

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,

GEORGE E. OLBER,

At No. 133, Notre Dame Street.

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.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.

Single copies, price 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Kiddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup) No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dutton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1861.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

CAYOUR is dead—may the Lord have mercy on his soul! Christ died for all men; we should therefore pray that His most precious blood may not, in the case of Carour, have been shed in vain.

Cavour is dead—and by his death the Pope has been freed from one of his most bitter enemies; the Catholic Church has been delivered from the most insidious of her foes; and the sacred cause of religious liberty has been avenged, by the death of one of its most constant and dangerous oppressors.

Cavour is dead—in the midst of his impious schemes of robbery and sacrilege, whilst meditating fresh outrages against the Lord and His anointed. So in like manner and under very similar circumstances died another Cavour—mentioned in Holy Writ, Acts xii, 21, 22, 23:—

"And upon a day appointed, Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, sat on the judgment seat, and made an oration to them."

"And the people with acclamations cried out—It is the voice of a God, not of a man."

"And forthwith an Angel of the Lord struck him, because he had not given the honour to God—and eaten up by worms he expired."

So perished the infamous Herod, of whom it is also said, that "he stretched forth his hand to afflict some of the Church." So perish all the enemies of our Holy Mother; and may every one who raises himself up against the See of Peter, be in like manner unfounded—Amen!

Whilst therefore charity bids us pray that even a Cavour may have had time given him to repent of his thefts, of his cruel persecutions, and sacrileges innumerable, our love for our Church, and our allegiance to the Holy Father, as well as our sincere devotion to the cause of civil and religious liberty, bid us rejoice that the Church and the Pope have been delivered from an enemy, as cunning and as skillful, as he was unscrupulous and unprincipled; and that he who has long trampled under foot the civil and religious liberties of the Italian clergy and Religion, has it no longer in his power to oppress.

As a consummate statesman, the deceased Count has left no equal behind him. He was the life and soul of the anti-Catholic movement in Italy—alone able to direct and control it—Victor Emmanuel is but a brave cavalry officer, a drunken sensual captain of dragoons, an Italian Blucher. Garibaldi is but a skilful and dashing filibuster; cool under fire, but without resources in the turmoil of political life. Mazzini is a coward, who carefully eschewing all personal risks, preaches rebellion, and urges his listeners on to the encounter, from which he with prudent regard to his own safety, shrinks. Amongst the surviving leaders of the Italian revolutionary party, there may be men competent to excite, or even organise an insurrection; there may be some equal to the task of conducting a campaign; but there is not one capable of devising and carrying out a comprehensive scheme of policy, or of realising the dream of a United Italy. Cavour was the incarnation, as it were, of the spirit of democratic "Absolutism," of which the fundamental tenet is, that Governments are absolved from all moral obligations, and that they have the right to do whatsoever they deem necessary for their own preservation. This doctrine, subversive of all morality, as well as of all liberty, is openly enunciated by the Protestant press in their eulogistic notices of the late great anti-Catholic statesman, as the justification of his robberies and persecutions; and is by the *Montreal Gazette* of the 18th instant embodied in the following formula:—

"A Government may take any step, involving either life or property for self-preservation."—*Gazette*.

This is the principle which underlies and animates all democracies. It is a plea which may be urged in behalf of every tyranny that ever existed, or that ever may degrade and desolate the human race. It is however the only plea which the most ardent Protestant admirers of Cavour and his policy can urge in extenuation of the thefts by him perpetrated upon the private property of the Church, and the Religious Orders in Sardinia. As against Catholics, Protestants urge the maxim as incontestable; but were it to be retorted upon themselves; were a Catholic Government in Lower Canada to

confiscate all the church property of the Anglicans, and to banish their Bishops and clergy, the former would scarce admit its truth, or recognise the justice of the procedure; but were Catholics to plead in justification, of the severities imputed to Mary Tudor by Protestant historians—of the so-called "Massacre of St. Bartholomew"—or of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the expulsion of the Huguenots by Louis XIV.—that "a Government may take any step, involving either life or property for self-preservation"—we are inclined to suspect that a general shout of execration against the moral teachings of Popery would arise from the Protestant press; and yet it would not be difficult to show that the tyrant's plea of "necessity" might be far more successfully urged in behalf of Mary Tudor, of Charles IX., or of Louis XIV., than in behalf of the deceased Cavour, and Victor Emmanuel. What however will be the probable results of the death of the great Italian statesman?

The ambitious designs of the King upon his neighbors will now probably be frustrated by the loss of his astute and unprincipled adviser. In the South, the people of Naples will be stimulated to make fresh exertions to throw off the hated foreign yoke which Piedmontese invasion has imposed upon them; the brigands and revolutionists of Rome, if their ardor for plunder be not abated, will, by the death of their chief patron, be seriously discouraged and perplexed;—and, no longer controlled by the superior talents of Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini may probably succeed in provoking their several followers to some hasty and ill-advised aggression upon the Austrian dominions, which will bring disgrace and discomfiture upon the arms of Sardinia. Some such events as these may be reasonably anticipated; and though an immediate lull cannot be looked for in the storm which has so long and furiously agitated Italy, Catholics who know that God has promised to protect His own, will see in this sudden cutting off of the persecutor and sacrilegious robber, of this violent remover of his neighbor's landmarks, a renewed pledge of the continual presence of the Lord with His Church, another instance that it is a dangerous policy to engage in hostilities with Rome, and to provoke her anathemas. Many have engaged in it—captains, princes, and emperors; all have come to a speedy and ignominious end—all have perished miserably.

The other European news, by the Africa is devoid of interest. In Great Britain, the civil war in the United States is the topic which still engages all attention in the political and mercantile worlds. The strictest neutrality, as betwixt the belligerents, is proclaimed as the policy of the Government, and cases containing arms for New York have been seized upon.

The relative position of the Federalists and the Southern insurgents has not materially changed since our last. The authorities at Washington complain forcibly that their plans of campaign are regularly made known through the indiscretion of the New York press, and that thus their designs have been frustrated. No general engagement has as yet taken place, but a skirmish was reported, in which the Southerners were defeated.

To advocate the claims of any particular or individual candidate to the support of the electoral body is at best an invidious task, and certainly one hardly becoming the Catholic journalist. It is at all times difficult to separate men from measures, or measures from men. In opposing, or supporting principles, it is difficult in actual political life to avoid the appearance of opposing or supporting persons; but we trust that it is possible to lay down a few general rules for a Catholic constituency, without either sacrificing principle, or giving personal offence. This task at all events we will humbly attempt to accomplish.

We need not insist upon the importance of the franchise, or upon the still greater importance of exercising the political power thereby conferred, prudently and conscientiously. If it is a great thing to have a voice in the framing of the laws by which we are governed, it is a still greater privilege to be able to exercise a powerful influence over the moral and religious conditions of our country—conditions which happily may affect the well-being of generations yet unborn. If the possession of a vote is the mark and the boast of the freeman, the wise and conscientious casting of that vote should be the subject of deep and earnest attention to the Catholic.

In vain will men insist that there is no connection betwixt politics and religion, and that the latter should have nothing to do with an election. Religion is and must be considerably interested in politics, and therefore in the results of the elections now pending; and it is no light duty which the Catholic elector is called upon to perform. He has to co-operate in the selection of a member of a body which, as society is at present constituted, arrogates to itself the right of interfering in the education of our children, of legislating upon the most important of social questions—that of marriage—and which at every moment has it in its power either to thwart, or to

give assistance to, the Ministers of religion in their divinely appointed vocations. As Catholics, we require that our views on the great social questions of the day be in some degree fairly represented, and efficiently advocated in the Legislature; and for this reason we should combine our suffrages, and so make our selection from amongst the several candidates, as to return to Parliament no one who has not the necessary qualifications as the representative and guardian of our particular interests.

These qualifications are three-fold. We require that he who aspires to represent us in the Legislature should be socially, intellectually and morally qualified for the post; and though we would not presume to indicate any particular candidate as either worthy or unworthy to receive the Catholic vote, yet with a safe conscience may we define what we mean by the threefold qualification insisted upon above; leaving it to the Catholic voter to apply in each particular case the rule which we would attempt to lay down in general.

By "social qualification" we mean that the recipient of the Catholic vote should be a person fitted to represent and advocate the interests of his constituents, by his social position, or position in society. We mean that he should be a man of independent means or fortune, and not a needy political adventurer; that he should be one possessed of a considerable material stake in the country, either as a merchant, as a farmer, or the holder of real estate. A poor man may be a very good man, and a very clever man;—but, as a general rule, a poor man will not make a good Member of Parliament. If a man of honor, the poor man will be too proud to engage in political life, and thereby expose himself to the suspicion of being actuated by personal and mercenary motives; and if not a man of acute honor, he is one whom no constituency would be wise to trust. Indeed it may be laid down with perfect safety, as a general rule, that no honest man, being poor, that is, not possessed of independent means, or realized capital, will ever seek to enter Parliament. And as no man ever did, or ever can, honestly advance his personal interests, or ameliorate his pecuniary condition by accepting a seat in the Legislature of his country, so we may be sure that the poor man, struggling for his living, who seeks to enter Parliament, is a mercenary rogue; one who intends to sell at a considerable advance, or profit to himself the trust reposed in him by his constituents. Needy political adventurers, fellows without money in their pockets, or principle in their hearts, are the bane of representative institutions, and no where more so than in Canada. The Legislature has hitherto often swarmed with them;—thence perjury and false swearing. The law requires what we require, a *bona fide* property qualification; and to evade this law, fraudulent contracts are entered into, and the sacred name of God is solemnly invoked to a deliberate lie.—How can constituencies expect that their representatives will be true to them, if they elect men whose first entrance into public life must be signalised by a solemn perjury, and premeditated mockery of God's Most Holy Name? A social qualification is therefore requisite; not that riches *per se* make their possessor honorable or amiable; but because they tend to weaken the force of that temptation to which public men are often exposed, and thus prevent the suspicion of unworthy and mercenary motives on his part; and because no honest man, no gentleman in the true and highest sense of the word, not possessed of them, will ever present himself as a candidate for Parliamentary honors.

We require also an "intellectual qualification," on the part of him whom we honor with our suffrages. We require that, by education, and by the natural endowments of a clear head, and a facile tongue, he be competent to understand our wants, and to advocate them forcibly. We do not require that he should be a Demosthenes, or a Cicero; but we do insist upon a good education, a general acquaintance with history and politics, with finance and the principles of political economy; but we do require of our representative the faculty of expressing himself grammatically, lucidly, and, if necessary, energetically.

And above all we insist upon "a moral qualification," as of more, infinitely more importance than either of the preceding. A poor man may be honest even in Parliament; a stupid man, unable to speak two consecutive words, or to express himself intelligibly, may cast a good vote, and take the right side on a division; but the immoral man, no matter how wealthy, or how talented, will be the disgrace of the constituency which he represents, and the curse of the country for which he is called upon to legislate. Highly as we value property and talent, we value morality infinitely higher; and towards him who aspires to represent a Catholic constituency, we are on this head rigorous and exacting in our demands. We insist upon stern integrity, and unimpeachable honor; from our representative we expect all the characteristics of the knight of old—that he be *sans peur et sans reproche*—that he possess all that constitutes the Christian gentleman of the present day. To such a one we may safely commit our interests; but of this be sure, that the liar or swindler, the drunken rowdy, or the bar-room lout, the libertine or the profane swearer, no matter how great his wealth, how illustrious his lineage, or how brilliant his talents, can but bring well merited opprobrium upon those whom he represents, and ruin to those interests with

which the infatuation of his constituents has entrusted him.

It may be observed that we do not insist upon a national or a denominational qualification on the part of our representatives.

We do not insist upon the first, because the national origin of our Legislators, is a consideration by which no one intellectually above an idiot, or morally superior to a knave, would ever allow himself to be influenced. Here in Canada, all Her Majesty's subjects are, as respects national origin, on a footing of perfect equality, and it would be most unwise and ungenerous to insist upon "race" as either a qualification or disqualification for office. If a candidate be honest and intelligent, a loyal subject and a good member of society, and therefore one in whom it is prudent to trust, the land of his birth is a matter of as much indifference, as the color of his hair, or the family name of his maternal great grandmother. We therefore purposely omit the mention of a "national qualification" as either necessary or even desirable.

Neither would we, though Catholics, insist as a condition *sine qua non*, on a Catholic representation. The questions which the Legislature has to deal with, are for the most part in the natural order, in which Catholics and Protestants can, and often do, hold common principles. We ask, as Catholics, from the Legislature the recognition merely of our natural rights, and claim no privileges because of our supernatural or religious status; and thus, though all other things being equal, we should prefer a Catholic to represent us—yet we should never hesitate to vote for an honest Protestant who was willing to accord to us the full exercise of our natural rights as parents in the education of our children, and of our civil rights as free citizens in the disposal of our property for ecclesiastical and charitable purposes. An honest Protestant, being a gentleman, and a loyal subject of Queen Victoria, is in every respect better entitled to the support and confidence of a Catholic constituency, than a lax, indifferent, or immoral Catholic, whose religion is ever on his lips, but is allowed to exercise no influence over his daily life. Not even George Brown with all his affected bigotry, not the most rabid Orangeman, can do so much injury to Catholic interests, or bring such discredit on the Catholic cause, as is done and brought by the dishonest or "Liberal Catholic." It is of him alone that we stand in dread, and it is against him that we would especially warn the Catholic elector.

A respectable social position, a sound education with a general knowledge of business, and above all, a moral character unimpeachable—these are the conditions which we rigorously exact; and if these are to be had, the national origin of their possessor should be a matter of perfect indifference to all intelligent men, whilst his religious errors, or errors in the supernatural order, should not be allowed to neutralise his other excellencies. We require as our representatives gentlemen—emphatically, gentlemen—men of unblemished honor, men who would scorn to do a dirty action, and who are exemplary for the morality of their conduct in public and private life. We require Christians; we would of course prefer Catholics; but we should never hesitate about giving our hearty support to an honest, gentlemanly Protestant willing to deal with others as he would himself be dealt with.

A good cause may be damaged by injudicious advocacy, and no indiscreet friend may sometimes do as much harm as a designing foe. This is particularly the case with the Catholic cause; and the Catholic journalist should therefore be very careful not to put arguments in the mouths of her enemies, or weapons in their hands, by misstating her teachings, or misapplying her injunctions. We are all liable to error—to errors of the head—to errors of the heart; the Church alone can never err or lead astray; and most careful should the Catholic journalist be not to compromise her, not to mix her up in the sordid strife of political parties, or the ignoble passions of a General Election.

It is for this reason, and certainly in no captious spirit, that we feel ourselves compelled to express our regrets at some remarks which appeared in a "Communication" published in the *Toronto Mirror* of the 14th instant; and which, we think, would not have been inserted, but for the absence of the editor of that journal. The article we complain of was, we are certain, written with the best intentions; but its insertion was an oversight, and its allegations with reference to His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal call for a few words of notice.

The writer thus speaks of that Reverend Prelate:—

"The Bishop of Montreal is very indignant at his—Mr. McGe's zig-zag course in public life, and though it is not likely that cautious and prudent prelates will openly interfere, yet it is certain his opposition will be none the less effectual."

We can assure the correspondent of the *Toronto Mirror*, that the Bishop of Montreal never has, and never will, directly or indirectly, approve himself the political partizan or opponent of any man; and that neither "openly" nor secretly will his Lordship interfere in the pending electoral contest. Mgr. Bourget is, and for many weeks will be, engaged in his pastoral tour; exhorting, confirming, and devoting his undivided attention to the fulfilment of his sacred and Episcopal functions. That he will pray for his people that they may be wisely directed in their choice of candidates,—that he will pray fervently that the elections may be conducted peaceably, honestly, and soberly, without strife, without bribery and perjury, and without bloodshed—we are confident; but we are also confident that, beyond this, and perhaps laying down the great principles by which the Catholic elec-

tor should be guided, His Lordship will not in any manner interfere betwixt the several candidates and the electors. It is thus that His Lordship Mgr. de Tio, the Administrator of the Archdiocese of Quebec, has acted. He has in a public *Mandement* warned his flock of their duty; but with the prudence, zeal, and charity which he so eminently combines, the venerable Prelate has carefully avoided all semblance of dictation, and has not deemed it necessary to say one word which any one of the rival pretenders to Parliamentary honors can legitimately construe as an approval, or a condemnation, of his personal claims. Neither by open interference, nor by secret intrigues do our Pastors seek to control the elections, or to determine the triumph of one man over another. They content themselves with laying down the general principles which should guide us; leaving it to us to make due application of those principles. They remind us, as the guardians of our souls, of our duties; we do to us! if we do not discharge those duties fully, fearlessly, conscientiously, and to the best of our intelligence and abilities.

We entreat our cotemporary not to be offended with these remarks; and we assure him that it is merely respect for our venerated Bishop, and not ill will towards the *Toronto Mirror*, that dictates them. We would also, and in the same friendly spirit, express our dissent from some of the conclusions to which the *Toronto Freeman* arrives, as to the duty of Catholics at the present political crisis.

We expressed last week our sincere opinion that, when reduced to a choice betwixt two evils, betwixt two bad candidates—one an Orangeman but the supporter of a good Separate School law, and the other a non-Orangeman, but the avowed opponent of Separate Schools—the Catholic elector would act well and wisely who should give his vote to the former, or to the Orange supporter of Separate Schools. This opinion the *Freeman* imputes as upon the following grounds:—

I. "Proposition.—All secret societies are condemned by the Church."

II. "Proposition.—Orangemen is a secret society."

Therefore whosoever supports a known, avowed Orangeman, more especially a chief or leader amongst them, supports that which is condemned by the Church."—*Toronto Freeman*.

The *Freeman* must permit us to point out to him the substitution in his conclusion, of the term "Orangeman," for the term "Orangeism" which occurs in his premises. This change is a defect in logic which vitiates his conclusions; and besides, if his argument again at giving a vote, or political support at an election to an Orangeman, were sound in logic, it proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. By precisely the same logical process it might also be proved that no Catholic could consistently with his duty to the Church, "support," or vote for a Protestant. As thus:—

I. Proposition.—All heresies are condemned by the Church;

II. Proposition.—Protestantism is a heresy;

Therefore, whosoever supports a known, avowed Protestant, more especially a chief or leader amongst them, supports that which is condemned by the Church.

This argument against voting for, or giving political support to a Protestant is not good, as perhaps the *Freeman* will perceive; and if he will examine his own similarly constructed argument against voting for, or giving political support to an Orangeman, he will, we suspect come to a similar conclusion with respect to the latter.

We must be careful not to overstate our case, lest we weaken it, and not to put forward unjustifiable or exorbitant pretensions, lest we provoke contempt for our moderate and legitimate claims. Strongly therefore as the Catholic Church condemns Orangemen, and all secret oath-bound politico-religious organisations, we should not go so far as to accuse the Catholic voter who casts his vote for an Orangeman, of "supporting that which is condemned by the Church;" neither is it prudent for Catholics to insist upon the political ostracism of Orangemen. It is a good rule, in politics, as in shooting, never to aim at anything out of range, and to reserve your fire for objects within reach. Now it is a moral impossibility, though no doubt very desirable, to exclude Orangemen from the Legislature; to attempt it therefore, is but to throw away powder and shot. But we believe that, with the assistance of the Catholics of Lower Canada, and a section of the non-Clear-Grit Protestants of the Upper Province, who on the subject of education held opinions analogous to ours, it is possible, even if not very easy, to procure such amendments to the School Laws as shall secure to the Catholic minority of the West the full enjoyment of "Freedom of Education." On this one object therefore should our fire be concentrated; and we will also add, that, in our opinion, a good School system, even with Orangemen in the Legislature, is by far preferable to infidel or common-school education accompanied by a total exclusion of all Orangemen from Parliament and the Ministry. The Orange Lodge is a great curse to the country no doubt, but the "common-school" is a greater; and though we may wish that it were in our power to bring down both, yet if the latter alone presents a fair mark, or one which we have any chance of hitting, let