

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
 No. 696, Craig Street, by
 J. GILLIES.
 G. E. OLBERG, Editor

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
 To all country subscribers Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a 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 Depot, Single copy 3d.
 We beg to remind our Correspondent that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 14.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE — 1867.

Friday, 14 — Ember Day. Of the Octava.
 Saturday, 15 — Ember Day. Of the Octava.
 Sunday, 16 — Trinity Sunday.
 Monday, 17 — St. Barnabas, Ap.
 Tuesday, 18 — St. John de Fac, O.
 Wednesday, 19 — Ste. Julienne, V.
 Thursday, 20 — Corpus Christi.

ST. ANN'S HALL.

A GRAND LOTTERY

Will commence in the ST. ANN'S HALL, Corner of Kempt and Ottawa Streets, on MONDAY EVENING, June 10th, for the

BENEFIT OF ST. ANN'S CHURCH,

To be continued during the week.

All the Tickets will be prizes—no blanks. Doors open at half past Six o'clock every evening. Entrance free.

Several Members of the St. Ann's Band will play during the evenings.

TO OUR DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.

We are compelled to address ourselves to this very numerous class of the subscribers to the TRUE WITNESS, with the object of inducing them to pay up a portion, at least, of the arrears in which they stand indebted to this office. That the "times are hard," and money unusually scarce, are the excuses with which our demands are constantly met; but we do think that a little, a very little exertion on the part of those to whom we address ourselves, would enable them to discharge our claims upon them, and spare us the disagreeable necessity of asking, but asking in vain, for the payment of a just debt.

We would respectfully invite all who are interested in the TRUE WITNESS to endeavor to extend its circulation. If each one would send in a new subscriber, and if the new and old would make it a rule to pay their subscriptions, that would be doing something substantial for the paper.

To our paying subscribers, our best thanks are tendered.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

We have sad news from Ireland. In consequence of the long and severe winter, and the late Spring, there is much distress in the Western districts, and this will no doubt be taken advantage of by political agitators, and used as a means for keeping alive political dissatisfaction with the Government. Unfortunately the latter has no control over the seasons, nor is it in the power even of an Act of Parliament to make grass grow, or to ensure good crops. We have no doubt however, but that the Government, assisted by the private charitable contributions of the people of England, will do all in their power to mitigate the sufferings of the poor people, and to ward off the dangers of actual famine.

There has been another attempt at assassination at Paris. A pistol shot was fired into the carriage in which were seated Louis Napoleon and the Emperor of Russia. It seems that the missile was destined for the latter, and that the agent in this horrid crime is a Pole. Great preparations are making in Rome for the celebration of the Feast of the 29th inst. The Continental news is, in other respects of but trifling interest.

ORDINATION AT THE GESU.—On Sunday morning—Pentecost—took place at this Church the promotion to the Holy Order of the Priesthood of the Rev. Mr. D. Ransay who received his Deacon's Orders in the Holy City.

The officiating Prelate was His Lordship Mgr. Jos. Larocque, whose health we are happy to say has, since his release from the arduous duties of the Episcopate at St. Hyacinthe, decidedly improved. The Church was crowded, and large numbers of our most eminent citizens were present at the ceremony.

The office commenced at 7.30 a.m. and was conducted with all the solemn grandeur of the Roman Pontifical. It is now about four years since the newly ordained Priest had the happiness of being received into the Catholic Church, and at last the dearest wish of his heart has been accomplished by his admission into the ranks of that army of which we hope he may long be a zealous soldier, and by his talents, and erudition, an ornament.

DIOCESE OF SANDWICH.

NOTICE TO THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF THE DIOCESE.

I beg to call the attention of the Clergy and Catholics of the Diocese of Sandwich to an Act assented to, August 15th 1866, and styled thus: "An Act to regulate the means of egress from public buildings."

In virtue of said Act, it is enjoined by Her Majesty's Government that in all Churches, Halls and other buildings hereafter to be constructed for holding public meetings, all the doors shall be so hinged that they may open freely outwards.

The same Act provides that doors of existing Churches, Halls and other buildings used for public meetings, shall be altered, if necessary, and made to open outwards, so as to facilitate the egress of people in case of alarm from fire or other cause: said alteration to take place within twelve months from the passing of this Act, consequently, before the 15th of August, 1867.

Parties who shall violate the provisions of this Act, shall be liable to a fine of fifty dollars. A further fine of five dollars shall be added for every week succeeding that in which the complaint is laid, if the necessary changes are not made.

This Act does not apply to Convents or private Chapels connected therewith.

The Clergy and people of the Diocese of Sandwich are hereby requested by me to carry into execution the provisions of the aforesaid Act.

J. M. BRUYERE, V.G.,
 Administrator of the Diocese of Sandwich,
 Sandwich, June 8th, 1867.

We must respectfully, but at the same time firmly, decline taking any such action in party politics, or the squabbles of place holders and place seekers, as to appear even as if it were our intention to identify the sacred cause, and the Catholic principles, which we sincerely, though imperfectly advocate, with those of any particular political party. We have, it is true, often warmly protested against the doctrine that the Protestant Reformers of Upper Canada were our natural allies; and by so doing we have made ourselves many enemies, have incurred much obloquy, and no doubt have had to pay the penalty of our inflexible, even if mistaken, adherence to principle. But though we have protested, and do strongly protest, against the proposition, that Catholics can ally themselves politically with Liberals, it does not logically follow that we pretend to identify ourselves as Catholics on all political questions, with the opponents of "Protestant Reformers." On the contrary; though as Catholics, and inspired by the Church, our political proclivities must set strongly towards what is commonly called by some Conservatism, by others Toryism—reproach that has often been hurled in our teeth—we cannot but recognise the fact, that even amongst the Conservatives of Upper Canada are to be found the advocates of political principles which, as Catholics, we cannot endorse, which we cannot but strongly condemn.

What then is it that we would recommend or suggest? for we have not the presumption to suppose that we have any right to dogmatise or dictate. Simply this:—That the Catholic voter act in accordance with the dictates of his conscience. Not of the dictates of his self-interest, or of his pocket, but, of his conscience as a Catholic. That he make the rule "*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*," the rule of his political action, as well of his private action; and that he regard the franchise conferred on him by the State, as a trust, for the conscientious exercise of which he will be judged by God. If to this we add that, when there are two candidates, of whom neither is the representative of principles to which the conscientious Catholic can give an unqualified support, the better course is to select him whose principles approach the more closely to those of which the Church approves—we shall have said all that we deem it necessary for us to say on the matter to which our attention has been called; all, in short, that we have any right to say.

But this we may add that, whatever may have been our attitude as towards the great Constitutional changes when these were first mooted, it is our duty, and our highest wisdom, now that they have become law, to submit to them frankly, loyally, and without a murmur, and to try and make the best of them; at liberty to seek, of course, by legitimate and constitutional means to improve them, if they be still susceptible of improvement; but in the mean while, carefully and loyally abstaining from all factious opposition, from all throwing of obstacles in the way of those on whom the task of running the new Government machine shall devolve. If the Upper Canada Radicals, the Protestant Reformers or Clear Grits, seek not to abuse their great victory, and are willing to deal generously and forbearingly with Lower Canada—not putting forth their newly acquired giant strength against her, we may hope that our old party dissensions may die out, our old party war cries may be put to silence, and our old party lines of demarcation may be obliterated. All depends upon the spirit with which the overwhelming Upper Canadian majority in the United Colonial Legislature, shall be inspired: at its first assembly; but whether the Union about to be proclaimed, result in failure, or eventuate in success, it should, we think, be the care of every Lower Canadian Catholic so to

accept it, as that none shall hereafter be able to hold him responsible for a failure should it not turn out as favorably as its framers expected.—Our duty, as well as our best policy, will be to accept the new law in a frank and loyal spirit—submitting ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, so that by well doing we may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Beware, however—beware of political atheism—that is to say, of acting as if there were no connection betwixt religion and politics; as if it were really desirable to abolish all semblance of connection between Church and State; as if the Catholic voter really owed no account to God for the manner in which he exercises his political privileges; or as if he were not bound, both as a citizen and as an individual, to seek first, and above all things, the kingdom of God, and His justice.

A GLIMMER OF REASON.—Our Yankee neighbors are beginning to see that they have no real cause of complaint against either France or Great Britain, in that both these Powers recognised the Southern or Confederate States as belligerents during the late war betwixt North and South. Even Mr. H. Greely perceives this, and very cleverly insists that, in this matter, the European Powers gave no cause of legitimate offence to the Northerners.

He might indeed, and with truth, have admitted more:—To wit, that but for the recognition of the Southern or Confederate States by France and England as belligerents, the Northern States, with all their pluck and wealth, and their still more important numerical superiority, would never have been able to crush out the spirit of freedom in the South; and that the latter would now be, what we hope they will some day, and soon be, a free and independent country. For instance:—Had the European Powers refused to acknowledge the Southern or Confederate States as belligerent, then—as it requires two to make a quarrel, and as *one* belligerent necessarily implies at least *one* other belligerent—it would have been impossible to have recognised the Northern States as belligerent, or to have ceded to them belligerent rights on the high seas. Then of course it would have been impossible for France and Great Britain to have permitted armed vessels under Northern or Yankee colors, to stop and search French or British merchant ships for contraband of war, on the high seas. Then also these European Powers could not have admitted the validity of the blockade proclaimed by the Northern States—for the right of blockade is a belligerent right, and can be claimed by none but a belligerent.—But the recognition of the belligerent character and rights of the Northern States rendered it logically imperative to recognise the belligerent character and claims of those with whom the Yankees or Northern States were waging war—for no *one* nation can be a belligerent, any more than any one man can be his own partner, or his own opponent. The thing is an absurdity, it involves a contradiction in terms.

And yet, but for the right of blockade, and the belligerent rights on the high seas accorded by France and Great Britain to the Northern or Yankee States in the late war, it would have been impossible for those States to have enforced the blockade, or to have prevented the influx of aid, in men and arms to their Southern opponents. War too would have been inevitable betwixt the said European Powers, and the Northern States. Collision betwixt the Yankee armed cruisers and merchant ships under French and British colors on the high seas, and under the pretext of searching for contraband of war—(and none but belligerents have the right to institute such search)—must necessarily have been of daily occurrence: and who could doubt what would have been the result, if France and Great Britain had openly taken sides with the gallant Southerners during the heat of the long and gallantly maintained conflict. In short, the whole question as to the recognition of the South as a belligerent resolves itself into this. Did the French and British Governments do right in recognising the right of the Northern States to exercise belligerent rights on the high seas, and to blockade the Southern ports? Now this they could not have done without recognising the Northern States as belligerent; and as every belligerent supposes necessarily one other belligerent at least, they were compelled to recognise the Southern States as belligerent also.

PIC NIC.—We understand that the Saint Patrick's Society have obtained permission from the Major General Commanding to hold this year their annual Pic-Nic on the St. Helen's Island, and that the Committee of Management are busily engaged in perfecting the necessary arrangements to make this Pic Nic worthy of the Society, and of the eventful day on which it will be held, the 1st of July next. Full particulars will be given in a few days.

OTTAWA, June 5.—Judge Aylwin has sent in his resignation to the Government, after twenty years' service on the Bench. It is doubtful whether he will be provided with a pension, as there is no available fund for that purpose at the disposal of the Government at present.

"Boglesmen, are sometimes apt to wonder why all the world cannot be comfortably governed on the principles of the British Constitution."—*Montreal Gazette*, 5th inst.

They must be very stupid Englishmen indeed, who thus wonder, with more beef in their bellies than brains in their heads. The thing that would be really wonderful would be the success of the principles of the British Constitution in a community amongst whom did not exist the social elements from which that Constitution arose, and with which it is indissolubly associated, so that the destruction of the former would inevitably entail the death of the latter. The fundamental principle of the British Constitution is that of Government by the "Estates of the Realm"; that is to say King—Lords, Spiritual and Temporal—and Commons: and where any one of these Estates does not exist, or exists only in a feeble decrepid state, there it would be as impossible to reproduce the faintest imitation of the British Constitution, as it will be for the Yankees to cultivate with success sugar, cotton and tobacco, in their newly acquired Polar Territory, called *Walrusia*.

And even now, in these our days, and in England, the British Constitution is fast becoming an anomaly, incompatible with the new ideas which are intolerant of its fundamental principle—that is to say Government by the Estates of the Realm, or in other words class-government. The new idea is, that there are, or at all events should be, no distinct Estates or classes within the realm; but that the entire social body should be fused down, till it become one uniform homogeneous mass, or people. When this process shall have been accomplished, there will no longer be Estates in the Realm; no reason, or principle therefore for the existing British Constitution, which will have to give place to another Constitution founded on a principle in harmony with the new social order. Whether this shall be accomplished suddenly and violently, or whether the process shall be more gentle and gradual,—an euthanasia rather than a cataclysm,—we do not venture to predict; but in either case the result will be Revolution, or organic change, and all organic change in the political order presupposes death.

The *Witness* is not, we hope, a fair exponent of the Protestant mind throughout Canada; nevertheless, it does, we fear, but too correctly represent the opinions of a large section of the non-Catholic community, and does but too faithfully reflect the lack of honesty frequently prevalent therein, when it advocates the wholesale robbery of the Catholic Church throughout the world:—

"Just as in Mexico, and all countries where the Church of Rome obtains very large properties, so in Italy, there can be no true liberty or peace until these properties are secularised, as was done in Britain and France."—*Witness*, 4th inst.

In England, the property of the Church was not entirely secularised. Much of it indeed was given by a profligate and arbitrary prince to his still more profligate sycophants: and the direct result was the tyranny of the Tudor and Stuart sovereigns, which it required two rebellions, and one civil war, to suppress. So much for the "liberty and peace" which the spoliation of the Church, and the seizure of her property by the Crown, established in England. It must, however, be remembered that of that property a great part was not secularised, but transferred from the Catholic Church, both in England and Ireland, to a new ecclesiastical society created and organised by Act of Parliament, and called the Established Church.

But if the advantages of secularising property set apart by its original owners for religious purposes, be so great and so numerous, the process must be as just, and as salutary when applied to the church property of the Protestant sects, as when applied to that of the Catholic Church. Now the proverb warns us of the prudence of making our first experiments on "vile bodies;" and therefore we say, let this of secularisation be tried by all means in the first instance upon some of our evangelical communities. Let the State seize upon, and confiscate to its use, their revenues, their lots of land, and all buildings thereon erected; and then, if the experiment be satisfactory, will it be quite soon enough to think of extending it to Catholic Church property. What says the *Witness*?

It is not only the possession of property by the Church as a Corporation that the *Witness* looks upon as an evil to be abated, but it is equally indignant with the clergy for presuming to speak and act as if their Ordination had not destroyed in them the quality of citizens, or British subjects. Not only would our contemporary deprive the Church of her estates, but her hierarchy of their civil rights.

Thus the *Witness* quotes with approbation the insolent language of a low journal printed at St. Hyacinthe, in which the editor approves himself to be as ignorant of the first principles of liberty, as he is of the obligations of a gentleman. Mgr. the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe, Mgr. Jos. Larocque, and several of the clergy signed, it seems, a friendly address to M. Currier, to be presented to that gentleman when he returned from Europe, and to which the signatures of the most respectable citizens of St. Hyacinthe were also attached.

Who can call in question the right, legal and moral, of our clergy thus to act—seeing that in the eyes of the law they are not only Bishops and Priests, but citizens with the legal obligations and legal rights of other citizens?—And yet this very impertinent writer, whom the *Witness* cites with approbation, has the insolence to tell these respectable citizens, lay and cleric, who signed the address, that they are but a "coterie which St. Hyacinthe tolerates in its midst"—as if, in short, they existed there not by right, but by sufferance!

These are but trifles, it may be said, but trifles will show how the wind blows, and in which direction the current is setting. Here, with the evangelicals, its tendency is to deny, not only to the Catholic Church those proprietary rights which the sects claim, and enjoy, but the rights of citizenship to the Catholic Clergy. We must therefore be pardoned for insisting upon the truism, that our Bishops and Clergy are citizens; that the law imposes on them all the obligations of citizens; and that therefore they have the right to exercise all the civil rights of citizens when, and in such manner, as to them it shall appear good to do so.

A highly esteemed correspondent writes to us complaining of the, to Catholics, offensive matter or insinuations that the Rev. Mr. Ryerson publishes in the Upper Canada Journal of Education, and which thereby, at the expense of the community, he disseminates throughout the Province. As a Methodist minister, the Rev. Mr. Ryerson has, no doubt, the right to his own particular religious opinions, and to make converts to them if he can. But we contend that as a public servant, he has no right to employ the public funds for this purpose.

Our correspondent refers us to the number of the Journal of Education for May last, p. 941, where the following passage occurs:—

"It was not arrogance to question, any more than it was arrogance on the part of . . . Luther, Calvin, Melancthon . . . to propound thoughts overthrow the erroneous systems of former ages."

Here, for instance, we think that the laudation of the above named heresarchs, and the implied condemnation of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, is out of place. The Journal of Education is published at the expense of Catholics as well as of Protestants, it is intended to be circulated amongst both; and should, therefore, we contend, we kept free from anything offensive to either. The Rev. Mr. Ryerson is evidently of a different opinion, for he avails himself of it as a channel for circulating his anti-Catholic prejudices, and it is of this that our correspondent with good reason complains, as very dishonest on the part of our Methodist minister, who takes off the public funds to circulate his Protestant opinions, and as very dishonest towards Catholics out of whose pockets, in part, the money is taken.

We find in the *Montreal Herald* a paragraph to the following effect, with regard to a decision lately given at Cincinnati, in a matrimonial suit, lately brought before the Civil Courts of that City:—

MARRIAGE A CIVIL CONTRACT.—The Court of Common Pleas of Cincinnati has decided marriage to be purely a civil contract. James and Michael Taylor lived together as husband and wife, maintaining themselves as reputedly as any other couple, although bound by no other tie than that of a mutual agreement, which they have maintained honorably and honestly. In all the legal instruments executed by them, the legal relations of man and wife were acknowledged. He recently died, leaving his wife and six children surviving. Relatives undertook to deprive her of her right to dower on the ground that they were never lawfully married. The Court decided the facts, as proved, established her widowhood sufficiently under the laws of the State of Ohio.

It strikes us that the citing the decision given above as in favor of the more civil contract theory of marriage, indicates on the part of our Montreal contemporary some confusion of ideas as to the essential difference betwixt marriage, considered as a religious contract, and marriage considered as a mere civil contract. The decision of the Cincinnati Court does not touch upon this point of difference: or if it decides anything at all thereupon, it is decisive against the mere civil contract theory, and in favor of the Catholic view of marriage.

Had there been in the Statute Book of the State of Ohio, a law insisting upon the performance of some religious ceremony as indispensable to the contracting of a valid marriage—thus declaring it to be in some sense a religious contract—then of course a legal decision virtually dispensing with the requirements of such a law might be interpreted as a decision in favor of the "mere civil contract" theory. But as it is, all that the Courts of Law have explicitly decided is this:—That certain civil ceremonies imposed by Statute may be dispensed with; and therefore by implication, that the essence of marriage consists, not in the sanction to the union given by the civil magistrate, but in the mutual consent, intelligibly expressed, of the contracting parties. This also is not very far from Catholic ultramontane doctrine.

For there where the decrees of the Council of Trent have not been published, the priest is not even the indispensable witness of the marriage contract: for in the words of the great majority of the most eminent of Catholic doctors, the con-