

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by

J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3d, can be had at this office; Pickups, News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1863.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The English journals are almost entirely devoted to long descriptions of the triumphal progress of the Princess Alexandra through the streets of London, her marriage with the Prince of Wales, and the rejoicings consequent thereupon. The pageant was evidently very splendid, but its success was dimmed by the loss of several lives, and the injuries inflicted upon many of the spectators of the illuminations and fireworks in the evening. At Cork there was a riot of some kind upon the occasion, but we have not got the full particulars.

The Continental news are very meagre. We learn that the insurgent Poles still continue the unequal conflict with the colossal power of Russia, and that in several battles the advantages have been on their side. Unaided, however by any of the European Powers, it is to be feared that the Poles must succumb, and that the horrors of the last conquest will be renewed throughout the again subjugated land. The sympathies of France and Great Britain have been strongly expressed, and if the mere enunciation of good wishes could avert the misfortunes, their cause is safe. But alas! bayonets are not to be turned aside by sympathies however warm, nor can any given quantity of admiration for the valor of the Poles, arrest the progress of the formidable columns with which the Czar is prepared to crush them. The "Great Britain" does not, like his Gallic neighbor, go to war for "auxilia," and without the co-operation of the former, France seems unwilling to provoke another conflict with Russia. The *Opinion Nationale* which is supposed to speak under the inspirations of Plo-Plo is very indignant with the "misericord policy" of England towards Poland, and accuses the British Government of acting with duplicity towards France.

We have no important events to record in the United States. The war lingers on, unmarked by any great or decisive engagements.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.—It is strikingly characteristic of the temper in which the advocates of State-Schoolism approach this question, and of the logical affinities of Liberalism, that our opponents never venture to discuss the School Question on its real merits. They always commence by assuming that which is in dispute; and having thus disposed of the arguments of the friends of Freedom of Education, they speedily settle the case to their own entire satisfaction.

The one great question at issue—that which therefore none of our opponents dare to discuss, is this. To whom of right, does the education of the child belong? to the parent or to the civil magistrate? to the Family or to the State?—All other questions—such as, do the majority of the people of Upper Canada approve of Common Schools? do these Schools encourage the diffusion of education, and tend to promote good will amongst the children therein educated? are utterly irrelevant. The question which above all others, or rather which alone deserves consideration is this: Has the State the right to supersede the Family?—has the civil magistrate the right to dictate to the father, how, by whom, and with whom, the children of the latter shall be educated?

Upon the solution of these questions the entire controversy depends. If the State has the right to establish Common Schools, and to compel every father of a family to support those Schools, it must be because education is the legitimate function, not of the Family, but of the State. But if, as we contend, God has confided the education of the child to its parents—if He holds them, and not the civil magistrate, responsible, then to them, and to them exclusively, belongs the education of the child; and no human authority has the right, directly or indirectly, to interfere therein.

This is the principle for which we contend—not in the interests of Catholics alone, but of all parents, of all denominations; not merely in the interests of revealed religion, high as these interests are, but in the interests of natural liberty. We assert, and in the fullest sense, the absolute right of the father of the family to sole control

over all that concerns the education of the child: we deny to the civil magistrate, or "Jack-in-Office," the slightest semblance, even of a right to interfere therein; and we base our claims for the parent, and our protest against the interference of the State, upon the grounds that the Father of the Family holds his authority from God direct, and rules by "right divine."

And this is the only "right divine" which we will acknowledge in any form of government upon the earth, outside the Catholic Church. As in the XVI. century it was the office of the Catholic controversialist to refute the impious doctrine of the "right divine" of kings, so now, in the XIX., it is his task and his duty to protest against the still more impious, the still more slavish doctrine of the "right divine" of peoples, and of brute majorities. With all its faults, there was something redeeming, something almost chivalrous and ennobling in the homage which Sovereigns of the XVII. century claimed, and which they then often received from their subjects. To bow before a *Grand Monarque* did not degrade a man, did not make him vile, as does an abject submission to the will of that "people-God" or "public opinion" which modern Liberalism has set up in the room of the "king-God" of the days of the Stuarts in England, and of Louis XIV. in France. Both were bad; but of the two, the former is by far the more revolting, and its worship the more irretrievably degrading, and disgusting to the man of honor.

To neither kings nor peoples do we concede any the slightest right to dictate to us in the matter of the education of our children, or to exercise authority within the sacred precincts of the Family. There the parent rules supreme, as king, as the vice-gerent of God Himself, and as responsible to God alone for the manner in which he discharges his sublime functions. Most important amongst these functions, is the education—that is to say the religious, the moral, and the intellectual development of the child. The parent—not the State—is bound to feed the child, to clothe the child, to protect it from the inclemency of the weather, and in a word to minister to all its bodily wants. But above all is he bound to provide for the moral and intellectual wants of the little one, whom he receives at the baptismal font from the hands of the priest—a child of God, an heir of the kingdom of heaven, and for whom therefore God will one day call him to a strict account. With such a sacred deposit, so solemnly confided to us, and under such grave responsibilities—what care we, what cares any Christian, what cares any parent from whose soul every noble sentiment has not been squeezed out, for that "public opinion" which the *Globe*, and others of that Liberal stamp, are incessantly urging as a valid argument for "Common Schools?" It is to us but as so much stinking breath; to which we are not only not bound to yield any deference, but which as freemen and as Christian parents we are bound to spurn with contempt, when it seems to us to be at variance with the due performance of our sacred functions. We fear God and His judgments; therefore we do not fear majorities, therefore we do not stand in any awe of public opinion and its blatant belovings.

Neither will we ever condescend to discuss the question, whether our objections as parents to the "Common Schools" of Upper Canada are well founded? As parents, we owe no man a reason for our objections to those Schools; we owe no man any explanation why we will not send our children to them. They may be all that their advocates assert them to be; but, if we as parents, in the exercise of our absolute rights as fathers of families, do not see fit to allow our children to attend those schools, no man has any right to call us to account, or compel us to pay for their support.

In a word: Education is not the function of the State, but belongs exclusively, and by right divine to the Family, and to those to whom in the plenitude of his parental authority, the father may see fit to confide it. If our adversaries deny this, and if they attempt to defend their position by argument instead of brute force, and bombastic appeals to "public opinion," they must make common cause with, and advocate the fundamental principles of the "Communists." They must appeal to the maxims and precedents of the days of Paganism, when the State was all in all, and the individual nothing, except in so far as he contributed to the grandeur or divinity of the State. From this abject social servitude, Christianity, by teaching the value of man as individual, as an immortal soul, redeemed us: to this state of things—the logic of the advocates of State-Schoolism, if consistently carried out to its last consequences, would inevitably bring us back. In the name therefore of Christianity and of individual liberty, we utter our protest against Communism and Common Schools.

To O.M.—We cannot comply with your request, nor can we open the columns of the *True Witness* to such a controversy as that which your communication would raise. It is one thing to condemn the injustice long exercised towards Ireland by the British Government; and another and a very different thing to preach up revolutionary and socialistic doctrines, subversive of the authority of all Government, and the rights of property. Besides in Canada there is no shadow of excuse for disloyalty. Every man who is here, is so of his own free choice. If he hates British rule, no one asks him to remain subject to it, and the best thing for him to do is to pack up his traps, and go across the "Lines;" but so long as he voluntarily remains in Canada, he is bound to be a loyal subject, loyal in word and deed. If he wants to spout treason against Queen Victoria, and the British flag, he has no right to do so whilst enjoying the protection of that flag. *Jam. satis.*

The *Toronto Globe* publishes the following from the Rev. Mr. Northcote of St. Michael's Cathedral, Toronto, in reply to some remarks of the "Protestant Reform" organ upon His Lordship the Bishop of the same Diocese:—

"To the Editor of the *Globe*."

"Sir—In your issue of this morning, you state that the *Canadian Freeman* is the regularly authorized organ of the Bishop of Toronto, Dr. Lynch. His Lordship wishes it to be understood that he has no official organ. He also wishes me to state, that as far as he knows the sentiments of his Right Reverend brethren, the Catholic Bishops of Upper Canada, and of the Catholics generally, they are quite satisfied with Mr. Scott's Separate School Bill.

"Yours respectfully,
GEO. R. NORTHCOTE,
Rector of St. Michael's Cathedral.
St. Michael's Palace, Toronto,
20th March, 1863."

We see not how the above, as the *Globe* pretends, contradicts the statement of Mr. Patrick in the House—to the effect that the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church are prepared to accept Mr. Scott's Bill as a final settlement of the question. Mr. Patrick had certainly no authority to speak in the name of the Catholic Hierarchy or Clergy of Canada; neither has the *True Witness*, which is a journal conducted by laymen, who alone are morally as well as legally responsible for every word that therein appears. But, without presumption, we may assert that the Bishops and Clergy of Canada are "prepared to accept Mr. Scott's Bill as a final settlement of the question," provided only that, after a fair trial, it shall be found to secure the objects for which the School agitation was commenced. That upon trial it may work well, we hope; but not having the gift of prophecy we cannot presume to affirm that it will do so. If it does not, and if a re-agitation of the School question be the consequence, the fault will be, not with the Catholic clergy, who are prepared to accept any measure that will restore "Freedom of Education" to their people; but, with the opponents of Mr. Scott's Bill both in the Legislature, and in the press, who have curtailed its fair proportions, and impaired its efficacy for good.

The *Globe*, relying upon its readers' ignorance of history, their disregard of facts, and assured of their leniency towards all falsehood told in the interests of the Holy Protestant Faith, goes on to say:—

"The Romish Church has been always, and is now the enemy of free, untrammelled education."—*Globe*.

Coming from the foremost champion of the degrading system of State-Schoolism, which modern Liberalism has succeeded in imposing upon society, the above *morceau* is rich, beyond the richness of a pork-pie. Were the editor of the *Globe* one addicted to argument, one who could condescend to definitions, and entertained a respect for facts—we should presume to call upon him for proof of his thesis, for a clear exhaustive definition of the term "free, untrammelled education," and for a statement of facts which show the hostility of the Romish Church thereunto.—But our contemporary is of course above such considerations as these; and definitions are in abhorrence amongst all Liberals, whose congenial atmosphere, that in which they live and move and have their being, is one of vague generalities, and unmeaning platitudes. To suit their purposes they have perverted language, and corrupted the very meaning of words. Good they call evil—and evil good. The most oppressive despotism ever exercised towards a subject race, they call freedom, provided only it be exercised by and under the name of a brute majority; and, as in their corrupt and debased vocabulary, the formula "a free Church in a free State" implies the subjection of the Church to "Jack-in-Office" so when they prate about "free and untrammelled education," we know well that they simply mean State-Schoolism.

We will however give the *Globe* a definition of "free and untrammelled education," and we defy him to furnish a better. Freedom of Education consists essentially, in its entire immunity from all State control, or interference of any kind, direct or indirect. Education is there "free and untrammelled," and there only, where "Government Jack" cannot upon any pretence meddle therewith; and where the will of the individual parent as to the education of his children in all its branches, is as against the State, or civil magistrate, absolute, supreme and unquestioned.

The School is "free" upon the same conditions only, as those upon which the Church is "free." Education is "free and untrammelled" then only, when to it are applied the same rules as those whose application ensures "free and untrammelled religion." That the State shall exercise no authority over the Church or over the School is the essential condition of religious and educational freedom; and the "Romish Church" has always been the foremost in contending for "free and untrammelled" freedom both of education and of religion, since she has always been foremost in resisting the impertinent aggressions of "Jack-in-Office" upon either.—True, Protestant sects have in their own interests, contended for the same principle. The Covenanters of Scotland, the Dissenters of England, and still later the Scotch "Free Kirk" men have stoutly insisted that to be free, the

Church, in her doctrines, in her discipline, and in the appointment of her Ministers, must be exempt from all State control—that in these matters the civil magistrate has no legitimate jurisdiction, and that if he attempt to interfere therein, such interference is at all hazards, and at all costs to be resisted. What is true of the Church and of religion, is equally true of the School and of education. The freedom of the latter, as of the former, consists, essentially, in its entire immunity from State control or interference of any kind. State-Churchism and State-Schoolism are both incompatible with freedom—the one with "freedom of religion," the other with "freedom of education;" and if the "Romish Church" opposes, and ever has opposed "State-Schoolism," she has thereby approved herself not the "enemy" but the consistent friend of "free and untrammelled education;" even as by opposing "State-Churchism," the Covenanters, the Puritans, and the adherents of the modern "Free Kirk of Scotland" have asserted an essential condition of "free and untrammelled religion."

Unfortunately, however, Protestants have almost always two sets of weights and measures—one wherewith they mete out to themselves, the other set wherewith they mete out to Papists. Thus whilst according to Protestant logic, the freedom of religion is secured by its independence of the civil magistrate in Protestant communities, a "Free Church in a free State" consists in the subjection of the Catholic Church to the secular powers. Thus, too, the same men who most loudly applaud the action of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour towards the Catholic Church in Italy, are also the loudest in condemning the assumption of authority over the Protestant Church of Scotland, by Charles II and Lauderdale; and thus again the noisiest fanatical brawlers against State-Churchism, are also the foremost champions of State-Schoolism.

THE "EDINBURGH REVIEW"—January, 1863.

B. Dawson & Son, Montreal.

The contents of the present number are—1. *Index under Lord Dalhousie*. 2. *Principles of Frederic von Gentz*. 3. *Gold fields and Gold miners*. 4. *Contributions to the Life of Rubens*. 5. *The Campaign of 1815*. 6. *Modern Judism*. 7. *Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables"*. 8. *Convict System in England and Ireland*. 9. *Public Affairs*. Of the above articles the best is that on Victor Hugo's last medley of false philosophy, and mawkish sentimentality. The *Reviewer* pronounces a severe, but well merited censure upon this work, whose popularity indicates the low taste, and still more debased morality of the French reading public.

THE "NORTH BRITISH REVIEW"—February, 1863. B. Dawson & Sons, Montreal.

This is the organ of the "low" or evangelical section of the British Protestant world. It is very orthodox, according to the orthodoxy of the conventicle, but somewhat dull in comparison with the *Westminster Review*, the organ of the opposite section of the Protestant community.—This, and the other American reprints of the leading British Quarterlies are always on hand at the Messrs. Dawsons, Great St. James-street.

"HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY"—April, 1863.—Harper Brothers, New York.

This contains a vast amount of light reading matter, which would be agreeable to the Catholic palate—were it not so often, and so highly seasoned with No-Popery condiments.

We have much pleasure in complying with the request preferred to us by the Secretary of the St. Patrick's Society of Kingston, as may be seen by turning to our second page.

(Communicated.)

The summer of 1854 was a sad epoch in the annals of Canada, for the most fatal of maladies, the cholera, again visited its shores. This plague, carried hither by the numerous emigrants from foreign lands, made sad havoc on board of the different vessels bound for the New World, and many who had left home, in the hope of a happy future, greeted America's shore, but to find a grave. Such was the fate of a poor Bohemian and his wife, who a prey to the fell disease, left their two orphan boys strangers in a strange land. A Jesuit Father, who tended to the wants of foreigners, incapable of speaking the French or English language, found the orphans, and brought them to the St. Patrick's Asylum. Many means were there tried to soften the grief of the lone little ones, but several days passed before they could be tempted to share their comrades' pastimes. Their sorrow gradually wore off, and after some weeks the little fellows amused all by their pleasant attempts in speaking the language of their new home. Weeks grew into months, and months into years, making many boys of the stranger orphans, yet the Asylum still claimed them as her children. The day came at last, when according to the rules of the Institution, the elder boys must bid farewell to its sheltering roof and begin a new career. Francis (Francis) turned came, and he was confided to the care of a respectable family. The good conduct which characterized him in his boyhood's home bore him nobly on through the world's trials, and after the lapse of a few years, during which time he frequently visited his former home, his savings amounted to some \$240. No sooner had he drawn them from the hands of his master, than he presented a donation of \$10 for the benefit of his old home; in order, as he said, to fulfil an intention formed while yet a boy. He

has identified himself with the home of his youth, and become so thoroughly a child of St. Patrick, that he claims Ireland as his fatherland, and is as proud of the Shamrock as any native of Erin's soil.

Gratitude has effected a strange metamorphosis. It has transformed the Bohemian boy into an Irishman heart and soul.

Mr. James Feeny has kindly consented to act as Agent for the *True Witness* in Brantford and vicinity.

CELEBRATION OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY IN KINGSTON.

To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

Kingston, March 22, 1863.

SIR—There was the usual turn out of the St. Patrick's Society of Kingston on Tuesday, the 17th March, the Anniversary of the Patron Saint of Ireland. The number of celebrants were fully as large, if not larger, than on the previous Anniversary. Everything went off as merry as a marriage-bell. The day was unusually fine; the Society's banners, so frequently described in your columns were displayed to great advantage, and looked superb. There is no place in Upper Canada where Irishmen turn-out in greater numbers, or make a more imposing display than they do in Kingston. This is no doubt, owing to the enthusiasm and unity which pervade all who breathe the healthy atmosphere of "the good old Town." Union among any class of persons who have a common object to attain is necessary to secure success; with the Irish in Canada it is of the most vital importance that union should exist, for without it they are powerless; and their role is, first, to secure unity of action, and then by the wise and judicious exercise of that power which it is certain to achieve, to show those who have been taught to dislike and look with suspicion upon their efforts, that the Irish colonists possess all the essentials necessary to enrich a State, and guard with fidelity its institutions, its government and laws, from the encroachments of those who might attempt to destroy the one, or infringe upon the free and equitable administration of the other. The legacy left to Irishmen at "home" is to protect and guard the Faith once delivered to the Saints; and in this country they have a double mission, not only as champions of the faith of their fathers, but also to be faithful guardians of that civil liberty, that practicable freedom, to secure which Irishmen have made so many sacrifices, both at home and abroad. It is pleasant to think, and to know, that in the struggle to obtain constitutional liberty in Canada, Catholic Irishmen have always been amongst the foremost in the battle, and adhered with unflinching fidelity to the champion of Canadian independence—the lamented Robert Baldwin—to the last moment of that patriot's existence. Their fidelity to constitutional principles ought not to be forgotten.

It was my intention to give you a full description of all our proceedings on St. Patrick's Day—of the Grand Pontifical High Mass celebrated in the Cathedral by His Lordship the Bishop of Kingston, assisted by the Vicars-General Macdonell and Dollard, and the resident Clergy—of the sermon of the Director of Regiopolis College, the eloquent and gifted Father O'Brien—and of the capital speeches in the Cry Hall, delivered by the President of the Society and other gentlemen connected with it. But alas! I cannot. The news from Peterborough fills us all with grief and indignation. The outrage perpetrated on unarmed men by the Orange desperadoes from Emily and Cavan, and from Smithtown and Manvers, has so excited the people of Kingston that they neither think nor speak of anything else. It is a startling fact, that in this free country, where law is supposed to be supreme, and its strong arm sufficient to protect its inhabitants from the violence of mobs, it should be impotent; such, however, is the case.

On Tuesday last, the quiet town of Peterborough was invaded by a band of men to the number of five hundred, armed to the teeth, accompanied by loaded cannon, and inspired with the determination of murdering their fellow-subjects, if they persisted in marching to church with the National banners and music, on the Anniversary of the great Apostles of Ireland! Let the Peterborough *Review*, the leading Protestant paper of the town, tell you of the atrocious deed:—

"More disgraceful conduct than that which large bodies of men, styling themselves Orangemen, pursued in this town on St. Patrick's Day, was scarcely ever before witnessed. Humiliating to the Order, which inculcates charity to all men, and boasts of being a bulwark of civil and religious liberty, every enlightened member of the Orange Institution, must blush for the conduct of his weak, and, in this matter, assuredly erring brethren. It can never be the purpose of a society to which such a man as the Honorable John Billyard Cameron belongs, which boasts of having within its pale, some of the most learned and pious of the clergy of the Church of England, and ministers, indeed, of every Protestant denomination, to set law and order at defiance, and to crush out that very liberty of speech, thought and action, which Protestants desire and everywhere insist upon for themselves. Yet that was done in Peterborough, in enlightened Protestant Upper Canada, on Tuesday last. Persons said to be members of that Society to the numbers of between 400 and 500 assembled here on the occasion of an intended celebration of the birth-day of Ireland's patron saint, a thing every where tolerated in Canada, and to which Mr. Ogle R. Gowan, and a Mayor Bowes, of Toronto, lend their countenance, to prevent the Roman Catholics of this town from proceeding in an orderly manner to church with banners flying and music, with marshals on horseback, and with the vicars." They flocked in from Emily and Cavan, Smithtown and Manvers; men, in defiance of all law, aimed to the teeth with fowling pieces, pistols and bludgeons, the five arms being loaded, had come late to the town. Nay, this was not all; the men who poured into Peterborough, and took possession of it to spite of the authorities, brought cannon with them to intimidate and subdue unarmed men. And for what reason was this interruption of an intended peaceable procession, this wonderfully frightful demonstration made? A fool, or bigot, it may be both, had given out that it was a Ribbon Society, which was to publicly exhibit itself in Peterborough. Is Protestantism so powerless for good and to prevent by moral means the extension of Romanism, that it must resort to armed violence, wherever it happens to be physically in the neighborhood? We should think not. On the occasion, however, of the meeting of the St. Patrick's Society in George Street, on Tuesday last, it was to be manifest that some held another doctrine. There the Orangemen drew up across Water Street, and when the Society was forming on the Market