

The True Witness.

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

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, SEPTEMBER 23

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

- 23, Friday—2nd Ember Day East. St. Linus P. M. 24, Saturday—3rd Ember Day East. Our Lady of Mercy. 25, Sunday—Nineteenth after Pentecost. 26, Monday—St. Joseph de Cupar C. 27, Tuesday—St. Comas and Damien M.M. 28, Wednesday—St. Veneslas, M. 29, Thursday—Dedication of St. Michael. The "Forty Hours' Adoration" of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:— 24, Saturday—St. Mary's College, Montreal. 26, Monday—St. Eustache. 28, Wednesday—St. Lin.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

There is a perfect dearth of political news from Europe. The meeting of the Congress at Malines, is to Catholics one of the most interesting events of the week. Mgr. Dupanloup, the illustrious Bishop of Orleans had arrived, and was expected to deliver an address on the subject of Education.

The Liberator brings dates to the 5th inst., Government was about to appoint a commission to enquire into the late Orange riots at Belfast. Rumors of an alarming nature were again rife concerning the health of Louis Napoleon; it is hinted that the Emperor is meditating the creation of a new nobility in France, as a counterpoise to democracy. This is probably a canard, for so astute a politician as Louis Napoleon must be aware that he might as well attempt to create an old oak as an aristocracy.

No important military events have occurred in the States since our last. Farragut is still a good way off Mobile, but the fall of that place now that Atlanta is in the hands of the enemy, may be anticipated. General Sherman's position at Atlanta is said to be precarious; his communications are infested with Confederate guerrillas, and his supplies are running short. The proceedings of the army of the Potomac are devoid of interest; it seems however that Gen. Lee managed the other day to get into their rear, and to carry off with him the enemy's supply of beef cattle, in number about 3,000.

At Bermuda, Yellow Fever still rages; and we regret to say that several members of the medical staff who a few weeks ago were dispatched from Canada to the afflicted island, have been carried off by the dreadful disease.

PERSONAL.—Noticing the fact that the name of the editor of the TRUE WITNESS appears in connection with a resolution adopted at a meeting held in Montreal to discuss the question of Colonial Confederation; and in which meeting such Confederation was condemned because inapplicable to communities in the position of Colonies, or dependent Provinces all whose external affairs are managed for them by the Imperial Government—the Toronto Mirror has the following remarks:—

"There can be no reason to suspect that the editor of the Montreal TRUE WITNESS took part in the Catholic meeting held in Montreal, or that he sustained their resolutions without the sanction of the highest ecclesiastical authority. Mr. Clerk is not in the habit of taking such steps without sufficient warrant from headquarters. In moving therefore, as he undoubtedly did, by aiding in a public meeting of Catholics to discuss Federation, and in passing a series of resolutions on the subject, with the sanction of our Venerable and ever-to-be-esteemed Hierarchy, he has given the gentlemen who assembled in London on the 6th of September, the highest authority for the action which they have taken."

We request the Mirror to have the goodness in his next issue to formally contradict this statement. The Bishop of Montreal has expressed no opinion, direct or indirect, on the question at issue: neither has he in any manner approved or disapproved of the steps taken by the editor of the TRUE WITNESS, who has acted throughout entirely proprio motu, and on his own responsibility. If in that action there be ought to censure, the editor of the TRUE WITNESS must bear the blame alone: for, again we repeat it, neither directly nor indirectly was His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal implicated therein, or even cognisant thereof.

Catholic laymen, whether editors of journals, or not, should be most careful never, by act or word, in any manner to compromise their Bishops or clergy, or to drag the names of their ecclesiastical superiors before the public without express permission. A Bishop in this respect has as

much right to demand forbearance from his laity, as has a lady from every one calling himself a gentleman. Therefore, once again we respectfully beg the Mirror to give an unqualified contradiction to his assertion respecting the complicity of the Bishop of Montreal in the acts of the editor of the TRUE WITNESS; and once again, and once for all, we repeat, that for every word that appears in the TRUE WITNESS, for every act of its editor, the latter alone is any manner responsible, and that the undivided blame thereof must be borne by him.

The Toronto Globe of the 5th inst., does us the honor of addressing itself particularly to us, and as our contemporary raises an issue of fact, we will do ourselves the pleasure of replying thereunto.

The Globe, admitting the consistency of the TRUE WITNESS—which is but an act of bare justice to us—asserts that for our opposition to the proposed "constitutional changes" as defined by the Globe, and—as according to the organ of the President of the Council—agreed to by the Ministry, the TRUE WITNESS has—"never condescended to give particulars or to show reasons."

To this assertion we will confine our remarks for the present; and as politely as it is possible to do so, we give the Globe to understand that his assertion is not true, and that our contemporary must know that it is not true. Unable to refute our arguments, afraid therefore to reproduce them in its columns, the Globe finds it convenient simply to deny that we have ever offered any "reasons" at all for our opposition and hostility to its measure. Our contemporary may pretend that our reasons are futile; but if so, why does he not reproduce them, and by exposing their futility, expose at the same time the TRUE WITNESS to well-merited ridicule.

But are our arguments futile? We have argued that the proposed "constitutional changes," if carried on would impose on us a Government cumbersome, unnecessary so long as we retain our dependent position on Great Britain, and menacing to the autonomy of Lower Canada. These reasons may be very futile: but for all that, we find them urged against the plan of "Colonial Federation" by men who certainly have enjoyed in their day a reputation for statesmanship, and the power of arguing.

For instance, a person of whom perhaps Mr. George Brown may have heard, known in Canadian history as Lord Durham, thus gave his opinion of "Colonial Federation," in his famous Report of 1839:—

"I was fully aware that a Federal Union would in many cases produce a weak and rather cumbersome government."—Lord Durham's Report.

The TRUE WITNESS says in its issue of the 9th instant:—

"A Federation, so long as Canada remains a British Province, would be at best useless, expensive, and cumbersome."—True Witness, 9th Sept.

Again in his Report Lord Durham objects that in a Colony, a Federal Government would have scarce any functions to perform; since the chief functions of such a Government are, and must be performed by the Imperial authorities:—

"A Colonial Federation must have, in fact, little legitimate authority or business, the greater part of the ordinary functions of a federation falling within the scope of the Imperial Legislature and Executive."—Lord Durham's Report.

The TRUE WITNESS arguing against the necessity of a Federal government for a Colony says:—

"In short, the Imperial Government actually discharges for us all the legitimate functions of a Federal Government."—True Witness, 9th Sept.

Lord Durham argues against a Federal Union of Colonies because, in their case, the chief inducement, or reason for such a form of government, must, because of their dependent position, be wanting:—

"The main inducement to federation, which is the necessity of conciliating the pretensions of independent states to the maintenance of their own sovereignty, could not exist in the case of Colonial dependencies."—Lord Durham's Report.

The TRUE WITNESS thus argues against Federation, not in the abstract, but as applied to our particular condition, that of a British Colony or Dependency:—

"The True Witness looks upon the federation of Upper and Lower Canada at the present moment and under our actual circumstances—i.e. whilst a British Province, and whilst bound together in Legislative Union as one Province—as undesirable and indeed as morally impossible."—True Witness, 9th inst.

One whom perhaps the Globe looks upon as a more clear sighted politician than Lord Durham, only a few years ago expressed precisely the same opinions, and used the same arguments against a federation or "central government" for British Colonies, as those expressed and used by Lord Durham in his Report of 1839, and by the TRUE WITNESS in 1864. This person, to whom we trust that the Globe will lend an attentive ear, is known in Canada as Mr. George Brown, and in 1853 this person thus expressed himself:—

"In a country which has no foreign affairs to control, it would be seen that one Legislature ought to suffice. To give Congress merely control of the tariff and post office would make it a nullity; and if the management of legal affairs, and questions pertaining to public morality were committed to it, there would be no need for local legislatures."—Toronto Globe as quoted in Montreal Gazette of 15th inst.

Here again we find a perfect coincidence between the views of the TRUE WITNESS, and those of Mr. George Brown upon the functions and ne-

cessity for a "central government," or congress in a federation of British colonies. If then the Globe condemns our arguments as futile, or inconclusive, it passes sentence upon the President of the Council, as well as upon Lord Durham. Nor upon these merely: for other members of the actual Cabinet have also declared themselves against Colonial Federation, giving their reasons for their opposition to a joint or "central government." The gentleman whom we are next about to quote is known as Mr. J. A. Macdonald, and in a speech delivered at London in 1860, and quoted in the Montreal Gazette of the 15th inst. he thus expressed himself:—

"If we ask ourselves what this joint authority is, we shall see how crude the idea is. Is it a legislature, or is it a bench of bishops? If it means anything, it means that Canada is to be divided into two, that there are to be two separate legislatures, but a central power. Now if the joint authority which is to govern all Canada is to legislate on all points affecting Eastern and Western Canada, why that is what we have just now. The only difference would be that under the proposed system we would have three Parliaments, any amount of speakers, any amount of maces, one central power, and two wings, not doing anything however, because the central power if it was entrusted with real power, would do every thing. But if the real power was to be in the local government, the central one would be of no use whatever; it would be a mere figure head." (The italics are our own.)

Our arguments may be very weak, so weak as to be no arguments at all: but to refute them, the Globe will have to refute, not merely the humble and obscure editor of the TRUE WITNESS, but Lord Durham, but Mr. J. A. Macdonald, but Mr. George Brown himself.

And the Globe will please bear in mind that the arguments of the latter against federation of Colonies are based, not upon some thing in the condition of the Canadas which time has changed or modified; but upon facts that are as actual and as potent to-day as they were in '39, in '53, and in '60—upon the facts—1st. that the Canadas are a British Colony or Dependency; and 2nd. that the federal principle cannot be profitably applied to any such Colonies or Dependencies. There are the facts which we cite as our reasons for opposition to the scheme of "constitutional change" as defined by the Globe: and we therefore, without having the vanity to pretend that our reasons are conclusive, or indeed worth anything, insist that they are worthy of serious consideration because of the eminent men by whom they have at different times been urged—and whom we have quoted above.

One other incorrect statement of the Globe of the 5th instant we will indicate. It pretends that the opposition of the TRUE WITNESS is based upon hostility to Mr. George Brown, which is not the fact. True, Mr. G. Brown has been for years the slanderer of our Bishops, our Clergy and our Religious Sisterhoods: for years he was the uncompromising opponent of Free Education, using all his influence to maintain an unjust and immoral system of State Schoolism. True also that he, by his applause of every act of robbery and tyranny perpetrated by the Liberal Government of Piedmont against the Catholic Church approves himself to be at heart to-day what he was years ago—the enemy of that Church, of the Immaculate Spouse of Our Lord Jesus Christ. But not for this do we reject any particular measure which he advocates. No. We estimate it by its intrinsic merits, and on these alone do we condemn it.

The Montreal Witness of the 12th instant makes a serious charge against the Hon. M. Chateaubert, Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada, and instances a grievance to which the Protestant minority of Lower Canada are exposed in the matter of education.

The charge against the Superintendent of Education amounts in substance to this: That he purposely, and to prevent the establishment of Protestant dissentient or Separate Schools, and to cause their destruction there where they actually exist, makes proprio motu, frequent and arbitrary changes in the boundaries of existing school municipalities. This is often done, says the Witness, not only "without the consent, or even the knowledge of the parties concerned," but "in direct opposition to the wishes and interests of the" said parties.

The grievance indicated by the Witness, and to which he pretends Protestants are subject is this: That a dividing line passing through the midst of the residents of a district wherein there is a dissentient school which they support, kills that school, because thereby it is deprived of the school-taxes of many of its former supporters:—

"That power"—(the power of changing the boundaries of school municipalities)—"is the more dangerous because it is well known that it has frequently been enacted to help the church of the majority in her proselytising designs, to crush Protestant Schools."

This is the gist of the Witness' complaint.—As to what refers to the Superintendent of Education we need only remark that since the Witness does not adduce any proof of his charges against the honesty of that official, we may logically conclude that he has no proof to offer; and that his accusations are therefore as ill-founded, and as calumnious, as these which he is constantly in the habit of making against private gentlemen—as in the case of the Marquis of Ailsa—and against the officials of the Grand Trunk, and for which he has been so often compelled to do pub-

lic and ignominious penance, to eat his own dirty words, and to swallow his own falsehoods.

For what refers to the Protestant minority, supporters of dissentient schools, we have no hesitation in saying that they ought to be allowed to pay their school-taxes as they please, independent of any boundary lines whatsoever; and if there be on the Statute Book any law which deprives them of that right, or throws obstacles in the way of its exercise, it should be repealed. What we ask for the Catholic minority of U. Canada, neither more nor less, should be prepared to give, not as a favor, but as a right, to the Protestant minority of the Lower Province; and if the latter will but embody the remedy for their grievances in a Bill—abstaining from the vile practice of the Witness, and refraining from unjust and unfounded imputations upon the integrity of Catholic officials—we think that we may venture to predict that no opposition will be offered to them by the Catholic representatives of Lower Canada.

At all events it is the boast of the TRUE WITNESS to have but one set of principles, but one set of weights and measures, which he applies impartially, and without distinction of persons to Catholics and to Protestants. For the former, in Upper Canada, we have always insisted that they should be allowed to circumscribe their own school districts, irrespective of the limits of the common or Protestant school district: and we contend in like manner that the minority in Lower Canada, whether Protestant or Catholic, should enjoy a similar right. Whatsoever we would that men should do unto us, that should we do unto them. This is what we mean by liberality; and in the interests of our co-religionists of the West, as well as in the sacred name of justice, would we invoke a favorable hearing to the complaints of the Witness, respecting the manner in which in the matter of their school districts, his co-religionists are sometimes treated. If upon examination it should appear that these complaints are well founded, redress ample and immediate should be provided: and if on the other hand it should turn out that the allegations of the Witness are false, our readiness to do justice to others, will give additional weight to our demands for justice for ourselves.

We much regret that we have not been able to make ourselves understood by the Courrier du Canada, because in our article of the 9th instant to his address, we did our best to make ourselves intelligible; and because we are very anxious that there should be good and perfect understanding betwixt so respectable a journal as the Courrier du Canada, and the TRUE WITNESS. Our contemporary however in his rejoinder of the 12th instant, says that he does not understand us; and since it is so, we will suppose that it is the TRUE WITNESS that is in fault; and we will therefore, even at the risk of being tedious, endeavor to explain our position to our contemporary.

So far from its being hostile to Federation, or to Confederation, that position is, in one sense, eminently favorable to it; and indeed, no one who opposes us can be a friend to the measure. Our position is this: that repeal of the existing union betwixt Upper and Lower Canada, and the restoration to both of their respective legislatures and autonomy, is the indispensable preliminary to any Federation betwixt Upper and Lower Canada—without which in short Federation is not possible or even conceivable; seeing that in the words of the Canadian of Quebec of the 26th ult.:—

"In order that there be a Confederation there must be a certain number of sovereign independent States, delegating to a central government a definite portion of their rights and their power."

In other words, so long as Upper and Lower Canada remain a political unit, it involves a contradiction in terms to speak of Federation betwixt them. When again they shall be politically two, then only will a Federation be possible or conceivable.

Now it does not appear that the Ministerial scheme of constitutional changes embraces the essential preliminary of the restoration to Upper and Lower Canada respectively, of a distinctive political existence; and therefore without further investigation we oppose the Ministerial scheme in so far as announced by the President of the Council—not because it embraces the Federal principle, but because it does not embrace it; not because we are opposed to Federation, but because we think that in no very remote future, and under the proper conditions, Federation would be possible, and might be perhaps desirable as "the best possible"—though on this latter point we would not at present commit ourselves.

We care not, however, in what terms the Ministerial measure of "constitutional changes" mis-called Federation, may be couched, but we insist that it cannot give us the Federal principle; and we fear that the acceptance of it by Lower Canada would render a real Federation impossible, when Federation would be possible, and might be desirable. This is our second objection to the Ministerial scheme.

We look forward sorrowfully to the day—not very distant if the recall of the Guards from

Canada, if the language of the London Times, and other organs of public opinion, have any meaning—when the tie hitherto existing between Great Britain and the Canadas shall be severed. It may be five or ten years hence; it may even be the end of the present century when the beards of the young men of to-day shall be falling white beneath the hands of the barber—before this painful but inevitable change shall be accomplished. But whether at hand or remote, it is the part of wisdom and sound policy to prepare for it, and to make of it an important element in all our political calculations. Our enemies, the Liberals and Clear-Grits of Upper Canada see this clearly enough; and hence their anxiety to compromise Lower Canada now, by procuring her acceptance of such a position as towards their section of the Province, as shall put it out of her power, to insist at a future day upon her State Rights, and her distinctive political existence. Mr. George Brown's object is plain enough; his interest as the leader of the "franco-phobes," and No-Popery men of Upper Canada in urging on a bogus federation at the present moment, is easily discernible.

Look you. Whatever form of Government, or constitution you accept now, will adhere to you when the Imperial tie shall have been severed; when the only reliable guarantee for the faithful observance of the terms of the Union, which you now propose contracting with Upper Canada—when the only barrier against the encroachments of the Central Government, shall have ceased to exist. That Central Government which you propose to create and to invest with sovereign attributes, will, when the hour of independence strikes, occupy towards you the same position as that now occupied towards you by the British Government; with this difference—that whilst the latter is bound by its Treaties with France to respect your peculiar institutions, the other will be untrammelled by any such engagements. Of what avail will it be then to urge?—"Oh, the Constitution guarantees to us such and such rights." The reply would be—"You hold from us, not we from you. What we gave we may take away; what we delegated we may rightfully resume."

And in this case the sovereign central government would have right and sound reason as well as might on its side. Only upon the hypothesis, sustained by facts, that it holds from the several States, can a federal government in any case be reproached with exceeding its legitimate functions. But this hypothesis would be out of the question, false in theory, as well as in fact, in the case of a federal government deriving its authority in the first instance, not from the delegation of sovereign and independent States, but from the Imperial Government—and into whose place it would naturally step the moment that the authority of the latter should have been suspended by the recognition of Canadian independence. The central government in such a case we say, would be served heir to the defunct or abdicated Imperial Government; heir of all its rights and privileges, and fully competent to modify or rescind all guarantees, or concessions of power that its predecessor might have been pleased to make to the subordinate local or municipal governments. Does it require the gift of prophecy to foretell what, under such circumstances would be the fate of Lower Canada, and her religious institutions? Listen to the sounds of greeting with which the Globe and our other Liberal allies receive the tidings of each fresh act of sacrilege and church robbery perpetrated by Victor Emmanuel, and his excommunicated accomplices.

Therefore is it that we oppose the proposed plan of Colonial Federation, since no matter in what terms it may be conceived, it proposes to saddle us with a sovereign central government which in our actual position must derive its authority, not from within, or from the States over which it is to bear rule; but ab extra, and from an Imperial Government with which our connection must cease ere many years be past; and to which, and to the plenitude of whose authority, the said central government would then inevitably succeed. Our position would then be that of a subject Province, not that of a State, or independent member of a Confederation.

In conclusion we will give expression to the sincere hope that our friend the Courrier du Canada will take these explanations in good part, and as a proof of our desire to co-operate with him in the good cause. We have no ill will to his Ministerial friends; on the contrary, amongst them there are men of whose hearts we entertain the highest opinion, though we presume to differ from them in opinion on certain political questions. Yet therefore do we not accuse them of bad motives, or evil designs. God forbid.

Nor is the difference of opinion very great, if we may take the Courrier as an exponent of Ministerial views. In his issue of the 16th, our contemporary distinctly says that:— "Lower Canada will never consent to a Union such as the Montreal Gazette (and we may add the Toronto Globe) propose. Never will it accept a Union in which the legislative element shall predominate, because such a Union would be certainly the most fatal blow to the nationality, and the institutions of French Canadians."—Courrier du Canada, 16th inst. To this we add. But in any conceivable