

## The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 225, 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, OCTOBER 14.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

OCTOBER—1864.

Friday, 14—St. Calixtus, P. M.  
Saturday, 15th—St. Theresa, V.  
Sunday, 16—Twenty-Second after Pentecost.  
Monday, 17—St. Hedwig, V.  
Tuesday 18—St. Luke, Ev.  
Wednesday, 19—St. Peter of Alcantara, Conf.  
Thursday, 20—St. John of Cantii, C.

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

Friday 14—St. Edward.  
Sunday, 16—St. Theresa.  
Tuesday, 18—St. Placide.  
Thursday, 20—St. Joachim Point Claire.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK

Rumors of a convention or agreement between Louis Napoleon and the robber King, with a view to the withdrawal from Rome of the French army of occupation, have been for some time in circulation, and have at last been confirmed by the tidings of which the substance will be found on our sixth page. Within two years from the date of the signature of the convention, the French troops are to leave Rome; and Victor Emmanuel engages himself to keep his hands from picking and stealing, to abstain from attacking Rome himself, and to prevent any attack upon the Eternal City by the Garibaldians, and extreme revolutionists; he also engages to take upon himself the burden of the public debt of those Provinces which he has wrested from the Holy See, and of which he holds military possession. It is also stipulated that the Sovereign Pontiff shall raise and support a body of troops for his own defence against the internal enemies with whom he has to deal; and that since Rome cannot become the capital of the *bogus* Italian Kingdom, the honors of metropolitan city are to be transferred from Turin to Florence. Military as well as political reasons are assigned for this latter change.

Any how, the people of Turin, who care more about their own petty and local interests than about those of the Italian Kingdom of which their city has hitherto been the nominal capital, are highly indignant; and already, we are happy to say, serious disturbances have broken out in Turin, which it is to be hoped may have still more serious consequences, and lead to a rupture between the Piedmontese Government and its subjects. Scarcely can it be doubted that the Neapolitans will also see in these events further motives for prolonging their arduous struggle against Piedmontese rule; and the same local jealousies which have stirred up the people of Turin, will influence the citizens of Naples against a Government which has reduced their beloved city from the rank of capital of a European monarchy, to that of a petty provincial town.

It may be asked what part does the Sovereign Pontiff take in those arrangements? does he revoke his "*non possumus*?" does he consent to barter away any of the territories of the Church which were committed to him when he ascended the Papal throne? As far as we can see the Pope takes no part whatever in the business, which is wholly transacted between Louis Napoleon on the one part, and Victor Emmanuel on the other. The Pope engages himself to nothing, and makes no concessions. In spite of all that the two contracting parties may say or do, they cannot bind a third, who is not a party to their treaties; they cannot deprive him of the least of his rights—or rather the rights of the Holy See—over provinces wrested from it by Piedmont. Victor Emmanuel indeed engages himself neither directly nor indirectly to take part in any assault upon Rome or the Pope; but the latter does not, so it appears to us, agree to waive any of his claims over the territories of the Church, or in any manner bind himself to recognize the pretensions of the Piedmontese usurper. In so far as the rights and duties of the Pope are concerned, the treaty between Louis Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel, is of no more consequence than a sheet of waste paper. The Sovereign Pontiff at all events, remains free and untrammelled.

But another question that prevents itself, is—Will Victor Emmanuel remain faithful to his engagements? will he suspend his policy of aggression upon his weaker neighbor? will he abandon his designs upon Rome? These questions may be best answered by an appeal to the antecedents of Victor Emmanuel, to the proofs that he has already given, that no engagements, however solemn, can bind him; that no promises from his mouth offer the slightest obstacle to his ambitious designs. The man who ere the ink was well dry, violated every important article of the Treaty of Villa Franca, is not likely to turn out to be a very scrupulous observer of the convention of September 1864. He is the leader of the Italian Liberal party; and the Liberal party has always and everywhere approved itself destitute of honor, regardless of truth and justice.

We expect nothing therefore from the good faith of Victor Emmanuel, and we hope but little from the action of Louis Napoleon. True, he also is a party to the convention; true also that he thereby binds himself to respect, and to cause others to respect the independence of Rome and the Sovereign Pontiff. But he also was a party to the Treaty of Villa Franca, and he also, as we remember, allowed, or winked at, the violation of that Treaty in its all most important provisions. We would not accuse Louis Napoleon of entertaining designs hostile to the Papacy: nay, we believe that in so far as without endangering his own position, or compromising himself with the party of the Revolution to which he in virtue of his position belongs—he can do so, he will gladly maintain the temporal power of the Pope, and assert the integrity of the Holy See; but neither do we suspect the man of any romantic devotion to the Church, nor do we believe him willing to break with the Revolution altogether, in the interests of Catholicity.

But if France, forgetful of the glorious traditions of her past, and careless of her reputation for the future, abandon her duties as the eldest child of the Church, it will not be forgotten that the Church has other children who will perhaps gladly and proudly occupy the honorable post which in obedience to the behests of the Revolution France has ignobly deserted. As an independent sovereign, menaced by his neighbors, abandoned by his natural allies, the Holy Father might call on Spain, and promptly would the chivalrous children of Spain respond to the call of the Father of Christendom in his distress. Besides it appears that the Pope is to be invited to raise an efficient army of his own, for his protection against the rascal hordes of Liberalism, and the *canaille* of the Revolution. Here then is a glorious opportunity for the sons of Erin to display their manhood and their devotion. Instead of shedding their blood in the interests of an obscene Yankee Silesius like Abe Lincoln and in an unholy cause, they will be able to find honorable and most righteous service in the Papal Brigade which of course will soon again be incorporated, and in which the gentleman and the Christian should feel it an honor to be enrolled. No. Though France, or rather though Louis Napoleon, may abandon the Holy Father, and enter into compact with the oppressors and spoilers of the Church, yet we fear not for our Pope. God will raise up protection for him, nor will He leave His servant, His Vicar upon earth, naked to his enemies.

It is not as yet easy to determine in what light this action of Louis Napoleon is viewed by the Catholic and anti-Catholic parties in Europe. In so far as France is concerned, all seem to admit that she has lost *prestige* by consenting to abandon a policy of which, if Louis Napoleon has reaped the profits, General Cavaignac was the author. But in so far as the Church is concerned opinions vary. Some Catholic journalists see in recent events, and in the abandonment by Victor Emmanuel of the idea of Rome as his capital, a great gain to the Pope: and it is to be hoped, and indeed reasonably expected that one effect will be to widen the breach, and to intensify the existing hostility between Victor Emmanuel and the extreme Garibaldians. From the falling out of rogues, good to honest men is always to be expected.

On the other hand France again ratifies the acts of robbery perpetrated by Piedmont upon the States of the Church, and in a manner guarantees to the thief the quiet possession of his plunder. She also, since it is notorious that no reliance can be placed upon any pledges to the contrary given by the government of Victor Emmanuel, virtually abandons Rome and the Holy Father to the tender mercies of the most unscrupulous, the most acquisitive, and the most dishonest of European sovereigns; and indeed the withdrawal of her army of occupation seems almost intended to invite Piedmontese attack upon the territories of the Sovereign Pontiff. Thus it would appear as if there were both good, and evil elements in the scheme. On the one hand the abandonment of Rome as the capital, is the virtual abandonment of the idea of an Italian Kingdom: for though the Neapolitans might consent to be governed from Rome, and to waive the pretensions of their own city in favor of the City called Eternal, they will never consent to be ruled by a Government located either in Florence or in Turin, to which attach none of those grand historic memories and moral prestige

that adhere to Rome. So far there would seem to be good; but on the other hand it is to be feared that the attack on Rome is only postponed to a more convenient season; and that the Treaty or Convention of Louis Napoleon with Victor Emmanuel will not prove very effectual to restrain the ambitious and aggressive designs of the latter. On the whole we fear that the evil propensities over the good, and were it not for the promises of Him Who founded His Church upon the rock almost should we be inclined to tremble. At all events we are about to witness a new phase of the Italian Question. Victor Emmanuel, like Grant with Richmond, finds it impossible to succeed against Rome by an attack in front—so he is attempting to turn its flanks, in which movement every Catholic will pray that he may be ignominiously discomfited.

As the time for the Presidential election draws nigh it becomes a political necessity to the Unionists to confirm the failing spirits of their friends by constant announcements of brilliant victories. To the account of this political necessity must be set down the triumphant tone of late telegrams, which relate the great successes of the Yankees over the Confederates. The real truth of the matter seems to be that the Federals have nothing to boast of, and that their position in the South and West is not brilliant. Sherman finds his communications harassed by the Confederates, and can scarce maintain his position. In Tennessee the Federals have been worsted. Missouri is almost entirely in possession of the Southerners, and Sheridan has been effectually brought to a stand still by General Early. Telegrams may cry "*victory, victory*" if they will, but the late rise in the price of gold gives them the lie, and inspires us with hopes that the cause of liberty and "States' Rights" is by no means in a desperate or even very precarious position.

The Colonial Delegates to discuss the Union of the B. N. A. Provinces were to have held their first meeting at Quebec on Monday. It is expected that their deliberations will last throughout the week—and that the results arrived at will shortly be made public.

Our neighbor, the *Montreal Gazette*, boasts that we think prematurely, of having convicted the TRUE WITNESS of inconsistency, in that the last named journal is of opinion that in Canada, and indeed in British North America, we have not the "social elements" of Great Britain, "and are therefore unable to reproduce the peculiar political system" of the latter—especially its hereditary monarchy; and in that we also express an opinion, a strong opinion, against the system of an elective executive such as obtains in the United States. Wherein, we ask the *Gazette*, is there any inconsistency between those two opinions?

First we state a fact; that we have not in North America the social system of Great Britain. We have not got the latter's landed gentry, or its law or custom of primogeniture, to which the existence of a wealthy and political influential class of British society is due. Is this statement true, or is it false?

In the second place we conclude from the facts or premises—1st. that our social system, or social life, is not as that of Great Britain—and, 2nd, that the political system of a people must be in harmony with its social system, or else revolution is inevitable,—that it is in vain to attempt to reproduce in British North America the peculiar political system of Great Britain; since the result would be a want of harmony between our political and social systems. Is not this conclusion a logical deduction from our premises? If it is not, we are open to correction.

Again we express our opinion that the Yankee democratic system of an elective executive should be held in abhorrence by the loyal subject of Queen Victoria, by every man who loves liberty and order. An "elective executive," we have said, and we repeat it, is in our opinion a curse, an evil to be avoided, rather than a blessing to be courted. Is there in this expression of opinion anything unbecoming a loyal British subject, or incompatible with the opinion that we cannot reproduce in British North America the peculiar political system which obtains in Great Britain? If so, we are open to correction.

If indeed the TRUE WITNESS advocated the separation of these Provinces from Great Britain, if the TRUE WITNESS had in any manner advocated a course of policy which by tending to assimilate our institutions to those of the States must tend to precipitate the evil, but we fear inevitable, hour when the tie which binds us to Victoria's Empire shall be severed—then indeed we might be taunted with inconsistency. But as the ever recurring burden of our song is "let us do all in our power to maintain and prolong our connection with the Mother Country; let us use all means in our power to put off or delay, even if we cannot avert, the calamity that menaces us"—we can see in the passages which the *Gazette* cites against us, but proof of our aversion to the impending constitutional changes; which we fear can but have the effect of assimilating our institutions to those Yankee institu-

tions which we abhor, and therefore of precipitating the evil day when in default of an hereditary sovereign we shall be compelled to fall back upon an elective executive.

The *Gazette* takes further exception to our comments upon the evils of an elective executive, in that we have failed to take account of the fact that, in case of what it ludicrously calls a "Confederation" of the British North American Colonies, the Governors of the several States or Provinces members of that Confederation, might be appointed by the Federal or central government. This is certainly true; for it never entered into our imagination that any one would be so foolish as to apply the term "Confederation" to a system such as that anticipated, and hinted at, by the *Montreal Gazette*. What is the possible use of keeping up the farce any longer? No one is deceived by it. The *Gazette* knows, the advocates of the proposed "constitutional changes" know, that the result thereof cannot bear the most distant resemblance to a Confederation, or to any Federal system of Government that has ever existed since the days of the Amphictyons to those of Abe Lincoln and Jeff Davis. We, in our article which the *Gazette* criticises, considered the inevitable consequences of a real Federation upon the several Provinces; and we therefore, of course, assumed that all executive offices or appointments within the several States or members of that Federation, would be perfectly independent of the central or Federal Government; for to give to the latter any the slightest power of interference with the internal affairs of its several component parts would be destructive of the Federal principle. The Governor of a State is not only head of the executive, but is necessarily one of the branches of the legislature, since he exercises legislative as well as executive functions. What then would remain of the Federal principle, were the central government to be invested with the right of appointing or nominating one of the branches of the legislature of the several States? what vestige under such circumstances would remain of State Rights, and Provincial autonomy? And yet the only reason that can be assigned for preferring a Federal to a Legislative, or Incorporating Union is this: That under the former the Rights of the several States and their autonomy would be secured. Therefore again we say that we would infinitely prefer a Legislative or Incorporating Union of the several British North American Colonies, to the mongrel Union which the *Gazette* advocates, and which would entail on us all the expenses, all the inconveniences, and all the cumber of a Federal Union, without a single one of its compensating advantages in the shape of security to our local institutions.

The farce of Colonial Federation is pretty nigh played out. The mask that its advocates have hitherto worn in the vain hopes of concealing their features is too transparent; it is so flimsy that every one not stone blind can see through it. No one is imposed on by it any longer. There is no one so simple, or so dull of intellect as not to perceive that the scheme in contemplation, and traced out by the *Globe* and the *Gazette*, is neither more nor less than a Legislative Union of the British North American Provinces, with Representation by Population; and that the terms "Federation" and "Confederation" are only made use of to gull simpletons as are the sugar and molasses with which nurses try to deceive and coax the peevish child making wry faces at the obnoxious dose of physic. The *Gazette* knows as well as we do, that it is the rankest humbug to apply the term "Confederation" to such a Union as that which it contemplates; and the sheerest hypocrisy to pretend that therein is to be found any the slightest guarantee for the local and peculiar institutions of any one of the several Provinces, should unfortunately those institutions be obnoxious to the national or religious prejudices of the majority of the central government. Drop then the useless mask with which in vain you attempt to conceal your true features; and do cease your nauseating cant about Federation, and a Federal Union of the Colonies. You deceive nobody except those who from party motives are determined to be deceived; who having eyes see not, and who having ears yet cannot hear. The sham has been long enough kept up; amusing perhaps at first, it is now simply tiresome to the spectators, and degrading to those who take active part therein.

It is easy, by leaving out, or suppressing a single word of an opponent's argument to make him appear in a ludicrous light. Thus has the *Courier du Canada* dealt with us, by omitting the single word "Colonial." We had argued with him that, whilst we intended to express no opinion hostile to "Confederation," we objected to the scheme of union proposed for the B. N. A. Colonies, seeing that *Colonial* Confederation, in the proper sense of the term Confederation, was impossible.

We cited, first the definition of Confederation given by the *Canadien* of Quebec; and then the terms upon which alone, according to that journal not unfavorable to the Ministerial policy, a Confederation is possible:—

"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 powers." *Canadien*, August 26.

To this definition of, and to the conditions assigned by the *Canadien* as indispensably necessary to any real Confederation, we supposed that the *Courier du Canada* would not object, and we therefore gave it as the major premiss of our syllogism.

Our minor was:—

"But Colonies are not sovereign independent States."

And therefore our conclusion was against, not "Confederation" as the *Courier du Canada* in its issue of the 28th ult. incorrectly asserts—but against a "Colonial Federation." Here are our words:—

"Therefore it is 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 desire its authority, not from within, or from the States over which it bears 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."—*True Witness*, 23rd ultimo.

Our argument is of course a legitimate subject of criticism, and as such the *Courier du Canada* had the right to deal with it; but we contend that it had not the right to misrepresent it, either by the *suggestio falsi*, or by the *suppressio veri*—by adding of its own thereunto, or by suppressing the word "Colonial," upon which our argument entirely depended, and which we had therefore because of its significance expressly marked in Italics. It is, we will not say dishonest, but scarcely within the limits of honorable discussion, thus first to distort an opponent's meaning, and then to hold him up to ridicule as inconsistent and self-contradictory. We certainly expected better things from the *Courier du Canada*.

Once again therefore—and we have the right to ask the *Courier du Canada* to set us right with his readers to whom he has grossly misrepresented us—we will define our position.

Without committing ourselves on the question of "Confederation" which has not yet come up for discussion, because there can only be Confederation (as the *Canadien* says), between "Sovereign Independent States," and the British North American Colonies are not "Sovereign Independent States"—we declare ourselves decidedly opposed to that proposed mongrel union of the said Colonies to which the ludicrous misnomer of Confederation is applied by certain of our Ministerial contemporaries.—It is "*Colonial Federation*," not Federation that we oppose; and we oppose the former because "*Colonial*."

*Colonial* Confederation is impossible; and the term is employed only to deceive the less educated classes of the people, and thus to induce them to swallow the nasty dose of representation by population, and to submit to the unjust and insolent pretensions of Protestant U. Canada. When the question of a real, not a *bogus*, Confederation shall come up—a Confederation in which the essential principle is clearly laid down, "that the Federal Government holds from the States, and not the States from the Federal Government," then will it be time enough to discuss the merits or demerits of a Federal form of Government. At the present it is enough for us to expose a gross imposture, and a dangerous snare.

And if after all that we have said the *Courier du Canada* still cannot or will not understand us, we will indicate a method by following which our meaning will become clear to him.—Let him take a sheet of paper, and write out thereon a clear and exhaustive definition of the words Federation and Confederation, distinguishing sharply wherein a Federal Union differs essentially, or *formally*, from a Legislative Union.—When he shall have done this, we do not fear that we shall be any longer unintelligible to him.

And if he should still ask what is the object of the TRUE WITNESS in opposing the "constitutional changes" proposed to us by the Ministry as "*Colonial Confederation*," we tell him again that our object is to assure to Lower Canada the chance of taking part in a real Confederation when the time for such a measure has arrived. The day must come when what are now British Colonies shall become independent States. It is our desire, it should be the object of every patriotic Canadian, that when that day arrives, the position of the several Provinces or Colonies towards one another shall be as was the position towards one another of the Thirteen Colonies which in the last century wrested their independence from Great Britain, when that independence was acknowledged by the Government of George III. We would, that when our connection with the Imperial Government of Great Britain shall have been dissolved, Lower and Upper Canada should then occupy as towards one another the positions respectively occupied towards one another by Massachusetts and Virginia at the close of the war of American Independence. Then indeed, and in such circumstances, but in such circumstances only, would Upper and Lower Canada be able to contract a real and mutually profitable Federal Union.—