

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 210, St. James Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. CLERE, 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.
The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.
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 figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus John Jones, Aug. '71, shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.
S. M. PETERGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. ROWELL & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 1872.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MAY—1872.
Friday, 10—St. Antoninus, B. C.
Saturday, 11—St. Gregory Nazianzen, B. C. D. (May 9.)
Sunday, 12—Sunday within the Octave of the Ascension.
Monday, 13—SS. Nereus, etc., MM.
Tuesday, 14—Of the Octave.
Wednesday, 15—Of the Octave.
Thursday, 16—Octave of the Ascension.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Carlist insurrection is now suppressed. Marshal Bazaine's trial by Court Martial for the surrender of Metz is about to commence; loud complaints have been made in the National Assembly against the dishonesty of the contractors for the French army. The Cincinnati Convention has put forward Mr. Horace Greely as its candidate for the Presidency. In our Legislature, the great event of the week has been Sir J. A. Macdonald's speech in defence of the Washington Treaty. It occupied many hours in the delivery, and is on all sides admitted to have been one of the finest oratorical displays ever witnessed in Canada. We regret to say that fresh difficulties to the carrying out of the Geneva Conference arbitration have arisen.

His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal has issued a Circular Letter with reference to the visit from His Grace the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Province of Quebec, with which Montreal is this week honored, and the ceremonies celebrated in the Church of Notre Dame on the occasion of his assuming the Pallium; the signification of which is by His Lordship fully explained, as are also the ceremonies accompanying its preparation and benediction.

The name Pallium seems to have been given originally to a kind of cloak, or ornamental dress put on by the members of the ancient *hetæra*, or confraternities. It is now confined to an ornament peculiar to the Pope, to Patriarchs, and Archbishops who alone have the right to wear it, and of whose especial dignity it is the emblem. Made of finest wool, shorn from the back of lambs blessed for the purpose, and decorated with the cross, the Pallium is the appropriate symbol of the great flock committed by Our Lord to the care of the Pastors of His Church; worn on the shoulders, it is significant of the functions of that Good Shepherd Who, having lost one of His sheep, goes forth into the wilderness to search for it; and Who having found it, lays it tenderly upon His shoulders, and brings it back with gladness to the fold from whence it had strayed. The Pallium is thus prepared.

Yearly on the 21st January two young lambs are blessed at Mass on the altar of the Church of St. Agnes at Rome, and are then presented to the Sovereign Pontiff who lays his hands upon them. Carefully tended, they are when the fit season arrives, shorn, and their wool is spun by the Sisters of a Religious Community, which is thus made into the Pallium. On the eve of the Feast of the Blessed Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, a certain number of these are reverently deposited in the Confession, from whence, after the First Vespers of the Feast, they are brought with much pomp to the Sovereign Pontiff who blesses them with duly prescribed rites; then they are replaced in a silver casket covered with gold, and laid near the body of the Prince of the Apostles. When an Archbishop is named, he makes application to the Holy See for his Pallium; and his prayer granted by the advice of the Cardinals, he receives, and assumes the mystic dress with many imposing ceremonies after Mass, and after having sworn to defend and uphold the rights of the Holy See, and the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. His Lordship concludes his Circular with an exhortation to the faithful to manifest their love, respect and loyalty to their illustrious Archbishop.

The first steambot of the season, the *Bethier* of the Richelieu Company, from Sorel, arrived in port on Wednesday, 1st inst.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK SCHOOL QUESTION BEFORE THE DOMINION PARLIAMENT.—The grievance of the Catholic minority of the Province of New Brunswick in the matter of Education, was brought before the notice of the Dominion Parliament on Monday, the 29th ult., by M. Renaud, who moved for the production of the correspondence relating to the School Act lately passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick.

The motion was supported in an able speech from Mr. Anglin, who invoked for his co-religionists of New Brunswick the protection of the Confederation Act, which made the Dominion Government the guardian of all educational rights of minorities, guaranteed by local law, at the time that Confederation came into effect. He insisted that the new law was not only iniquitous, but unconstitutional; and a violation, if not of the letter, at all events of the spirit, of the clause of the Confederation Act that secured to all minorities the perpetuance of all privileges in the matter of education, and of separate schools, that were legally existing before the passing of the said Act; and he showed that, by the action in the matter of the New Brunswick legislature, the actual position of the Catholic minority in that Province of the Dominion, had been injuriously affected. He concluded that therefore the Dominion Government was bound to interfere in behalf of the unjustly used minority of New Brunswick, by opposing its veto to the lately passed School Law of that Province.

The question thus raised in our Parliament naturally splits into two distinct questions.—The first being a question as to the intrinsic merits of the New Brunswick law; the second, as to the legal right of the Dominion Government to interfere in the matter. The first is a question of right, or of principle; the second, one simply of law.

On the first of these two questions there was but little difference of opinion expressed in the discussion that ensued. Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier, and other speakers who took an active part in the debate, made no secret of their views as to the injustice, and inexpediency of the Provincial legislation complained of. Sir J. Macdonald appealed to his well-known antecedents to show that he was not one who could approve of any such legislation as that now brought before the notice of the House. "He was very much at one," he said, "with his honorable friend in regard to the separate schools; his record showed this, and he was right glad when his Roman Catholic brethren obtained their separate schools."—So also, much to the same purpose, did Sir George Cartier express himself upon this question on the merits of the lately passed New Brunswick School Law; for, as he remarked, "he very much regretted the action of the New Brunswick Legislature." On the intrinsic merits of that legislation, amongst our leading members of the Dominion Government, there was then but one opinion, and that altogether favorable to the claims of the Catholic minority of New Brunswick.

But on the other question, the strictly legal question: that is to say, the competency of the New Brunswick Legislature to legislate in the manner which both Sir John Macdonald, and Sir George Cartier regretted—the opinion pronounced was not favorable to the claimants.—After a careful perusal of the Confederation Act it did not appear, either to Sir John Macdonald, or to Sir George Cartier, that the new School Law was unconstitutional, or could be vetoed as unconstitutional by the Dominion Government. The Confederation Act only made provision for the perpetuating of such educational privileges as were by positive law in existence in each particular Province at the time when that Act came into force; but as a matter of fact, at that time, there did not exist on the New Brunswick Statute Book any positive provision for Separate Schools—even though as a matter of fact, or in practice, such schools did exist. Interpreted strictly, therefore, as a legal document, the Confederation Act did not oppose any obstacles to the action of the New Brunswick Legislature of which the Catholic minority of that section of the Province now justly complained.

Warmly interested as we necessarily are in the success of the claimants, and sympathizing deeply with them as we do, we feel that on a question of pure law, or the proper interpretation of an Act of Parliament, we cannot presume to set up our opinion against that of eminent members of the legal profession, who took no unimportant part in the drawing up of the Act which they are now called upon to interpret. Much as we may, and do, regret the decision of these gentlemen, we cannot doubt but that it was honestly arrived at, and we therefore bow to it. We feel confident that if the law could, without straining, be so interpreted as to give to the Catholics of New Brunswick that which they ask for, it would be so interpreted by the great lawyers whose names we have mentioned; and we know that that interpretation would be cheerfully accepted by the great body of the Conservative party

throughout the Dominion, and by the Catholics of the Province of Quebec in particular.

But, remembering how we, the Catholics of that Province, are situated; remembering that as compared with the entire population of the Dominion, we are but a minority—we would not on any account have that law strained, no not even for the sake of anticipating by a few months or years, the justice which, if but true to themselves, the Catholics of New Brunswick are certain to obtain. From a question of Education, the question at issue, as presented to our House of Commons—has passed into a question of State Rights, and of Provincial autonomy, or Home Rule. For those Rights, for that autonomy, the TRUE WITNESS has always been, ever will be, the unflinching stickler; and any opposition to, or doubts of the success of, the Act of Confederation that we may have ever manifested or expressed, proceeded purely from the dread that thereby State Rights would not be sufficiently protected, and Provincial autonomy would not be sufficiently secured against the aggressions of centralisation. We cannot, therefore, to-day be recreant to our principles, or forswear our hatred of centralisation, by advocating, even for so valuable an end as justice to our co-religionists of New Brunswick, the extension of the sphere of the Federal Government, or the granting to it powers, not expressly and clearly accorded to it by the Act of Parliament that made it. In short our rule is that, if—when the pretensions of the Federal and Provincial Governments clash—there be a reasonable doubt, the verdict should always be given in favor of the latter, or Provincial Government. Now that there is in the question before us—to wit, the legal right of the Federal or Central Government to disallow the legislation of the State legislature of New Brunswick, room for reasonable doubts—we cannot deny; since we, laymen, have not the presumption to set up our opinion on a question of law,—not of right or of principle,—but of pure law, or the interpretation of a Statute, in opposition to that of eminent juriconsults, and statesmen like Sir John Macdonald, like Sir George Cartier, and other distinguished members of our legislature, who also have adopted the conclusions of their political leaders as to the "legality," not the justice, of the New Brunswick School Law. As Conservatives we are and must be, to the backbone, in favor of State-Rights as against Centralisation.

Yet, for all this, we are not discouraged, we do not propose to ignore the New Brunswick School Question. Discouraged indeed! Why, or how should we be discouraged, after the real victory, because a moral victory, that the Catholic cause has won? It was Napoleon who used to say that in war, "the moral was to the physical as nine to one." So too in politics; and the moral victory is undoubtedly ours.

The public opinion of our best Dominion Statesmen on the merits of the law complained of, has been pronounced. In the House of Commons scarce a voice was raised, we do not say to justify, but even to apologize for it. As an unjust, iniquitous law, more disgraceful to those who enacted it, than onerous even to those who groan beneath it, it has been condemned on all hands. Can it then long stand, or be permitted to disgrace the Statute Book of New Brunswick, if the Catholics of that Province be but true to themselves, and their holy cause? No! that is impossible. For very shame, if not for justice sake, the tyrant majority of New Brunswick will have to give way; and unpalatable to them though it may well be, will be forced to assimilate their legislation to that of Catholic Lower Canada, where the true principles of civil and religious liberty are understood, and practised.

A FAIR STAGE AND NO FAVOR.—"It would thus appear," says the *Witness* of the 11th April, after enumerating the steps taken by the several governments of Europe to assume control of the schools, and to deprive the Church of all influence therein—"it would thus appear that Education is the battle ground where this 'conflict of ages' between the Church of Rome and Protestantism is to be carried on. It was by their schools that the Jesuits, three centuries ago, turned back the Reformation; and as long as the training of the young is left in their hands, they will continue to check-mate it."

This is a remarkable and valuable confession, coming as it does from the lips of an evangelical. If Education be left really free; and if the State interfere not in behalf of Protestantism, the latter has no chance with the Church, cannot resist her, and must, as was the case three centuries ago, still expect to be check-mated.

As to the question of the training of the young, that we assert is a question that the parents of the young, that their fathers and mothers alone, have the right to decide; and that with their exercise of this their legitimate parental function, neither the State, nor any human power or earthly authority has any right to interfere. If they, the parents, see fit to entrust the education of their young to the Jesuits, no one

has the right to say them no, or to put any obstacles in their way; if they do not so see fit, we ask not that the State compel them to send their children to the Jesuit School. All we crave is a fair stage and no favor. In the battle betwixt Protestantism and Catholicity, the conflict of ages, all we ask is that the State be neutral: that it interfere not in favor of either one combatant, or of the other—and we have no doubts as to the result; neither has the *Witness*.

He knows that but for State aid, that but for the material assistance given to it by the Governments, and by the princes of the day, the Reformation would have perished within twenty years of its birth. Its triumphs, such as they were, were due not to the innate force of truth, but to the force of the sword; and wherever the two forces, Catholicity and Protestantism, have been left free to fight out the battle without State interference, there, as the *Witness* recognises, the Reformation has been check-mated.

STRIKES.—These are the order of the day. There are strikes amongst the printers, the carpenters, the agricultural laborers; and the movement has extended to the religious community. The converts of the Swaddling Societies of Canada are actually on the strike, and are insisting upon better terms—failing in obtaining which, the said converts openly declare their intention of going back to Rome, or of joining some other and better paying Protestant denomination. Now the funds of the F. C. M. Society not being in a very flourishing condition, this is a very serious matter indeed; and a French Protestant paper published in Montreal is quite pathetic upon the subject. We translate, literally, a portion of an article that appeared in its columns last week:—

"Every autumn our ministers are harassed (*harcelés*) with proposals of this kind. 'We will come regularly to your church, we will send our children to your schools, but you shall clothe them for us, and furnish us with wood, provisions, etc., etc. It sometimes happens that for several months they have been careful to come very regularly, to persuade the minister that they were converted; but when they find out that our churches do not pay their proselytes, they immediately abandon them, either to return to the Church of Rome, or to connect themselves with some richer church that does not look so close.'

This it is that makes the work of converting the French Canadians so hard. What we may call the "Police Court" class of converts can still be had cheap enough; but for any grade above this class, and that of the inmates of a particular description of houses, a stiff price must be paid, and a liberal allowance made in the shape of clothes, fire-wood, and victuals, failing which comes the "strike." So true it is, "pas d'argent, pas de Suisses." It is probable, too, that the opening of the navigation, which will allow wood-barges to reach the port, and the mild weather, have had much to do with the independent tone adopted by the converts, and with that rise in their market price, of which the French Protestant paper quoted from, so feelingly complains.

VERY ACCOMMODATING.—The Athanasian Creed is the great bone of contention in the Anglican establishment at the present moment. Some are for abolishing it; a few for retaining it as it is; whilst the majority are in favor of retaining it, but with modifications, leaving belief in it optional. The damnatory clauses, if not abolished are to be explained away; and a meeting of Protestant ministers at Oxford proposed the addition to the Creed of the following note:—

"Note, that nothing in this Creed is to be understood as condemning those who, by involuntary ignorance, or invincible prejudice, are hindered from accepting the Faith therein declared."

The principle here involved throws open the gates of heaven not only to all believers, but to all unbelievers—to all heathen—to all in short who through the depths of their ignorance, or the strength of their prejudices, refuse to accept the Christian faith. The principle is also as applicable to morals as to faith; and we may shortly expect to see an Anglican modification of the moral precepts of the Gospel; and a note attached to the very illiberal denunciations of drunkenness, and unchastity which we find in several of the Apostolic writings—explaining that nothing in these is to be understood as condemning those who, from an invincible love of drink, or the strength of their passions, persist in making beasts of themselves. Catholics alone under the new regime will remain exposed to the penalty of damnation.

CAN IT BE OUR SCHOOLS?—The New York *Herald*, astonished and terrified at the rapid growth of horrid crime in the U. States, feels itself obliged to admit that something must be wrong somewhere, but cannot exactly determine what or where. "As we have intimated before," he says:—"there must be something radically wrong in our society, in the laws or the administration of them, when such fearful crimes—crimes by the wholesale—follow each other in quick succession."—*New York Herald*.

Lord Dufferin, the new Governor General for British North America, will sail for New York on Tuesday the 11th of next month.

THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—We are yet unable to report any great improvement in the health of our Bishop. He still remains at the Hospital of the *Hotel Dieu*; but we may hope that as the warm weather comes back to us, so also may his strength and health return to our beloved Bishop.

Mgr. Poinsonneault, Bishop of Birtha, received, in the chapel of the Grey Nunnery, the vows of Sister Margaret Jane Page; and gave the religious habit to Sister M. Anne Franklin—in religion Sister St. Patrick—and to Sisters Caroline J. Janson, Clerina Ledue, and Agnes Carroll.

It is our melancholy duty to record the death of the Rev. M. Prefontaine of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, in the 35th year of his age, and the 9th of his Priesthood. The deceased was attached to the Church of St. Anne, of whose schools he was also in charge. His funeral service was celebrated on Monday last.

The Chapel of Nazareth was solemnly dedicated on Monday the 29th ult. This new sanctuary is attached to the Asylum for the Blind under the care of the Grey Nuns, and is a very elegant building, for which we are indebted to the zeal of the Rev. M. Rousselot, Cure of Notre Dame.

The Rev. Mr. McGavran of St. Patrick's Church, Quebec, is about to make a trip to Europe for the benefit of his health. He has the prayers of his people for his speedy return, with the object of his voyage fully accomplished.

THE MILLION DOLLAR GRANT.—The voting on this question has gone on throughout the week in a most orderly manner. From the first the *Ayes* had it; indeed the votes against the measure are so few in number as to be not worth noticing.

FIRST STEAMER.—The *Scandinavian* arrived in port on Sunday afternoon, being the first arrival of the season of sea-going vessels. Navigation is now open, and many wood barges have arrived in port.

THE CATHOLIC REVIEW—BROOKLYN.—This is the title of a newly published Catholic paper of which one number has reached us.—The appearance of the *Review* is very creditable indeed, and affords a striking proof of the strong position on this Continent that Catholics occupy.

WAS ST. PETER EVER IN ROME? In order to shew our gratitude for small favours, it is well to see what historical testimonies our adversaries are willing to grant us. We have already seen, which they wish to reject. To those from Irenæus downwards already adduced by us, Bishop Brown adds two others, that of the Apostolic Constitutions, and that of Lactantius. The Apostolic Constitutions (VII. 46.) he tells us, say that Linus was made first Bishop of Rome by St. Paul, and that after his death Clement was ordained to the same office by St. Peter.

Lactantius, he says, tells us that the time of St. Peter's going to Rome was the reign of Nero.

After enumerating the discrepancy as to dates of the various testimonies, Bishop Brown draws this—

Objection 9. "None of them say, he was Bishop of Rome. On the contrary all agree in saying that the first Bishop of that See was Linus."

As to the discrepancy of dates, which our worthy Anglican Bishop uses so adroitly, as almost to make it appear as an objection, we would remind our readers, that it does not invalidate the testimony, since it is a question of fact not of dates, that we are considering; and to the fact of Peter having been in Rome all the testimonies agree. And not only does this discrepancy of dates not invalidate the testimony of fact, but it even adds to its value, since it shews, that these witnesses are independent and are not the one following the other. This is important, and confirms what we have already said about *lost records*. There have evidently been different records of events, and these various writers are but bearing testimony from these various records. This discrepancy also points to a further conclusion: that as there were various records of events, there were also various events, and that St. Peter was not only in Rome, but that he was twice there. "Lactantius says Peter was in Rome in the reign of Claudius," says Bishop Brown exactly; and who is to say that both are not right? Has Bishop Brown any especial mission to deny historical facts? If he can prove, that St. Peter was not or could not be at Rome at both, or either of these two specified times, well and good. We are prepared to hear him. But until he can bring against these two testimonies something stronger than *invenio*, we must beg leave to hold them as valid, and as affirming the fact that St. Peter driven from Rome by the Emperor Claudius' decree, banishing the Jews from that city, returned again prior to the persecution of Nero.

That none of the authorities say that St.