

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS.

GEORGE E. OLBERT and JOHN GILLIES, PROPRIETORS.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor, G. E. OLBERT.

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; and at W. Dalton's, No. 3, St. Lawrence Main Street.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1860.

REGULATIONS FOR LENT.

All days in Lent, with the exception of Sundays, are Fast Days of obligation.

By a special indulgent use of flesh meat is allowed on every Sunday in Lent, with the exception of Palm Sunday; as well as once a day on the Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, of the five first weeks in Lent; but its use is forbidden on Palm Sunday, and the six other days of Holy Week, as well as on Ash Wednesday and the three following days. On those week days when flesh meat is allowed, no fish is allowed at the same time.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Rumors of war are still rife, and the general opinion is now that the affairs of Europe must yet be settled by the sword. In the meantime the farce of collecting the suffrages of the people of Central Italy on the question of annexation to Sardinia, will be played out, and a free declaration of public opinion will be elicited by the agency of foreign bayonets. The Continental news is however but scant, and the great event of the past week has been the Circular addressed by the French Government to its diplomatic agents, justifying the action of Louis Napoleon by the precedents of the first French Revolution. His case must be a bad one, when he feels himself compelled to shelter himself behind the acts of the Directory. Louis Veullot is gone to Rome, and a pamphlet on the Italian question may soon be expected from his practised pen.

The Commercial Treaty with France and Mr. Gladstone's Budget will not be carried without opposition; the article which binds England not to prohibit the exportation of coal to France, will be treated from a strategical rather than from a financial point of view, seeing that coal is one of the chief elements of Great Britain's naval superiority. The question of the annexation of Savoy to France had been discussed in the Imperial Parliament, and in the House of Commons Lord John Russell gave assurance that Sardinia would never consent to the transfer. Lord Elgin is to be sent on another mission to China, and an amicable arrangement with that Power is now generally looked for.

THE "HUNGARIAN"—As yet no complete, and official list of the passengers by this ill-fated vessel has been given to the world. The commander of the Africa states the number of the Hungarian's passengers at 140; and amongst these it seems now certain that we must include Mr. Talbot and his newly married wife.

GREAT PAPAL DEMONSTRATION AT QUEBEC.

On Sunday last, after Vespers, the Catholics of Quebec, assembled en masse in their several churches, to address His Holiness the Pope upon the state of his affairs, and to testify to him their ardent sympathy and devoted attachment. Of course, in a city like Quebec, and with such a large Catholic population, no one edifice could be found large enough to contain even a small portion of those who would naturally desire to take part in the proceedings: it was therefore arranged that the meetings should be held simultaneously, but in different localities. The Catholics of French origin meeting in the large hall of the Laval University, and in the St. John's, St. Roch's, and St. Saviour's churches. The Irish, and English speaking, portion of the Catholic population met in the St. Patrick's Church, under the presidency of their beloved pastor, the Reverend B. M'Gauran.

The Laval University meeting was presided over by His Lordship the Bishop of Fion, who opened the proceedings by a most eloquent and moving speech, worthy of the occasion, and of the speaker. His Lordship having resumed his seat, His Honor the Mayor, seconded by Isaias Gaudrie, Esq., moved the first resolution:

"That it is to us an imperious duty to offer to the Sovereign Pontiff a public testimonial of our profound veneration and filial love in the present circumstances, when his paternal heart is torn by cares and griefs, which day by day become more overwhelming."

The second resolution was admirably proposed by the Hon. Mr. Cartier, Attorney-General, and was seconded by the Hon. U. J. Tessier:

"That we desire to avail ourselves of the solemn occasion on which we are called to manifest our sentiments towards the Visible Chief of the Church, to proclaim openly, that happier than other people, we are subjects of a government under which we enjoy the advantage of being able to give expression to our sentiments with full and entire liberty."

The third resolution was proposed by Sir E. P. Tache, and seconded by C. Chapais, Esq., M.P.P.:

"That we regret bitterly with His Holiness, the revolt which has been excited by the enemies of order and religion in the States of the Church, and the support which this revolt appears to obtain contrary to the hope and expectation of the Catholic world, in the policy of powers who have material force at their disposal."

The fourth resolution was proposed by the Hon. Jos. Cauchon, M.P.P., seconded by the Hon. Frs. Lemieux, M.P.P.:

"That we are aware that, while on the one hand there is no occasion to fear that, during the present

trials, the edifice erected on the immovable rock of divine promise should be shaken from its foundation; yet on the other hand we know, from the experience of past ages, that divine light and salvation are spread throughout the world, in proportion to the freedom of action of the Supreme Pastor and his independence of all foreign control. We moreover believe that it is by a special design of Divine Providence that the liberty of action and freedom of speech of him, whose mission it is to guide Christ's flock and to confirm his brethren in the faith, has ever been powerfully aided by the possession, so ancient and legitimate, of his temporal sovereignty."

The fifth resolution was proposed by H. Dubord, Esq., one of the city representatives, seconded by Charles Fremont, Esq., M.D., Dean of the Faculty of Medicine in Laval University:

"That we joyfully unite with all the children of the Church, in offering our thanks to His Holiness, for the firmness with which he rejected the proposal made to His Holiness to give up a portion of the Patrimony of St. Peter, on the promise of an uncertain guarantee, which could not have strengthened his title, but which, we have reason to think, would have served as a pretext for future pretensions."

The sixth resolution was proposed by J. E. Turcotte, Esq., M.P.P., seconded by Dr. Desaulniers, M.P.P.:

"That we confidently hope that the evils which we now deplore in conjunction with the Vicar of Jesus Christ will be only of temporary duration, and that God who in His goodness limits the fury of human passions, and who holds in His hands the hearts of the rulers of this earth, will soon render the cause of justice victorious, and will once more manifest to the world the protection which He vouchsafes to His church; and that we at the same time assure His Holiness that, however long and violent the storm may rage, we shall not cease to supplicate the Almighty to calm the winds and bid the waves be still, and to restore tranquillity to the Catholic world, by strengthening and rendering more secure the authority of His Viceregent on earth."

The seventh resolution was proposed by L. G. Baillarge, Esq., Bailonier of the Quebec Bar, seconded by Edouard Glackmeyer, Esq., President of the Quebec Board of Notaries:

"That an Address based on the preceding resolutions shall be prepared, and that His Lordship the Administrator of the Diocese be requested to transmit to His Holiness this expression of the sentiments and wishes of the faithful in this city."

In accordance with these resolutions the following Address to the Holy Father was adopted:

"TO OUR MOST HOLY FATHER POPE PIUS IX."

"MOST HOLY FATHER—We, the Clergy and Faithful of the Metropolitan City of Quebec, humbly implore your Holiness to permit us to lay at Your feet the homage of our profound veneration for Your sacred person, and our unalterable affection to the Holy Apostolic See."

"It is with love that we fulfill this duty of filial piety towards Your Holiness under existing circumstances, when Your paternal heart is overwhelmed by daily increasing cares and troubles. We cannot but deplore bitterly with Your Holiness the revolt excited by the enemies of order and religion in a portion of the Ecclesiastical States; and the support which that revolt appears to have received, contrary to the hopes and expectations of the Catholic world, in the policy of the Powers which have at their disposal material force."

"We are aware that, while on the one hand there is no occasion to fear that during the present trials, the edifice erected on the immovable rock of divine promise should be shaken from its foundation, yet on the other hand we know, from the experience of past ages, that divine light and salvation are spread throughout the world, in proportion to the freedom of action of the Supreme Pastor, and his independence of all foreign control. We moreover believe that it is by a special design of divine Providence that the liberty of action and freedom of speech of Him, whose mission it is to guide Christ's flock and to confirm his brethren in the faith, has ever been powerfully aided by the possession, so ancient and legitimate, of his temporal sovereignty."

"We joyfully unite with all the children of the Church, in offering our thanks to your Holiness, for the firmness with which you rejected the proposal made to your Holiness to give up a portion of the Patrimony of St. Peter, on the promise of an uncertain guarantee, which could not have strengthened your title, but which, we have reason to think, would have served as a pretext for future pretensions."

"We confidently hope, most Holy Father, that the evils which we now deplore in conjunction with your Holiness will be only of temporary duration, and that God who in his goodness limits the fury of human passions, and who holds in His hands the hearts of the rulers of this earth, will soon render the cause of justice victorious, and will once more manifest to the world the protection which He vouchsafes to His Church. We at the same time assure your Holiness that, however long and violent the storm may rage, we shall not cease to supplicate the Almighty to calm the winds and bid the waves be still, and to restore tranquillity to the Catholic world, by strengthening and rendering more secure the authority of His Viceregent on earth."

"Prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we humbly beseech you to grant us and all your children of the Diocese of Quebec, the Apostolic Benediction."

Quebec, 4th March, 1860.

Messrs. L. J. C. Fiset and O. Cremazie acted as Secretaries.

The above Resolutions, and Address were adopted by the other Meetings, which were addressed by the edict of the Catholic residents of Quebec, and attended by attentive thousands.

From the Courier du Canada, we glean the following details:

THE MEETING IN ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH.

This was presided over by the Rev. Mr. M'Gauran: the Resolutions were proposed and seconded by the following speakers:

- 1st Resolution—Moved by the Hon. C. Alley, Provincial Secretary, seconded by Wm. Quinn, Esq., Supervisor of Cullers.
2nd. Moved by John Maguire, Esq., J.P., seconded by J. P. O'Meara, Esq., J.P.
3rd. Moved by M. A. Hearn, Esq., Advocate, seconded by John Flanagan, Esq., J.P.
4th. Moved by John Hearn, Esq., City Councillor, seconded by F. G. Cannon, Esq., N.P.
5th. Moved by Maurice O'Leary, Esq., seconded by T. J. Murphy, Esq.
6th. Moved by J. C. Nolan, Esq., seconded by John Lane, Jr., Esq.
7th. Moved by W. M'Kay, Esq., seconded by Joseph O'Donnell, Esq.

The meeting was attended by upwards of two thousand persons.

THE MEETING IN ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.

- The Rev. A. Racine, Chaplain, presided.
The 1st Resolution was proposed by G. H. Simard, Esq., M.P.P., seconded by Michael Tessier, Esq., J.P.
The 2nd was proposed by Louis Bilodeau, Esq., seconded by Louis Amiot, Esq.
The 3d was proposed by Frs. Vezina, Esq., seconded by David Dussault, Esq.
The 4th was proposed by Dr. Robitaille, seconded by Eug. Chinic, Esq.
The 5th was proposed by Germain St. Pierre, Esq., seconded by Olivier Lepine, Esq.
The 6th was proposed by Professor A. Aubry, D.O.L., seconded by German Roberge, Esq.
The 7th was proposed by A. D-Riverin, Esq., seconded by Gregoire Matte, Esq.

THE MEETING IN ST. ROCH'S CHURCH.

- The Rev. M. Gharest, curé, in the chair.
The 1st resolution was proposed by Dr. P. M. Barty, seconded by Jos. Hamel, Esq., City Inspector.
The second by Louis Prevost, Esq., N.P., seconded by F. L. Gauvreau, Esq., N.P.
The third by P. Legare, Esq., Advocate, seconded by P. Vallee, Esq.
The 4th by J. P. Rheunau, Esq., Advocate, City Councillor, seconded by Jean Tourangeau, Esq., Advocate.
The 5th by Dr. Roussau, City Councillor, seconded by Chas St. Michel, Esq., of the Morning Chronicle.
The 6th by Dr E. Lemieux, of Laval University, seconded by A. Cote, Esq., of the Journal de Quebec.
The 7th by P. G. Huot, Esq., N.P., seconded by J. B. Bruneau, Esq., N.P.
J. B. Martel, Esq., Secretary.

THE MEETING IN ST. SAUVEUR CHURCH.

- The Rev. Father Durocher presided and Mr. J. L. F. Lemieux acted as Secretary.
The 1st resolution was moved by Clement Gamaiche, Esq., Mayor of the Parish of St. Roch, seconded by Louis Therien, Esq.
The 2nd by Mr. W. Roy, seconded by Mr. Francis Langlois dit Traversay.
The 3rd by J. B. R. Dufresne, Esq., seconded by George Cook Esq.
The 4th by J. B. Plamondon, Esq., seconded by Mr. P. Valois.
The 5th by Felix Bigaouette, Esq., seconded by Mr. Narcisse Dion.
The 6th by J. Giroux, Esq., seconded by Mr. Jos. Bigaouette.
The 7th by Mr. Francis Kironac, seconded by Mr. Olivier Moffet.

MORE SYMPATHY FOR THE POPE.—On Tuesday evening last a great meeting of the Catholics of Toronto, presided over by His Lordship the Coadjutor, the Right Rev. Dr. Lynch, and attended by His Lordship the Bishop of Hamilton, a large number of clergy, and upwards of 4,000 of the laity, was held in St. Michael's Cathedral. We must defer particulars to our next.

THE MONTREAL "GAZETTE" AND THE POPE.—We have endeavored to signalize one error which pervades all our cotemporary's tirades against the Pope; the error of qualifying the Papal Government as a despotism, and Pius IX. as a despot; whilst in no instance has the Gazette so much as attempted to cite one act of that Pontiff's career which savors of despotism, or of a desire even to govern despotically. And here we might well afford to let our case rest; for to make out a case for the revolted people of the Legations, their advocate, the Gazette, must establish his accusation of despotism against Pius IX; and he must cite, at least one act of that Sovereign Prince by which he has justly forfeited his right to the allegiance of his subjects. Yet as the Gazette raises some other points, and as we have no intention to shirk any one of these, we will again devote a few lines to our anti-Papal cotemporary.

He is in error, and in serious error, in attributing the revolt against the Pope, and the movement in favor of annexation to Sardinia, to the people. By letters by us copied from the London Times, and commented upon elsewhere, it is now, and by the admission of the insurgents themselves, conclusively established, that the revolt, and the vote of annexation, were the acts of less than one-third of the people; that the truth was suppressed by the scrutineers; and that a deliberate falsehood was imposed upon Europe by the revolutionary party. If there be then any one fact in connection with the Papal territory and its affairs beyond dispute it is this—that more than two-thirds of the people are opposed to the policy of the insurrectionary party.

How comes it then, we shall be asked, that the majority allow a minority, as contemptible in point of numbers, as in respect of moral worth and integrity, to impose their will upon the community? The answer is not difficult. Because the insurrectionary minority are concentrated in the cities, and organized by means of secret societies; because the well affected and orderly disposed majority are scattered and dispersed and destitute of organization; because, as the history of all revolutions shows to be the case, the friends of order are unwilling to move until constrained by an imperious necessity; and lastly, because the insurrectionary minority are actively assisted by Sardinia, and the agents of revolution throughout Italy. In the words of our cotemporary "Venetia is sending its thousands of recruits to swell the revolutionary levies in the Duchies and the Romagna;" while the peaceable, quietly disposed citizens of the Papal States, are awed by the hordes of foreign mercenaries by whom their soil is polluted. Thus a Paris mob has always been able to control France; and thus an urban minority, if supported by foreign Powers, can always, at the beginning of a revolution succeed in making its voice pass for the voice of the people, over whom it exercises a truly despotic sway. There is in short no fact connected with revolutions better established than this—that it is one of the most difficult of things to excite the quiet and orderly portion of the population to have recourse to arms even in their own defence. Why even in Montreal, we saw some few years ago the entire city, for several days, at the mercy of a vile rabble; who with impunity, burnt the Houses of Parliament, attacked and pillaged the dwellings of our most respectable citizens, and notwithstanding the presence of a large military force, and the disgust of the immense majority of the citizens, set law and order at defiance! Why was this? Because it is always easier to induce rogues to combine for purposes of outrage, than to persuade honest but quietly disposed citizens to unite in self-defence.

And above all it must be remembered that the revolutionary party everywhere, have always at first an immense advantage over the friends of order; in that they have no conscientious scruples as to means. The former appeal to brute force, and by assassination put to silence the anti-revolutionists. To these means their political opponents—in that they are the friends of order—cannot have recourse. In Bologna for instance, a journalist who should be rash enough to espouse the cause of the Pope against the canaille, or to expose the infamy of the revolutionary government, would be treated as Anvitu was treated; his press would be wrecked, his property destroyed, and his throat cut, by the "friends of liberty." In short, the revolutionists carry their points by appeals to physical force; whilst the principles of their opponents render such an appeal on the part of the latter almost an impossibility. Thus too, though in the long run the proverb that "honesty is the best policy," may even in worldly matters sometimes hold true—there is no doubt that the unscrupulous knave will thrive faster in business than the strictly honest and conscientious dealer; thus too in political strife, the party least hampered with conscientious scruples, to whom the stiletto and the bludgeon are legitimate weapons, will always at first, carry the day over the heads of their more scrupulous opponents—even though the latter be numerically the more powerful. Thus it is with the revolutionists of Italy, as with the revolutionists everywhere. On their side are all the rowdies, all the bullies, all the billiard-room blacklegs, all the prostitutes, knaves, thieves and sharpers of the community; the dagger, the pistol and the bludgeon are at their command; and with such allies, and such weapons, it is not wonderful that for a season they can daunt their more numerous, but undisciplined, and scrupulous opponents, and successfully inaugurate a "Reign of Terror." Was it not thus in Paris? Does not the Gazette know that "The Terror," beneath which so many of France's best and bravest succumbed, was the work of a minority; contemptible in point of numbers, formidable only in their disregard of all moral obligations, in their release from all trammels of conscience?

But whatever the Gazette may say of our reasons, the fact remains incontestable, because avowed by the revolutionary party themselves, that "not one-third" of the population approves of their policy; and that the scrutineers of the pretended vote in favor of annexation taken some six months ago, were so well aware of this damaging fact, that they did not dare to publish the truth to the world. This fact—explain it as we may—is before the world; attested to by the revolutionists themselves; and this simple fact disposes of the Gazette's argument in favor of the latter, and stated by our cotemporary in the following words:—

"We set out in the argument of this question with the TRUE WITNESS, basing our argument upon the declaration that the re-establishment and prolongation of the temporal power of the Pope over the States of the Church involve a wrong to the people of those States, who longed for disestablishment." This basis, upon which our cotemporary's argument rests, having been proved to be false by the avowals of the revolutionists themselves, the entire superstructure must needs come toppling down about his ears. We will therefore merely abuse ourselves by tossing about some of the debris.

Not only was the basis on which the Gazette's argument was erected, rotten, but the edifice raised thereon was viciously constructed.—Throughout he labors under the disadvantage of having to reconcile two irreconcilables; to maintain the duty of subjects to their rulers, and to assert the right of subjects to throw off that duty or obligation, at their pleasure. As the apologist of Romagnolo rebels he was constrained to the latter; as the Great Briton, insisting upon his right to rule in Ireland and in India, he felt himself compelled to attempt the other. He has of course failed in both, and given in his own person an illustration of the truth of the old adage that it is impossible to be on both sides of a hedge at the same moment. We feel indeed, during the perusal of our cotemporary's articles that he is himself conscious of his own inconsistency, and that he is crushed by the insuperable difficulties of his task. He has two set of principles, one applicable to British and Protestant subjects; another which he applies to the subjects of Catholic Sovereigns. According to the first, the Irish Catholic—though as compared with the one monster grievance of the Irish Protestant Church Establishment, all the grievances which the malice of faction has alleged against the Governments of the Italian States are but as a grain of dust in the balance—is still bound to submit to that grievance, and is forbidden to appeal to arms; and the people of India, if they presume to rise in rebellion against the alien Power that bears rule over them, are to be consigned to the tender mercies of powder and cold steel. According to the other set of principles, the subject of the Pope, though he cannot cite a single valid grievance against his ruler, has the perfect right to rise in revolt; and with the aid of Sardinia, to renounce his allegiance to his legitimate Sovereign. John Mitchell is a felon, a traitor, fit food for the gibbet; but Mazzini and Garibaldi are heroes, meet companions for the gods. Nana Sahib is a monster; but the bloodthirsty rabble of the Roman States, clamoring for the lives of the Catholic clergy, are patriots worthy of the admiration of mankind. Such are the conclusions to which our cotemporary's contradictory principles lead. The absurdity of the conclusions is the refutation of the principles.

Our cotemporary meets our assertion that to constitute the subject sole judge of the circumstances under which the moral obligation of allegiance ceases to be binding on him, is virtually to absolve him from the moral obligation altogether; and that no man or set of men is or are qualified to adjudicate upon a case wherein he or they is or are interested—with the rejoinder that our doctrine necessarily leads to perpetual foreign intervention. Were this true, it would not set aside an axiomatic truth: but it is not true, for we suggested to our cotemporary an alternative, though one of which, as a Protestant, he cannot avail himself. The question, when does allegiance to the temporal power cease to

be a duty? is—if allegiance be a moral obligation imposed by God Himself—a question in the moral order, upon which none but a judge infallible on faith and morals is qualified to decide. Now by asserting such infallibility of the Pope, under certain circumstances, defined by theologians, we assert such a judge; and much as it may shock our cotemporary's Protestant prejudices, we have no hesitation in avowing for ourselves that, were the Pope to give his decision ex cathedra, and speaking in the name of the Catholic Church, that the conduct of our sovereign had been such as to absolve us from our moral obligation, or duty of allegiance, the question of whether we should any longer obey that rule, would with us be a mere question of prudence. This by no means asserts that the Pope has the power to depose princes not holding from him, or to release their subjects from their allegiance; all we assert is the Pope's competency to pronounce judicially, when, and under what circumstances, the ruler, by his own misconduct and abuse of power, has himself released his subjects from the moral obligation of allegiance. The most pudding-headed Great Briton in existence must surely perceive the difference betwixt such a judicial act, and an unlimited deposing power; and the Gazette need not fear for the loyalty of his Catholic fellow subjects, so long as our common sovereign violates no precepts of the natural law; or so long as the throne of Great Britain is occupied by one, who like our own beloved Queen Victoria, is as remarkable for her constitutional exercise of power, as for the brilliant example of every domestic virtue which she sets to her subjects.

But, continues the Gazette with a remarkable disregard of logic and grammar, "if no man can be judge in his own case, how, we repeat, is the Pope to be allowed to decide the case on his side? quis custodiet ipse custos?" (sic.) If the Gazette will do us the honor of referring to what we have already said on the subject, he will see that we asserted the necessity of a judge on questions of allegiance, "morally distinguishable from subject on the one hand, and from prince on the other." Now the Pope, as Head of the Church, and speaking to, and in the name of, that Church on a question of faith and morals, is "morally distinguishable" from the temporal ruler of the Papal States. In the one capacity we believe him, in virtue of the promises, to be supernaturally assisted; in the other capacity we claim for him no other immediate supernatural guidance than we claim for any other sovereign; and, therefore, without any inconsistency we can still assert the necessity of a judge "morally distinguishable from subject on the one hand, and from prince on the other," and yet discover that judge betwixt the people of the Papal States and their ruler, in the Sovereign Pontiff of the Catholic Church.

Hitherto, however, no occasion has arisen for that act of judgment on the part of the Pope.—His revolted subjects have not as yet attempted even to make out a case in their favor, or against their Sovereign. Their sole argument is, "We have the power, aided as we are by Sardinia, to throw off our allegiance, and, therefore, we have the right to do so." On a case of subject against prince so stated—and we have not certainly stated it unfairly—there is but one verdict that would be returned by any tribunal in Christendom.

For this week, however, we must conclude, but shall perhaps say a few parting words to our Protestant opponent in our next.

CENTRAL ITALY.—We would direct attention to the Marquis of Normandy's able speech in the House of Lords, and to the Italian correspondence which we copy from the London Times, as throwing much light on the state of parties in Central Italy. The statements of the noble Marquis are strongly, though unintentionally, confirmed by the revolutionary correspondents; who admit, who indeed boast of, their utter disregard of the wishes of the majority of the people of Central Italy with respect to the question of annexation; and who also frankly admit that the great sentiment underlying and animating the entire movement is, not love for Italian liberty, but hatred of Catholicity, and indeed of Christianity—since, like their prototypes of 1792, the Protestant liberals of Italy, in rejecting Catholicity repudiate all religion.

Thus one of the writers by us referred to, fully admits, what we have all along pretended, viz., that the revolutionary movement was anything but popular:—"Six months ago," he says, "the elections for the Assembly demonstrated that the majority of the population kept apart from the movement, and none of the scrutineers dared to announce the number of voters—which did not amount to one-third of the electors."

From this several things are clear. First, that the leaders of the Revolutionary party in Italy are unscrupulous liars, who wilfully suppress the truth, when the truth militates against them; secondly, that two-thirds of the people only six months ago, when called upon to ratify the acts of the Revolutionists, refused to do so; thirdly, that the former rulers of the revolted districts could not have been the tyrants they have been represented—seeing how contemptible was the minority which, aided by foreign bayonets—accomplished their overthrow.

But the same writer tells us that—though fully two-thirds of the people are opposed to the policy of the revolutionists—"at present nobody cares for those who are opposed to the annexation with Piedmont." Not indeed because a change has occurred in the minds of the people; but because, assured of the armed assistance of Sardinia, of moral, if not physical aid from France, and of the determination of France and England to prohibit the intervention of Austria—the revolutionary minority now feel that it is in their power to impose their will by brute force on the majority, and to ride rough-shod over the liberties of the Italian people. These, be it remembered, are the confessions of the liberals themselves; by them openly avowed, and without scruple published in the London Times. Overawed by foreign bayonets, the people of Central Italy, are again to enact the farce of a vote of annexation to Piedmont; but though six months ago the