

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
 No. 369, Notre Dame Street, by
 J. GILLIES.
 G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.
 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 True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "JOHN JONES, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription FROM THAT DATE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

OCTOBER—1865.

Friday, 14—St. Edward, Conf.
 Saturday, 15—St. Gallitus, P. M.
 Sunday, 16—Nineteenth after Pentecost.
 Monday, 17—St. Theresa, V.
 Tuesday, 18—St. Hedwig, W.
 Wednesday, 19—St. Luc, Kv.
 Thursday, 20—St. Peter of Alcantara, Conf.

The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—

Saturday, 14—St. Theresa.
 Monday, 16—St. Edward.
 Wednesday, 18—St. Placide.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Though the British Government has not relapsed into its former apathy, and though arrests continue to be made both in Ireland and in England, the Fenian conspiracy is, if we may form an opinion from the tone of the press, but as a punctured bladder. It has collapsed, and is rather the object of ridicule than of dismay.—Two laboring men, and a journeyman tailor seen in so far as yet has come to light, to be the heads of the conspiracy in Ireland, and the rank and file are said to be destitute of arms, money, and organisation. Under these circumstances, the Government can well afford to be merciful and to deal leniently with its prisoners. It would be, at all events, a wise as well as a novel policy to try the effect of a little justice and moderation, as agents for putting down Irish disaffection. It is absurd, it is but adding mockery to injury, to tell the Irish that they have no cause, or reasonable pretext for their disaffection, so long as the Established Church asserts its odious presence, and so long as full Freedom of Education is not granted to the Catholics of Ireland.—Many, no doubt, of the grievances of Ireland are social rather than political, and therefore far beyond the reach of legislative remedies; but others again consist in artificial restrictions imposed by Protestant legislation upon a Catholic community, and these it is within the power of the law to remove. What has been done, and done with the best effect, and the happiest consequences in Catholic Lower Canada, might surely be tried, and relied upon to produce good effects, in Catholic Ireland; and were the majority of the people of the last named country put upon the same legal footing as are their co-religionists of Catholic Lower Canada, we might then expect to see the people of Ireland as loyal and as contented as are our French Canadian fellow-citizens. Had the latter, however, been treated in the matter of religion and education, of their Church and their colleges, as the Irish have been treated, Canada would still be in a state of chronic insurrection, and no sane person would have reason to be surprised at the disaffection of Lower Canadians.

The cattle disease continues its ravages in England, but does not appear to have crossed over to the sister island. In consequence the price of animal food has been greatly raised, and extensive importations of bomed cattle from France are taking place. A few cases of cholera have appeared at Southampton.

The outbreak of cholera in Italy, by calling into more prominent exercise the heroic virtues of the Catholic clergy and the nuns, has given us an excellent commentary upon the policy of Victor Emmanuel's revolutionary Government towards the religious Orders. As heedless of the threats and the tyrannical edicts of the usurper, as of the horrors of pestilence, the exiled Italian Bishops have rushed back to their respective dioceses wherein the plague has broken out, to carry succor and consolation to the sick and dying; and while municipalities, and the whole tribe of official hirelings have fled panic-stricken from the infected districts, the proscribed nuns, and the contraband Sisters of Charity have rushed in to supply their vacant places. Nay! the authorities themselves have been compelled to sue for the services of those whom they lately persecuted, and whom when the present tribulation shall have passed, they will again revile and persecute with tenfold bitterness. Sisters of Charity have actually been sent to San Severo where the ravag-

es of cholera are worst, and already eleven of their number have fallen victims to their heroic and Christian charity; whilst, as the infidel *Pungolo*, an extreme Protestant paper, admits, but for the Friars of St. Francis, the sick would have been left unattended, and allowed to die like dogs.—Similar scenes have occurred at Bologna; and the order issued by the Piedmontese butcher Cialdini for the robbery and exile of the Capuchins has been virtually cancelled by a requisition to the same Religious from the Marchese Pepoli, calling upon them to furnish chaplains for the cholera patients in the Lazaretto. To this requisition the Capuchins promptly replied, that they were ready not only to furnish a few chaplains, but to attend upon the plague-stricken in a body, stipulating only that their ordinary residence as a community might be left to them.

The prisoners arrested on suspicion of Fenianism have been examined before the Dublin magistracy. The Counsel for the Crown asserted that large sums of money had lately arrived from the United States for the purpose of promoting insurrection, and that arms to a considerable extent had been imported and manufactured. The insurrection, it is said, was to have been inaugurated by the wholesale assassination of the nobility and gentry. Our latest dates are per *China* to 30th ult.

THE "TIMES" ON IRELAND.—"Satan" so the sweet singer of the Protestant Israel tells us—"finds some mischief still, for idle hands to do." Having in this dull season of the year, and pending the opening of Parliament, no pressing work on hand, the London *Times* devotes its attention to Irish affairs and to the state of Ireland; reading her people long homilies upon their vices, and warning them to take example from their virtuous and therefore more prosperous neighbors on the other side of St. George's Channel. It is a rule or rather habit with the *Times* and other English journalists, that whenever they have nothing else to do or speak about they must pitch into Ireland.

So the *Times* discusses the great social difficulty of Ireland—the tenure of land questions and the relations existing betwixt landlord and tenant, which even the *Times* admits to be unhealthy. They are so, as the critic truly observes, not because of any thing in her present laws upon the subject peculiar to Ireland, but because of the abnormal condition of the great mass of the Irish working classes, and the consequent incessant and undue competition for land. This competition is so great as to place the tenant, or would be tenant, completely at the mercy of the owner of the land, who can impose such terms as he pleases in the bargain; and this competition is again the consequence of the almost total want of all profitable occupation for the laborer.—There is nothing for the Irishman in case he cannot rent a piece of land, to fall back upon except emigration from the country. So far there is nothing to find fault with in the *Times*'s statement of the case, which it puts thus:—

"We should be glad, of course, if an improvement in the condition of Ireland could reduce the present balance of argument in favor of emigration. But how is this to be accomplished? First, in our opinion, by diminishing the extravagant and almost fanatical demand for land. So long as the one object of an Irishman's life is to get a bit of land and live upon it, so long must the Irish 'land question' be an intractable difficulty. An Irish landlord may be of any creed, politics, or character, but he must be a very prodigy of virtue if he were not spelt by the terms of the Irish land market. Twenty tenants are running after him at once, and each one of these is ready to bid over the other—to offer more rent, or to accept harder conditions. Of course, the result is distress, with denunciations of landlordism and clamour for tenant-right. If tenants knew what they were about, they would make this right for themselves. They cannot make it at present, because when they produce their stipulations the landlord can refuse them, and he can refuse them because if he first accedes to the bargain, there is another ready to close with it on the spot. An Irish tenant may live on hard terms, but they are terms which he knowingly and voluntarily accepted. Ask him why he accepted them, and he will tell you truly that he could get no better. Ask him then why he took the land at all, and his answer, if he gives it, will be the answer to the Irish land question altogether. He took it because he knew of no other trade, and saw no other means of subsistence. Put half-a-dozen good alternatives before him, draw the people off their small holdings, set two landlords running after one tenant instead of twenty tenants after one landlord, and the whole difficulty is at an end.
 "England is rich and Ireland poor, because England has fifty industries, and Ireland, Ulster excepted, only one."

But, admitting that the above contains a full and fair explanation of the fact that "Ireland is poor whilst England is rich," why is it, how came it to pass that, Ulster excepted, Ireland has only one industry, to wit, the tillage of the soil? In the answer to this question lies the whole secret of Irish poverty, of Irish discontent, of Irish agrarian outrages, of Irish emigration, of all that so shocks and surprises good heavy, stolid John Bull as he contrasts the condition of Ireland with that of England, congratulating himself the while on his superior intelligence, thrift, energy, and his higher civilisation. We can fancy therefore that this is not a question that the *Times* much cares to discuss.

Ireland has, with the exception of Ulster, no industries but one, that of agriculture, whilst England has fifty, simply because English legislation interfered with, and successfully prohibited the establishment or development in Ireland of those industries which she feared might enter into competition with her own nascent industries.—

During the whole of the last century the policy of England as towards Ireland was to discourage and put down all industries, all manufactures in Ireland, with the exception of that which still thrives in Protestant Ulster. This wicked policy, of which to-day we are reaping the fruits had a two fold object—the protection of English industries, and the suppression of Popery; and though the spread of Free Trade principles on the one hand, and a keen sense of the danger to which in case of foreign war the prolonged persecution of Irish Papists exposed the Empire, on the other hand, have of late years brought about a repeal of the code which denied access to all industries to Irishmen and Papists, the disastrous consequence still are felt, and will be felt to the latest generation. The evil has been done, and it is not in the power of man to remedy it, or to obliterate the traces of the barbarous legislation of the XVIII. century. No political applications, or mode of treatment can make the actual condition of Ireland that which it would have been to-day if the political and social antecedents of Ireland had been essentially different from those which the Penal Code of Protestant England engendered: and no honest and intelligent man can fail to perceive and to admit that the non-existence of "industries" in Ireland is the direct result of English prohibition of those industries—for the want of which again Ireland is poor whilst England is rich. All the poverty, all the agrarian crime, all the political incongruities of Ireland—at which Englishmen are astounded, are the direct inevitable result of English legislation. They are the consequences of that extravagant and fanatical demand for land" which the *Times* deploras: and that demand for land is extravagant and fanatical because, owing to the policy adopted towards Ireland by England throughout the last century, there exist in the former no industries, no remunerating employments, no manufactures upon which a redundant agricultural population can fall back for employment. These industries were carefully fostered in England until fully developed they could walk alone. Then came the era of Free Trade which found these industries in full operation in the one country, whilst in the other they had been carefully discouraged and suppressed. And yet with these facts staring them in the face men will still repeat the silly common-places that Ireland is poor because her people are Papists and priest ridden; England rich because she is the land of Gospel freedom and "an open Bible."

We insist the more upon this point because it strikes us that in repelling the absurd charge that the present deplorable condition of Ireland is due to the Catholicity of its people, as the national prosperity of England is due to the Protestantism of England, the Catholic and friend of Ireland sometimes misstates his case, and thus gives his adversary an advantage, by attributing the distressed condition of the Irish agricultural classes to actually existing laws, or to some positive enactments of the legislature regulating the relations betwixt landlord and tenant, peculiar to Ireland. To this it is easy to retort that in principle, the laws determining those relations are the very same in England and Scotland, and in the U. States as they are in Ireland. It is the social not the legal relations of tenant and landlord that are different in Ireland to what they are in any of the other of the above named countries: but that difference of the social relations, which leaves the tenant at the mercy of the owner of the land, is the direct result of laws, repealed indeed to-day, but of which the consequences are and must be eternal. That all force is indestructible is an axiom no less in sociology than in mechanics, holds as true in the moral as in the material order: and so long as this earth and the human race shall exist so long will the traces of the Protestant Penal Code be clearly discernible by the unprejudiced observer.

Especially on this Continent; because of the important consequences of that Celtic and Catholic stream of immigration which is one of the consequences of that Penal Code. No doubt there would under any circumstances have been emigration from the more thickly peopled districts of the Old World, to the sparsely peopled districts of the New: but the Irish Exodus would not have assumed its actual gigantic dimensions, but for the constant pressure upon the means of subsistence of the Irish people, and the want of all industries but one, as the *Times* has it. Now it is just because the Irish Catholic emigrants have come *en masse* that they have not been absorbed by the more numerous Protestant and Anglo-Saxon population by whom they were surrounded. Arriving in dribbles they would have been so absorbed at once; but rushing in in a mighty stream, broad, continuous and impetuous, they, like some great river which at first refuses to mingle or confound its sweet waters with the salt and bitter sea, have retained to a great degree in their new home, their distinctive nationality, their peculiar Celtic characteristics, and above all their Catholic faith. In spite of the sad apostacies which so often occur amongst them, which are so general amongst their descendants, the first generation of Irishmen have been as it were the pioneers of the Gospel in America, and to them, as well as to the French, this quarter of the globe is indebted for the blessings of the Catholic Faith.

Thus the very means which Protestantism employed to extirpate Popery in the Old World have, but resulted in propagating it in the New, and thus does the Lord confound the devilish artifices of man.

SECTARIANISM IN THE SCHOOL *ver.* SECTARIANISM IN THE KITCHEN.—"No Catholic Need Apply." How often do these words, or words to the same effect, meet our eyes in advertisements from house-holders enquiring for servants. We do not complain of them; we think, indeed, that they are in very bad taste, because uncalled for, since every master or mistress of a family has it in his or her power to ascertain the religion of the applicant for a situation before concluding the engagement; but also certainly we think that the conscientious Protestant acts consistently in admitting none but Protestants within his family circle.

We say that we do not quarrel with the principle involved or implied in these words; on the contrary, we highly approve of it, and wish that every Catholic would reduce it to practice, though without making an offensive and quite unnecessary parade of it in the advertising columns of the journal. The principle implied or involved is this:—That, such is the importance of sound religious principles, and so irreconcilable is the antagonism betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism, the presence of one of the former persuasion in a Protestant household, and as a member of a Protestant family, is to be deprecated because it might endanger the sound Protestantism of the other inmates. It is not so much because Protestants doubt the capacity, or the honesty of a Catholic cook or a Popish nurse that they reject her services, as because they dread the powerful and deleterious moral influence to which the presence of said Romish cook or nurse might expose their children and other dependants.

In their own case we see Protestants are keen sighted; they can argue soundly, and act consistently. Let them but apply the same principle to the household, and see whither that principle will lead them! Let them only be as logical in the selection of their children's teachers, as they are in the selection of cooks to cook their children's victuals, or of a maid-of-all-work to wash their own linen—and what will be the result? We answer Separate Schools; Sectarianism in the educational as well as in the culinary order.

"I do not choose," says *Pater-familias*, being a zealous and consistent Protestant, "to have Romish servants in my household; because although they may not directly tamper with the faith of my children, yet may they from association and intercourse, acquire such a moral influence over those children, as to unsettle those Protestant foundations which it is my duty as a father to place beyond the reach of all disturbing influences. There may indeed be no Popery in the broth, no savor of Romanism in the pudding, and the domestic linen may be free from all taint of Mariolatry, although cook does go to Mass on Sundays, and Biddy does say her beads every night before going to bed; but still I dread the example; I dread the indirect influences which, from their position in my household, cook and Biddy might acquire over the plastic minds of my young children." In some such form would Protestant *Pater-familias* explain, if taken to task, the motives which prompted him when advertising for a domestic to append the caution "No Catholic need apply."

Let us transfer this principle, which is a sound one, from the kitchen to the school, and apply it to the teacher as well as to the maid-of-all-work. Let us also postulate that Catholic parents have the same right to protect the religious principles of their children, against the influences of Protestantism, as have Protestant parents to guard their children against the insidious approaches of Romanism. This done, and this granted, we have the whole case for Separate Schools, as stated by Catholics, made out and admitted at once by Protestants.

Let us grant, for the sake of argument, that, in the "common school," where the majority of the taught are Protestants, and where the teacher is likewise a Protestant, the prescribed course of study is, like the broth of the Catholic cook, innocent of all religious bias whatsoever; still as the indirect influence which a teacher exercises—especially if he knows how to make himself respected and liked by his pupils—must, whether for good or evil, be immeasurably greater than that of a servant girl over the other inmates of the family, whether these be her social equals, or her master's children; so the danger to which the Catholicity of the pupil is exposed in the one case, is far greater than the risk which, in the other case, the child's Protestantism runs. For precisely the same reason, therefore, that the Protestant *Pater-familias* refuses to have Catholic servants in his household, or about his children, does the Catholic parent refuse to have Protestant teachers to instruct his children. The objection, we say, of the Catholics to the "common school" with its Protestant teacher, and Protestant pupils, is of the same kind, but infinitely stronger in degree, as that which finds expression

in the formula of Protestant advertisements "No Catholic need apply."

And to conclude our argument, we contend that in the choice of a teacher for his children, the Catholic parent, no matter what his social position, should, in so far as the law is concerned be left as free and unrestricted as is the Protestant master of a family in the choice of his domestics. With the latter the State has no right to interfere, directly or indirectly, and so also with the former; and it is as gross a violation of the essential or constituent principles of civil and religious liberty to compel a Catholic parent to pay, in part even, the salary of a Protestant teacher, as it would be to compel the Protestant householder to engage and pay the wages of a Catholic cook.

"No Catholic Need Apply." Well, we are not disposed to quarrel with our Protestant fellow-citizens for their kitchen "sectarianism," but we demand only this, that they be equally indulgent to our school "sectarianism." They will not tolerate a Romish cook in their kitchens, or an idolatrous Papist in the laundry; and they assert, against the State in general, and against the majority of the house-holders of the district, township, or section in which they reside, their absolute right to unrestricted liberty in all that appertains to the choice of their domestics. They will not pay wages to cook or housemaid not of their own selecting. Against this we have not one word to say.

But we ask to be treated with equal justice, but we challenge equal consideration for our own "sectarianism." We will, so help us God, no more tolerate Protestant teachers for our children, than they will tolerate Catholic cooks; and we will not allow them, under any pretence, or in any manner whatsoever, to compel us to pay the salaries of those teachers whose services we, in the exercise of our absolute right as parents, reject for our children.

THE "GLOBE" ON CONFEDERATION AND ITS RESULTS.—We have already in our last, quoted from the *Globe* on this subject, with the view of showing that the Confederation policy was not adopted by Mr. George Brown as a means of protection against foreign invasion, or with any idea of strengthening British connection, and of warding off the danger of Annexation.—Though in England it may suit Mr. George Brown to tell one story, and to represent himself as a very loyal personage indeed, intent only upon perpetuating and consolidating British rule in North America, when addressing his own constituents he well knows that there is no need for such hypocrisy, and that such an argument would tell more against than in favor of Confederation amongst Protestant Reformers. No! in Upper Canada, and addressing Upper Canadian Reformers, a class of gentry whose eyes have all along had a very evident and decided cast in the direction of Washington, Mr. George Brown drops the loyal and British dodge altogether, and puts the matter, Confederation, on its right footing. He recommends it to his Clear Grit friends and challenges for it their support, not because it opposes obstacles to their long-coveted Annexation; but simply, but wholly and solely, because it assures to Protestant Anglo-Saxon and democratic Upper Canada that preponderance in public affairs over Catholic and non-democratic Lower Canada to which its numbers entitle it. This, this alone, is the beauty of Confederation upon which Mr. George Brown, in the *Toronto Globe*, expatiates loudly and eloquently:—

Removing the burden of local expenditure to local shoulders, and awarding to Upper Canada a preponderance of seventeen votes in the General Legislature, with a re-adjustment according to population, every ten years! To carry that, the Reform leaders of Upper Canada may well consent to submit for a while to much more than they have been called on to accept as members of the Government. And assuredly; if we know the men aright, it is not the snarling of a few malcontent journals and politicians that will make them turn their eyes for one moment from the goal they strive for. We do not doubt that complete success will reward their efforts—but come success or come disappointment, the effort to obtain justice to Upper Canada will have been an honest, earnest effort—and people will remember with indignation the conduct of those who attempted to weaken the hands of the men who fought the battle.—*Toronto Globe* 2nd October.

The *Times*, speaking not without warrant we suppose makes public the importance fact that the information in virtue of which the late action against the Fenians was taken, was furnished by the Washington Government to the British authorities. The *Times* adds that the deluded youths who have been saved from plunging further into rebellion have reasons to be thankful to Mr. Seward for having denounced them, and their plans.

FAILURE OF JUSTICE.—The scoundrels who in August last attempted to kidnap Mr. Saunders, were put on their trial last week, and though the evidence was conclusive against them, yet the Jury refused to agree on a verdict, to the disgust, if not the surprise of all honest men. Of course, in a case like this, one single unprincipled jurymen, who has no scruples about perjury, is able to bring about the disgraceful result, and thus to give occasion for very serious doubts as the value of trial by jury.