

## The True Witness

**CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,**  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 696, Craig Street, by  
J. GILLIES.  
E. J. CLERK, Editor.

**TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:**  
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, 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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 29.

## ECCLÉSIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH—1867.  
Friday, 29—The Five Wounds.  
Saturday, 30—Of the Feria.  
Sunday, 31—Fourth of Lent.  
APRIL—1867.  
Monday, 1—Of the Feria.  
Tuesday, 2—St. Francis de Paul, O.  
Wednesday, 3—Of the Feria.  
Thursday, 4—St. Isidore, B.D.

## APRIL DIVIDEND OF THE ROMAN LOAN.

Office of the Roman Loan, at the Banking House of Duncan, Sherman & Co., 11 Nassau street, corner of Pine, N.Y.  
March 19, 1867.  
The coupon of interest of this loan due on the 1st of April, 1867, will be paid as follows:—  
New York, at the banking house of Duncan, Sherman & Co.  
Philadelphia, at the banking house of Drexel & Co.  
Baltimore, at the banking house of L. J. Tormey & Co.  
New Orleans, at the Southern Bank.  
St. Louis, at the banking house of Tesson, Son & Co.  
Louisville, at the banking house of Tucker & Co.  
Cincinnati, at the banking house of Gilmore, Dunlap & Co. and Hermann Garaghty & Co.  
Boston, by Patrick Donahue.  
Providence, R. I., by George A. Leste, Esq.  
MONTREAL, Canada, Bank of Montreal.  
QUEBEC, Canada, Branch of the Bank of Montreal.  
Havana, Cuba, J. O. Burnham & Co.  
Lima, Peru, Alsop & Co.  
ROBERT MURPHY, Agent.  
AGENT FOR CANADA:  
ALFRED LAROCQUE, Montreal.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

There seems to have been no renewal of disturbances in Ireland. The Government continues to make arrests, and it occasionally manages to lay hold of arms, secreted by the disaffected.—The U. States journals hitherto most favorable to Fenianism admit the late rising in Ireland to have been a complete failure; and indeed the police alone, without the intervention of the regular troops, were almost sufficient to quell it. The prisoners will be tried before the ordinary civil tribunals. There is nothing of any importance to report from the Continent of Europe: great anxiety is felt, however about the Eastern Question.

The colossal power of Prussia, able now to turn against France all the forces of Germany, is creating much uneasiness amongst the subjects of Louis Napoleon, who by no means relish the idea of seeing their country reduced to a second rate Power. They see now the folly of which they were guilty in allowing Austria to be crushed by her rival: but the encouragement by them given to the cause of the Revolution in Italy, compelled them to abstain from offering any effectual resistance to the ambitious designs of the ally of Victor Emmanuel, in last year's war. This then is the first instalment of France's punishment for her Italian policy.

We hear that there are still a number of insurgents in the Galtee mountains. They are said to be destitute of arms, and food, and to be suffering greatly from exposure to the inclement weather. The trial of the Fenian prisoners will commence on the 9th of April. The Bill for the Union of B. N. America has passed its third reading in the House of Commons, and awaits only the Royal Assent to become law.

**ORDINATIONS.**—On Saturday, the 16th inst., is Lordship the Bishop of Montreal conferred the Order of Sub-Deacon on the Rev. Frere, Prosper Chaborel, of the P. O.; and of Deacon upon the Rev. MM. Paul Agnel, and Ovide Charbonnier.

His Lordship the Bishop of Kingston has been pleased to appoint the Rev. M. O'Keane pastor Port Hope in room of Rev. Father Madden who has retired on account of ill-health.

The *Courier du Canada* publishes a communication from the Rev. Mr. Cameron, Grand Vicar of the Diocese of Arichat, rebutting the allegations of its correspondent *Jean Baptiste* with respect to the unfair treatment of the French portion of the population, by the Scotch. The *Jourier*, with much good taste, and frankness, expresses its sincere regret that its correspondent should have fallen into so many, and so grievous errors, and that it should have been in any manner instrumental in propagating them.

Speaking of the clauses relative to State-Schoolism in the Union Act, the *Richmond Guardian*, Protestant, exclaims:—"These clauses point a lesson in religious toleration which Western Protestants, and some in the East too, may copy with much advantage."

**THE CONSERVATIVE CREED.**—We think that the *Montreal Herald* is a little too hasty in concluding from the fact that a British Ministry, calling itself Conservative, has, yielding to the pressure from without, consented to introduce a Bill for reforming, and extending the franchise—"that Conservatism is a false political creed, which sooner or later its own votaries must give up by piecemeal, acknowledging on every occasion of yielding that they have committed a new error, and have thus to the extent of their ability sinned against the prosperity of their country."—*Montreal Herald*, 22nd inst.

The "Conservative Creed" is, not that any particular political order that exists, or that ever did exist, is, or was, a perfect system; and as applied to England in particular, it most certainly does not impose a belief that the existing political order with respect to the election of members of Parliament is the *ne plus ultra* of human wisdom, which cannot be improved, which must not therefore be touched. If any there be who hold this Creed, they are not Tories, they are not Conservatives, but they are the political children of the Whigs of 1832, of the men who then raised the cry of "The Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill."

The Conservative Creed, as held, and acted upon by many is this:—That liberty has more to dread in this nineteenth century from the ascendancy of an unlimited, or absolute democracy, than from the resuscitation of either absolute monarchy, or of feudal aristocracy; that democracy is active and aggressive; and that therefore in the interests of menaced liberty it is well that there should be an opposition offered to its onward march, so as to postpone, if not altogether avert, the evil day. Acting upon this creed, and these principles, the Conservative concedes only to democracy when successful resistance is no longer possible, and when, if prolonged at all, it would only precipitate the catastrophe. Guns are very excellent things on board of a frigate, and so are masts; both guns and masts it is the duty of the Captain to conserve if possible; but the most rigid of Courts Martial would hold him guilty were he, on a lee-shore, or in a heavy gale with his ship on her beam ends, to throw the one overboard, or to cut away the other, in order to save the hull, and the ship's company.

Exception may be taken to the premiss that liberty is, or can be menaced, by the ascendancy of democratic principles in the political order; and to complicate the question yet more, contradictory significations may be, and actually are, given to the word "liberty." Thus, for instance, we see that by many of our contemporaries, the setting up of Martial Law in the Southern States by an absolute or uncontrolled Northern democracy, is spoken of as the establishment of liberty! so widely do men now, as in the days of the fair Girondist Made. Roland, differ as to the meaning of that much used, not to say abused word "liberty," in whose names so many hideous crimes are daily committed.

But, if we consider that even theoretically, or according to the interpretation given to the word "liberty" by the most advanced democrats, it means only the absolute, uncontrolled right of a majority to impose its will upon the minority; and that, in fact, men never have been, and most probably never will be, all of the same way of thinking upon many of the most important questions, questions in which their happiness and freedom of action in every relation of life, as citizens, as parents, and as Christians are deeply involved;—if, we say, we consider these things, we perceive that the "liberty" of one is merely what another calls "slavery." These important questions directly concerning us, and our happiness, are present with us at every moment of our existence. They lie in wait for us at the cradle, they dog our every step, meet us at every turn, and follow us to the grave. In one form or another they are ever clamoring for a solution—a solution impossible to human reason; for in their last analysis they all resolve themselves into the question of the respective rights of the State or Society, and the Individual. For instance. In Upper Canada, the Protestant Liberal party being in the majority, asserts its right to impose upon the Catholic minority, and to force them to pay for, a system of education to which the latter are conscientiously opposed.—The Catholic minority, on the other hand, contend that this is a violation of the rights or liberties of the individual parent; to whom, and not to the majority, belongs all that appertains to the feeding, the clothing, and to the education of the child. The Catholic Conservative asserts, in short, as of the essence of liberty, that the State—or, in other words, the majority—has no more right to dictate in the matter of Primers and Spelling Books, than in the matter of pap, or clouts. The democrat, on the contrary, assert the contradictory of this proposition; and thus what the latter seeks to enforce in the name of "liberty," the former in the same hallowed name indignantly strives to reject.

The Conservative, therefore, can appeal to history, to facts, in support of the truth of his premiss, that the absolute rule of a majority is slavery to the minority. Consistently with this

creed, therefore, may be oppose by every legal means at his command, the onward march of democracy, whose blasphemous battle cry, or symbol is, that the "voice of the people"—or rather of the majority of the people, for the people never have been, and never will be, unanimous—"is the voice of God," to which a blind, unquestioning submission must be yielded by all. And again: consistently both with his Conservative Creed as to the dangers of absolute democracy, and with his Conservative practice of opposition to democratic progress, can the Conservative statesman, when prolonged opposition might lead to an immediate cataclysm, cut away with his own hands some of the Conservative bulwarks, in order to save the vessel of State from instant destruction. So may he postpone, even though he may be unable to avert, the evil day, when his country shall be delivered over to democratic absolutism.

And it should also be noted that, on the question of the extension of suffrage in Great Britain, there is, betwixt the party of which Mr. D'Israeli is the acknowledged leader, and that which fights beneath the banner of Mr. Gladstone, no difference of principle whatsoever.—Both parties admit that the suffrage is not a right, but a privilege, which the State, guided by motives of expediency, confers or withholds.—This is a self evident proposition; for, if the suffrage were a right inherent in every person subject to British laws; and taxed for the support of the British Government, women as well as men would have the right to vote, and be voted for; besides, were the suffrage a personal right inherent in every citizen, the voter would have the same right to sell his vote, as he has to sell his ox, or his ass, or anything else that is his. No; both parties admit that the suffrage is not a right, but a privilege, or function, conferred by the State upon certain individuals, to the exclusion of all others, from motives of expediency, and to be exercised therefore as a public trust. Where Conservatives and Liberals differ, therefore, is on a question, not of principle, but of expediency. The question at issue betwixt them is, as to where the line—which must always be an arbitrary or a conventional line—betwixt the voter, and the non-voter, the *citoyen actif*, and the *citoyen passif*, as the French would say, shall be drawn? This is a difficult question; for if you draw such a line at all, draw it where you will, it will always admit to the suffrage some who are unworthy of its exercise, and exclude others well worthy to exercise it. Thus the issue between the two parties in the House of Commons, at present, is one only of expediency and detail. The day will come, is perhaps not far distant, when another question, a question of principle, a burning question, will come up for discussion; that question will resolve itself into this:—What right has any one man, or have any number of men—if all men are equal—to make laws for, to enforce their observance upon, or to exercise any kind of control or authority over, other men, opposed thereto? This is a question which of course can be settled, outside of the Catholic Church, only by the sword, or the holy guillotine; and the object perhaps of Conservative concessions to-day is to stave off, or postpone till to-morrow the discussion of those rather serious and irrepressible Social questions, which now in one form, now in another, are agitating the most intelligent minds in the non-Catholic world.

In the House of Commons, on the 5th instant, the Bill for the Union of the British North American Provinces being under discussion in Committee, Mr. B. Cochrane objected to the clause which assigns to the Governor General the nomination of the local Lieut. Governors.

Mr. Cardwell replied for the Ministry, and completely overruled Mr. Cochrane's objection, by showing that the appointment of the local Lieutenant Governors direct by the Crown "would be contrary to the whole scope of the measure, and the object desired by it. The Governor General," added he, "is alone to be looked to as representing the Crown, the object being to make the Provinces approach as near as possible to the character of Municipalities."

This is precisely the view that we have always taken of the measure, and which, during the last two or three years, we have repeatedly expressed.

Another most important question was raised by Mr. Hamilton, who asked how, in case of a conflict betwixt the Central and Local Governments, the dispute was to be decided? "This, of course," is by far the most important, indeed as experience will soon show, the *One* important question.

Mr. Adderley, in reply, thought that all would go smoothly so long as supreme power was vested in the Governor General.

Mr. Roebuck said that the framers of the Constitution of the United States—(that is of the old Constitution which existed before the late Revolution)—foresaw, and did their best to provide against this, the great difficulty of all Federations, by the creation of a Supreme Court whose province it was to adjudicate betwixt the Federal and the State Governments. The Bill before the House seemed however a lop-sided measure, since it contained no provision for preventing the passage of unconstitutional measures by the Central Government. In other words, the Central Parliament would be supreme.

Mr. Cardwell again replied for the Ministry. "This is one version; another represents Mr. Cardwell as merely saying that it was the object of the measure to unite into one Power all the British North American Provinces."

He admitted the defect, but feared that it was one which could not now be remedied. As at present arranged, if the Central Legislature transgressed its proper functions, the question of legality might be carried before the Privy Council. The point had been considered by the Delegates, who thought it better to leave things in this state.

We trust that we may be pardoned the remarks we are about to address to some of our contemporaries, whose policy is, it strikes us, not quite decorous on the part of Catholic laymen; and is a little imprudent on the part of Lower Canadian Catholics.

First—We think that it is hardly decorous for laymen to keep constantly dragging the names of the Bishops and Clergy of Canada, into their controversies for, and against, the new Constitution. Like other men, the clergy have of course their own individual opinions as to the merits or demerits of this measure. But as a body, the Canadian clergy have never pronounced any opinion at all upon it; and no one, therefore, has any right to attribute to them opinions either favorable, or unfavorable. Their political teachings amount to this. Obey the laws, fear God, and honor the King.

In the second place, we think that it is a little imprudent on the part of Lower Canadian Catholics, to take the initiative in any agitation for a reform in the separate school laws of Upper Canada; or to make parade of greater zeal in the matter than that which, for their own good reasons, the Catholic minority of that section see cause to display. We must surely know how susceptible is the Protestantism of Upper Canada on the School Question; how jealous it is of all Lower Canadian interference with its domestic right of wallowing in its own nigger. We must not, therefore, seem even, as if we were trying to excite our Upper Canadian coreligionists to a renewed agitation; we must not—if we would not arouse all the jealousies and prejudices of Upper Canadian Protestantism against Catholic separate schools—we must not assume the attitude of principals in a battle, in which our proper place is that of auxiliaries. If the Catholics of Upper Canada find themselves hurt, they will sing out; and when they do so sing out, it will be time enough for us to strike in. We only hope that the men who to-day, when there is no call for such vanities, make constant parade of their zeal for the cause of "Freedom of Education," and of Catholic principles; who so ostentatiously tender their unasked sympathy to the Upper Canadian minority—will, when the day of battle comes, when their action against the dangerous principles of modern Liberalism, is invoked—approve themselves only one-half as brave, as active, and as staunch in their resistance to actual democratic oppression, as they are eloquent in their denunciations of prospective danger.

## GENERAL ELECTION IN P. E. ISLAND—BIGOTRY STAMPED OUT.

[FROM A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.]

The history of British America for the last few years records few events which so clearly prove the utter inutility (to use no stronger term) of appeals to religious bigotry for party purposes, as the result of the General Election which has lately taken place here in P. E. Island. The Government which was so signally defeated on the 26th ult., got into power, eight years ago, as many of your readers are aware, by stirring up sectarian strife, and at the succeeding elections obtained the popular verdict through the same unhallowed means. The very large proportion of the people who were deceived, on both occasions, by the clap-trap of "Protestantism in Danger," have lately, we are happy to say, completely righted themselves, and the result is a complete triumph for the Opposition or Liberal Party. Districts which, four years ago, elected Government men, now return Liberals to Parliament; whilst many of the M.P.'s who, at that time, headed the anti-Catholic crusade, had prudence enough not to face their constituencies at all! So complete a stamping out of bigotry in so short a time we have seldom witnessed, and we sincerely congratulate our Canadian neighbors on the auspicious event. If they wish to see ten years hence, a real, old-fashioned bigot, the best thing they can now do, is to catch one of those that may yet remain among us, and have him stuffed.

The attitude which Prince E. Island has assumed on the question of Confederation, has down upon her devoted head the indignation of two or three of your leading Canadian journals. It is not our intention to set up a defence of the conduct of the Islanders in general, or of some of their leading men in particular, on the important question. If they choose to enter the arena with Canadian journalists they are quite able, (we speak with all respect for your brother editors in Canada) to fight their own battles, and, to talk frankly, it would require no very great talent to tear some of the latter's arguments to pieces.—We have been particularly struck with the tone, which the *Montreal Gazette* has lately adopted towards its Island Sister. That journal has lately devoted three or four articles within as

many weeks to the discussion of P. E. Island matters; and, in some cases, has, we have been sorry to see, used language towards some of the public men of this Colony, which is quite unworthy of the reputation of the *Montreal Gazette*. Your contemporary is particularly severe on the line of conduct which has been pursued, on the Confederation question, by Messrs. Coles, Palmer, and A. A. Macdonald. We are not prepared to say whether or not these gentlemen have been inconsistent in this matter. We know many persons who from conviction have changed their opinions on many public questions, and have not been held up to public execration either;—but if the *Gazette* is in a mood to lecture the public on political consistency, it has no necessity, we think, of travelling seven hundred miles from this Canada of yours to find fit subjects wherewith to "point a moral." As to these three gentlemen, we remember to have seen it alleged in some of the Island papers, shortly after the Quebec Conference, that these gentlemen, or at least one of them, signed the Constitution, not as approving of it, but merely certifying that the document then under consideration was the authentic one, and that "this fact was well known to all the delegates." Be this as it may, we have reason to know that these three gentlemen yet stand high in the estimation of their fellow-colonists. Messrs. Palmer and Macdonald were, at the time of the Conference, and have been since, members of the Legislative Council; and as for Mr. Coles, the mere fact that he was elected the other day for the Lower House without opposition, and that he has since been entrusted with the formation of the new Government, shows conclusively, we presume, that he has lost a very small mite indeed in public opinion. It is very poor philosophy to aim at getting this Island into Confederation, by abusing some of the men in whom the Islanders generally place the largest confidence; and the sooner that Canadian editors and Canadian orators understand these small matters, the better, as regards Prince Edward Island, will be the prospects of Confederation.

It has lately been a favorite idea with extreme Unionists, to seek to put down all opposition on the part of P. E. Island, by having her forcibly legislated into Confederation. We are not of those who approve of either the expediency or the propriety of such a violent proceeding.—Forced legislation rarely succeeds, and we believe that nothing is farther from the present temper of the British Government than to force this Province into a Union which she abhors. If it is sought to make P. E. Island a member of the Confederation, the "coercion" arguments may as well be dropped at once, and their place supplied by sound, dispassionate reasoning. The braggadocio style in which some journals indulge will frighten nobody. Prince Edward Island has rights "as numerous and as sacred" as those of Canada; and so long as your Island Sister declines to pin her fortunes on to yours, it is sheer nonsense to try to gain her consent by coolly telling her, for instance, that *Montreal* surpasses her "infinitely" in wealth, as the *Gazette* of your city modestly stated a few weeks ago.

**EVANGELICAL HONESTY.**—Some two weeks ago, we gave a formal contradiction to a positive statement made by the *Echo*, a low Anglican journal, to the effect that one of the Jesuit priests had joined the Methodists of this City.—To this the editor of the *Echo*, with true evangelical honesty, and with that delicate sense of honor eminently, and universally characteristic of the class to which he belongs, replies in his issue of the 20th inst.:—"Not by making good his first statement, or by giving the name of the degraded priest who had joined the Methodists; not by retracting, confessing, and apologising for his error, as every gentleman would do, under similar circumstances—but simply as follows:—"

"I"—the lie about the Jesuit priest—"was however stated as a fact by the *Montreal* correspondent of a country paper, who, we believe, belongs to the Methodist body."—*Echo*, 20th March.

That the originator of the lie "belongs to the Methodist body" is, we are prepared to admit, very probable; but as the *Echo* originally published it, not upon the authority of the said anonymous correspondent of an unnamed "country paper," but as an item of news of its own—the *Echo* is morally responsible for the truth or falsehood, of the assertion. The receiver is as bad as the thief, and betwixt the retailer of a lie, and the original author of the lie, there is little or no moral difference. We will not however insist any longer upon the matter. We know that Evangelicals hold that lying and slandering are fair weapons against the Jesuits, and we seek not to disabuse the "saints" of their cherished delusion.

**UNHAPPY OTTAWA.**—The *Ottawa Times* says a rumor has been circulated, and has gained ground, to which many give credence, to the effect that every inhabitant of Ottawa is a candidate for the Confederate Parliament. This is not correct. There are 11 persons, we are authorized to state, who do not intend offering themselves. These latter persons, however, will run for the local legislature.