

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
At No. 212, 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, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.  
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.  
The True Witness can be had at the News 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, MARCH 24.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.  
MARCH—1865.

Friday, 24th—Five Wounds of our Lord.  
Saturday, 25th—ANNUNCIATION. Obligation.  
Sunday, 26th—Fourth of Lent.  
Monday, 27th—Of the Feria.  
Tuesday, 28th—Of the Feria.  
Wednesday, 29th—Of the Feria.  
Thursday, 30th—Of the Feria.  
The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—  
Saturday, 25th—Convent of St. Lawrence.  
Monday, 27th—Seminary of St. Theresa.  
Wednesday, 29th—Convent of St. Henry.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

In the death of the other matter, the publication of Louis Napoleon's long announced and anxiously looked for "Life of Caesar," may be looked upon as the event of the week. As yet only the Preface has been given to the world, but the first volumes were expected to be issued from the press about the beginning of the present month, and the critics are all intent to profit by their appearance.

When an Emperor appears before the public as an author he merits a careful reading, and this no doubt a "Life of Caesar" by Louis Napoleon will receive, not only from its intrinsic importance, but from the peculiar position of its writer. Of course—and this the Preface seeks not to conceal—instead of Caesar we must read Napoleon, if we would understand the object of the work, which is to show that God providentially raises up from time to time, great men, such as Caesar, Charlemagne and Napoleon, to regenerate the world and society; and that peoples who obstinately refuse to accept these great and providential men as their leaders, who smite them with the dagger of the assassin, or consign them to exile in St. Helena, act as the Jews acted in crucifying their Messiah, renounce their future, and pronounce on themselves and their descendants the doom of death.

In the British Parliament there have been lively debates, resulting as all such debates result in mere expenditure of breath. They will have this good effect however, in that they will direct public attention to Ireland, and thus compel the Government of the day to be careful in its mode of dealing with that portion of the Empire. The London Times on the subject publishes some very important statistics, showing that in spite of bad seasons, famine, and emigration, Ireland is still one of the most densely populated countries in Europe; and that though nearly destitute of manufactures, and industrial occupation for its inhabitants, it contains a far larger population per acre than does France with its superior soil, and more genial climate. The ratio of population to area in France is as 178 to every square mile; in Ireland as 184 persons to the square mile. The average mortality of Ireland is also, according to the same statistics, considerably less than in France; in the most wretched districts of the first named country never exceeding 2 per cent per annum, whilst in some parts of France it averages about 3 per cent.

The Continental news is of no great importance. In Italy every thing seems for the present to have relapsed into a state of peace. The health of the Holy Father was reported excellent, and he had received an Address from the Catholic visitors at Rome, expressing their unqualified loyalty to the Holy See, and thanking him for his late Encyclical. The Address was read by Lord Stafford, and His Holiness returned a most gracious reply.

The news from the seat of war on this Continent is anything but cheering to the friends of liberty, or encouraging to the people of Canada. The Confederates seem now to be pretty nearly exhausted. Oppressed by superior numbers, right must succumb to might, and to brute force. They have made a noble struggle for their independence and the cause of freedom and justice—a struggle which will form the brightest page of American History to all generations; but like the Poles their fate is to all human appearance sealed, and the victory of democratic tyranny accomplished.

The tone of the Southern press is desponding. The President has sent a Message to Congress of the Confederate States in which he depicts in strong colors the almost desperate condition of

the country. The enemy are superior in force on every point, and General Lee is unable to meet his opponents with any prospects of success, owing to his inferior numbers.

Before its prorogation, the Provincial Parliament voted the appropriation of a million of dollars to the defence of the country. This is so far good, but what as compared with our actual wants are a paltry million of dollars! We have an army and a navy to construct; fortifications to build and arm; canals and railroads to open up, so as to maintain communication betwixt the Ocean and Lake Ontario, without which money and men, ships and guns, would be of no avail for the protection of the Province, since its defence consists essentially in the maintaining of a naval supremacy on the Lakes and the St. Lawrence.

The St. Alban's case is again before the Courts, Judge Smith having recovered from his long and severe indisposition. A final judgment is expected this week.

CATHOLIC RIGHTS AND PROTESTANT RIGHTS.

—With respect to the division on the 13th ult., upon M. Bourassa's motion, we think it right to give the list of members who voted thereupon, as published by authority in the "Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly":—

March 13th—Hon. Mr. Att. General Macdonald moved that a Select Committee, consisting of Hon. Messrs Att. General Macdonald and Cartier, and Galt and Brown, and M. M. Robitaille and Haultain be appointed to draft an address to Her Majesty on the Resolution agreed to on Friday last, the 10th instant, on the subject of the Union of the Colonies of British North America.

M. Bourassa moved an amendment, that the following words be added to the original motion:—"and that it be an instruction to the said Committee to provide that the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada be placed on the same footing as the Protestant minority of Lower Canada under the Local Governments of the Confederation of the Provinces of British North America";—

which was negatived on the following division:—

Ayes: Messieurs Bourassa, Caron, Coupal, Dorion [Drummond and Artabasque], Dorion [Hoehelaga], Dufresne [Iberville], Fortier, Geoffroy, Holton, Houde, Labreche-Viger, Lafontaine, Lajoie, Macdonald [Cornwall], O'Halloran, Paquet, Perreault, Pinsonneault, Rymal, and Sylvain.—20.

Nays: Messieurs Abbott, Allyn, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Biggar, Blanchet, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burwell, Cameron [North Ontario], Carling, Attorney General Cartier, Cartwright, Cauchoy, Chapais, Cockburn, Connors, Cowan, Currier, De Boucherville, Denis, De Niverville, Dickson, Duckett, Dufresne [Montcalm], Dunsford, Evanturel, Ferguson [Frontenac], Ferguson [South Simcoe], Galt, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gibbs, Harwood, Haultain, Higginson, Howland, Jones [South Leeds], Knight, Langevin, Le Boutillier, Attorney General Macdonald, Macdonald [Toronto West], Mackenzie [Lambton], Mackenzie [North Oxford], Magill, McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGiverio, McLuttre, McKellar, Morris, Morrison, Parker, Poulin, Poirer, Powell, Raymond, Remillard, Robitaille, Ross, Ross [Oxaplan], Ross [Duquesne], Ross [Prince Edward], Scatcherd, Scoble, Shanly, Smith [East Durham], Smith [Toronto East], Somerville, Sturton, Thompson, Tremblay, Wallbridge [North Hastings], Walsh, Wells, White, Willson, Wood, and Wright [East York].—85.

The Toronto Globe is naturally jubilant over the result of this division, as fatal to the arrogant demands of a Romish minority in Upper Canada, to be placed in educational matters on a footing of equality with a Protestant minority in Lower Canada:—

Mr. Bourassa, in a similar way, proposed to secure to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada who refuse to support our non-sectarian system of common school education, the same legal privileges as are allowed to Protestants in Lower Canada who refuse, as they must do, to support the sectarian system of the French Roman Catholic majority. The two cases are not in the slightest degree similar, but Mr. Bourassa thought the French supporters of Confederation would be embarrassed by his motion and therefore overlooked its manifest unfairness. He does not, however, seem to have caught any of his unionist fellow-countrymen, as his own party is large enough to furnish the twenty votes which he got. Mr. Bourassa was not so glaringly inconsistent as was Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, yet it is always a little amusing to see the Rouges, whose real ideas of religion are understood to be so extremely "liberal," striving to outbid the French Conservatives in their devotion to the interests of Mother Church.—Globe.

This then is the first ostensible fruits of the union of so-called Catholic Conservatives with the Clear-Grits of Upper Canada; and from the language of Mr. George Brown's organ, it is clear that the Ministry have no intention to do justice towards the Catholics of the West, whatever may be their benevolent intentions towards the Protestants of the East. "The two cases are not in the slightest degree similar," says Mr. George Brown's paper; and it is true that there is betwixt them all the difference that there is betwixt "my" ox, and "your" ox. In other words, there is still to be henceforward one law for Papists, and another law for Protestants.

We see not however what there is to marvel at in the fact noticed by the Globe, that the Opposition section of the French Canadians, whom it brands as Rouges, displayed more zeal in the cause of Freedom of Education for Catholics, than did those whom it qualifies as "French Conservatives." This is only what we have seen for years; and is just what was to have been expected from men who invariably subordinate principle to party, and with whom Conservatism consists solely, in keeping one set of men in office, and thus assuring to themselves an ample share in the distribution of the public plunder.—Very likely that of those who voted "Yea" on M. Bourassa's motion were influenced by a mere spirit of party-opposition, and cared nothing for the principle at issue; but as the ridiculous nick-name "Rouge" is applied to every

public man who does not so act as if the Alpha and Omega of politics were to keep the present Ministry in office, no matter at what cost to the best interests of the country, it is equally credible that a still greater number of those who voted with the minority, were actuated by conscientious principles.

The fact is that the terms "Rouge" and "Conservative" are ridiculously misapplied.—If by the former opprobrious epithet be meant a democrat, or the fautor of anti-Catholic and revolutionary principles, then most assuredly may it justly be applied to those, amongst French Canadians and Catholics, who in any manner ally themselves politically with Mr. George Brown, and the revolutionary and anti-Catholic party of whom he is the head, and as it were the incarnation. If by the term "Conservative" is meant one who, like the TRUE WITNESS, with all his heart and soul and strength, loathes and abhors the party of the Revolution; its principles, and all its abettors, then is that name desecrated by being applied to men who acknowledge Mr. George Brown—the partizan of the infamous Gavazzi, the adlogist of Mazzini and of Garibaldi, the scurrilous slanderer of the Sovereign Pontiff, and of the Bishops and Clergy of Canada, the obscene libeller of our Nuns and religious, the unscrupulous and mendacious instigator to outrage against the Catholic laity, and the sworn enemy to Freedom of Education in Upper Canada, and of Popery everywhere—as their political ally and colleague. We protest against the application of the honorable appellation of "Conservative" to such men; to men who on a question vitally affecting the religious and moral interests of Catholics could be found voting on the same side as Mr. George Brown, and the Clear Grits of Upper Canada.

The plain truth of the matter is that amongst our public men in Canada there are not three, we doubt if there are two, to whom it is not absurd to apply the term "Conservative" in its legitimate sense. We have but two parties in Canada; of which one is more or less infected with the abominable principles of the Revolution, and whose members are called "Rouges;" of which the other has no principles at all, and its members have no object beyond the keeping themselves and their friends in office at any price, and monopolising the patronage of the Government, in the shape of situations, contracts, and newspaper advertisements. With the first, the conscientious Catholic cannot in any manner sympathise, though he may recognise the private virtues, the integrity and amiability of very many of its members; with the second he cannot, if he has the proper pride of a gentleman, in any manner consent to identify himself, lest he too be brought into contact with Mr. George Brown, and be thereby polluted.

And it is just because there is so little of principle at stake betwixt the two contending parties, that the animosity betwixt them is so bitter and so great. Because Mr. George Brown's political allies cannot show wherein, in principle, their policy differs from that of their opponents, they avenge themselves by denouncing those adversaries as "Rouges;" and think to justify their revolutionary policy by arrogating to themselves the title of defenders of good principles forsooth! "les bons principes"—to which title they vindicate their right by negating such a motion as that which M. Bourassa—actuated by we care not what motives—brought forward, for securing to a Catholic minority in Upper Canada, equal rights in the matter of education, with a Protestant minority in Lower Canada. What could the reddest of the Rouges, what could the most rampant Orangeman, what could the worst enemies of the Church amongst the infidel hordes of the Revolution, do worse than this? If the 85 who voted Nay on M. Bourassa's motion be Canadian Conservatives, and if these Conservatives be the best friends of the Church, then are her prospects poor indeed; then indeed have we good reason to invoke the help of God against such friends; then indeed, if we have the faith of Catholics, and the honorable sentiments of gentlemen, will we repudiate such friends and such defenders of our cause:

"Haud tui auxilium, non defensoribus istis."

No one can be called upon to prove a negative, and it is not for the Catholics of Upper Canada, or their representatives to prove that they never did contract to accept Mr. Scott's School Bill as final, and that upon the faith of that contract, the said Bill was passed by the Legislature; but it is for those who assert the existence of such a contract, and insist upon its observance, to show when, by whom, and in what terms it was made. This they have not attempted to do except in two instances:—The letter of the 20th March, 1863, published by authority of His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto in the Globe; and the "nods" asserted by Mr. Ryerson to have been made by the Rev. M.M. Cazeau and Macdonell, whilst, clause by clause, Mr. Scott's Bill was read aloud to them in the presence of Mr. Scott and Dr. Ryerson.

Of these two solitary instances, the first is effectually disposed of by the Globe itself; for

the files of that journal are still extant, from which it may be seen that in March, 1863, when it published Mgr. Lynch's explanations, so far from looking upon them as a pledge that the Clergy of Canada had contracted to accept the School Bill then just passed, as "final," the Globe pretended to find therein reasons to suspect the said Clergy of an intention to reiterate their demands for further amendments in the School system of Upper Canada: and an implied contradiction of a statement made on the floor of the House by Mr. Patrick, to the effect that the Catholic Hierarchy were prepared to accept Mr. Scott's School Bill as final. In March 1863, the Globe put a construction on the Bishop's letter, the very contradictory to that which it puts upon the same letter to-day; and in so far as His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto is concerned, this is a full and perfect vindication of his honor and good faith, against the impertinence and mendacious attacks of Mr. George Brown's organ, the Toronto Globe.

The other, or second instance, can be disposed of with equal facility. Dr. Ryerson does not so much as pretend that, either by letter or by word of mouth, the reverend gentleman whom he cites before the tribunal of public opinion, ever gave him reasons to believe that they were prepared to accept Mr. Scott's School Bill as final. All he relies upon, to make good his charge of breach of faith against them, is that, when the said Bill was read to them, clause by clause, they from time to time "noded." Now there is no dictionary of "nods," whereby we can interpret their significance, no universally recognised system from whence the phonetic value of waggings of the head can be determined. On the other hand we have the assurance of the "nodders" themselves, that they never intended to convey to Dr. Ryerson the idea that they, either as individuals, or as representing the Catholic community, were prepared, or authorised, to accept the Bill so read out to them, as a final settlement of the School Question of Upper Canada—in the sense that the minority of that section of the Province had agreed to waive, in consideration of its being allowed to pass the Legislature, all further claims for reforms or amendments.

Dr. Ryerson also pretends that the ecclesiastics whom he names waited upon the Minister, Mr. J. S. Macdonald, and requested of him to support the Bill which had just been read to them "as a satisfactory and final settlement of the Separate School Question," p. 13; but that they did not, and could not have urged this request is evident from this:—That the Bill which they actually urged on Mr. Macdonald's acceptance was not the Bill which Mr. Scott had originally introduced, and of which they had approved; but a greatly modified or emasculated edition of that Bill, which they were satisfied to accept as an "instalment of justice," seeing that they had no chance of obtaining that, which by their approval of the Bill as it originally stood, they had claimed, and therefore still claimed, as a right. So a creditor will accept, nay will even entreat his reluctant debtor to pay, a dividend of fourteen shillings in the pound, without thereby in any sense renouncing his right to demand at some more favorable opportunity payment in full. This, according to their own statement—was the substance of the interview between Mr. J. S. Macdonald, and the Rev. M. M. Cazeau and Macdonell; and this is the only semblance even of any contract betwixt the Clergy on the one hand, and the State on the other, that Mr. Scott's emasculated School Bill should be accepted as a final settlement of the School Question.

And here is another consideration to which we invite attention, as in the absence of direct evidence on either side, it throws strong light on the question at issue. Did Mr. J. S. Macdonald himself, in his interview with the Rev. M. M. Cazeau and Macdonell, contract that the School Bill presented to him, by them, and urged on his acceptance, should be a "final settlement" of the School Question? Did he himself regard the Bill in that light? and did he give his support to it only upon that express condition? These questions we propose to answer by Mr. J. S. Macdonald's subsequent conduct.

On the night of the 13th instant Mr. J. S. Macdonald voted "YEA" on M. Bourassa's motion that the Catholic minority of U. Canada should, in case of Confederation, be placed in the matter of their schools upon a footing of equality with the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. Now by this vote M. J. S. Macdonald asserted by implication, two things:—

1. That if the claims of the Protestant minority of L. Canada should be granted, their position under Confederation would be better than would be that of the Catholic minority of L. Canada if their Separate School law be left untouched. This is a self-evident proposition.
2. That he never did contract with the Rev. M.M. Cazeau and Macdonell that the Bill of '63 which he supported should be final; and that he supported it only upon that condition. This proposition may require a word or two of demonstration.

In contracting with the Rev. M.M. Cazeau and Macdonell, Mr. J. S. Macdonald must have acted not only in his capacity as an individual, but as Prime Minister, as officially the agent for, the representative, and the guardian

of the interests, of the people of Canada, but of the Protestant people of Upper Canada more particularly, when it was his duty to protect against the encroachments of Romanism. He contracted, if he contracted at all, not for himself alone, or in his own name, but for the Upper Canadians and in their name; and if so, the contract is still as binding upon him as it can be upon the other, or ecclesiastical parties thereunto, unless the Upper Canadians as whose agent he acted have released him from the obligation.

But Mr. J. S. Macdonald shows by his acts, and by his vote on M. Bourassa's motion, that he does not feel himself bound by any contract obligation to uphold as "final" the Bill which in '63 he aided in passing, and which without that aid would never have passed at all. Therefore it follows that—as to every contract there must be two parties; and as Mr. J. S. Macdonald does not feel himself bound as one party to any contract to maintain the Bill of '63 as "final"—so also he does not believe that the Rev. M.M. Cazeau and Macdonell as the other parties to the contract, stipulated with him in the early part of 1863, that to all time and under all circumstances Mr. Scott's Bill should be a "final settlement" of the U. Canada School Question.—Q. E. D.

But since then, the relative positions of Catholics and Protestants have been menaced with an entire revolution by the projected "Confederation scheme," as it is called. According to the programme of this new state of political existence on which the people of Canada are about to enter, it is provided that the minorities of each Province, shall be maintained in the enjoyment of such educational advantages, only, as they respectively enjoyed at the date of their Confederation. In all other respects full right of legislating on the subject of Education is given to the Local or Municipal legislatures, subject to the veto of the central government, which veto, however, must be exercised within twelve months after the Bills from the local governments have been laid before it. Thus the only guarantees which the Catholic minority of Upper Canada will have under the new political order for the integrity of their School system will be these—1st. The honesty and good will of a legislature in which it is certain that their enemies, the avowed enemies of Freedom of Education, will be in an overwhelming majority, and in which it is doubtful whether Catholics will have a single representative; and 2nd., the honesty and good will of a central government in which also their enemies must be in an overwhelming majority.

But if against all reasonable expectations, these two guarantees should prove sufficient to prevent the taking away from the Catholic minority of aught that they now possess, neither would oppose any obstacle to a course of legislation by the local government of Upper Canada, which would be highly detrimental, and in the long run probably fatal to Catholic Separate Schools. It might leave to the latter all they have; but it might easily destroy the balance of advantages betwixt them and the non-Catholic Schools, and thus depress the latter, by giving to the other, or non-Catholic schools more than they now possess; and in which "more" the Catholic Separate Schools would have no power to share, seeing that all that is guaranteed to them is, that which they actually possess at the moment of Confederation. Under these circumstances, which have also prompted the Protestant minority of L. Canada to demand ere the fate of their Separate Schools be irrevocably fixed by the new political order, a reform in the existing School Laws—the Catholic minority of U. Canada have commenced an agitation on the educational question; demanding arrogant mortals that they are! that ere they and their schools be handed over to the mercies of an exclusively Protestant legislature, they be placed in School matters on the same footing as their fellow-citizens who compose the Protestant minority of L. Canada. The very head and front of their offending bath this extent, no more.

And apart from the intrinsic justice of this demand, who can pretend that in their actual circumstances it is uncalled for? or that Catholics are debarred from putting it forward because so long as their schools were under the safeguard of a Legislature of which Catholics formed a very considerable part, they were content to accept Mr. Scott's Bill as final? We deny that any agreement to this effect was ever made by any body authorised or competent to act in the name of the Catholic community; but granting for the sake of argument that such an agreement or contract had been entered into, it would be binding so long only as the political and social conditions of the contracting parties remained unchanged, so long as the guarantees or security for its faithful observance remained intact. But these conditions are, if Confederation become a fact, about to be entirely changed; and the moral guarantee which from the composition of our actual Legislature, the Catholics of U. Canada actually possess, is about to be repealed. Therefore with perfect right they demand that under these altered conditions some fresh assurance or guarantee for the integrity of their schools be given to them. This they hope to obtain by the reforms for which they are now agitating; and of the details of which we propose next week to say a few words.