

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,

At the Office, No. 3 McGill-Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.

To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, who will give receipts for the same.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Since the declarations of Lord Derby in the Lords, and of Mr. D'Israeli in the House of Commons, the proceedings in Parliament have lost much of their interest. The Army and Navy Estimates, and the Bill for providing for an effectual system of National Defence will, most probably, be passed without much opposition, and the country will then be called upon to decide upon the great question of Protection upon Corn.

The 2d April was named as the day for the election of a successor to the late lamented Archbishop of Dublin. The Catholic Clergy of the diocese select three of their number, whose names are laid before the holy Father, who decides upon the merits of the respective candidates; the whole number entitled to vote is stated at fifty-four.

In France every thing remains quiet. An extraordinary decree, not to exceed three lines, is spoken of as destined to surprise the world, no less by its brevity than by the importance of its contents. Speculation is on the alert, to discover what this mysterious announcement may mean.

The State Legislature of New York has rejected the Maine Liquor Law, by a majority of 69 to 45.

SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

"The active opposition which Kossuth, his mission, and the cause of Freedom as represented by Hungary, have encountered from the Catholics of this country, especially the naturalized Irish and the priests, has opened the eyes of many to the inherent repugnance between Democracy and Papal authority."—National Era.

The above extract from a Protestant paper of the United States, we copy from an article in the *Montreal Witness*, headed Spiritual Despotism. The writer seems to think, that the hostility of Catholics to Kossuth, to his mission, and to the cause of freedom as represented by Hungary, coupled with the approval which the majority of Catholics have manifested towards the political conduct of Louis Napoleon, is a clear proof, that Papal Authority cannot co-exist with Democracy; that the two principles are essentially opposed to one another, and that no true Catholic can be, heart and soul, a Democrat, in the modern acceptation of that term. Fortunate would it be, if our Protestant brethren would always form as correct an estimate of the tendencies of Catholicity, as has the writer in the *National Era*; he has done us poor Papists justice, and no more than justice: Catholics are opposed to Kossuth, to his mission, and to the cause of freedom as represented by Hungary; modern Democracy is irreconcilable with submission to Papal, and indeed to any other, authority, and, therefore, as our cotemporary concludes, a true Catholic cannot be a Democrat, in the modern acceptation of the term.

But it does not follow, that because a Catholic is not a Democrat, that he is opposed to true liberty, or that he is friendly to Despotism. On the contrary, seeing that Democracy and Liberty are not only not identical, but are utterly irreconcilable principles, that Democracy, wherever it has been triumphant, has always been, and always must be, fatal to freedom, it is but a legitimate conclusion from the premises—that Catholicity is favorable to liberty, because it is hostile to modern Democracy, that is—to the vilest and most degrading tyranny under which mankind has ever groaned; no—if Catholicity were friendly to Democracy, she would, indeed, be what her enemies represent her—the foe of freedom, and the enemy of the human race.

When Protestants hear Catholics professing themselves to be friendly to civil and religious liberty, they immediately conclude, that by the same words, Catholics mean the same things as they do themselves: hence, as it is well known that Catholics are not friendly to civil and religious liberty in the ordinary Protestant acceptation of the words, we are often set down by our separated brethren as hypocrites, and as ashamed of, and therefore, trying to disguise, our true principles, under the mask of liberal phrases; the whole misunderstanding arises from the totally different meanings that Protestants and Catholics attach to the word liberty: the liberty of the one, being the bondage of the other.

Were a Catholic called upon, to give a precise definition of liberty, he would define it as submission to legitimate authority. In the moral order—to consist in submission to God, and to His Church; in the civil order—in obedience to the legitimate authorities; by this definition, the Catholic would at once show, that, not only he does not believe authority and liberty to be incompatible, but that he makes the very essence of liberty to consist in submission to authority—in other words—in order.

The Protestant, on the other hand, will generally define liberty by negatives. Liberty, as he under-

stands it, consists in the negation of authority, in the absence of control, as far as he himself is concerned, but in the right of coercing and controlling others—or, as it has been not unaptly expressed, "in the right of walloping his own nigger." In the civil order it means with him, political power; in the moral order, the right to accept or reject God's revelation to man, as he thinks fit, and the right to coerce and persecute the Catholic Church. Thus, whilst according to the Catholic idea of liberty, the free spirits in Heaven, are these alone, who persisted in their allegiance to God, and in submission to His Divine authority, the Protestant must look upon them as the abject slaves of an absolute despot, and weep over the defeat of "the cause of freedom, as represented by the devil and his angels." With these radically different ideas of the essence of true freedom, we can understand how it is that Catholics may be the friends of civil and religious liberty, in their sense of the words, and yet actively opposed to the freedom that is represented by Kossuth, Mazzini, by the Swiss Radicals, and the cut-throats of modern Rome.—Catholics, we are told, are actively opposed to Kossuth, to his mission, and to the cause of freedom, as represented by Hungary; it is true. They are opposed to Kossuth, because they believe him to be neither a great, nor a good man—because they know him to be the enemy and reviler of their Church, and of their religion—because they know that he has been publicly accused, in the face of all Europe, by men high in station, and worthy of credit—by the best and bravest of his own countrymen, of dishonest practices, which would defile a galley slave; and because, thus publicly accused, Kossuth has never yet dared to challenge investigation, or attempted to clear his character. They are opposed to his mission, because his mission, if successful, would have the effect of plunging their country into war with the powers of Europe, with whom it is the policy, as it is the duty of America to maintain peace—because his mission is to make of the great American nation a Propaganda of revolution and insurrection, to convert her children into brigands and marauders, and to get up another piratical Cuban expedition, on a larger scale. They are opposed to the "cause of freedom as represented by Hungary," because that cause was in reality the cause of tyranny and oppression—because the cause of freedom, in Hungary, was merely the attempt of about four millions Magyars, to retain in slavery about double that number of their fellow creatures, of Slavonian and Croatian origin, an attempt which Austria, justly and humanely overruled—because, in fact, the cause of freedom in Hungary, was only the assertion on the part of the Magyars, of their right to "wallop their own niggers." The "cause of freedom as represented by Hungary," is a mighty pretty cause to speak about; its exterior is fair at a distance, but it won't bear too close an inspection; it reminds one of the face of Mrs. Harris, as described by Mrs. Gamp, "quite like an angel's face, which but for pimples it would have been." Unfortunately for "the cause of freedom as represented by Hungary," the pimples are very numerous; indeed, we might almost say that they amount to blotches.

With regard to Louis Napoleon, and the revolution or *coup d'état* of the 2d December, Catholics may and do hold very different opinions; but upon one point all are agreed—that, whatever may have been the motives of the President, the result has been favorable to the cause of order, and, therefore, of true freedom; that the revolution of December, 1851, has anticipated the horrors that threatened Europe from the revolution of May, 1852. We may thus thankfully accept the act, without blindly approving of the actor, or attempting to palliate some of his measures—such, for instance, as the decrees confiscating the Orleans property. We may accept the harsh rule of Louis Napoleon, without looking upon it as the best of all imaginable governments, but simply, as the only government practicable in France at the present moment, thanks to the Democrats and Revolutionists, who, by destroying respect for authority, have rendered liberty impossible, and left France no third alternative betwixt anarchy and Caesarism—betwixt the soldier and the mob. We may admit that the government of the bayonet is bad, but even the government of the bayonet is better than no government at all, and thus, whilst regretting that any country should be reduced to such an alternative, we may consistently rejoice, and give God thanks, that He, in His mercy, has been pleased, even by such means, to restrain the passions of furious and bloodthirsty Socialists.

STATE SCHOOLISM.

Whilst many of our Protestant cotemporaries daily, tri-weekly, or weekly, as the case may be, make the welkin ring with denunciations of the horrors in store for Canada, from an *ism* that does not yet exist, *vide licet* State Churchism, we have, from time to time, exclaimed against the gross injustice that is actually inflicted upon the Catholics of Upper Canada, through the operation of the infamous system of State Schoolism that at present prevails in that portion of the Province. Fortunately for us, our opponents make our task an easy one; their eloquent denunciations against State Churchism, by merely substituting the word School for that of Church, furnish us with incontrovertible arguments against State Schoolism, whilst their bigotry abundantly supplies us with facts and "instances," in support of our theories. As a specimen of the operation of these State School laws, in Upper Canada, and of the manner in which the rights of Catholics, as citizens, and as parents, are systematically violated, the following statement, for which we are indebted to the *Toronto Mirror* of the 2d ult., will afford us a striking example:—

Mr. Maurice Carroll is a Catholic, resident at Georgetown, Esquussing, Upper Canada, and is

apparently surrounded by a highly liberal and intelligent Protestant neighborhood. In virtue of the Upper Canada School law, Mr. Carroll's Protestant neighbors, being the majority, compel him to pay for the support of a State School; of which the control is given to a retired, or half-pay, Methodist preacher; and which—as he is compelled to pay for this State School, and has no choice between sending his children to it, or not sending them to school at all—Mr. Carroll has, hitherto, allowed his five sons to attend, having first, as was his duty as a parent, warned them not to participate in any act of religious worship, or instruction, with the Protestant pupils, and told the teacher, that he, as their father, would not allow his children to read the government version of the Bible, which every Catholic looks upon (whether with or without cause is of no consequence,) as a corrupt and mutilated version. Now, considering that in this Priest-ridden section of the Province, where Catholics are in the majority, Protestants are by law allowed to have their separate schools, supported by a fair share of the money received by local taxation, and of the government grants; it is bad enough, in all conscience, that the same privilege—or rather, bare act of justice—should not be conferred upon the Catholic minority in Upper Canada; it is bad enough, that Catholic parents should be compelled to pay for schools, and yet have no schools given to them, save schools to which they cannot send their children, without exposing them to the risk of having their faith and morals contaminated, if not entirely subverted. But this is not all: for it seems that not only are Catholic parents not allowed to have separate schools for their children, but that the Trustees of the State Schools have given orders that the Catholic children be compelled to join in the devotions and religious instructions of the Protestant pupils. We will give Mr. Carroll's own statement:

"Having five children attending the Georgetown Mixed School, the five all being under thirteen years of age, and over five, I first cautioned the oldest of them to watch over the rest, and to tell the teacher I would not allow them to read the school Testament. He insisted they should, but yet they did not do so. The worthy master being, as I understand, once a Methodist divine, he still retains his piety or yet gross absurdities. On one morning, the oldest of my children told me that on refusing to read the Testament they were all compelled to join in evening prayer. On hearing this, I went to one of the Trustees, and told him he would much oblige me if he told the teacher to allow my children to withdraw from school when he begins his religious ceremonies. He got enraged at once upon my making this civil and simple request, and told me I should see the master about that, or—would I not wish to ask for a blessing on my children, when leaving school? My reply was—not from him or them; however, I went to the master and asked him for the same privilege as I have stated before, which he half consented to grant. Before one hour went round, the master was with me, and told me he should take back again his promise from me, as the Trustees came to him and reprimanded him for giving any such privilege, and as the school was under their control, they would not allow any such conduct carried on there."

So much for religious liberty, where Protestants have the upper hand.

It would be a waste of time and words, it would be an insult to the common sense of our readers, to attempt to prove the injustice of this conduct, on the part of the State School Trustees. It requires no labored argument to demonstrate that a law which puts it into the power of Protestants to compel Catholic children to assist at devotions, which the latter look upon, not only as not pleasing to God, but as exceedingly offensive to Him, is an unjust and iniquitous law, and one, therefore, that must be abolished. Instead, therefore, of wasting time in arguing against such an unjust law, we would rather take counsel to see how its repeal may be effected, or, failing in that, how its provisions may be most effectually resisted.

The grievance complained of is—that Catholics are compelled to pay for Protestant schools. The remedy demanded is—that if government compels Catholics to pay school rates, it shall grant to them the right of separate schools in Upper Canada, just as the Protestant minority enjoy the right of having separate schools in Lower Canada. The question for consideration is—How are Catholics to obtain the justice that they demand? Perhaps we might obtain an answer to this question, by seeing how Protestants would act in similar circumstances, if they were the aggrieved parties.

Let us suppose that, in Lower Canada, Protestant parents were compelled, by law, to pay for the support of schools under the control of Catholic Trustees, and taught by Catholic Clergymen; that being too poor to pay for two set of schools, these Protestant parents were thus compelled, by law, either to send their children to Catholic schools, or not to send them to school at all: let us suppose, also, that being thus compelled to send their children to these Catholic schools, these Protestant fathers and mothers should discover that, not only was the belief of their children exposed to considerable danger, by their continual association with Catholics, but that the Trustees and masters compelled them to read Catholic books of devotion, and to assist at acts of Catholic worship; we shall then have imagined a state of affairs in Lower, precisely analogous to that of which Mr. Carroll complains, as existing in Upper Canada. What, we ask, under such circumstances, would be the conduct of our Protestant fellow-citizens? Firstly, we are certain, that the members of all the different Protestant sects, forgetting their mutual antagonism, and remembering only their common hatred of Catholicity, would join together as one man, to resist such an outrage upon their rights as citizens, and as parents; and that they would proclaim, in plain but energetic language, their determination no longer to submit to it; secondly, that they would endeavor to obtain redress from the Legislature, by bringing to bear upon that body, every influence within their power; thirdly, that if they could not obtain redress, by quiet and legal means, that they would take it—that is—that they would refuse to pay one farthing of school rates, and thus render it impossible to levy them, except at the point of the bayonet—a mode of procedure which no government would long dare to enforce. Yes, we have no doubt, that if the Protest-

ants of Lower Canada were the victims of the same tyrannical enactments, as those to which the Catholics of Upper Canada have long been subjected, the Legislature would soon be glad to repeal or amend them, forced thereunto, if not by a sense of justice, at least by the dread of bloodshed, and civil disturbances.

Such would be the conduct of Protestants. In that conduct Catholics may find something not unworthy of their imitation—and firstly, the necessity of Union. Without distinction of politics, or of origin, Catholics should unite themselves together, with the firm determination to obtain a revision of the School Laws of Upper Canada, legally, peacefully, if possible, but, above all, to obtain that revision, no matter at what cost, or at what hazards. If the Legislature should persist in refusing their demand for justice, (an event not likely to occur if the Catholics, both of Upper and Lower Canada, will but unite, to show their strength, and their firm resolve to maintain, intact, the first principles of civil and religious liberty;) but if it should—then the only resource left will be an "Anti School Rate League," in imitation of the great "Anti Corn Law League," by means of which Cobden compelled a reluctant Parliament to listen to the people's cry for untaxed bread. Shall Catholics be less zealous for their religion, than the men of Manchester are for their cottons and their calicoes? Shall they not, in the cause of Free Education, be as bold as the advocates of Free Trade? and can they doubt, that if they use the same means, accompanied with fervent prayer to the Throne of Grace for help—for this, after all, is the Catholic's great reliance—can they doubt, we say, that equal success will crown their efforts?

Union, then, amongst all Catholics, is the first requisite.—Unity of design, that all may thoroughly understand what work they have to do;—unity of action, that the work may be by all well and fully accomplished. Already, throughout both Provinces, the Catholic Institute is in existence, formed with the avowed object of watching over, and defending the rights of Catholics from all aggression; in these Institutes we possess the machinery for the requisite organisation; through them, the Catholics of one part of the country may be made acquainted with the wants and necessities of all their brethren; by means of them, they can be brought to work together, as one man, for one common object; and what object more worthy their attention than to procure freedom of education for their brethren in Upper Canada?

Freedom of education—the right to have the schools, for which Catholics are compelled to pay, exclusively under Catholic control—is all that we demand. We demand it, not as Catholics, but as citizens—not as holders of peculiar dogmas, but as rate-payers: we demand good money's worth for our good money, and we demand nothing for ourselves that we do not desire to see accorded to our Protestant fellow-citizens. Many of these, we know, will join with us in our demand for separate or Free Schools; the authorities of the Church of England have declared, that it is expedient that all lawful methods should be adopted to move the Legislature to make separate grants for the support of Church of England schools; and the members of many other sects (as indeed must all honest men not blinded by the cant of modern liberalism,) freely admit the justice of our demands, and recognise that it is as gross a violation of true civil, and religious liberty, to compel a Catholic to pay for the support of Protestant State Schools, as it is to compel the Dissenters in England to pay for the support of the ministers of a State Church; indeed, common sense shows that no argument can be employed in favor of State Schoolism, or National Education, that cannot be urged with still greater force, in favor of State Churchism, or National Religion. As Catholics, we are willing to obey the law, to accept the system of State Schoolism, in spite of its defects, provided that it be not used against us as a sword in the hands of the proselytiser; provided that we are allowed to have our separate schools, in which, under the superintendence of the Church, the doctrines of the Church may be imparted to the pupils; upon these conditions only, can we accept State Schoolism. Give us, we demand of the government, our separate schools—or else allow us to fall back upon the voluntary system; but separate schools, or no separate schools, it is well that Catholics should declare, "temperately and moderately," as the *Mirror* says, but at the same time clearly and fearlessly, their determination no longer to pay Protestants for perverting their children.

We subjoin the letter of his Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, to Mr. Carroll, highly approving of his conduct as a dutiful son of the Church:—

Toronto, 3rd April, 1852.
My Dear Sir,—Let your Bishop bless you and your family for your judicious, noble, paternal, and quite Catholic conduct in the very painful emergency mentioned in your letter to the Editor of the *Mirror*.

You sent to school five children of yours from 5 to 13 years old. Honor to your zeal for instruction, dear sir; and let every father do the same, by steady, industrious, and temperate habits, and our part of the Province will deserve to be the Upper one. You sent your five children to the mixed school of Georgetown, but with the precaution of a sentinel and a watchword. Honor to the simplicity of the dove, combined with the prudence of the serpent—honor to your tolerance and wisdom; you thought that a mixed school, true to the law—true to public speeches, pamphlets, and reports, though a very incomplete system of education, is still better than no school at all. But you thought, too, that there were dangers in mixed schools—danger in the teacher—danger in the books—danger in the low-pupils—danger even in religious exercises; and you thought to guard your dear little ones against all these dangers. Let every head of family, having a religious persuasion, do the same; and, at least, religion shall be respected in our mixed schools, and they shall not be schools in which every denomination is laughed at in its turn—schools of sceptic indifference and infidelity; and we will not see here, as elsewhere, *Nothingarians*, becoming more and more numerous, as it is stated in every census; and the hierarchy of our Catholic Church will tolerate the educational, or rather the instructional machinery; and Catholic children and parents, though mixing with mixed schools, will be admitted to the Sacraments, provided, that at home, as in the churches, religious instruction be carefully attended to; because, both parents and children are equally bound to the preservation of faith and morals from any immediate danger, and to the acquirement of Catholic knowledge, and practices of piety; and because secular instruction, without religion, is a calamity, instead of being a blessing.