

The True Witness.

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. OLIER, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.
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 prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 11.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

NOVEMBER—1864.

Friday, 11—St. Martin B. C.
Saturday, 12—St. Martin, P. M.
Sunday, 13—Twenty-Sixth after Pentecost. St. Stanislaus.

Monday, 14—St. Didacus, Cony.

Tuesday, 15—St. Gertrude, V.

Wednesday, 16—Of the Feria.

Thursday, 17—St. Gregory, Th. B. L.

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

Friday, 11—St. Martin.

Sunday, 13—The Epiphany.

Tuesday, 15—St. Liguori.

Thursday, 17—St. Joachim, Chateauguay.

NOTICE.

We request all our subscribers in Quebec and vicinity, who are in arrears, to hand in the amounts due to our agent, MR. JEREMIAH O'BRIEN, 18 BUADE STREET, Quebec.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

The latest mails have not brought any very interesting news from Europe. From France the news is altogether unimportant. The Emperor had left Paris to visit the Czar at Nice. The latest advices inform us, however, that in Italy the proposition of the Convention will be carried out by a large majority. The position of Victor Emmanuel is not very enviable at this moment. The Turin correspondent of the London Times gives a very gloomy picture of the situation at present. He states that, owing to the unpopularity of the King, he cannot go into the city without a strong body guard of armed men; in our opinion Victor Emmanuel is only about to commence his troubles. The number of persons killed at the late riots in Turin is about 180. It appears to be definitely arranged that Parliament will be transferred to Florence. Our neighbors on the other side of the Lines do not appear to be making great progress towards a solution of their difficulties; in fact the state of the money market would indicate that the North has been losing ground for some time past. On Tuesday the election for the Presidency took place between Lincoln and McClellan; it is generally believed, although the final result is not yet known, that Lincoln has been elected by a heavy majority.

In our own Province, the Delegates from the Lower Provinces, have returned home; the only excitement now going on, is that in connection with the investigation of the officers of the raiders on St. Albans. This affair is moving on slowly, and evidently will not be completed for a very great length of time.

SECTIONAL DELICACY, AND SECTIONAL MORALITY.—Much disappointment was felt and expressed in Lower Canada and by the Lower Canadian press, in that at the Montreal Banquet no declaration was made as to the results arrived at by the Conference lately held at Quebec to determine the conditions of a Union of the British North American Provinces. This declaration we were assured by the Lower Canadian Ministry and their friends could not be made, because delicacy required, that the proceedings of the delegates should be laid before the Imperial Government, before they were given to the Canadian public; and because every member was in honor bound not to divulge what had taken place in the secret sittings of the Conference, and of which secrets he had cognizance only through his official position. This explanation of the reticence of the French Canadian Ministers present at the Montreal Banquet, was accepted; their decision to keep the results of their deliberations secret was acquiesced in; and their motives were no doubt duly appreciated.

Other laws of delicacy, quite another code of morality, however obtain as we go West; and the reasons assigned above for keeping the decisions of the Conference a secret at Montreal, and from the people of Lower Canada, are without weight in Toronto and in the case of Upper Canadians. No feelings of delicacy, or sentiment of honor such as closed the lips of M. Cartier in Montreal, deterred the President of the Council from speaking out in the capital of the West, and from divulging all the secrets of the Council chamber of the Quebec Conference to

the expectant ears of an Upper Canadian audience. The depths of this mystery the *Minerve* of Saturday last vainly attempts to fathom. If—thus does the *Minerve* state the case—if M. Cartier was bound in duty and in honor not to divulge the secrets of the Conference to a Montreal audience on the 29th of October, how is it that neither duty nor honor operated to prevent Mr. George Brown from divulging the same secrets to a Toronto audience, on the 3rd of November?

The explanation of the mystery is we think to be found in the fact that the divulging of the secret in Montreal implied the confession of a humiliating and crushing defeat to Lower Canada: whilst its divulgence in Toronto implied the proclamation of a full and glorious triumph to Upper Canada. Now no man likes to be the herald of his own discomfiture, and every soldier is well pleased to be the bearer of dispatches announcing a splendid victory. The results of the Conference are no doubt humiliating, most disastrous to Lower Canada; but for the same reason most satisfactory to the other section of the Province, whose political ascendancy over her hated Romish rival thereby seems to be effectually secured. We can therefore easily understand why M. Cartier, himself a French Canadian, and a leader amongst French Canadians, should have shrunk from declaring the results arrived at by the Quebec Conference to a Lower Canadian assemblage; and we find it equally easy to understand why Mr. George Brown, an Upper Canadian, and the chief of the Clear Grits should gladly avail himself of the first opportunity that presented itself for proclaiming the triumph of Clear-Grit principles, and the defeat of Conservatism to an Upper Canadian audience. As Samuel Weller would say "it is human nature."

The *Minerve* may deal with our explanation of the mystery as it pleases, but we think that it will be unable to suggest one more plausible, or which more naturally suggests itself to the looker on at the great game of politics now playing. There is also another little suggestion that we would take the liberty of offering to our contemporary. The *Minerve*, referring to the Toronto Banquet, and Mr. George Brown's discourse, naively asks:—

"If Mr. Brown has taken it upon him to divulge the secrets of the Conference, whilst M. Cartier deemed it his duty to abstain from so doing in Montreal, it must be admitted that Mr. Brown is a terrible man, and that he was quite capable of violating the discretion solemnly promised by the members of the Conference at the beginning of their labors."

"But if Mr. Brown was authorized to act as he has done, we should like to know why the tongue of M. Cartier was not in like manner untied at Montreal."

Minerve, Saturday, 5th inst.

A very pretty dilemma indeed: or it might be thus stated:—

If the reasons assigned by M. Cartier for not divulging the plan of Union agreed to by the Conference at the Montreal Banquet on Saturday the 29th ult., were valid, then Mr. George Brown has been guilty of conduct unbecoming a statesman and a gentleman in that he divulged that same plan in Toronto on the 3rd of November; and he is therefore one whom no true statesman or gentleman would associate with, or accept as his colleague in office.

But:—

If Mr. Brown was justified in divulging the plans of the Conference to a Toronto audience on the 3rd instant—then the reasons assigned by M. Cartier for not divulging that same plan to a Montreal audience on the 29th ult. were not valid; then M. Cartier was humbugging—to use a cant phrase—the people of Lower Canada, concealing from them a matter in which they were deeply interested, and on which they had the right to demand full information; and therefore M. Cartier who without valid reason kept that information from them, and assigned false reasons for his silence is not

We leave the *Minerve* to fill up the hiatus as the wisdom and long experience of our contemporary shall dictate.

The *Montreal Herald* having been for many years a zealous champion of Upper Canada, and an advocate of its claims for representation by population, is well entitled to a hearing from Lower Canadians, upon the merits of the proposed "constitutional changes" as revealed to us through the columns of the *Toronto Globe*, the *Montreal Gazette*, and by the President of the Council himself at the banquet given to the delegates in Toronto on Thursday the 3rd inst. The *Herald* then accepts these changes as a payment in full of all Upper Canada's demands, and even as something more—as concessions so liberal as to leave nothing more for Upper Canada to claim, or for Lower Canada to give up. Here is what the *Herald*, in this case a competent because impartial judge, says upon the matter:—

"Taking this constitution in reference to past controversies, it manifestly involves very liberal concessions by those who have hitherto refused to admit a readjustment of the representation in the sense now adopted. Hitherto from a fear which we have thought exaggerated, in what we may call both its branches—fear that the French element would be swamped numerically in United Canada, and fear that being so swamped it would be treated unjustly—a resolute stand has been made against every concession of increased representation to Upper Canada. In the present scheme however, instead of sixty-five

members from Lower Canada, that is, chiefly from French Canada, being confronted with eighty-two members from Upper Canada, which would have placed them in a minority of forty-one, reckoning twelve English speaking members from Lower Canada, they will now, if we still assume twelve English speaking members to be sent from Lower Canada, be in a minority of one hundred and thirty-seven; or if we consider the sixty-five Lower Canadians as all French Canadians as all French members, in a minority of one hundred and twenty-five. Taking either of these proportions it places the French element in the joint Legislature in a position of very inferior importance to that which it would have held in the Legislature of United Canada, under any equitable scheme of representation, and this fact becomes of still more importance when it is coupled with a consideration of the numbers agreed upon for the Legislative Council. Equality there would have been at any time cheerfully accepted by the Upper Canadians, and Lower Canada would then only have been tied as to numbers with Upper Canada, whereas, taking Lower Canada to represent the French element, it will now, even supposing every Lower Canadian Councillor be a French Canadian, find itself in a minority of one to two. We acknowledge very readily that this scheme of Confederation is not ours,—it is perhaps the last one we should have tried in order to get rid of existing difficulties; but it having been adopted as the remedy, we are bound to say that the necessary concessions have not been made in any niggardly spirit. If again the form adopted be not so directly a legislative union as we should have desired it to be, it cannot be doubted that the nomination of the Lieutenant Governors by the Central Government, will confer upon the latter very large powers of influencing the local legislatures—perhaps it will be found in practice, we do not say too large, for we do not think that possible—but too direct. What we mean is this—that the Lieutenant-Governors are almost certain to be political officers, and that their change with changes of Ministry, or for other purposes, may be found an inconvenient interference with legislatures, which, while acting within their own sphere, ought to be as perfectly independent of the general government as our Municipal Councils are at present.

Yes! "which ought to be as perfectly independent of the general government as our Municipal Councils are at present;" but which, as the *Montreal Herald* by implication admits, will not be so independent. This it is that in the eyes of the Clear Grits and of Mr. George Brown constitutes the chief merit of the scheme just elaborated by the delegates at Quebec; but this also, if there be aught of manhood, of intelligence, and of honesty amongst the Lower Canadians should ensure its rejection in this Province.

And that it will be so rejected we have every reason to believe, if any credit can be given to the pledges, if any reliance can be placed on the promises, of the Ministerial section of the Lower Canadian press. Over and over again these journals have assured their readers and the public of their firm resolve to oppose such a scheme of union as that upon which it now is certain that the delegates at the late Conference have agreed; a scheme which if carried out would not only give to the central government supreme authority over the local legislatures, but which would not even leave to the latter the independence actually enjoyed by our Municipal Councils. That which some few weeks ago the *Journal de Quebec*, for instance, dealt with as an hypothesis, has now become a certainty: or rather it is now certain, not only from the quasi official utterances of the *Globe* and the *Gazette*, but from the formal statements of the President of the Council himself, that the scheme actually agreed upon by the Conference contains provisions more fatal to the autonomy of Lower Canada than those which our Lower Canadian contemporary above indicated denounced in the following strain:—

"If we are to understand by the article in the *Gazette* that the central parliament will have supreme authority and that the local legislatures will be delegations from this authority—the guarantees given in local legislatures would be but idle words; and those things that the Province seek to defend would be subjected helplessly to the will of the majority."

"Were we compelled to select we would prefer a single legislature, to a central parliament and local parliaments in case the former should have sovereign control over the others; we should be spared at least the inconvenience of an expensive tyranny. It might be despotism, but at all events it would be cheap despotism, whilst the other whilst oppressing would beggar us."—*Journal de Quebec*, 6th September, 1864.

We cannot, we will not until compelled to do so by the clearest of evidence, believe that the French Canadian section of the Ministry approve of, or in any manner intend to countenance the policy now fully made known to the public by their colleague Mr. George Brown.—We have been by their organs asked to have confidence in them, in the honesty of their intentions, and in their ability and determination to protect the rights of Lower Canada committed to their care by a generous and confiding people; and we reply that that confidence we are prepared to give, but on one condition—to wit, that they now speak out and act as becomes honest men, patriotic French Canadians, and loyal Catholics, worthy of the trust that has been reposed in them. No man, however blinded by prejudices, can now fail to see that a scheme of Union which if carried out would leave the local governments more dependent upon the central or general government, than are our actual Municipal Councils, would be the ruin of State autonomy, and that to accept such a scheme would be basely to sacrifice the interests of Lower Canada in particular; that it would in the words of the *Journal de Quebec*, impose on us a tyranny which whilst oppressing, would beggar us. Assuming then the honesty and good intentions of the French Canadian section of the Ministry, and their right to demand our confidence, we must necessarily assume that they are heart and soul opposed to the scheme as divulged

by the President of the Council; that they are determined at all hazards to oppose that scheme, and thus to maintain the State rights and autonomy of Lower Canada. If our assumptions be correct then, we should waive our paltry party disputes, and rally round our Ministers to a man, and we should seek to strengthen their hands to resist our enemies and their enemies. Yes, if they would but boldly and frankly appeal to their fellow countrymen in this crisis of our fate: if they would throw themselves confidently on the people of Lower Canada for support—pleading that though fully prepared to accede to any reasonable terms for settling the long outstanding differences betwixt Upper and Lower Canada—that though ready and willing to consider the question of a league betwixt all the British North American Provinces—they were determined never—no matter what the consequences of their refusal—to accept such monstrous terms as those which Mr. George Brown tells us have been agreed upon; never to give their assent to a Union such as that of which their President of the Council in his official speech at the Toronto banquet, and through the columns of the *Globe*, has divulged the conditions—Yes, we say, if our French Canadian Ministers would but do this, they would merit and they would receive the confidence and support of their countrymen, and of all lovers of constitutional liberty throughout the Province.

But if they will not act thus: if they will not follow the path of honor and of prudence; if they will not speak out and detach themselves from Mr. George Brown and his schemes for our degradation—how, and with what show of reason can they ask us to place confidence in them? or to look upon them in a different light from that in which we look upon Mr. George Brown and the Clear Grits of Upper Canada?

New LIGHT.—We congratulate the *Montreal Witness* upon the new light that has lately dawned upon his brain. Some of the effects are very extraordinary indeed, and deserve to be recorded.

It will be remembered no doubt that, since the commencement of the war betwixt North and South, the *Witness* has always insisted that it was a war having its origin in the slave question; and for its objects, on the one hand the abolition, on the other hand the perpetuation and extension of negro slavery. The *True Witness* on the contrary has always insisted that not slavery but the question of "States Rights" was the cause of the war, and the question at issue: and that slavery though it may have precipitated the inevitable rupture betwixt the States, and the Federal government, was but an accident of the quarrel, not the great interest at stake.

This we urged to justify our sympathy for the Southerners, and as against the plea of the *Witness*—a virulent Yankee organ—to the effect that the Northerners were fighting for the freedom of the blacks. Remembering that it was by these same Northerners that the trade in human chattels has long been carried on; and that it was Yankee capital that furnished the Cuban slave market with its quota of black flesh, we could not but admire the impudence and the hypocrisy of the Abolition organs, and the stupidity of those who could accept their ardent professions of love of freedom, as the genuine article. On this point the *Witness* has however done us justice. He has come completely round to our side of the question; and aided by we know not what glimmer of celestial light, he now recognises that not to slavery but to the collision betwixt Federal pretensions and "States Rights" is to be attributed the great American war. In a late issue of our contemporary, he thus recants his errors:—

"This great question of State rights in opposition to Federal power, is the one upon which the United States have split and gone to war."—*Witness*.

Our contemporary continues:—

"We little thought then, that the very same question would soon be agitated amongst us, as a vital one to the destinies of Canada."

This shows how blind, or at all events short-sighted our contemporary must have been; for as the *True Witness* has never failed to insist, no one with any pretension to clear sightedness can have failed to notice the striking analogy betwixt the relative positions of Upper and Lower Canada, and these of the Northern and Southern States. Often have we insisted upon this perfect analogy, endeavoring to deduce thence a rule for our future guidance, and for so doing we have been taken severely to task by many of our contemporaries. The Upper Canadians are, as we have for years insisted, "our Yankees;" to us of Lower Canada they hold the same position as that which the Yankees hold as towards the Southerners: the latter are fighting the battle of State rights or of local self government: the Yankees, that of Centralisation, or of a sovereign Central government: the cause of which in the Northern States *Beast Butler* may be taken as the champion and fitting representative, is the cause of the Clear-Grits of Upper Canada, of whom Mr. George Brown is the national type and spokesman. On all these points we have long insisted as conveying a most valuable

lesson to Canadians, and Catholics; and we are well pleased to see that we have at last convinced the *Witness* of the perfect accuracy of our views on these points.

Whilst congratulating our contemporary upon his newly acquired faculty of vision upon some points, we will take the liberty of pointing out to him how very feeble are his eyes as to some other important points. The *Witness* asks—Why French Canadian Catholics should express so much fear of Anglo-Saxon and Protestant ascendancy, and at the same time expect that the British and Protestant minority of Lower Canada should not be equally afraid of French Canadian and Catholic ascendancy? The reply is very obvious. We dread the intentions of the party of whom Mr. George Brown is the chief, and at whose mercy our religious, our charitable, and educational institutions would be placed by the accomplishment of the proposed "constitutional changes," because they have constantly and openly avowed their hostile designs against these institutions: because, as a body they have never failed to applaud every act of violence, and theft perpetrated by the revolutionary governments of Italy and of South America against "nunneries" and "monasteries," because they have always approved themselves the enemies of "Freedom of Education," and the supporters of "State-Schoolism." We judge them out of their own mouths. If it be right and a good work—as they pretend—to suppress convents in Italy, and to secularise the property of the Church, it must be right and a good work to do likewise in Canada: and we cannot believe that Mr. George Brown and his friends would hesitate to employ—were it in their power so to do—the same weapons against the Church in Canada, her Clergy and her Religious Orders, as those which, with their unqualified approbation, the Liberals of Italy, of South America—and indeed of every country in the world where Liberal principles prevail—employ against the same Church, the same Religious Orders, and institutions abroad. In that the Liberals of Upper Canada approve of the policy pursued towards convents and nunneries in Italy by Victor Emmanuel, have we not the best of reasons for believing that they would, were it in their power to do so, pursue a similar policy towards our religious, charitable, and educational institutions in Canada?

We have therefore the best of reasons for dreading the ascendancy of Liberal principles; but the British Protestant population of Lower Canada have no such reasons for dreading unfair treatment from the hands of a Catholic majority—because they cannot assign a single instance in which that majority has ever yet attempted, or expressed even a wish, to deal unfairly with them. On the contrary, the Catholic majority of Lower Canada—even when a Liberal Protestant majority in Upper Canada was enforcing a tyrannical system of State-Schoolism upon the reluctant Catholic minority of that Province—recognised the right of the Protestant minority in Lower Canada to educate their children as they pleased; and if Protestants here have still ought to complain of in the matter of schools, they have but to make formal application to Parliament for redress, and we are sure that neither from the Catholic press, nor from the Catholic members of the Legislature, will they encounter any opposition. If Protestants in Upper Canada would but deal with their Catholic minority, as the Catholic majority in Lower Canada have always, and spontaneously dealt with the Protestant minority of their section; never would there have been heard a note of those "sectarian" discords which Protestant intolerance alone evoked.

This is our answer to the query of the *Montreal Witness*; and if he deem it not conclusive, we challenge him to cite one single instance, in which, by word or deed, through the press, or through the Legislature, the Catholics of Lower Canada have given their Protestant fellow-subjects reason to dread unjust treatment from a Catholic majority.

MACVOY'S HIBERNICON.—A view of Old Ireland once more.—It will be seen by an advertisement in another column that MacVoy's *Hibernicon* is being exhibited in this city. The crowded houses that witnessed this interesting panorama of Ireland on former occasions will no doubt, draw still larger ones now, as the performance offered is a good one. As it will not remain long in the city, it is to be hoped that the lovers of Irish scenery, almost unsurpassed for beauty, will not fail to go and see it.

The collections taken up on last Sunday, for the poor, in St. Patrick's, St. Ann's, and St. Bridget Churches amounted to \$300.

PROCURING A SOLDIER TO DESERT.—Richard Baker, a tavern-keeper in St. Lewis Suburbs, was to-day convicted by the Judge of the Sessions, of procuring one Hickey, a private soldier of the 25th Regiment, to desert from the service, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment, and to pay a fine of £40 sterling and costs. Baker not only got the soldier out of Quebec in disguise, but managed to take him safely across the lines, where he is now, no doubt, serving in the American army. The evidence upon which the case rested, was that of a seaman, who accompanied Baker and the soldier in the journey, and who made a full confession of the whole affair, having quarrelled with Baker on account of his leaving him to find his way back from Island Pond without money.—*Quebec Mercury*.