

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE
 PROPRIETORS,
 GEORGE E. OLBERK and JOHN GILLIES,
 At No. 228, Notre Dame Street.
 All communications to be addressed to the Editor,
 G. E. OLBERK.

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 car-
 riers, 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;
 Pickups News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and
 at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 14, 1860.

Mr. Gillies, of the TRUE WITNESS, is
 now on a collecting tour throughout Upper Ca-
 nada, and will visit all our subscribers who are in
 arrears. We trust that he may be well received,
 and that, in consequence, we shall not be com-
 pelled to adopt other measures for procuring the
 payment of our long outstanding accounts.

The Editor of the TRUE WITNESS throws
 himself upon the indulgence of his readers, and
 trust they will attribute any short comings in the
 present number to indisposition under which
 he is laboring.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE pertinacity with which Francis II. still
 maintains at Gaeta an apparently desperate cause
 excites the surprise of the politically indifferent,
 whilst it must extort the admiration even of his
 enemies. What he expects from this prolonged
 resistance, it would be hard to say; he has little
 to expect from the active interference of any of
 the other European Powers, and his hopes, if he
 still entertain any, must be based upon the strong
 and rapidly spreading disgust of the Neapolitans
 with the alien yoke imposed upon them by Victor
 Emmanuel and his "foreign mercenaries." Al-
 ready we learn that five Provinces are in open
 insurrection, that martial law has been proclama-
 ed, and that the Liberator is busily engaged
 shooting down his new subjects in the sacred
 name of civil and religious liberty. This, which
 is a fact admitted by the revolutionary press, is a
 sufficient comment upon the proceedings of the
 Italian revolutionists. The Pope still remains at
 Rome, but of his future plans nothing positive
 has yet transpired.

The project of a French Independent Church,
 announced to the world in a semi-official pam-
 phlet, seems to meet with but little favour from
 the people of France, and the author of the pam-
 phlet will probably be disavowed. The experi-
 ment has been already tried in 1790, and has
 signally failed. Amongst the French, all who
 are of any religion—with the exception of avowed
 Protestants—are staunch Papists; and will
 therefore have nothing to do with the mere civil
 or constitutional clergy; those who are not
 staunch Papists are of no religion at all, and will
 not therefore submit themselves to any clergy,
 whether civil or Papal. The adherents of the
 new Napoleonic Church therefore will have to
 be looked for solely amongst the ranks of the
 bureaucratic or government place-holders.

The British news is uninteresting. We have
 tidings from China to the effect that the allied
 armies were advancing upon Peking, intent upon
 dictating the terms of a peace under the very
 nose of his celestial Majesty. Breadstuffs were
 reported dull and flour a shade lower.

The secession movement in the United States
 is assuming serious, indeed gigantic proportions.
 We are now assured that South Carolina seri-
 ously contemplates secession from the Union,
 and will be accompanied by four other States.

The attempt made to justify the scandalous
 conduct of Victor Emmanuel, his invasion of a
 territory against all the laws of justice; his en-
 tire contempt for, and open violation of, the
 principles which have been, among civilized na-
 tions, the basis of their relations with each other,
 is for all honest and well-thinking men a subject
 of melancholy reflection. The material result
 of revolution is of a comparatively small impor-
 tance; whether Victor Emmanuel possesses limit-
 ed or extensive dominions, whether he rules over
 three millions only or over six millions of sub-
 jects, it matters but little; what is to be deplor-
 ed is the consequence of revolution, the mislead-
 ing and corruption of the minds of the people,
 the consecration of principles most subversive of
 social order.

When these principles are confined within the
 dark enclosure of clubs and of secret societies,
 when they are professed privately, and only by
 brigands and cut-throats, whom society abhors
 as monsters, the evil no doubt is great, society is
 threatened, her life is in danger, and nothing but
 an incessant vigilance and an energetic action
 can ward off the storm which is gathering over
 her head. But when these principles are no
 longer hidden from day light, when they are pro-

claimed in the face of the world, not only by
 public writers, but by statesmen; when Kings
 themselves, forgetting that they are the guardians
 of social order, and acting after these principles,
 are encouraged by their fellow monarchs, we
 may say that the evil has reached its last limits;
 that the head itself meditates the destruction of
 the whole body already laboring under a most
 grievous disease.

Such is the situation in Europe; society is
 rotten to the core, and those who hold in their
 royal hands her destiny seem struck with blind-
 ness. Instead of applying the remedy, they
 unrobe the poison which has already thrown their
 subjects into the convulsions of death.

One of these false principles is—that the peo-
 ple have a right to overthrow a government with
 which they are not satisfied. Now, this proposi-
 tion, as it is here laid down, is false. Never
 have the people a right of overthrowing a govern-
 ment for the mere reason that they are not sat-
 isfied with it. It involves a false notion of power,
 in reality a notion altogether anti-Christian. It
 lowers down the authority of Kings to the con-
 dition of a mere human institution; it disposes
 of this authority of its sacred character and
 leaves it the sport of the people; in a word, it
 is at variance with the Scriptures, which says—
Per me reges regnant, (by me kings reign.)

Unless we deny Scripture, we must acknow-
 ledge that the legitimate Sovereign, in govern-
 ing his States, exercises a right—a right with
 which he is invested by God—*per me reges reg-
 nant*—it is in his own name that he rules.—
 Now it is easy to understand that he cannot be
 stripped of this right without lawful reasons; it is
 easy to understand how puerile it is to assert
 that the people may, at their caprice, depose this
 authority because it is not in accordance with
 their taste. To be justifiable in resisting or
 overthrowing this authority, it should be proved
 that he who exercises it has made a bad use of
 it; and even in the case where the overthrowing
 of this power would be likely to bring on a great-
 er evil, it should be maintained. But it is not
 our object to discuss here this delicate question
 which would require more space; we merely in-
 tend to point out the falsity of the above propo-
 sition.

The sovereign in his relations with his sub-
 jects must be guided by principles of reason and
 justice. If he should deviate from the path
 pointed out to him by these principles, his
 authority would no longer be acceptable. But
 the observance of the rules of reason and justice
 must necessarily be reciprocal in the mutual re-
 lations between Kings and subjects. It would
 be not only inconsistent, but ever an immoral
 doctrine to declare the people free from this ob-
 servance,—and such is the case with the above
 proposition, since it is asserted that the people
 can depose their sovereigns if they are not satis-
 fied with them; that is to say, in the case that a
 people were demoralised, would lose the notion of
 good and evil, in the case where Christian legis-
 lation would no longer suit their depraved and
 corrupt taste, they would be justifiable in excit-
 ing a revolution; in other words, however good,
 just, and moral a government be, if the people
 take the notion to overthrow it, if they declare
 themselves not pleased, "they are the best
 judges," they may banish their sovereign, and
 loose themselves from their oath of allegiance.—
 Not only this, but on a mere complaint on the
 part of the people, a foreign power may inter-
 fere and lend its assistance in overthrowing the
 legitimate Sovereign. Such is the pernicious
 doctrine contained in the above proposition,
 which once admitted, leaves no security to Sov-
 ereigns, however good their government may be
 supposed to be.

The only condition to render rebellion justifi-
 cable is not to be satisfied with the government
 —according to the above proposition. There-
 by you legitimate at once revolution, and this in
 an absolute manner, without any qualification.—
 You deprive yourself of the privilege of censur-
 ing in any case whatsoever since you do not invoke
 the immutable principles of right and justice, but
 merely the taste of the people, since you declare
 them alone judges in this matter. For revolu-
 tionists never say they rebel against their will
 or their taste, they always allege dissatisfaction,
 always find fault with their government; and,
 moreover, as the power conferred upon Kings is
 exercised by men, we cannot expect it to be per-
 fect, since perfection is not to be found here be-
 low; and consequently revolutionists will always
 find a pretext to exonerate themselves from any
 guilt; therefore, after your principle, revolution,
 in every imaginable case, can be justified.

To sum up what we have said, the above propo-
 sition is false, for it rests on three false sup-
 positions. 1st. That power is not of divine in-
 stitution, but a mere faculty of governing, granted
 to Kings by their subjects, and that they may
 withdraw from them according to their caprice; 2nd,
 that power exercised by men can be per-
 fect, free from the least subject of censure; 3d,
 that subjects, in their appreciation of govern-
 ments, are infallible, free from error and pas-
 sion.

The consequence of the principles contained
 in the above propositions is dreadful—it leaves

no security for Sovereigns. In a time when re-
 volution is raging on the Continent, when it
 threatens to set Europe in a blaze, for a state-
 man openly to proclaim such an immoral and
 dangerous doctrine is the greatest injury that
 could be inflicted upon society. Depend upon
 it, these untimely expressions will not be lost,
 they will be garnered up, and when a favorable
 circumstance affords itself, the people will avail
 themselves of them.

We will not offer the author of this infamous
 proposition the insult of saying that he has there-
 in declared his own convictions; this would be
 too injurious to his intellectual faculties. No,
 the hatred of Catholicity alone has caused him
 to launch these words on the public. Bigotry
 must have a great influence over a man; the
 pleasure of seeing the Pope's dominions attacked
 and the pleasure of seeing him despoiled of them,
 must be very agreeable to his bitter dispositions
 to make him proclaim a principle which, if car-
 ried out, might turn to-morrow against its au-
 thor.

The above proposition is nothing else than the
 Protestant principle applied to politics. It is
 but consistent; when the people have been
 taught in matters of faith to reject the authority
 of the Church, to abide by their own notions, it
 would be strange that in politics they should re-
 cognise any other authority but their own will.
 But this principle, which has entailed such a con-
 fusion on the religious world, must inevitably, if
 admitted, entail the same confusion on the politi-
 cal world—viz., a complete anarchy. It has
 ever been the object of Protestantism to over-
 throw authority and to extol the human intellect;
 it leaves it free to decide upon the sense of re-
 velation, to reject the authority of those appoint-
 ed by Christ to decide it, to accommodate
 Scripture to every one's own appetite; in a
 word, religion has really become a matter of
 taste: the same principle is introduced into the
 political world by the above proposition. The
 people are no longer bound to abide by the im-
 mutable laws of right and justice in their re-
 lations with their Sovereigns, but are at liberty
 to follow the dictates of their own imaginations.

Deplorable doctrine proclaimed by States-
 men, put into practice by Kings, and whose re-
 sults are received with apathetic silence by the
 different Courts of Europe. We say in silence,
 for the remonstrances made to Sardina from
 certain quarters are a mere mockery.

In the midst of these great scandals, of the
 storm of revolution, how great the Pope appears
 to us, and saying:—"Who amongst you can con-
 vey me of sin? My dominions I hold by the
 most legitimate titles that ever existed; my
 neighbors I have respected; never have I made
 upon them an unjust war; my subjects I have
 treated with kindness; therefore, no pretext can
 justify before the tribunal of God in Heaven,
 and before that of Justice upon earth, the in-
 vasion of my States. It is true I am weak, I have
 no army, no soldiers; I may be beaten, but I
 cannot be conquered; my cause is that of jus-
 tice, and it must prevail." At the present mo-
 ment, when men, struck with blindness, trample
 upon the principles which have civilised the
 world, which govern societies and secure them
 happiness; in the midst of this awful confusion
 the world is highly indebted to the Pope for up-
 holding these principles before the world, and
 giving them the sanction of his high and divinely
 derived authority.

RECIPROCITY.—If we offer a few comments
 upon an article published in the Toronto *Free-
 man* of the 6th inst., we do so in no hostile
 spirit, with no design of rekindling the embers of
 past strife. On the contrary, we would beg of
 our cotemporary to believe that, forgetting all
 differences which may have occurred betwixt us,
 it is our sincere desire to co-operate heartily
 with him and his friends of the Upper Province
 in procuring a speedy settlement of the long
 vexed School Question.

It is in this spirit that we submit to him the
 following remarks upon his article upon that
 same question of the 6th inst. He recognises,
 and recognises truly, that the settlement of the
 Upper Canadian School Question in a manner
 satisfactory to the Catholic minority cannot be
 attained without the active intervention of the
 French Canadians. He complains, but com-
 plains unreasonably, of the "apathy" of the lat-
 ter, and their indifference to Upper Canadian
 interests he erroneously attributes the difficulties
 under which he and his coreligionists of the West
 still labour in the education of their children.

It is not our object to justify the Ministry or
 the French Canadian portion of the legislature
 in their general policy on the School Question.
 They have committed many and grave faults,
 and the TRUE WITNESS has never been slack
 to notice and condemn those faults. But justice
 compels us to tell the Toronto *Free-man* and his
 friends that much of the "apathy" of which
 he and they complain is due to themselves, and to
 the attitude of active hostility which of late years
 they have adopted, by ostensibly allying them-
 selves with the avowed enemies of this section
 of the Province, and in taking up and reiterating

the war-cry of the "Clear-Grits" against French
 Canadian domination.

The French Canadians have, we admit, often
 proved themselves apparently indifferent to the
 Catholic interests of Upper Canada; but on the
 other hand, it is no less true that the Catholics
 of Upper Canada, or a portion of them, have
 proved themselves actively hostile to the dearest
 interests of Lower Canada, those interests which
 it is the duty of every French Canadian Catholic
 to maintain at all hazards. By interfering in
 the affairs of Upper Canada the French Cana-
 dians expose those interests to the assault, not
 of the *Clear Grits* and Protestant Reformers
 alone, but of the Catholic minority as well,
 whose battles the Toronto *Free-man* expects the
 French Canadians to fight. At the Toronto
 Convention, at which Catholics assisted, in whose
 proceedings Catholics took part, and to whose
 resolutions Catholics formerly agreed, it was de-
 clared that the domination of Lower Canada
 over Upper Canada was an intolerable grievance
 calling imperatively for such changes in the
 Constitution as should have the effect of, for the
 future, giving a legislative preponderance to
 Protestant Upper Canada. As a particular in-
 stance, of this French Canadian domination, the
 existing Separate Schools of Upper Canada
 were cited; and in return for the French in-
 fluence by which this measure of justice to the
 Catholics of Upper Canada was carried, the
 Catholics of that section of the Province, through
 their organs of the Press, declared themselves in
 favor of Representation by Population, or such
 other Constitutional changes as should secure
 Upper Canada from a repetition of a similar out-
 rage.

When the good offices of French Canadians
 have met with such a return, and whilst the ac-
 tion of the Catholic delegates at the Toronto
 Convention has never elicited one word of cen-
 sure from, or been publicly repudiated by, their
 Upper Canadian coreligionists, it is not wonderful
 that the people of this section of the Province
 should feel little interest in the Catholic affairs
 of Upper Canada, or that they should indeed
 look upon the Catholics of that section of the
 Province as upon enemies against whom they are
 bound to defend themselves, rather than as upon
 friends whom it is their duty to serve. The first
 duty of the French Canadian Catholic is to-
 wards Lower Canada and Lower Canadians in-
 stitutions; and if he finds, or has reason to be-
 lieve, that he imperils her interests or puts those
 institutions in danger by interfering in the affairs
 of Upper Canada, it is the duty of the French
 Canadian Catholics to abstain from all such in-
 terference. But the actual result of French
 Canadian interference with the Upper Canadian
 School Question has been hitherto to elicit the
 wrath of both the "Clear Grits" and the Upper
 Canadian Catholics joined in an holy alliance
 to prevent the further extension of French Cana-
 dian domination in Upper Canada, and to secure
 a preponderance of Upper Canada in the Legis-
 lature. It is to this that the present refusal of
 French Canadians again to interfere in the Up-
 per Canadian School Question must mainly be
 attributed.

How is this state of things to be remedied?
 how are the active sympathies of Lower Cana-
 da to be won back by their coreligionists of
 Upper Canada? We reply that this must be
 effected by mutual interchange of good offices,
 by reciprocity of services. The Catholics of
 Upper Canada, oppressed as they are by over-
 whelming Protestant majority invoke the aid of
 Lower Canada. The essential condition of that
 aid being given is that, henceforward those who
 invoke that aid, repudiate publicly all semblance
 even of any political connection with the *Clear
 Grits* or Protestant Reformers who are the
 avowed enemies of Lower Canada and of her
 peculiar natural and religious institutions. This
 we may say, is a condition *sine qua non*, and
 which must be complied with before the Catho-
 lics of Upper Canada can have any reason to
 expect or right to demand the interference of
 this section of the Province with the Upper
 Canadian School Question. They must break at
 once and completely with George Brown and all
 his political allies or followers; they must give
 no countenance to any party or any man which
 or who advocates Representation by Population,
 or any such Constitutional changes as should
 give a political preponderance to the Western
 section of the Province; and in return for the
 assistance given by the French Canadians on the
 School Question, they must be prepared, at all
 hazards, and on all occasions, to advocate at the
 polls and at the hustings the rights and the in-
 terests of Lower Canada.

These are the conditions propounded by the
 TRUE WITNESS as the basis of an honourable
 profitable, and permanent alliance betwixt the
 Catholics of the two sections of the Province. It
 cannot be expected that French Canadians
 should actively interest themselves in behalf of
 men who are leagued with the bitterest enemies
 of Lower Canada; it cannot be expected that
 we should again expose our religious and nation-
 al institutions and our political autonomy to the
 renewed assaults of George Brown and his friends
 unless we are previously assured that the Catho-

lic minority of Upper Canada, for whose sake we
 expose ourselves to those attacks, shall join with
 his heart and soul in repelling the attacks of our
 common enemies—of one who, in the words of
 the *Free-man* himself, seek to sweep away every
 vestige of every Catholic institution now exist-
 ing in the Province.

Such are our terms which we propose to the
 Toronto *Free-man*, holding out to him at the
 same time the right hand of friendship and ten-
 dering to him the olive branch, the symbol of
 peace and good will. Will he accept those
 terms? If he will, we think that we can pro-
 mise him in return the active co-operation of
 Lower Canada on questions interesting Upper
 Canadian Catholics.

This too we would respectfully point out to
 him; that on the school question of Upper Ca-
 nada, we of the Lower Province can act as aux-
 iliaries only, and not as principles. It is for our
 brethren of the West, acting of course under
 the advice of their proper leaders, to advocate
 what reforms they require in their existing school
 system; to embody those reforms in a Bill to be
 laid before Parliament at a convenient season,
 and to secure the co-operation of their French
 Canadian coreligionists, and thus assuring its tri-
 umph in the Legislature by showing a lively in-
 terest in the affairs of the Lower Province and
 by approving themselves on all occasions the
 enemies of George Brown, of every political party
 and indeed of every man who has shown him-
 self or themselves inimical to Lower Canadian
 interests.

Having thus, we hope in no hostile spirit, in-
 dicated the line of policy that alone can lead to
 a satisfactory settlement of the school question,
 we would take the liberty of pointing out and
 correcting what we deem to be an error in our
 cotemporary's article, above alluded to. The
 Toronto *Free-man* says that the "Coalition
 Ministry" never hesitated in admitting the jus-
 tice of the separate school principle. When, by
 whom, and in what terms did the Coalition Mi-
 nistry ever make this admission? If we under-
 stood them rightly, their object was to effect a
 settlement of the school question by imposing
 upon the people of Upper Canada, one common
 or uniform system of schools, and that a separate
 school system form no part of their political pro-
 gramme. Indeed the *Free-man* admits as much,
 for he recognises the fact that George Brown,
 the head of the Coalition Ministry, has never
 abandoned his hostility to the principle of separate
 schools, or to what the *Globe*, in its peculiar
 cant, terms "sectarian education."

THE EXTRADITION CASE.—Judgment in this
 case, to which we referred in our last, will be
 delivered on Saturday next, and is naturally
 looked forward to with much anxiety by the
 Canadian public. There is one view of the case,
 however, which we have not yet seen taken by
 any of our provincial cotemporaries, but accord-
 ing to which it would appear that the demand by
 the American Federal Government for the sur-
 render of a fugitive slave, as a criminal under
 any conceivable circumstances, involves a logical
 absurdity.

Crime or criminality can be predicated of
 persons only, and not of things or chattels.—
 Now if we understand the American theory as
 to the status of the slave, the latter is a thing or
 chattel and not a person; not one, therefore, of
 whom crime or criminality can logically be pre-
 dicated, and whose surrender therefore as a cri-
 minal it involves logical absurdity to demand.

Under what character then do the American
 authorities demand the surrender of this Ander-
 son?—as a free-man or as a slave; as a person
 or as a chattel? If as the latter, then his sur-
 render should at once be refused, as a thing or
 chattel, is incapable of crime; if as a person—
 viz., as a free man,—then the American Govern-
 ment virtually emancipates Anderson from a
 state of bondage; and in case that the British
 authorities should surrender him as a person or
 free man, it will be their duty to take effectual
 measures to secure his being dealt with by the
 American tribunals as a free man or person, and
 therefore as one one amenable to those codes
 which regulate the conditions of things, chattels,
 or slaves.

The *Montreal Witness* indulges in some ill-
 natured comments upon the fact that Thursday,
 the 6th inst., the Government Thanksgiving Day
 was not observed by the Catholic portion of the
 population as a religious holiday. The reason
 assigned by the *Montreal Witness* for this neg-
 lect of a government notice is a valid reason,
 but not the only reason. It is perfectly true
 that it is a fundamental principle of the Catholic
 Church that the civil magistrate has no inde-
 pendent authority in matter religious or ecclesi-
 astical; and for this reason a government order
 for the observance of a holiday or a religious
 celebration of any kind can be of no force whatso-
 ever on the Catholic conscience.

But besides this we would remind the *Witness*
 that, unlike Protestant places of worship, all
 Catholic Churches are open every day of the week
 for the celebration of the Divine mysteries, and
 that therein are daily offered thanks to God for
 all His mercies both temporal and spiritual.

Again, Saturday the 8th inst., was already a
 holiday of obligation to all Catholics, viz; a day
 upon which all Catholics were bound by the laws
 of their Church, under pain of mortal sin, to ab-
 stain from all servile work, and to assist at the
 divine offices. It would have been therefore a
 severe tax upon the Catholic population of the
 province had they been compelled to observe an-
 other holiday of obligation in the course of the
 same week; and this reason no doubt will to
 every candid Protestant appear sufficient to ex-