

THE TRUE WITNESS

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, BY J. COLLINS,
FOR GEORGE E. COLLINS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
At the Office, No. 4 Place d'Armes.

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
paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

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

Single copies, three pence; can be had at Messrs.
Sudlers Book Store, Notre Dame Street—Flynn's,
McGill Street.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor
of the TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post
paid.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 1, 1858.

We beg to direct the particular attention of our readers in and about Montreal to the notice of the St. Patrick's Orphans' Bazaar, announced to open on Monday next, and to be continued during the week. However hard the times, we feel a real pleasure to see our admirable Ladies enter on their annual campaign of charity, animated with a zeal and devotedness peculiarly their own, and which never fail to secure for them a brilliant victory. We need say but little to recommend the Orphans' Bazaar to public favor. It is well known that this annual Bazaar has hitherto been the chief support of the St. Patrick's Asylum—an institution which yearly renders immense services to the whole community. Indeed, the call of the helpless orphan goes straight to every feeling heart—religion, charity, humanity itself, forbid us to turn a deaf ear to suffering innocence. We are informed that there are in the St. Patrick's Asylum, at present, more than 200 of these poor little ones, being a considerable increase over former years. In contributing to the funds of the Bazaar, we secure for those children of misfortune a happy home, where they feel not the loss of an industrious father, nor of a loving mother; and where, ignorant of vice, their young hearts are taught to love and serve their Creator. The Ladies, we understand, are well provided with an assortment of elegant and valuable articles to stimulate the charity of their patrons. We heartily wish them a degree of success worthy of their amiable zeal, and of the holy cause in which they labor.

A silly or rather mischievous suggestion that appeared a few days ago in the *Montreal Pilot*, for a centenary celebration on the 13th of September of next year, of the battle on the heights of Abraham which wrested Canada from the French, has very naturally aroused the national susceptibilities of our French Canadian fellow-citizens. Such a celebration would be to them a cowardly insult, in which no honest man would willingly take part; and we trust that the suggestion of the *Pilot* will be scouted with the contempt it deserves.

But if our French Canadian friends feel so acutely the indecency of the *Pilot's* proposition—if by them the celebration of the defeat of their gallant forefathers by a vastly superior force would be felt as an unmanly outrage upon their nationality—how is it we ask, that they do not sympathise a little more keenly with their Irish Catholic fellow-citizens; who, not once in a century, but annually, on every returning 12th of July are insulted and outraged by public demonstrations in commemoration of the defeat of Ireland's brave but unfortunate patriots, fighting for their native land and the faith of their ancestors? Would the French Canadian behold unmoved such a celebration as that proposed by the *Pilot*? and if he would not, if he would, and very properly, resent the unmanly insult, why should the Irish Catholic be blamed for his opposition to Orange Processions on the 12th of July; or reproached for the manifestations of anger which those celebrations naturally provoke?

We honor our French Canadian fellow-citizens for their sensitiveness upon all that touches their national honor; we should despise them for their apathy, we should look upon them as bastards, as unworthy to bear the name of the chivalric race from which they sprung, were they to put up patiently with such an insult as that which the *Pilot* recommends should be offered to them next September; and we would heart and soul join with them in frowning down the first attempt that might be made, no matter by whom or under what pretence, to celebrate the defeat of the noble Montcalm and his brave though unfortunate brothers in arms, by the fellow-countrymen and descendants of the victors. We can fully sympathise with the *Journal de Quebec* in its indignation against the proposers of such an unseemly display, and can well appreciate the honorable motives by which he is actuated; but, we confess, we cannot understand the apathy of French Canadians towards Orange demonstrations and Twelfth of July celebrations; we cannot understand how French Canadians—whose ancestors have endured, though in a far slighter degree, what Anglo-Saxons have inflicted upon

Ireland—could have been found base enough to vote for giving legal encouragement to a society expressly organised to celebrate the defeat of Irishmen, and the triumph of Protestantism over Catholicity!

And it is urged as a reproach against us, that the man who in his capacity of Governor—as the Representative of Majesty—has given official recognition to Orangism; who has taken a prominent part in the annual celebration of Ireland's misfortunes, and the long years of persecution which those misfortunes entailed upon the Catholic Church in Ireland—is looked upon by us with feelings of strong aversion! Our strongly expressed disapproval of the political and responsible advisers who sanctioned this gross outrage by Sir Edmund Head, upon our national and religious feelings, is attributed to mean and unworthy motives by those who, if a similar insult had been offered to them, would we are sure have risen up as one man to resent it! Why is this? How is it that French Canadians who are so sensitive to all that concerns themselves, are so indifferent to the insults daily heaped upon their Irish Catholic fellow-citizens? Suppose for instance that the suggestions of the *Pilot* were to be carried into effect—that a celebration in honor of the defeat of the French and the conquest of Canada were to be held—that the Governor-General should himself take a prominent part in this celebration; and that acting under the advice of his constitutional and responsible ministers, he should receive at his official residence, and graciously reply to a deputation from the chief actors therein—what would be the language of the French Canadian press towards the Governor? what the action of the French Canadians towards the members of the Ministry? We need scarce ask such a question; we know how they would feel, speak and act, for we have before our eyes the indignant remonstrances of the French Canadian press against the mere suggestion of such an outrage upon the faith and nationality of Lower Canada. The simple proposition of a celebration perfectly analogous to that in which the *Dear Brothers* of the Attorney-General for Canada West annually indulge, is treated as an "injure" by the *Journal de Quebec* of the 25th inst; and if persevered in, will we hope provoke a general outburst of indignation from the entire people of the Lower Province.

We are glad to see that the Irish press in this section of the Province are likewise beginning to speak out plainly upon the impertinent suggestion of the *Pilot*; and it is with much pleasure that we transfer to our columns the following very sensible remarks upon this subject, from the *Quebec Vindicator*:

We have people in Canada who lacking more useful and profitable employment, hesitate not to propose a celebration of the defeat of Montcalm and the French arms on the 13th September, 1759. It is coolly proposed by the *Montreal Pilot* to hold a centenary festival in commemoration of this national humiliation on the 13th September, 1859: to glorify in the defeat of one of the most gallant nations in Christendom; and that in the immediate presence of 800,000 of the descendants of those who fought under Montcalm. We wonder if this desire to establish another "Battle of the Boyne" anniversary is a result of the *Pilot's* spiritual manifestations during the recent religious revival; or if it is merely the ordinary effrontery of Anglo-Saxondom. In either case we feel confident this excitement-loving journal is counting without its host. Surely the fact of the conquest of Canada, glorious as it was to the conqueror and conquered, is no fit event for a merry-making. Surely no resident of Canada will lend himself to the scheme of disinterring from the tomb of history its dead bitternesses. If such is the case; if Canada is to become the new field of arrogance and domineering insult that once Ireland's past prosperity to death, we trust that the fight between the insulters and the insulted will be as short and sharp as it deserves to be. This must be no land for annual pledges to each other's damnation. Here we want no banquets flowing with the blood of the murdered, and lighted by the glare of the burning roof tree. Let Anglo-Saxonism be satisfied with the havoc and ruin it has made of Ireland. It has gorged its lust of blood with one victim, and is in no condition to trample upon another. It violated the treaty of Limerick, but it must respect the Capitulation of Quebec.

Why celebrate the 13th of September 1759, more than any other day in Canadian history? If Anglo-Saxonism on both sides of the line 45 must have a feast, even though a Banquet should attend unbidden, let us recommend to its notice the 28th April, 1760. Why not select that day for the meeting of our Sovereign Lady the Queen and Napoleon the Third, on the historic heights of Abraham? Surely if Anglo-Saxonism only seeks occasion to exercise its amiability, what better day for its purpose than that which witnessed General Murray fleeing before the wrathful legions of De Levi, and proving to the satisfaction of all posterity that "discretion is the better part of valour." We commend the 28th April, 1760, to the favourable notice of the *Montreal Pilot*.

The *Montreal Witness* is much exercised in spirit; his visage is more lank and cadaverous than ever, and daily his voice acquiring a deeper and more gloomy nasal tone. The poor man cannot contain himself for very trouble, and his bowels are disquieted within him. "Alas!" he cries forth in the anguish of his spirit—"the fine gold has indeed become dim, and the political Samson heretofore strong in truth and right is shorn of his locks!" Evidently the good man is in a very desperate condition.

And why is this?—what gold is it that has lost its lustre?—who is the Samson whose strength has departed from him? Alas! that we should have to chronicle such defections from the paths of Godliness. It is the *Globe* that is the gold that has become dim; and George Brown, the mighty one of Toronto, the indomitable champion of the Holy Protestant Faith, is the political Samson whose locks have been ruthlessly crop-

ped off by the fair hands of some profane and

Papistical Delilah!

"Certainly there has, for some months past," groans the poor *Witness* in confirmation of his worst suspicions against the *Globe* and its editor—"certainly there has, for some months past been a strange absence of all that class of articles respecting popery and its doings which heretofore constituted the chief characteristic, and chief attraction of the *Globe*." In other words, that journal has of late, under the necessity of conciliating the Papists of Lower Canada, become less abusive, less mendacious, and a good less obscene. In vain does the holy man of the *Witness* look now for those choice anecdotes anent monkeries and nunneries which in better and happier days formed the 'chief attraction' to the salacious damsels of "Our Zion;" and over which the elders of the conventicle were wont to hang enraptured, feasting their prurient imaginations upon the beastly details. The *Globe* has ceased to manufacture, or retail lies; it has become almost decent in its tone, and fitted for the perusal of gentlemen and Christians; therefore do the fair maidens mourn over the gold that has become dim, and therefore doth the *Witness* refuse to be comforted.

For the satisfaction of our cotemporary, we would also inform him that the Irish Catholics who voted for M. Dorion, have not "come to see that the principles maintained by Mr. Brown—namely, of opposition to ecclesiastical corporations, sectarian grants, and separate schools are correct in themselves, and beneficial to the whole community." Without going into the question of the merits of the Voluntary principle as applied to Education and Religion, to Church and School, this we can say, that the system advocated hitherto by Mr. Brown seems to us false in principle, and most unjust in practice. We can understand Voluntaryism; and without advocating it as the best system conceivable, we are certain that the Catholic Church would thrive well under it, provided only it were fully and fairly carried out. But it is because the Voluntary principle as expounded and advocated by Mr. Brown is one sided, and is not fully and logically carried out, that we oppose it—not because it is the Voluntary principle.

For Voluntaryism implies two essential conditions; one of which failing, or infringed upon by the State, the system itself can no longer be said to exist. Of these essential conditions, one is that no one be compelled to pay for the support of School or Church to which he is conscientiously opposed. The other, and equally essential condition of perfect Voluntaryism is, that no restrictions be placed by the State upon the natural right of the individual to do what he will with his own; whether by act of sale, of gift, or by bequest, provided only that in so doing he infringes none of the natural laws, or laws of morality. Thus under the Voluntary system in its integrity, and such as we should have no objection to accept, we should be released, on the one hand from all taxation, direct or indirect, for the support of Non-Catholic schools or churches;—and on the other, we should be delivered from all those absurd and iniquitous restrictions which the State imposes upon the individual with respect to the disposition of his private property. If our schools, colleges, hospitals, and religious institutions received nothing from the State, they would at least be left free to acquire by all legitimate means, and to hold to any amount, the gifts and bequests of the faithful. Abolish all laws, we say to the *Witness*, restricting the right of the individual to give, and of our institutions to receive; and we will willingly dispense with all State grants, and State assistance in any form whatsoever, either to Church or School.

But Mr. Brown and his friends with the inconsistency, or rather dishonesty, which is the almost invariable characteristic of the Protestant legislator, refuse us the Voluntary system in this form, and in its integrity. They would withhold all State aid; but they would still retain those shackles and restrictions which have hitherto accompanied and been made the condition of, State assistance. It is to this one-sided application of the Voluntary principle that we object; though as we have said before, to Voluntaryism in its integrity—we should have no manner of objection whatsoever. We do not advocate it; we do not urge its adoption, because we are not of those who hold that it is desirable to abolish all semblance even of connection betwixt Church and State; but we are certain that under its operation the Catholic Church and the Catholic School would both thrive; and we feel convinced that only by its adoption can the long vexed School Question in Upper Canada be brought to a satisfactory and equitable solution.

This then is our answer to the *Witness*. If Mr. Brown will propose to abolish all State grants for any religious, educational, or charitable purposes whatsoever; and if he accompany this with a proposition to leave us all at liberty—no matter to what denomination belonging—to form and endow to any extent we choose, such religious, educational, and charitable institutions as we approve of, without let, hindrance, or interference of any kind from the State—then, but not before, shall we be prepared to take his proposition into consideration.

The School Question seems to be attracting a good deal of attention amongst our Anglican friends. Of this we gave an instance last week, in the proceedings of the Anglican Synod at Kingston; and we see that the question was again made the subject of a lively discussion at a Synod of the same denomination, held in London. We find the following notice of the latter in the *Hamilton Spectator*:

Just before the conclusion of the sederunt, the Rev. Mr. Dewar, gave notice of a motion of an important character. He said it was his object to induce the Synod to forward a petition to the Legislature, for the embodiment in the School Act of a clause enabling every clergyman to demand admission into the Common Schools. He had not brought with him the precise words of the motion, but he wished them to be exactly those used by Mr. Cameron at the meeting of the Synod at Kingston, when moving an amendment to the motion recommending the establishment of Separate Schools.

The Synod then adjourned. It would have been far better, more logical, and more consistent with those Christian principles which, in spite of their separation from the Catholic Church, the members of the Anglican sect still retains, or profess to retain, to have moved at once a Resolution in behalf of separate schools in favor of all denominations whose members object to a "common" or "mixed" system. To retain however the latter, but to give license to all clergymen to demand admission to the "common" schools, and of course to give vent to their peculiar doxies therein, would be a source of endless confusion and dissatisfaction. No one would be content with such an addition to the secular element; and it would be impossible to decide who was, and who was not, entitled to admission as a clergyman.

For the term clergyman as used amongst Protestants is a vague term; one to which it would be impossible for the Legislature to attach any clear definition. For what is a clergyman in the eye of the law?—what proofs would the State require of the fact of the religious character of the applicant for admission into the "common" schools? The Catholic priest has a recognised standing; the Ministers of the Anglican, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Swedenborgian, and Unitarian denominations amongst Protestants, are known to the law as clergymen; but how, or by what sign could we detect the clergymen of other minor sects?—how decide upon their eligibility to admission to the "common" schools.—If Jones, Brown, Smith, and Robinson form themselves into a separate conventicle, and select one of their number to do their preaching and praying for them, would he thereby become a "clergyman" in the eyes of the law? Would the Mormon Elder—who is as much a Minister of the Gospel as the Archbishop of Canterbury—whose Orders are as good as those of any other Protestant Clergyman, be authorised to enter, and give religious instructions in, the "common" schools, under the operation of such a clause as that moved for at the Huron Synod? or what right would the State—betwixt which and the Church, there exists not in Canada the semblance even of any connection—have to discriminate betwixt the Ministers of one sect, and those of another? allowing these free admission to the "common" schools, and refusing all access to those "denominational" or "separate" system, and that system from which all positive Christian teaching is eliminated. As Christians, as Catholics, we reject the latter, and support the former. Were our Anglican fellow-citizens faithful to the Christian principles which they profess, they would in this instance at least make common cause with us. If they do not do so, it is because their Protestantism overrides their Christianity; because their hatred of the Pope is a passion stronger than their love of Christ.

PURITANISM AND IMPURITY.—The articles upon the drunkenness and immorality prevalent in Scotland, which appeared first in the *Scotsman* newspaper, were commented upon by the *London Times*, and of which we gave a brief analysis in our last—have provoked a reply from one who signs himself a "Scotchman," and professes to speak in the name of "The Working Classes of Scotland." The writer does not deny, nay he frankly admits, the soft impeachment to the effect that the Scotch as a people are the most intemperate of the inhabitants of the British Isles; but he asserts that the middle classes are, in this respect, at least as culpable as their poorer brethren; and that the general immorality of both rich and poor is the direct consequence of that outrageous Puritanism, which superficial observers confound with pure morality; and which especially delights to manifest itself in frowning down all innocent amusements and recreations—thus driving the sons of toil to seek relaxation from the labors of the week, in illicit and sensual enjoyments. He thus addresses the Editor of the *Times*:

Sir,—You have had a great deal told you of late about the drunken habits of us Scotchmen, your correspondents generally belonging to the upper crust of society. Perhaps in fair play you may be inclined to listen to a few words from one of the much maligned class to which I belong, and perhaps all the more so, as at the door of the working classes has been laid the chief burden of this crying sin. That the working classes of Scotland spend too much money in whiskey I admit and deplore; but that they are the chief sinners I as emphatically deny. I

charge the middle classes of Scotland with their full share of this national sin; and more than this, to the cowardice of the middle classes in allowing the clergy without remonstrances to stop every avenue to pure innocent amusement is directly to be traced much of the drunkenness prevailing at the present time. Let it be distinctly known to the people of England that all sorts of amusements are denounced from our Scottish pulpits. The theatre is called the synagogue of the devil; a trip on the rail, a ride to—when the poor dried and smoked denizens of Glasgow, escaping from their densely crowded close and dingy courts, redolent of everything abominable and filthy, embarked on board of one of the steamers at the Bromielaw on Sunday, a ruffianly mob, bounded on by the Glasgow clergy, assailed them on their return, hooting, hissing—in fact every insult short of personal violence was heaped upon them—and for what? simply because, in the exercise of that liberty to which, as British subjects, they were entitled, they had dared to breathe the fresh air of heaven, in opposition to the sweet voices of the Glasgow saints. Well, then, the Forbes Mackenzie Act is triumphant throughout the land; all public houses, &c., are shut from 11 o'clock on Saturday night till Monday morning at 8 o'clock. One would think the "unco guid" would rest satisfied now. No such thing. A crusade has begun against lemonade, soda-water, ginger-beer, cookies, bakers, snaps, sugar-boobs, baps, scones, penny pies, cowheel, pickled mussels, and rusted herrings. Any one daring to sell or eat such things on Sundays is to be summarily dealt with; and we citizens of Edinburgh are forthwith to be prevented sinning our souls by walking out to Duddington or round the Queen's Drive; and was to be that man who shall dare to treat the bairns to a blow out of strawberries or gooseberries. Dr. McFarlane, the parish minister of Duddington, brought this subject before the Established Presbytery of Edinburgh only a few days ago; and it was seriously proposed by some of the members to call on the civil magistrate to put down the sinful practice of the working classes walking on the Sabbath evening. Such is an imperfect picture of the painful state of hypocrisy, cant, and vile phariseism to which we are reduced. This gives rise to some serious reflection; in fact, is the main reason for the present writing. It has stirred the minds of thinking men here, and we are anxiously asking one another, how does it happen that we, renowned for our religious and church-going habits, turn out to be the most drunken and immoral people of the three kingdoms? Does the cause lie in our Calvinistic doctrines? Is it true that our clergy divorce faith and works, almost ignoring the latter?—that a clergyman who preaches prominently truth, honesty, chastity, brotherly love, charity, is pronounced by the loud professors among us to be a Caudine preacher, &c. &c. If the broaching of this question should provoke a discussion on this subject by able heads the writer of this will be truly glad.—I am, &c., A SCOTCHMAN.

Edinburgh, Sept. 8.

We doubt not that the writer of the above has truly indicated one of the chief causes of that drunkenness and immorality for which Scotland is at the present day so unhappily notorious. It is in the "Calvinistic doctrines," and the logical application of those doctrines, that that chief cause is to be found. It is because, in strict accordance with those doctrines, faith and works are divorced by a Calvinistic clergy, and the latter almost ignored, that "truth, honesty, chastity, brotherly love, charity," are so little esteemed by a Calvinistic people; it is because the same Clergy have done their best to make, and have unfortunately but too well succeeded in making Sunday a day of gloom, and wrath, a veritable devil's festival, that the country, where of all others Sabbatarian observances do most abound, does on each returning Lord's Day, most closely resemble a hell upon earth. Can we wonder that there, where for the hard worked artisan to take a stroll on a Sunday evening with his wife and children is denounced from the pulpit as a sin of so heinous a complexion as to call for the interference of the civil magistrate, the moral sense of the people is blunted; or that in revolting against the infernal despotism of a Calvinistic clergy, the victims of that grinding tyranny should too often throw off, together with the heavy burdens which their puritanical taskmasters have imposed, that gentle yoke which Our Lord Himself bade His disciples take upon them, as light and easy to bear!

It is difficult for any one personally a stranger to the exactions of Scotch Puritanism to form an adequate idea of the horrors of a Scotch Sabbath; they however will fully admit the truth of the "Scotchman's" complaint to the editor of the *Times*, who have themselves groaned under the cruel infliction. Many a noble spirit has been thereby crushed, many a well-disposed youngster has been driven into a career of irreclaimable vice; and he who in Canada, where as yet, thank God, we are free from the curse, undertakes to oppose its introduction in the shape of "Acts of Parliament for Promoting Sabbatarian Observances," deserves well of his country, as the friend of religion and morality. A Scotch Sabbath makes men drunkards; forces them into habits of debauch; compels them to become hypocrites; and too often ends by inspiring them with a lively hatred of Christianity itself. How indeed can it well be otherwise! or how can we wonder that the lad, who has been from his youth upwards taught to look upon heaven as a perpetual Sabbath—and who forms his notions of the Sabbath from what he has himself seen, heard and suffered in Scotland—should, in very dread of such a heaven as that of which a Scotch Sabbath is the type, boldly determine to take his chance of happiness in "t'other place!" All this may appear to our friend of the *Witness* very profane; but they who have heard, as we have oft times heard, the heart-felt gratitude with which a poor wretch groaning in spirit under the bitter, long-protracted agony of a Scotch Sabbath—"thanks God that it comes only once a week!"—will acknowledge the justice, and indeed the moderation of our remarks.—More especially will this be the case with those who have escaped out of the dreary bondage of Calvinism, into the fair regions of Catholic truth, and who therefore know how to appreciate the blessings of