

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE EDITOR, AND PROPRIETOR, GEORGE E. OLBERG, At No. 233, Notre Dame Street. TERMS: To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not in advance, 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; Puckey's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Piekup), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts. Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 13, 1861.

TO OUR READERS.

Mr. Gillies, of the TRUE WITNESS office, is now on a collecting and canvassing tour through Canada West. He has full authority to receive all monies due to this office, to give receipts, and to make such arrangements as he shall deem most convenient. We would respectfully bespeak for him a good reception from our numerous, delinquent subscribers.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

When M. Necker was recalled to take control of the finances of France, the revolution which consigned Louis XVI. to the scaffold was imminent. The task which Necker failed to accomplish has devolved upon M. Fould, who is called upon by Louis Napoleon to restore order to the finances of the Empire, and to rescue it if rescue be still possible, from the consequences of long years of extravagance and bad government. What this may portend no man can tell; but it cannot be doubted that the forced confession of a deficit of upwards of forty million sterling must materially affect the estimation in which Louis Napoleon is held by his subjects. By his treatment of the Pope, of the Bishops of France, and particularly of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, he has for ever alienated the affections of all the "devoted" or Catholic party. By his campaign in Italy, he has successfully established the fact that he is no General, and has in consequence lost any influence over the army that the prestige of his name might otherwise have assured to him; and by the complete failure of his domestic administration, and the fearful amount of debt into which he has plunged the country, he has for ever destroyed any reputation that he may have possessed as the "Napoleon of Peace." He has done one thing, and he has certainly done that well. He has by his immense armaments in time of peace, aroused the suspicions and jealousies of neighboring nations; and revived, in a great measure, those apprehensions of French aggression, which the less brilliant, but wiser policy of preceding Governments had well nigh allayed.

And even now, with bankruptcy staring him in the face, it seems doubtful whether Louis Napoleon will consent to any serious reduction in the military or maritime establishments of the Empire. The army is to be kept up, nearly on its old footing, and iron-clad frigates are still to issue from the naval arsenals of France. Neither, according to M. Fould's programme in so far as it has as yet been made public, is there any design to raise the revenue to a level with expenditure by increasing taxation. Here is the problem which M. Fould is called upon to solve. He must not seriously reduce the armaments of France, nor is he at liberty to impose fresh burdens upon the people; and yet he has to provide for an acknowledged deficit of forty millions.— If he shall succeed in satisfactorily solving the problem under these conditions, M. Fould will have established his reputation as the greatest finance Minister of ancient or modern times.

The clouds that long have lowered over Rome are now beginning to break, and occasional glimpses of sunshine pierce through the gloom in which the prospects of the Church have lately been involved. Not that the storm has altogether passed away, for still the aspect is menacing; but the Catholic may now reasonably indulge the hope that the tempest which the powers of hell have conjured up against the Papacy, is about to subside, or perhaps to recoil upon the heads of its authors. The finances of Victor Emmanuel are in a wretched plight; in the lately annexed Province the greatest discontent prevails—amongst the peasantry, upon whom the conscription weighs most heavily—and upon all classes of citizens, who find themselves burdened with a load of taxation, and daily outraged and insulted by Piedmontese taxgatherers and hordes of rude and alien officials. Naples will not submit to the foreign yoke, and spurs indignantly the rule of the robber king, and of his lieutenants; whilst the brave General Borgeas drives the foreign mercenaries of Piedmont before him, and inspires hope and confidence in the undisciplined levies by whom hitherto the contest for national independence has been gallantly carried on. The idea of a "United Italy" is therefore fast losing

ground, and the often talked of project of an Italian Confederation against looms upon the horizon. The plan, of which the details are given in the *Daily News*, is this—Italy is to be divided into three parts—a Northern kingdom, with Victor Emmanuel at its head—a Papal State, including Umbria and the Marches—and a Kingdom of Naples restored to the Bourbons, in the South. Austria is to be prevailed upon to cede Venetia to Piedmont; and it is hoped that the people of Italy, their soil thus delivered from the stranger, may enjoy peace and liberty under their several national governments. That this scheme shall be carried into execution is doubtful; but such a scheme is broached, however, is a convincing proof that public opinion with respect to the Italian question has undergone a great revolution within the last few months.

The affair of the *Trent*, and its probable consequences upon the diplomatic relations of Great Britain and the Northern States, continue to furnish matter for lively, if not very profitable discussion. We shall know in a few days how the tidings have been received by the British Government, and what action it intends to take in the premises. We hope that the affair may be settled amicably and honorably; that it will be so settled, is, in the present temper of the people of the Northern States, more than doubtful. Then there is the case of the *Nashville*, which if not carefully dealt with, may lead to very disagreeable results. The facts are these.

The *Nashville* is a man-of-war steamer belonging to the Confederate States' navy, which, eluding the blockade, managed to cross the Atlantic in safety, capturing en route and near the British coast, the ship *Harvey Birch* of New York. The *Nashville*, having we suppose no men to spare for a prize-crew, destroyed the captured vessel, as she had a clear right to do, and brought the captain and crew thereof to Southampton, where of course they were immediately liberated. The question raised is—Has the *Nashville* the right to refit in a neutral port? The Northerners will probably answer this question in the negative; and will insist that any assistance given to a Confederate States' man-of-war in a British port, is a violation of that neutrality which Great Britain has pledged herself to observe as betwixt the respective belligerents.

On the other hand it may well be contended by the Government of the Confederate States, that its men-of-war have just as good a right to demand shelter and repairs in a British port, as have the men-of-war of their Northern enemies. And it so happens that, only a few days before the arrival at Southampton of the *Nashville*, the *James Adger*, a man-of-war steamer belonging to the Northerners had sailed from the same port, after having refitted therein, and made preparations for continuing hostilities against the flag of the Confederate States. It would seem, therefore, that, if the principles of strict neutrality are to be observed by the British Government, no obstacles should by it be placed in the way of the refitting and provisioning of the *Nashville* in British waters. If the armed vessels of one belligerent are admitted to the rights of hospitality, so must the armed vessels of the other; and the only rule that can be adopted, consistently with professions of neutrality, is that of either excluding both, or of admitting both. This, we think, the law which the British authorities will insist upon applying to the men-of-war of the two belligerents, without distinction or favor to either; but from this very impartiality, the Northerners will deduce grounds of quarrel, for their idea of neutrality seems to be that Great Britain should actively side with the North against the South, should deal with President Lincoln as with an ally, and with President Davis as with an enemy. This one-sided neutrality will not, however, suit the people of England; and though we are certain that they have no desire to mix themselves up in any manner with the quarrels of their Transatlantic cousins, and no design to interfere in any manner in their domestic squabbles, we do not believe that they will allow themselves to be frightened by Yankee braggadocio and bluster into becoming the partisans of the North against the South. Hitherto the British Government has acted towards the contending parties with the most honorable neutrality—though all she has received in return has been insult and defiance from the North, together with threats of a "filibustering" expedition against Canada. We fear, however, that this can not last much longer; and that the Northerners by their absurd pretensions, and their outrageous demeanor will force Great Britain a war which every Christian and good citizen would fain avert.

No change of great importance has occurred since our last in the relative positions of the belligerents. The Northern army under General McClellan is no doubt acquiring habits of discipline, and preparing itself for the day of combat which is probably not far distant. Of the intended action, and actual condition of the Southern army we really know nothing, but what comes through Northern channels. Thus, however seems certain from the tone of the press, and of Congress—that sooner or later the war will become a war of emancipation, or in other

words, a servile war. From this terrible issue the President of the Northern States evidently recoils with dismay; yet it will be forced upon him by his Cabinet, by the Legislature, and by the voice of the people who, in their passion are unable to take a calm view of the inevitable consequences of the policy upon which they are most madly and savagely intent. To proclaim the freedom of the African race, and to put arms into the hands of the emancipated slaves, would undoubtedly insure the destruction of the South, but it does not follow that therein would be found the salvation of the North. Indeed we can conceive of no greater embarrassment than that in which the latter would find itself when face to face with an armed negro population, still reeking with the blood of their white masters, and with their appetites only whetted for further plunder and murder. What, under such circumstances, could Northern whites do with their African allies? how again reduce the latter to subjection after having proclaimed their emancipation? or how prevent them from turning against their Northern liberators, the very arms which, in a moment of madness, the Northerners had been foolish enough or wicked enough to place in the hands of the negroes of the South? Nobody seems to think of these questions now; nobody apparently deems it worth while to consider how the armed and emancipated slaves of the Southern States are to be dealt with, when, through their aid, the white populations of these States shall have been exterminated—for it should never be forgotten that a war betwixt master and slave—or servile war—means a war of extermination. Four million of armed and suddenly emancipated blacks, flushed with recent victory over their former masters, with the plunder of their master's homesteads, and maddened by blood and lust—not separated from one another by leagues of ocean, as were the negro races of the several British West India Islands, and who from their geographical conditions were unable to organize any combined insurrection against the planters—will neither coalesce with the people of the North, nor in any wise submit to their dominion. The latter, therefore, even when triumphant over the white population of the Southern States, will have to commence another, bloodier, more desperate, and more doubtful struggle with the blacks; which must end, either in the extermination of the latter, or the permanent establishment of an independent Black Republic in immediate contact with the White Republic of the North, amongst whose people the prejudices against negro blood are far stronger, inveterate, and bigoted than amongst the whites of the South.

There is nothing so like a "low Orangeman" as a "Protestant Reformer;" indeed it may be said that the former, or "low Orangeman," is only a "Protestant Reformer" raised to the highest power of fanaticism and intolerance.—The *Globe*, and the *British Herald*, can hardly be distinguished from one another; both raise the "No-Popery" howl; and so sweetly are their notes blended and in such perfect concert, that the most practised ear would find it impossible to distinguish betwixt these two organs—the one the organ of the "low Orangemen," the other that of the "Protestant Reformers." They are most clearly "natural allies."

The Orange organst having favored us with a solo on the subject of Lord Monck's visit to the Laval University, and other Catholic institutions at Quebec, the *Globe*, on the part of the "Protestant Reformers," inflicts upon us a repetition of the same theme—with a few brilliant variations suggested by the School Laws of Upper Canada; and "improves the occasion" by the introduction of a loud wail against Catholic Separate Schools which it, in common with the entire "Protestant Reform" party, holds in detestation, and is determined to overthrow—with the assistance, of course, of those fine, high-spirited and liberal *Kaouthicos* whom aptitude for dirty work has induced to don the plush breeches, and ignominious livery of Mr. George Brown. Betwixt them—that is to say, betwixt the "low Orangemen," the "Protestant Reformers" and the *Kaouthicos* hangers-on, or chorus-singers aforesaid—they make up a very choice concert indeed. We will make a few extracts from the *Globe*, by way of showing how perfectly in harmony are the views of the "Protestant Reformers" upon all matters where-in the interests of Catholics are at stake, with those of the *British Herald*—the organ of the "low Orangemen"—upon the same subject.

The latter, with that peculiar delicacy for which "low Orangemen" are remarkable, and alluding to the visits to Catholic institutions at Quebec, informs Lord Monck, that—

"this policy will at all events, not be tolerated in Protestant Upper Canada."

The *Globe*, upon the same theme—that of His Excellency's visit to Catholic Educational institutions—thus joins in, in concert with the *British Herald*—

"Such a visit is not in accordance with the views of the people of Upper Canada, nor, we may add, with those of the Protestants of Lower Canada."

And, referring to the visit of the Prince of Wales to the same Catholic institutions, and by way of a warning to Lord Monck of what he may expect from the loyal "Protestants" of the "Reform" party when he visits Upper Canada—the *Globe* reminds His Excellency that:—

"Very unpleasant circumstances took place in Upper Canada, however, as the consequence of that visit, and, moreover, the Prince of Wales might do as a visitor that which would not be fitting in a Governor."

We lay these extracts before our readers—not because of their intrinsic merits, but—to show them how perfectly identical in tone and spirit are the organs of the "low Orangemen" and of the "Protestant Reformers;" and to convince them, how silly, or rather how knavish they must be, who represent "Protestant Reformers" as less anti-Catholic than the most rabid of the "low Orangemen," and who recommend a political alliance with the former, as a means of defence against the "No-Popery brutality of the latter. Our object is to show that "Protestant Reformers" and "low Orangemen" are alike our irreconcilable enemies; and that in so far as Catholic honor, and Catholic interests are concerned, there is no appreciable difference betwixt them.

As a further specimen of the spirit with which the "Protestant Reform" party is animated, we will cite the language of the *Globe*, the chief organ of that party, upon the Catholic Hierarchy and Separate Schools; leaving it to our Catholic readers to judge how far they can in honor and consistency, with due regard to themselves and their Pastors, give any support to "Protestant Reformers" or encouragement to those who directly or indirectly give support to such inveterate enemies of their Church and creed.—Thus the *Globe* says:—

"In Upper Canada, the Hierarchy has excited the greatest alarm and indignation by its attempt to destroy our noble Common School system. It entered the wedge when it compelled the Government to grant Separate Schools to Catholics, and it has never ceased its endeavours since to rend the system to pieces. . . . The measure for Upper Canada, was introduced by a French Catholic, and ultimately became law, though considerably changed, owing to the opposition with which it was met by Upper Canadians."

"Under these circumstances it is impossible that the Protestant people of Upper Canada can have any good will to the Catholic Hierarchy. . . . They know the power of the Church; they understand the necessity of maintaining constant watchfulness in presence of a dangerous foe; they cannot desire to see the influence of that foe strengthened by the very men who ought to be expected to keep it in check. "The Romish Hierarchy is a political enemy."

We do not, of course, hold all Upper Canadian Protestants responsible for the avowed sentiments of the *Globe*; but we believe that, without injustice, we may be permitted to look upon that journal as, *par excellence*, the organ of the "Protestant Reform" party, and that we may therefore attribute to the latter the sentiments which their organ enunciates. Judging the former therefore from the latter, our readers must perceive—

1st. That if their School Laws are still very defective; that if in consequence they enjoy but in a restricted form and limited degree, the blessings of Freedom of Education, they are indebted for their inferior position, for those restrictions and limitations upon their natural rights, to the political action of that party in Upper Canada whom the *Globe* represents, and who are usually styled, both by themselves and others, the party of "Protestant Reformers."

2d. That the said party of "Protestant Reformers" entertain no good will towards the Bishops and Clergy of the Catholic Church; that they look upon the Catholic Hierarchy as their "enemy," as their "dangerous foe;" and that they deem it one of the principal duties of the Government of Canada to "keep that foe in check."

Such being the openly expressed sentiments of the "Protestant Reform" party towards the Catholic Church, and such the consequences of its political action, is it not wonderful, or rather is it not most degrading, to think that there are men calling themselves Catholics, forsooth, vile enough to advocate a political alliance with that party, and to represent its members as our "natural allies?" Is it not evident that men who pursue such a course, who give such advice to their coreligionists, must be traitors and renegades? Is it not evident that, despite of "bunkum" speeches, and "hiserlutin" notions which cost nothing, mean nothing, and profit nothing, they have, for their own sordid interests, consented to sacrifice the rights and interests of the Church, the sacred cause of "Freedom of Education," and to put in peril the immortal souls of those little ones whom through their thrice accursed system of "Common Schools," the "Protestant Reformers" are trying to drag down to perdition?

With what scorn then, with what bitter loathing should not all honest Catholics treat and regard the supporters and political allies of the "Protestant Reformers;" of that party to whose opposition it is owing—as the *Globe* boasts—that the Separate School system has been but imperfectly adopted in Upper Canada; and that in consequence the Catholics of that section of the Province are still subject to the curse and tyranny of Protestant "State-Schoolism"—a curse and a tyranny compared with which the Protestant "State-Churchism" of Ireland may almost be pronounced a blessing, and a boon? The

Globe itself take no pains to conceal its contempt for its *Kaouthico* allies, for those miserable place-beggars who march beneath the "No-Popery" banner of the "Protestant Reform" party. It tells them plainly, knowing that they are lost to shame and callous to infamy, that the party in whose ranks they serve, whose uniform they wear, whose wages they receive, and from whose hands they thankfully accept their broken victuals—is the "enemy" of the Catholic Hierarchy, the "foe" of the Church, and upon its accession to office designs so to exercise its political power as "to keep that foe in check." What then should honest Papists think of the "natural allies" of the "Protestant Reformers?"

It is evident, we say, that it is this party which is the only real obstacle in the way of "Freedom of Education," or in other words, that the "Protestant Reformers" are the chief supporters of Protestant "State-Schoolism."—It is equally evident, to every true Catholic, that the question of "Freedom of Education" is beyond comparison the most important with which the Legislature can be called upon to grapple; and that the establishment of a Separate School system, in its integrity, should be the primary object of all his exertions, seeing that the "Common Schools" are, as the decrees of our Provincial Councils affirm, and as the melancholy experience of the United States testifies, altogether dangerous to "faith and morals." It is therefore equally evident that the Catholic should look upon and treat as his enemy, every "Protestant Reformer," and every one who directly or indirectly gives aid or countenance to that party, of whose views and policy on the School Question the *Globe* is the exponent.—Our motto therefore is, and ever shall be, "War to the knife with the *Protestant Reformers*, and their allies!"

On one point do we partially agree with the *Globe*; it says:—

"It is only on strictly voluntary principles that peace and harmony can be maintained in these Provinces."

Well then, carry out this principle we say to the *Globe*. Apply the "Voluntary Principle" to the School as well as to the Church, and recognise its justice and efficacy in Education as well as in Religion.—If you will not consent to a "Separate School" system, at all events cease to attempt to force upon us your Yankee "State-Schoolism," to which—no matter what the consequences—we never will quietly submit. On these terms, but on these terms only, can harmony betwixt Catholics and Protestants be maintained.

The *Toronto Christian Guardian* copies our remarks upon the advantages which Catholics in Canada enjoy as British subjects, and concludes with the following remarks:—

"Our contemporary is becoming quite loyal; the complaisance of the Duke of Newcastle, during his tour with the Prince of Wales, seems to have produced a fine effect upon him. We hope he does not think the British Government more favorable to Popery than Louis Napoleon. True, Britain shows more fair dealing; but why should the *True Witness* object to Protestants having that liberty in France that it claims for Catholics in Britain?"

We are not aware that the TRUE WITNESS has ever been otherwise than loyal, and very loyal. Not in the sense indeed, of approving of all the acts of the British Government; for there is much both in its domestic and in its foreign policy of which we disapprove, as contrary to justice, repugnant to all the traditions of the Empire, and very dangerous to the material interests of the country. England has, until lately, been at the head of the Conservative party in Europe; and even when her domestic policy was most objectionable, was always found to be in opposition to revolution abroad. To approve, therefore, of her former policy, is to condemn that which she has of late adopted, more particularly towards Italy, and the Kingdom of Naples. The British fleet under Lord Nelson was bailed by the Neapolitan Bourbons as their protector against Italian Jacobinism; the Commander-in-Chief of H. M. naval force in the Mediterranean to-day, is, in so far as he is able, aiding, abetting, and giving moral support, to the revolutionary scoundrels for whom the hero of the Nile entertained the most thorough loathing. If, therefore, we stigmatise as unjust and impolitic the present foreign policy of our rulers, it is because they have gone far astray from the precedents of their predecessors.

The *Christian Guardian* "hopes we do not think the British government more favorable to Popery than Louis Napoleon." Indeed we do. We think, and upon good grounds, that the political institutions of the British Empire are far more favorable to Popery than are those of France, because Popery always thrives best on the most free soil, and in the atmosphere of free institutions. The Church is not indeed dependent upon political accidents or forms of Government. She can exist in spite of the most unfavorable political conditions, and can retain her vitality under the most depressing circumstances. Russian autocracy cannot kill her; neither can the still more odious despotism of a democracy deprive her of life, for even in the United States she lives and flourishes. But