

The True Witness. AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE PROPRIETORS, GEORG E. OLIERI AND JOHN GILLIES, At No. 223, Notre Dame Street. All communications to be addressed to the Editor, G. E. OLIERI. 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 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; Pick-up's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts. MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 11, 1861.

NEWS OF THE WEEK. OUR latest European dates are by the Nova-Scotian. The affairs of Italy remain unchanged; it is rumoured, on the one hand, that Louis Napoleon is about to leave Francis II. to his fate, and, on the other hand, that France and Russia are about to insist upon a cessation of hostilities against Gaeta till the Spring. An extraordinary levy of troops is said to be meditated by Victor Emmanuel; this will, of course, increase the affection which his new subjects of Naples bear towards him. Peace is ratified betwixt the Allies and China. The terms are thus given by the telegram: "Ministers to reside at Peking. The indemnity fixed to be doubled. Ten Tsin to be opened for trade immediately. Emigration allowed. Cowloon ceded to Britain. Treaty to be promulgated throughout China. Chusan to be evacuated by the British forces. The allied armies to leave Peking on the 8th." In the United State the Secession movement is still progressing.

Canadian press, may now be fairly looked upon as a public document, and as, therefore, the legitimate subject of public criticism. In this letter, the writer publicly expresses his political sentiments towards the Clear-Grits, and their chief Mr. George Brown:—"Let us give not merely a willing but generous and cordial support to those who enjoy the largest share of the confidence of the party, and if there be some one or two points of policy on which we cannot altogether agree, let these questions remain open, and let us heartily co-operate on all the cardinal doctrines of the political creed, in which we do agree. Above all, let none of us ever be guilty, even in thought, of the bad faith and false fellowship, of disparaging our own leaders in the vain hope to conciliate opponents, who will always assail the chiefs of the Reform party, in proportion to their vigor and vigilance, or compliment them in proportion to their timidity and pliancy." The above cannot be objected to as vague or obscure. It asserts the continued allegiance of the writer to the Clear-Grit cause; it urges upon the Catholics of Upper Canada the duty of remaining faithful to that cause; and more than hints that, for the sake of that cause, questions upon which Catholics and Clear-Grits can never agree—e.g., politico-religious questions, such as the School Question—must be treated as "open questions;" that is to say, Catholics must virtually abstain from insisting, as the condition sine qua non of their support to any political party, that the party to whom that support be given, shall publicly, energetically, and constantly, assert the right of Catholics to Separate Schools. This policy we do not attempt to criticise; we state only the fact that such is Mr. McGee's policy, such his advice to the Catholics of Upper Canada; and that so long as, by the French Canadians, Mr. McGee is looked upon as, in any sense, the political leader or representative of any large section of the Catholic body of Upper Canada; so long as by the Upper Canadian Catholic press, his policy is not unambiguously condemned, and his advice indignantly spurned—so long the Catholics of the West must be looked upon by their French Canadian coreligionists, not as brethren for whom they should exert themselves, but as dangerous enemies against whom every true Canadian, every sincere Catholic, should be on his guard. We presume not to dictate to our friends of Upper Canada what policy on the School Question they should pursue; it is a question which concerns them more immediately than it concerns us, one also of whose merits they are the best judges, and one which must be settled, if to be settled at all, mainly by their own exertions; for we of Lower Canada can never take part therein as principals, but only as auxiliaries, and at express invitation. If the Catholics of Upper Canada, or any portion of them, see fit to leave the "School Question" an "open question," be it so. We have nothing to say against their resolve, no fault to find with them for pursuing what they deem their best and wisest policy. Only would we protest against the impertinence of expecting the Catholics of this section of the Province to take an active part, or indeed any interest whatsoever, in the solution of a question which, by those whom it most closely concerns, it is consented to leave in abeyance, that is, to treat as an "open question." God helps those only who are ready to help themselves; and when the people of Lower Canada shall perceive the first symptoms of action on the part of the Catholics of Upper Canada, to procure an amendment to their actual School system; when, through their press, all alliances incompatible with such action shall have been publicly and universally repudiated, and all public men hostile to Catholic Schools, or for party purposes willing to leave the School Question an "open question," shall have been publicly denounced by the exponents of Upper Canadian Catholic sentiments, as enemies or traitors to the Catholic cause—then, but not before, will the French Canadian Catholics of the Eastern Province have reasons for believing that, in the Western section, the School Question is looked upon as a question of primary importance, and that the Catholics of Upper Canada take any very serious interest in the matter. It would, as we said before, be absurd to expect of us that we should take the initiative in such a measure, or that we should attempt to force Separate Schools upon those who by their support of a political party would treat the School Question as an "open question," have plainly manifested their profound "apathy" upon that great question. Yes! we tell the Freeman that he has far more cause to complain of the "apathy" of his own friends, than of the "apathy" of Lower Canadians, or even of Upper Canadian bigotry. But it is not for us to dictate, or even to criticise. We say this only—and we believe that we represent the views, on this matter, of a large section of the Catholic community of Lower Canada. We are most sincerely desirous to see our Western co-religionists in the full enjoyment of a sound system of Education; we are most willing to help them in their struggles against the intolerance and bigotry of the "Protestant Reformers," from whom the opposition to Separate Schools has mainly proceeded; but before stirring ourselves, in this matter, we must

see those in whose behalf we are called upon to act, adopting a lively and energetic course; and showing at least some symptoms of a willingness to help themselves. Hitherto we have looked in vain for any such symptoms. We find in the Montreal Gazette of Tuesday the following allusion to the TRUE WITNESS:—"We know it is held by R. C. writers,—it was a short time ago, in a controversy with this journal by the True Witness, that it is the duty of subjects, their religious duty in fine, to obey their governors, and that rebellion cannot in any circumstance be considered a right." The Gazette misrepresents the TRUE WITNESS. We have denied the "right of rebellion," because rebellion implies armed resistance to legitimate authority, and because it is the duty of the Christian to obey all legitimate authority. But we have never maintained the thesis that the right of the prince is absolute, or that all his acts are necessarily legitimate; but have admitted that, when illegitimate, such acts may be rightfully resisted. But here arises the question, how and by what means is it to be decided when the acts of the prince are legitimate and are therefore to be submitted to, or illegitimate, and therefore to be resisted? This is a question upon which neither prince nor subject is a competent judge, for it is one in which both prince and subject are interested parties, and no one can be a competent judge in his own case. Here is the difficulty with which all Protestant political writers have to contend, and whose solution is to them manifestly impossible. Protestants may talk of the "higher law," but cannot appeal to it, as no one amongst them is recognized as being more than another the authorized interpreter of that "higher law" which, as being above the natural law, in that it is "higher," belongs to or lies in the supernatural order, and can be interpreted, therefore, only by a tribunal having jurisdiction in that supernatural order.—This tribunal, the Catholic finds in the Church, and he can thus logically reconcile the duty of absolute submission to legitimate authority with the right of resistance to illegitimate authority or despotism. With reference to the particular case in dispute—viz., the right of the people of Ireland to throw off by force of arms the foreign yoke originally imposed upon them, and still maintained by force of arms—Lord John Russell has himself laid down the law which obtains amongst Protestants, and is by Protestants applied to the armed resistance of a portion of the Italian populations to their native Catholic rulers. There is however this essential distinction to be made betwixt the case of the people of Naples and of the people of Ireland. The former had no such grievances to complain of as have the latter; for they were not, as are the Irish, held in subjection by a foreign nation—"aliens in blood, in language, and Religion." An Irish insurrection implies therefore something more than the resistance of a people to its rulers: it implies a national rather than a mere political movement, and is therefore far more easily defensible than is the late insurrection of the Italians against their native rulers. The position of Ireland to Great Britain is that of Poland to Russia, or as that of the Venetian Provinces to Austria; and although we do not pretend to justify or apologise for all the acts of Austria in her Italian provinces, we do not, on the other hand, assert the right of the people of those Provinces to rise in arms against the Austrians; so also in like manner we are far from asserting the right of the people of Ireland to have recourse to physical force to throw off the yoke of England. We do not admit the truth of the premises contained in Lord John Russell's famous despatch, and are therefore under no necessity of accepting its conclusions. But the Protestant, who applauds the Italian revolutionary movement cannot condemn armed insurrection in Ireland without making sacrifice of his logic and approving himself deficient both in intelligence and honesty. EXTENSIVE SWADDLING OPERATIONS.—The sixteenth of January is to be a regular field-day for the swaddlers; for on that day, as we learn, the gates of heaven are to be stormed by the united supplications of the saints of Protestantism for the conversion of us poor, benighted Romanists. The day has been selected as a memorable anniversary in the annals of swaddling. On that day fifteen years ago, it appears that no less than 20,000 letters to an equal number of Papists, calling upon them to come out of Babylon, and to join themselves to the Protestant Church, and to that noble army of martyrs, of whom Leuley, Achilli, Gavazzi, and Baron Cacin, are the illustrious leaders, and the worthy representatives. A "great door," so we are told, is now being opened for the people of God throughout the world; never have the prospects of Swaddling looked brighter, or its shares stood at a higher premium. When such activity prevails in the brothels and in the meeting-houses, the revival mania has driven thousands to the one, and filled the other with blaspheming maniacs; Rome trembles on her seven hills at the brightness of the coming of Garibaldi, and the people of the earth are rising to their might

against the bondage of Popery; wherefore, it behooves the elect, the chosen people, and all who snuffle through the nose, to bestir themselves in the good cause. Prayer, incessant and united, must be made for the conversion—not of the heathen myriads of Protestant England, nor for the conversion of the brutalized Protestant masses of the United States—but for Papists generally, and for the Papists of Ireland especially; that the daughters of Erin may become pure even as the mothers of Protestant Israel, and may be found clad in the white garments of a Maria Monk on the day when the Lord shall come to judge the nations. This is the object of the prayer, and we say, "Pray away, gentlemen, till you are black in the face." FATHER CHINIQUY.—In the Montreal Herald of Wednesday we find the following brief notice of that reverend light of the Conventicle, and illustrious ornament of the Holy Protestant Church—the Rev. Father Chiquy:—"FATHER CHINIQUY.—I know it will pain your readers to hear anything averse to Father Chiquy, who arrived from Great Britain last week; but from information derived from the most undoubted sources, I fear you will be shortly startled with some facts which it will be difficult to believe, in respect to the rev. gentleman's conduct. You may expect the information to emanate from New York ministers of the same denomination as the Rev. Father. However much surprise it may excite in the bosoms of the readers of the Montreal Herald, and of the Protestant community generally, to learn that their beloved Father Chiquy is but such another as Belial Achilli, it will excite none in the bosoms of Catholics. The latter well know, and so would Protestants if they would but read history carefully, what manner of men "conventicle priests" invariably are; that they are men who have renounced morality before publicly abandoning the tenets of their Church, and that no Catholic priest or Religious ever became a Protestant until he had thrown off all the restraints of the natural law. We trust that the French Canadian press will be careful to make their readers fully acquainted with the latest developments in the career of the notorious and now infamous Chiquy; who is but another and living illustration of the truth of our assertion, that Protestantism is but the cloaca maxima of the Church, the sink into which she ejects all her impurities. Before the days of Luther, and whilst Protestantism, as a thing distinct from the Church, was as yet not in existence, these impurities, these Achilli's, these Chiquy's, et hoc genus omne—remained apparently in the communion of the Catholic Church, corrupting by their feignity her moral atmosphere. Now, however, thanks to the Reformation, we have a drain, or common sewer which gladly receives all these impurities, all this fetid matter, and carries them off to a soil admirably adapted for their reception. Thus thank God is the health of the Church maintained in vigor. PERSONAL.—As we stated in our last, the charges preferred by the Toronto Freeman against the TRUE WITNESS, are in the hands of competent judges, who will in due time, decide upon their truth or falsity; *pendente lite*, we desire to remain perfectly quiet, and must therefore respectfully decline inserting any communications upon the subject. The principles by which the TRUE WITNESS has professedly been guided since its origin, are before the public—in our original Prospectus, and again on many occasions upon which we have referred to them in vindication of our career as Catholic journalists. Thus, writing in the TRUE WITNESS, July 29, 1859, we made public profession of those principles:—"For it is sufficient to repeat what we have before stated; that the TRUE WITNESS has never professed submission to "public opinion" or to any opinion save that of the Catholic Church, speaking by and through the mouth of her Pastors. It is the boast of the TRUE WITNESS—as it should be of every Catholic journalist—that he is "amenable" to no lay or secular influences whatever; that he recognises no authority upon the questions with which he exclusively deals—(politico-religious questions, i.e., questions into which the religious element enters)—except the authority of the same Church; and that in all things unreservedly submissive to that authority, and guided by her teachings, it is his highest ambition to be a humble instrument in the hands of the Church, to direct, not to follow—to enlighten, not to reflect or repeat—"public opinion." The question at issue is—have we been true to our professed principles; or have we, as the Toronto Freeman asserts, basely sacrificed those principles "for a consideration?" If we have, the TRUE WITNESS is a mercenary scoundrel who deserves to be kicked out of the house of every honest man; if we have not, if we have remained true to our publicly professed principles, then the Toronto Freeman is a mendacious slanderer, whose very touch is pollution to the gentleman and the sincere Catholic. ORANGE MEETING AT KINGSTON.—We learn from our exchanges that a meeting of the Orangemen of Kingston and Frontenac was held at Kingston on Friday last, under the presidency of D'Arcy Boulton Esq. Violent speeches were made; the Canadian Ministry were strongly and unanimously condemned; and

the toast of the Canadian Opposition being proposed, it was received with unanimous and enthusiastic applause. This is highly significant of the position of the Orange Society towards the Protestant Reformers of Upper Canada.—In the latter the Orangemen recognise truly their "natural allies" what then must be their position as towards Catholics? The following were amongst the Resolutions agreed to at the meeting:—"1. Resolved,—That the unsatisfactory issue of the meeting of the Grand Lodge of Central Canada, held at Brockville on the 30th October last, has rendered it necessary for the Orangemen of Kingston and county of Frontenac to adopt the alternative of giving expression to their opinions on the conduct of the Canadian Government during the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, by means of mass-meetings. Therefore, we, the Orangemen of Kingston, and surrounding neighbourhood, do declare that the present Ministry, by countenancing and permitting the tyrannical and Puseyite Duke of Newcastle (who has unheeded the sword of persecution against our brethren in Ireland,) to carry out the same policy here, have forfeited all claims to the confidence of the Orange body. Moved by W. Robinson, W. M., No. 6, seconded by M. Phair, W. M., No. 1, 1859, and— 2. Resolved,—That this meeting approves and fully endorses the opinions enunciated and the resolutions passed at the meeting of the Grand Lodge of Western Canada, held at Hamilton on the 24th October last, and pledges itself to oppose by every constitutional means the continuance in power of the present Ministry and all relatives of the same material—and calls upon the brethren of Central Canada to stand true to their colors as they have done to theirs, and call mass meetings to express their opinions freely and without dictation from any quarter whatsoever. The following which we clip from the Montreal Gazette is strikingly illustrative of the effects of the Confessional:—"THE DREZZES ROBBERY.—Some time last summer a pork butcher named Demers was robbed of \$2,100, while on "a bender" with one Edouard Orleans and the far famed Urbain Goderre. Goderre it will be remembered was put upon his trial for the said robbery, (Orleans acting in the capacity of Queen's evidence) but he received such a good character to his amazement that the jury immediately acquitted him. Soon after this disgraceful episode, Demers received \$900 of the stolen money from the Rev. Messire Tambreau of the Seminary, who stated that he had received it from a person with a request to return it to its owner. The same penitent sinner was recently again troubled with qualms of conscience for on the Friday before New Year, he or she called on Mr. Tambreau with a further sum of \$700 which was in due course handed over to Demers. As Demers after the trial besides the above sums received \$150 of the amount stolen, there remains a further sum on the total amount of \$350 still unaccounted for, which the sinner still further troubled by the "still small voice" will likely see the propriety of returning. OBSTETRIC MORALITY.—We have received from a reverend correspondent, a Catholic Priest of Upper Canada, a communication in which the dangerous consequences of Protestant morality are strongly brought to light and energetically condemned. For reasons which will perhaps suggest themselves to many of our readers, we content ourselves with merely giving the substance of this communication. Our reverend correspondent was called upon to visit a woman supposed to be in extremis.—On his arrival at her house, he was pleased to find the woman doing well, but was shocked by the spectacle of a newly-born infant lying dead in the room, bearing evident marks of strangulation upon its neck. In short the child had been killed by the woman's medical attendant, as the only apparent means of saving the mother's life. According to the moral precepts in vogue in the Protestant world, our separated brethren may, perhaps, see nothing revolting in this. To the Catholic, however, it presents a case of infanticide, and of deliberate violation of the law which says "Thou shalt not kill." Catholic ethics teach that it is not lawful to do evil that good may follow. It is not therefore lawful, even to save the mother's life, to take, or to be accessory to taking, the life of her child, and this law admits of no conceivable exception. We mention these facts, with which every Catholic ought to be familiar, in order that Catholics may be on their guard against the insidious counsels sometimes tendered to them by Protestant medical attendants. We must not be supposed as intending to reflect upon the morality of the Protestant members of the profession, which numbers many most honorable gentlemen amongst its members; but the moral code with which they are conversant differs, in several important particulars, from that whose precepts Catholics are bound to follow, and especially is this the case with regard to cases such as that to which our correspondent so strongly but so justly alludes. In that instance there can be no doubt but that the medical attendant was a murderer; the murderer not only of the body, but also of the soul of the unimpaled child, whose life he cruelly and unlawfully cut short, even though his intentions towards the mother may have been good. It behoves, therefore, all Catholic mothers, all Catholic parents, to be most careful in their choice of medical advisers; and when any difficulty presents itself, or when question arises as to the duty of the adviser, to bear in mind the words spoken amidst the thunders of Sinai, "Thou shalt not kill."