

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE
 PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
 No. 696, Craig Street, by
 J. GILLIES,
 G. E. OLDER, 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 5c.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, August '63," shows that he has paid up to August '63, and owes his Subscription from that date.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 27.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JULY—1866.

Friday, 27—Of the Octave.
 Saturday, 28—St. Nazarius Osele, &c., M. M.
 Sunday, 29—Tenth after Pentecost.
 Monday, 30—St. Martha, V.
 Tuesday, 31—St. Ignatius, C.
 Wednesday, August 1—Octave of St. James:
 Thursday 2—Ligouri, B. C.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Our latest news from Europe is by the steamers *Hermann* and *City of Paris*, which bring dates down to the 12th inst. We regret to learn there is but a very slight probability of the speedy termination of the great war now going on in the heart of Europe. The armistice which the Emperor of the French proposed to the belligerent powers has not been agreed upon; negotiations, however, still continue, and it is to be hoped that they will finally result in the establishment of a solid and enduring peace honorable to all parties. As a proof that Napoleon is thoroughly in earnest in this great work of reconciliation, it is stated in semi-official Vienna papers that he has taken fresh steps of an energetic character to effect an armistice, and that armed mediation has been announced at the Prussian headquarters. Whether this means that France is prepared to join her legions to those of Austria, and enter the arena of war side by side with that great Power, our despatches are too meagre to allow us to decide with precision; certain, however, it appears that Austria has played her cards with admirable dexterity, in converting France, by one master-stroke of policy, from a cool, calm spectator, as she had previously appeared to be, into a most friendly power, if not positive ally. In any case, the new face of things seems to be exceedingly favorable to the Papal cause, in which is involved the great cause of civil and religious liberty everywhere, for it is morally impossible that the two great Catholic powers of Europe, now that they are on the point of being masters of the situation, can submit to any terms that will be in the least detrimental to the justly-established claims of the Holy See. If Austria will, at any future date, through the instrumentality of France, cede Venetia to the "Robber King," Victor Emmanuel, we sincerely hope that Napoleon will not neglect this golden opportunity to have tardy justice done to the Sovereign Pontiff. There is another important question which will perhaps receive some developments in the course of these negotiations,—we refer to the fate of Poland. Who knows but that a new Poland will yet spring up from the ashes of the old, to be the bulwark, as in the days of chivalry, of civil liberty and Christian civilization? In whatever direction the cloud that at present overhangs Europe will burst, it is difficult not to admire the great efforts made by the Emperor of the French to have matters settled by diplomacy rather than by the stern alternative of war. As an instance of this untiring energy, we are told by the Paris correspondent of an influential English journal, that during the whole of the 4th of July the Emperor sat by his telegraph wire in the Tuilleries, and till very far in the night, talked with Berlin, Vienna, and Florence. "Alone, with only his telegraphic operator," continues our authority, "he settled by direct communication with the Emperor of Austria, after midnight, the details of the transfer of Venetia." It is not easy to understand how such persistence, coming from so high a quarter, can be unsuccessful, especially in the face of the threatened armed intervention with which Napoleon has lately backed up his proposals, and to which we have already referred. The thorough earnestness of the French Emperor in this matter is still further shown by another piece of intelligence which reaches us to the effect that the authorities of Toulon have received orders to hold themselves in readiness to arm ten steam vessels, with a certain number of frigates and corvettes. Notwithstanding the intervention on the part of France, of which we have spoken, the Italians, we are told, are advancing in spite, it is said, of the French orders. This is probably the reason why the French iron clad squadron, as we are informed immediately afterwards, was ordered to Venetia on the night of the 11th. So far as the Austrians are concerned, we are assured that they are evacuating Venetia, but are leaving the fortresses there well garrisoned. Since the engagements of which we spoke in our last number, they have had five successive encounters with the Italians at Borgoforte, and each time Victor Emmanuel's mercenary horde was completely routed. As to the war in the North, it is stated that, whilst a portion of the Prussian army was marching on Frankfurt-on-the-Main, another had taken possession of Prague, or was about to do so. Prince Charles holds the railroad to Prague, and seems likely to march direct south to Vienna. The Emperor of Austria has issued a manifesto, in which he says that the heavy misfortunes which have befallen his army of the North move his heart to its utmost core; but the reliance he had placed upon the devotion of his people, the courage of his army, upon God and his good and sacred right, had not wavered a single instant. He had addressed himself to the Emperor of the French, requesting his good offices for bringing about an armistice with Italy. Not merely had the Emperor readily responded to his demand, but he offered to mediate with Prussia for a suspension of hostilities; and for opening negotiations for peace. This offer he accepted, and announced himself prepared to make peace upon honorable conditions, to prevent bloodshed and the ravages of war. But he would not make peace by which Austria's position as a great power would be shaken; sooner than this, he would carry on the war to the utmost extremity. All available troops are being concentrated, and the gaps in the ranks filled up by conscription and volunteering. Called to arms by the newly-awakened spirit of patriotism, Austria has been severely visited by misfortune, but she is not humiliated nor bowed down.

The chief topic of interest in our British exchanges is the formation of the new Ministry. Lord Derby, after some difficulty, has succeeded in forming a Cabinet with the following result, published in the *London Morning Herald*:—

First Lord of the Treasury—The Earl of Derby, K.G.
 Lord High Chancellor—Lord Chelmsford.
 Lord President of the Council—Duke of Buckingham.
 Lord Privy Seal—Earl of Malmesbury, G.C.B.
 Chancellor of the Exchequer—right Hon. E. Disraeli.
 Home Secretary—right Hon. S. H. Walpole.
 Foreign Secretary—Lord Stanley.
 Colonial Secretary—Earl of Carnarvon.
 War Secretary—General Peel.
 Indian Secretary—Viscount Canning.
 First Lord of the Admiralty—right Hon. Sir John Pakington, G.C.B.
 Postmaster-General—Duke of Montrose (not in the Cabinet).
 Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—Not filled up.
 President of the Board of Trade—Sir Stafford Northcote.
 President of the Poor-law Board—Mr. G. Hardy.
 Lord Steward—Duke of Marlborough (doubtful).
 Comptroller of the Household—Lord Burghley.
 Lord Chamberlain—Earl of Bradford.
 Vice-Chamberlain—Lord Claude Hamilton.
 Master of the Horse—Duke of Beaufort.
 Master of the Backbonds—Lord Colville.
 First Commissioner of Works—Lord J. Manners (in the Cabinet).
 Lords of the Treasury—Sir R. Bateson, Hon. G. Noel, Lord H. Scott.
 Joint Secretaries of the Treasury—Colonel Taylor, Mr. Ward Hunt.
 Under Secretary for War Department—Earl of Longford.
 Under Secretary for Indian Department—Sir James Ferguson.
 Attorney General—Sir Hugh Cairns.
 Solicitor-General—Mr. Bovill.
 Lord-Lieutenant—Marquis of Abercorn.
 Irish Secretary—Lord Naas (in the Cabinet).
 Lord Advocate—Mr. Patten.

As to the foreign policy of the new Government in the present critical state of affairs, Lord Derby made a statement in the House of Lords on the 9th, in which he said that he held it to be the duty of the country to maintain amicable relations with all foreign countries, avoid entanglement with foreign disputes, and to abstain from all vexatious and irritating interference or advice. With respect to the war in Central Europe, the Government should maintain a peaceful neutrality, but would be prepared, in conjunction with other Powers, whenever a favorable opportunity presented itself, to offer its good offices for the restoration of peace. Commending the action of the United States Government in relation to the Fenians, he paid a warm tribute to the Canadian Volunteers, adding an expression of his desire that a confederation of all the British American Colonies might soon be accomplished. Lord Brougham in a speech lately delivered in the House of Lords, made use of these memorable words:—"Austria is the only power whose conduct (in this European war) can be justified. Italy has not the shadow of a pretext to take Venetia." The utterances of so distinguished a man on this question are of great weight, and tend powerfully to show that the "Robber King" is very far from having the sympathy of the whole British public on this all-engrossing topic. The latest news about the "Great Eastern" is that the telegraphic fleet arrived off Valencia on the 13th. The cable was successfully spliced to the shore end, and the Great Eastern commenced paying out. Signals through the whole cable were perfect.

In the absence of any matter of political interest from the United States, our exchanges take up considerable space in discussing the best means to be taken against that dreadful pestilence, Cholera, which is now, we are sorry to say, slowly but surely on the increase. Nine deaths occurred one day last week among the troops on Hart's Island, near New York, and ten in Governor's Island, whilst in the city itself two cases proved fatal, and in Brooklyn seven deaths occurred out of sixteen cases. Although no alarmists, we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that our community has not yet completely escaped danger from the Cholera this year, for the hot weather, which will continue for some time to come, is exceedingly favorable to the spread of this alarming disease. It, therefore, behooves our Sanitary Committees and police to redouble their energies if possible, whilst all our fellow-citizens should pay additional attention to the cleanliness of their premises, and to their own temperate habits, to avert, as much as lies in our power, the approach of the dread scourger.

Very little of interest to the general public has been done this week in the Canadian Parliament. Indeed so completely is public attention engrossed with Mr. Galt's new Tariff Bill, that every other political matter seems to sink into insignificance. This new measure had undergone considerable modifications since its introduction into the House, and our Ministerial contemporaries confidently assure us that when brought forward, it will receive the support of a large majority of both Houses of Parliament.

UNIONIST PAY.—There is a good deal of dissatisfaction existing among the members of the Active Force who have been on the frontier, in consequence of their being deprived of the arrears of pay still owing them. This does not rest with the officers alone, but extends to the men as well—many of the latter being creditors of the Government to the amount of \$20 and upwards. It is to be hoped that the state of things will not be allowed long to continue. The services of these men may again be required at any moment; but the Government ought to understand that where brave and great sacrifices are made on one side, they should be met with on the other; and that if the men are to fight with a heart, they expect their pecuniary wants will be attended to.—*Transcript.*

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE TEST OATH IN MISSOURI.

Our readers are aware that the democratic party in power in this State has passed a law enacting that no one shall be permitted to preach, teach, or exercise the functions of a minister of religion until he shall have taken a certain oath by it enjoined. This of course implies that the citizen of the United States has no right to open a school, to preach or address a congregation on religious subjects, or to exercise the functions of a minister of religion without the permission of the particular State in which he resides; for, of course, if the latter have the right to impose any restrictions upon teaching, preaching, praying, or offering sacrifice to God, it has an equal right to prohibit them altogether. It is not a question of the right of the State to inquire into seditious teachings, and rebellious preaching, but of its right to prohibit these acts to citizens of the United States, against whom no offence has been established, or stands recorded in any of the Courts of Law. Thus it will be seen that the question embraces the question of the right of teaching, or liberty of education; of the right of preaching or religious liberty—not merely in so far as the residents of the particular State of Missouri are concerned, but of all the citizens of the United States. If every unconvicted citizen of the United States has the civil right to open a school and teach, to build a church and preach therein, liable of course to prosecution if he teach or preach seditious doctrines, or doctrines subversive of the political order of the State, then is the law of Missouri a violation of the rights of the citizens—not of Missouri only, but of the United States. If it be not such a violation, then the United States citizen has not in virtue of his citizenship, the right to open a school and teach, to build a church and preach therein, subject of course to the conditions above indicated—without a special license from the particular State of which he is for the time being a resident. It would follow from this, we say, as a logical consequence, that any one of the Southern States would have the right to prohibit all colored people within its jurisdiction from teaching or preaching, except upon such conditions as its Legislature might see fit to prescribe. This is as clear as any proposition in Euclid.

Let us proceed to apply these principles according to the rules laid down by the advocates of the Civil Rights Bill lately carried by a two-third vote in the Senate against the Presidential veto,—and more particularly according to the law as laid down by the Hon. Mr. Turnbull in his great speech in the Senate. Mr. Turnbull we believe, an eminent juriconsult of the United States, and he is certainly a powerful speaker, and a master of the art of logic-fence.

Now, according to this gentleman, a citizen of United States, carries with him all the civil rights—not all the political rights or privileges indeed—but all the civil rights, of that citizenship into the State, no matter which, in which, for the time being, he may select to fix his domicile; therefore, argued the speaker, the negro, in that he is now a citizen of the United States, has, and must be protected in, all the civil rights of a United States citizen, whether he select to reside in the State of Connecticut, or in that of South Carolina. Now apply this same principle to the case of the teacher or minister of religion in the State of Missouri prohibited by the Legislature of that State from exercising his functions except upon certain conditions by it prescribed.

Every citizen of the United States, not convicted of any crime, either has, or has not, in virtue of that citizenship, the civil right to open a school and teach, to build a church and preach therein, so long as he teach and preach nothing subversive of the State, or *contra bonos mores*. If he has that right, and as the right to preach and teach is a civil, not a political right, or accident, the citizen carries that civil right everywhere along with him, into every State into which it may please him to move; and State law has no more right to deprive him thereof, or to limit him in the exercise thereof, than has the State law of South Carolina or Virginia to deprive the black man, resident within its limits, of any of his civil rights as a citizen, or to limit him in the exercise thereof, on the plea of his color.

We do not of course presume to offer any opinion of our own as to the constitutionality of the law just carried for protecting the civil rights of the negroes lately raised to the status of citizens; but we quote high authority for what we assert; and we contend that, the logic of the Hon. Senator of Illinois be worth one straw in favor of the black man's right to all the civil accidents of United States citizenship, irrespective of the adverse laws or legislation of the particular State of which he may chance to be a resident; then also the preacher or teacher resident in Missouri, being a citizen of the United States, has, if the right to teach and preach be a civil, not a mere political right—and therefore a right common to all United States citizens, without distinction of race, color, or creed—the right, the local laws of Missouri to the contrary notwithstanding, to preach and teach within the limits of that State, subject only to the same conditions or restrictions as those he would be

subject to, were he resident in New York, or Massachusetts. If he has not this right, then it follows logically, that neither has the United States citizen the civil right to teach, preach, or exercise any of the functions of the minister of religion in any State, except under such conditions, as that State may see fit to prescribe; and that therefore in the United States there exists neither liberty of education, nor freedom of religion, as a civil right, common to all U. States citizens; and inherent in that citizenship.

The apologists for the Missouri Test Oath—and such apologists we have in Canada amongst the writers for the *Rouge* press, because the Catholic Church is the object chiefly aimed at by the Missouri democracy—may take which horn of the above dilemma they please. They warmly supported the Civil Rights Bill for the black man of the conquered Slave States, as constitutional, as strictly in accord with the letter and spirit of the United States constitution, as in harmony with the legal decisions pronounced from the Bench of the Supreme Court by intellectual giants such as Chief Justice Marshall and others, quoted by the Hon. Mr. Turnbull. Well then we would propose to them the following questions:—

1. Is the right to preach and teach, and exercise the functions of a priest, a right which the Legislature may confer, limit, or withhold at its pleasure? Is it a civil right, common therefore to all free citizens? or a mere political right, or accident which the Legislature may give, take away, or abridge as it sees good?
2. If a civil right, common to all citizens; and if according to the principle of the black man's Civil Rights Bill, the citizen of the United States always carries along with him all his civil rights into every State of the Union which he may select as his domicile—what better right has the State of Missouri to limit, or assign peculiar conditions for, the exercise of the civil right of teaching and preaching, than would have the State of Virginia to limit, or impose restrictions upon the civil rights of emancipated black citizens of the United States resident within its borders?
3. But if the right to teach, and exercise the functions of a priest, be not a civil right of the citizen of the United States, and common therefore to all without distinction of locality, of color, of politics, of race, or of creed: if every free citizen of the United States has not the civil right to open and teach school, to officiate at the altar, to preach, and exercise the functions of the Christian priesthood—how, and with what face can the *Pays*, or any other *Rouge* organ, maintain that United States citizenship carries with it all the advantages, rights and immunities of freedom of education, and freedom of religion? How, and with what face can it pretend to criticize the action of the European Governments which do not give to foreigners the right to teach and preach doctrines subversive of the Roman Catholic religion and the existing political orders?

In short the whole question resolves itself into this. Is the right to teach and preach a civil right, common to all citizens? or is it a mere political right, or accident, that the State may confer, restrict, or withhold at its pleasure?—These questions we address to the *Pays* in particular, and we wait respectfully for a reply.

Throughout the British Empire, now-a-days, talk right to preach and teach, &c., is recognised as a civil right, inherent in all its citizens.

A FALSE ALARM.—Our contemporary of the *Daily Witness* has another grumbling article, in a late issue, on the School Question. This time the learned editor's anxiety, or rather ire, is excited by the sad prospect looming in the distance, that the present School Bill before Parliament is to put the Protestant minority of Lower Canada completely under Popish sway,—a sway which, if we believe the *Witness*, is of a most merciless description. So far, however, as the public have been let into the secrets of the Bill referred to, there does not seem to be the slightest foundation for this storm of indignation on the part of our contemporary. There are many other organs of Protestant opinion in Lower Canada besides the *Daily Witness* of Montreal, and we have failed to see in them a single remark showing that the interests of their co-religionists in the matter of education are in the slightest danger. So long as this is the case, and until Parliament will have given us a little more inkling into the matter, we will treat this last cry of "Popish encroachments" on the part of the *Witness* as only another "false alarm,"—a species of childish play in which our contemporary appears to be quite an adept. We, too, will watch the fate of this Bill with some anxiety, because we believe that every change in the School Laws of this Province has, as a general rule, an important bearing on the rising generation, and as such, is well worthy of the attention of every well-wisher of his country. There is, however, one great principle on which the whole foundation of education rests, and which we have frequently endeavored to instil into the mind of our contemporary, but as yet, it appears, in vain; else, why all this hue and cry? It is this: That the edu-

cation of the child belongs to the parent before it belongs to the State; and that it is consequently an act of gross injustice, and a flagrant abuse of power on the part of the State to compel the parent to contribute to a school to which he has a religious objection to send his child. This is the principle on which the whole fabric of education depends; this is the principle which the greatest names in the annals of statesmanship have unwaveringly defended, and in this age of ours, when almost every principle on which society rests, has met with opponents, any person will be found foolhardy enough to contest this great truth, he may safely promise himself the well-merited scorn, some day or other, of the wisest and best of his race. If the Protestants of Lower Canada shall have any reasonable cause of complaint in this particular matter of legislation, they know well in what quarter to apply, to remedy their grievances. So far as we are concerned, we earnestly hope that equal and impartial justice will be meted out to all irrespective of creed or nationality, and as we will never be satisfied if we see our co-religionists deprived of a single right that belongs to them, according to the principles of the natural law and of the Constitution under which they have the happiness to live, so are we anxious that our Protestant fellow-colonists should have every advantage to which in justice they have a right. More than this no reasonable man will ask us to grant; to wish for less, would be contrary to the first promptings of Christian justice. Such being the case, and such the sentiments which animate the whole Catholic body in Lower Canada, it is with no little surprise that we observe the *Daily Witness* raise, without the slightest reason, this tremendous shout of "Popish encroachments," thereby contributing most effectually to generate much lamentable dissension in a community which has, up to the present, been distinguished for a remarkable degree of harmony, union, and happiness. From the gloomy bigotry of the *Daily Witness* we appeal with pleasure to our other Protestant exchanges of Lower Canada, equally able if not more so, but less bigoted, and we respectfully ask them if anything in the previous history of this Province justifies this grave suspicion raised by our Evangelical contemporary against the Catholic majority of Lower Canada.

CONSECRATION OF THE NEW BISHOP OF ST. HYACINTHE.—The *Minerve*, of the 21st instant, contains the following interesting communication, relative to the consecration of the new Bishop of St. Hyacinthe. It will be seen that a special train will leave Montreal for St. Johns on the morning of the consecration, and return the same afternoon:—

"On Sunday, the 29th July instant, the Consecration of the new Bishop of St. Hyacinthe, the Rt. Rev. Charles Larocque, will take place in the Church at St. Johns. The Consecrating Prelate will be His Lordship, the Administrator of the Archdiocese of Quebec, assisted by their Lordships, the Bishop of Montreal and the Bishop of Ottawa. All the Bishops of the Province have given us to hope that it will be possible for them to do their new *confreres* in the Episcopate the honor of being present at his consecration.

"The new Bishop has requested me to inform his friends and the members of the clergy of the different Dioceses of the Province in general, that he has made no particular invitations for his consecration; but that he hopes, nevertheless, that all those of his *confreres* who will not be detained by the duties of their situation, will do him the honor of assisting thereat, to ask of God to pour down upon him His most abundant graces and benedictions, and to enhance by their presence the magnificence of that ceremony in itself so beautiful and so grand.

"A special train will leave Montreal for St. Johns on Sunday morning, at a quarter past seven. So that all those who will go to St. Johns by Montreal, can avail themselves, on Saturday night, of the generous hospitality of the Bishopric and Seminary of Montreal, who have kindly consented to this arrangement, and they will be certain to be at St. Johns in time for the ceremony, which will commence at 9 o'clock sharp. The passage from Montreal to St. Johns is done easily in an hour. This special train will return to Montreal on the same afternoon, Sunday.

"His Lordship the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe will take possession of his Diocese on the following Tuesday, the 31st July. His Lordship will arrive at St. Hyacinthe at nine o'clock in the morning, and will immediately proceed to the Episcopal Palace, with their Lordships, the Rt. Rev. Bishops, and all the members of the Clergy, who will be kind enough to accompany him from Montreal. A few moments afterwards will commence the ceremony of the installation, which will probably terminate at eleven o'clock.

(Signed)
 L. Z. MOREAU, Priest, Sec.
 Bishopric of St. Hyacinthe, July 19th 1866.

The Queen has been pleased to direct letters patent to be passed under the great seal, granting the dignity of a baron of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland unto Charles Stanley, Viscount Monk.

ACCIDENT AT THE HOUSE.—About half-past seven, p.m., on Tuesday as the Parliamentary buildings were being lighted up, an explosion of gas took place which carried away the stone steps at the Speaker's entrance of the Legislative Council wing. Through some defect in the pipe leading into that portion of the building, an escape of gas had taken place; completely filling the chamber under the steps; and as the young man opened the door leading thereto, with light in hand, the explosion took place instantaneously, with a fearful crash, but fortunately doing no other damage. Work was immediately commenced to ascertain where the leakage had occurred. Ottawa, Times: 13th.