the part of Mr. Froude that the Reviewer signalises is the incapacity of the former to perceive and do justice to the noble qualities of the Irish and their leaders in that struggle which terminated with the Treaty of Limerick, a Treaty violated in all important particulars ere scarce its ink was dry:

"It is a sign of the quality of his judgment that, while he properly admires the constancy of Derry, he says not one word of the heroism of Limerick; that he hardly alludes to Sarsfield at all—the robust figure on either side; and that he sneers at Irish valour at the Boyne, the fact being that the Irish horse—the infantry were a mere levy of peasants—fought with desperate and splendid courage, as we know, not only from the mouths of their foes, but from the cruel law which prohibited 'Papists' from having a horse more than £5 in value. As for the legislation of the Parliament of James II., it was, probably owing to fear of retaliation, not nearly so atrocious as many measures which Mr. Froude regards with delight; and a writer who praises wholesale 'transplantation,' thinks the 'execution' of Drogheda a noble work, and dwells with rapture on the proscription of a nation, has no right to condemn a faint emanation of the same policy by those who suffered from it, and still less to suggest that 'Popery,' as such, had really ought to do with the matter. Mr. Froude carps at William III., for having endeavoured to carry out against the will of intolerant Parliaments, measures of conciliation and mercy in Ireland; but a true view of history will note with regret how this humane attempt was frustrated, with consequences even now too apparent. Mr. Froude also is evidently sorry that the treaty of Limerick was not violated more completely than it actually was; and thinks it was a great mistake that the Penal Code was not made a more perfect engine of torture, and was administered with weak and feminine slackness. On this subject Mr. Froude's philosophy seems to have been prophetically glanced at by Burke when he condemns with scorn 'the doctrine repugnant to humanity and common sense that the security of any establishment, civil or religious, can ever depend upon the misery of those who live under it, or that its danger can arise from their guilt and prosperity' and we shall add nothing to the words of the master."

To the slanders of Mr. Froude the article from which we have quoted is a sufficient reply. Coming from such a source as it does, from the organ of the non-Conformist section of the evangelical Protestant community, it cannot be attributed to the Romish preclivities of the writer; and at the same time it confirms the historical truth of the statements of those Irish Catholic writers who have often fruitlessly insisted upon the injustice with which their country has been systematically treated, especially in the matter of the Great Rebellion of 1641, and the accompanying Massacre. This story henceforward must be left to writers of the Witness class, for all intelligent Protestants at the present day acknowledge it to have been

disproved by late researches; and, as Lord Castlereagh says, it is now well known "who they were that gave the orders to their parties . . . to spare neither man, woman, nor child."—See p. 269.

SECULARISM Vers. SECTARIANISM.—Were we at a loss for arguments against Common or non-Denominational Schools for a population of no common religious belief—that is to say, composed in part of Catholics, in part of Protestants—we should find these arguments in abundance in the controversial writings of the latter. For were there no such disturbing elements in the population, were it all one non-Catholic population, but broken up into different sects, there would still be carried on the same controversy on the School Question, the battle would be fought betwixt Denomination and Denomination, betwixt what we may call the "Religionists" and the pure "Secularists."

For of two things one. Either all religious education, all instruction that would tend to prejudice the child in favor of one form of religion rather than of another, in favor of Trinitarianism rather than that of Unitarianism, of Christianity rather than of Heathenism, must be carefully eliminated; or if, on the other hand, any distinctive religious element in instruction be retained it must needs be Denominational. Indeed, as Protestants themselves admit, a purely "Secular System in State Schools," for a religiously mixed population, would be intensely Sectarian.

This argument is well put by the London Times in an editorial on the School Question which is to be found in its issue of the 16th of April last. The occasion was furnished by the meeting at Manchester of the "National Education Union"—a "monster meeting," the Times calls it—at which were present at least 5,000 people, "representing various Denominations, differing in other respects, but agreed in resisting this common foe"—the Secular or Birmingham "school of educationalists." This meeting was opened by the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, by an address, "so forcible, so perspicacious, and so triumphant, that the question it will leave on the reader's mind is—How can there be any case against it?"

What then was the principle contended for by the Bishop of Manchester, and maintained so forcibly, with such perspicacity, and so triumphantly that the only question that can now suggest itself is—"How can there be any case against it?" The principle was simply the principle that in U. Canada Catholics so long fought for against the Liberals and Clear-Grits of that Province; that for years the Catholic minority in the United States have been contending for; the very principle asserted by the venerable Bishop Sweeney of St. John, in the name of his unjustly treated flock in the Province of New Brunswick. We will state it in the words of the Protestant Bishop of Manchester: for from his mouth it is unanswerable; though when coming from the lips of mere Papists it is too often contemptuously ignored. We again copy from the London Times:—

"Those"—said the Protestant Bishop—"who were on the platform with him were striving, probably from different standpoints, but united in general sympathy, and associated for one common object—viz., that the education of this country, particularly in its elementary department, should be based on religion in the future, as it had been based on religion in the past." (Cheers)—The Italics are our own.

In conformity with the unanswerable logic of the said Bishop, this Protestant "National Education Union" then adopted unanimously the following Resolution proposed by Mr. Raikes, M.P., and seconded by Colonel Leigh, M.P., and Mr. Wakefield of Kendal.

"That this meeting cordially recognises the great and vital principle on which the National Education Union is founded—viz., the maintenance of religious teaching as a fundamental element in the elementary education of the youth of this country, and decides to record its unalterable conviction that mere secular instruction apart from religion is unworthy of the name of education."—Times, 16th April.

But are rather altogether dangerous to faith and morals. If these authorities be right; if the logic of the Protestant Bishop of Manchester be good; if the Resolution unanimously adopted by England's great National Educational Union be sound—then are the Catholics of New Brunswick right, and their opponents altogether in the wrong; then is the logic of those who condemn the N. B. School Law of 1871, unanswerable; then is the Resolution of the Catholics of the Dominion never to cease from all constitutional efforts for righting that wrong, sound, and worthy of all approval from honest men.

But the Times itself, editorially, joins in condemning the "Secularists" as "Sectarian," that is to say, as endeavoring to force a virtually "Sectarian" system of Education upon the people; for there is a religious, as well as an irreligious, phase of "Sectarianism." Listen to the Times, who, when it pleases, can assume the aspect of an apostle of truth, and can enunciate the soundest of maxims. Pity that it will not apply to Catholics in particular, the same principles that it applies to religious Protestantism:—

"The history of the world without Christianity is just as much an appeal to faith as Christianity whether with or without the history of the world. The negative has to be believed or to be proved as well as the affirmative. Whoever has had but a little experience with opening minds, even in the indigent soil of a National School, knows that a good deal must be propounded on the authority of the book, the teacher, or the school, and must be commended to belief in the absence of demonstration. The Secularists may attempt to avoid the pitfall by merely physical instruction—by natural history, by chemistry, by mechanics, by history reduced to names and dates, and such neutral matters. They may do this with considerable success, and with the good results sure to follow any diligent and exact teaching. But they will be sure to find that whatever part of the mind they do not occupy will be sure to find its own occupation. The most fanatical authority and the most extravagant belief are found in the very persons bred in the purest elements of secular knowledge. If, then, the sin of erroneous belief and groundless authority does lie so heavy on the secular conscience as we are told it does, we would ask these gentlemen just to consider that there is no escaping from these calamities. Constituted as man is, and as the world is, there will be authority and faith. When the thoroughly enlightened and virtuous citizen pays his school rates or his taxes, he may be quite sure that he contributes not only to one authority or to one doctrine, but to a good many; and that whatever he denies to one he gives to another. Nature abhors a vacuum, and if one voice speaks not, another will; if one religion be not taught in our schools, they will speedily show a religion of their own, should none else be supplied."—Times.

What could a Papist say more in favor of positive religious teaching in elementary schools? Are not the words of the Times but a commentary on those of Him Who said, whoso soweth not with me scattereth? If in our elementary schools the pupils are not taught to respect Christianity as the truth, they will practically learn to contempt it; and the Christian Protestant parent has no more right to insist that his child shall not be brought up to despise Christianity than has the Catholic parent the right to insist that he be not compelled to support schools in which the pupils practically learn to despise Popery.

The "Secularists," in short, form as truly a "Sect" as do the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Quakers, the Unitarians, or any one of the Denominations which together form the Protestant community. Why then should the State establish and compel all to support the schools of one Sect? This is an argument that the Times admits to be unanswerable.

Well then! what remains? if the State is at all to interfere with the education of our children, and is, at the same time, bound to refrain from encouraging one Sect, one Denomination, one set of religionists, at the expense of any other? There is but one answer to this question. The State must accept, not as per se desirable, but as an unavoidable necessity, the "Separate or Denominational School system."

This, in substance, is the system in England; and the Times applauds it as being thoroughly popular and national. Why then should it not be popular, and national in the Dominion?

"The thoroughly popular, and national character of the existing system appears from the fact of 20,000 Denominational Schools—that is, schools in which a religion is taught—and particularly from the fact that of these, 25,000 are the schools of the National Church."—Times, 16th April.

Note well the word or definition of the Times! A Denominational school is one in which "a religion is taught," a non-Denominational school therefore, if the definition be good, is a school in which no religion is taught; but by the showing of the Bishop of Manchester in an unanswerable address, and by the unanimous Resolution of England's "National Education Union," it appears that, in the opinion of religious Protestants, "mere secular instruction apart from religion is unworthy of the name of education."