

The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by J. GILLIES.

G. E. OLBERG, Editor. TERMS: To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 27, 1863.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. The fifth session of the Imperial Parliament was opened on Thursday, the 5th instant.

The Polish insurrection is assuming a serious aspect, and there have been several encounters between the Russian troops and the insurgents.

The past week has been unmarked by any important operations in the United States.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.—The whole time of the Legislature has been occupied with making and listening to long speeches on the Address, and the several amendments moved thereunto.

The case of the Aylwards has been brought before the notice of the Legislature by a motion from M. Hoot for the production of all documents and correspondence on the subject.

Mr. Ferguson went on to cite the Aylward case, condemning in strong terms the Solicitor General West for prosecuting it to a conviction.

Mr. Ferguson then they could well understand that the hon. member was as anxious to witness the horrible scene of the execution of husband and wife as any man could be.

AN EXCUSE.—We have heard it urged that the Solicitor General could not consistently, as a member of the Executive, favor the prayer for mercy in behalf of the Aylwards, seeing that he had himself prosecuted them to conviction, and

that his professional reputation required that the couple should be hung. As a lawyer he had obtained sentence of death against them: in his capacity of one of the Executive, he was bound to have the sentence carried into execution.

We fear that the people of Lower Canada are not sufficiently grateful to the editor of the Toronto Globe for the trouble which he takes in their welfare, and the gratuitous advice which he tenders them.

The Globe in the most paternal tone, and with the most patronising aspect imaginable, assures the "French Canadian" to whom he addresses himself, that "it is vain and useless to endeavor to preserve for ever the present geographical limits, and internal relationship of the two Canadas."

As a preliminary to the denouncing process, and as inevitable according to the decrees of Providence, the "French Canadian" must make up his mind to submit to "Representation by Population."

Hear this, "French Canadian" people, whom the Globe addresses, and be docile in time! Your position is that of the traveller who, having fallen into the hands of thieves, is by the latter warned that he had best make over to them his watch and other valuables, since further resistance, since prolonged struggles on his part, or cries for the Police, would be as unwise, as they would be futile, and would lead to personal injury, as well as to the mere deprivation of property.

"No one," continues the Clear-Grit organ in the most honied accents—"no one seeks to do them injury, to deprive them of any privilege they now possess in common with the British portion of the population?"

Poor silly lamb! exclaims the Globe in short, as the timid creature shrinks from his outstretched hand—why won't you come and have your throat cut, pleasantly and quietly?

To the Globe's questions, why the French Canadian people hold themselves aloof from the Upper Canadians? why they do not desire to place the preponderance of political power in the hands of the latter? why, in short, they do not wish to draw closer or tighter the folds of the cord which now binds them in constrained and unhallowed union to Upper Canada?—it is not difficult to find an answer. God has made the

French Canadians and the Anglo-Saxons two; and no amount of human legislation can ever make them one. Ethnologically, they are distinct; as distinct, to say the least, as are the Venetians, from the other and Teutonic races comprised beneath the rule of Austria; and if it be not a sin on the part of the Venetians to "segregate themselves" from their Teuton fellow-subjects, so neither can it be a sin on the part of the French Canadians to act in like manner towards their fellow-subjects of Anglo-Saxon descent.

The Globe undertakes also to read the latter a lecture upon the "absurd pride of race," which induces him—the French Canadian—"to cherish his language as if it were a charm against the evil one, and to refuse to adopt any innovation on established usages, because it is derived from an alien people?"

"It is just as possible to dam the waters of the St. Lawrence as to keep Upper and Lower Canada on an equality in numbers and representation. The Anglo-Saxon population receiving large accessions from abroad, must continue to increase faster than the French Canadian, and will demand fresh fields to occupy, and representation in the Legislature according to numbers. Further resistance to this result on the part of the French Canadian people is as unwise as it will be futile."

With respect to two very important questions in which the Irish Catholics of Canada are vitally interested—the "School Question" and that of the integrity and inviolability of ecclesiastical property of every description, our contemporary's promises seem fair enough; and we therefore give him full credit for the soundness of his principles upon these two points—viz., the inviolability of ecclesiastical property; and the sole and absolute right of the parent over all that appertains to the education of his children—and, as the correlative of this right on the parent's part, the absence of any right on the part of the State, directly or indirectly, to control the education of the child.

The integrity of the property of our Catholic institutions, and the satisfactory settlement of the School Question, depend upon the maintenance of equality of representation in the Legislature as betwixt Upper and Lower Canada. Any change in the system of representation which should give to Upper Canada a preponderance

and generous heart, the insolence, and low-bred fanaticism of the leader of the Clear-Grits or Protestant Reformers of Upper Canada: we should certainly indulge in no "pride of race," should take no pleasure in our national origin, were these fellows, or their spokesman of the Globe, to be looked upon by our French Canadian friends as fair specimens of British gentlemen.

The Irish Canadian requests us to publish an article which appears in its issue of the 18th inst. We do not recognise either our contemporary's right to urge such a request, or any obligation on our part to comply with it. Yet as we would not give any one a semblance even of legitimate complaint against us, or of grounds whereon to base a charge of unfair treatment by the TRUE WITNESS, we comply with that request; with the understanding, however, that our compliance in this particular instance, be not considered as establishing a precedent, which we hold ourselves bound to follow:—

"Our Montreal contemporary, in his last issue, favors us with another column and a half in reply to our strictures on his notice of the Irish Canadian. He sets us down as 'unreasonable,' 'captious,' 'unjust,' 'ridiculous.' Very well. In half the space we shall show (and in as good natured a way as possible) that our contemporary deals with us unjustly. He is a great hand himself at inductive reasoning, and he knows very well that correct conclusions cannot be derived from partial or incorrect premises. Then of two things one. The editor of the True Witness, in criticising the Irish Canadian, has not carefully read this journal, or has wilfully misrepresented it. We told him so in our previous reply; we shall now demonstrate it. He says so-and-so appears in our 'prospectus.' Now, we issued no 'prospectus,' and what he quotes from was simply an 'outline' of our enterprise, issued by the founders of the paper with a view to obtaining shareholders. No doubt the gentlemen whose names are attached to that document would have been a little more careful in their choice of language could they have imagined that our contemporary was, with spectacles on nose, and 'dictionary and grammar in hand,' prepared to exercise his powers of literary dissection upon their unprejudiced production.

We objected before to his stating that our 'prospectus' contained a declaration that the 'specialty' of our paper was 'national,' not 'religious.' We have shown that we published no 'prospectus,' and we now state that what he referred to was simply an editorial remark appended to the Leader's notice of our appearance. This is not much, to be sure, but it shows clearly that our contemporary was careless. But the principal point is this (and it is very unfortunate for our contemporary, as it goes to show that he writes upon matters without being fully informed, dogmatizes and conspires without just grounds): that he altogether ignores our statement of objects and principles as published in our first number, and which was embraced in the article headed 'the work before us.' It was after a perusal of this article, no doubt, that the editor of the Metropolitan Record concluded that ours were 'the principles which need to be disseminated wherever individuals of the Irish race are found.' That article was our 'prospectus' in reality, and it would have been well had the editor of the True Witness read it and given us credit or criticism for the 'principles' it contained, instead of going to work with 'cork block and razor' to split hairs over an advertisement of the promoters of our enterprise.

"Of its (The Irish Canadian's) 'principles,' says our contemporary, 'as we know nothing, so also we said nothing.' But what did he do? Why, he laudibly went to work and made 'principles' for us! But why did he not know something of the principles we laid down for ourselves? Simply because he did not read us. We hope this announcement will let the light in upon our contemporary's vision, and enable him to understand why the Archbishop's organ stamped us with the seal of its approval. We shall again send our contemporary a copy of our first number and mark the article that we have reference to for his perusal. He will there find that we do not intend altogether to eschew 'those politico-religious questions' that make up so much his 'specialty,' and that upon that question, which of all others, he is so anxious about—the education question—we are not without settled views. We have declared emphatically enough we fancy, that 'Freedom of education and the rights of the parent we shall strenuously maintain!'

What says our contemporary to this? Has he not done us an injustice? Let him candidly confess it and lay aside his cavils. On 'the question of the integrity and inviolability of the property of our religious communities,' we have, it is true, said nothing, and we think that in stating the principles of a paper called The Irish Canadian it was altogether unnecessary. Can the editor of the True Witness for one moment imagine that we could favor a work of spoliation, such as he here hints at? Our name ought to have been enough for that, friend Witness. On the question of the 'autonomy of Lower Canada,' we claim the right of exercising our 'independent judgment, as it is not the interests of the people of Lower Canada that we specially advocate, but the interests of the Irish people in the whole province, and in dealing with a politico-sectional question like this, we shall take such a position as will best tend to their welfare, when occasion demands."

With respect to two very important questions in which the Irish Catholics of Canada are vitally interested—the "School Question" and that of the integrity and inviolability of ecclesiastical property of every description, our contemporary's promises seem fair enough; and we therefore give him full credit for the soundness of his principles upon these two points—viz., the inviolability of ecclesiastical property; and the sole and absolute right of the parent over all that appertains to the education of his children—and, as the correlative of this right on the parent's part, the absence of any right on the part of the State, directly or indirectly, to control the education of the child. But upon another point equally important, because essential both to the practical assertion of the principle of Freedom of Education, and to the integrity of our ecclesiastical institutions—the declaration of the Irish Canadian is vague and most unsatisfactory. We mean of course his declaration of principle upon the question of Representation.

The integrity of the property of our Catholic institutions, and the satisfactory settlement of the School Question, depend upon the maintenance of equality of representation in the Legislature as betwixt Upper and Lower Canada. Any change in the system of representation which should give to Upper Canada a preponderance

in the Legislature, would be fatal to the cause of Freedom of Education; for it cannot be doubted, it is not attempted to be denied, that the overwhelming majority of the people of Upper Canada—all of them in short with the exception of a small body of High Church Anglicans—are opposed to "Freedom of Education," and are warm advocates of a system of "State-Schoolism." It is only by, and through the influence of Catholic Lower Canada—an influence of which Representation by Population would deprive the latter—that a partial instalment of justice has been, after hard struggles, won for the Catholic minority of the Western section of the Province; and since he who sincerely desires the ends, must also desire the means by which alone those ends can be attained, so he who is sincerely the friend of "Freedom of Education" must also be the advocate of Equality of Representation, as the only means by which Freedom of Education can be obtained. He who pretends to be an advocate of the latter, and at the same time gives any countenance to a measure for assuring a preponderance in the Legislature to Protestant Upper Canada, must be either a fool, or a hypocrite.

And if our contemporary persist in looking at the Representation Question, from an Irish, instead of from an exclusively Catholic, point of view, one would think that the loud and reiterated complaints of the Irish people against a Legislative Union, forced upon them with a people "alien in blood, in language, and in religion," would convince him of the inconsistency of which Irishmen in Canada would be guilty, were they to lend their aid to impose a similar Union upon the French people of Lower Canada. If Ireland has a right to claim self-government, so has Lower Canada; if the clamors of the Irish against their Legislative Union with Great Britain are well founded, so also would be the clamors of the French Canadians against such a Union with Upper Canada as that which Representation by Population would impose upon them; and therefore, unless Irishmen desire to be treated as the most inconsistent of mortals, claiming for themselves that which they refuse to concede to others, they will strenuously oppose a measure which, if carried, would establish betwixt Lower and Upper Canada, the very counterpart of these political conditions now subsisting betwixt Ireland and Great Britain, and against which the Irish, both at home and abroad, so loudly and bitterly complain, as unjust towards Ireland.

The interests, no less than the honor, of the Irish Catholics in Canada, require of them to adopt this policy. No doubt that some amongst them may, by sacrificing the interests of their Church, and the rights of Lower Canada, curry favor with the Clear-Grits, or Protestant Reformers; and so establish a claim upon the latter for a larger share in government situations, government contracts, and dirty, though lucrative jobs of all kinds. But no matter what unprincipled demagogues may preach, or needy placed-beggars practise, the only honorable, the only truly profitable, course of policy for Irish Catholics to pursue is that which shall secure to Catholic Lower Canada an influence in the Legislature equal to that of Protestant Upper Canada; and which therefore will tend to promote a close union betwixt the Catholic minority of the Upper Province, and the Conservative Catholic majority of the Lower. The interests of the two are inseparably, for good or for evil, bound together; and the only true principles of political action "which need to be disseminated wherever in Canada individuals of the Irish race are found," are those which we have indicated above, and which may be thus summed up—"Union amongst all Catholics, irrespective of national origin." Only by such a union can the country be saved from the curse of "Protestant Ascendancy," with which, in the guise of Representation by Population," it is now menaced; only by such a union can the rights of the Church be secured, the property of her religious communities be guaranteed, and the inestimable boon of "Freedom of Education" be wrested from the hands of the tyrant majority of the Upper Province.

The Toronto Mirror has the following remarks as to the policy of the Irish Catholics of Upper Canada, on the question of Representation by Population:—

"Well, it is the business of the Catholics of Upper Canada, who, though they may be ignored upon the question, form no inconsiderable portion of the population, to see that the Tories are not 'strong' upon the question. After the amount of support which they have received from us as opponents of the measure, it is our duty to see that their present treason to Provincial interests is not successful. If we except a few of the more rabid amongst them—men whose secret intrigues, backed by the influence of Orangism, was always a source of annoyance to the Conservative or Coalition Government of the day—every man of them is pledged more or less against Representation by Population. It was upon their well-known opposition to this so-called reform, and upon their pledges favorable to Separate Schools, that most of them were elected to the present legislature. If they turn around, therefore, now, because they are out of office, and vote for the enslavement of Lower Canada, and the destruction of the liberties of the Catholics of the Province, they will prove themselves worthy of all that has been said against them—they will stand forward as pledge-breakers of the first water. Their resistance on one motion may be looked over; but a steady policy in favor of sectional and illiberal measures will draw down upon them the execration of those who were, at the last election, their warmest supporters before the populace."—Toronto Mirror.