

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE
 PROPRIETORS,
 GEORGE E. CLERK AND JOHN GILLIES,
 At No. 223, Notre Dame Street.
 All communications to be addressed to the Editor,
 G. E. CLERK.

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 3¢, 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, NOV. 23, 1860.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE long and heroic struggle in which Francis II. has been engaged with the invader of his dominions must by this time be at an end. By the last steamers from Europe we have news of another severe contest, in which the King of Naples was defeated with the loss of many thousand men, and a great part of the materiel of his army. Victor Emmanuel was making strenuous efforts to render himself master of Gaeta, which notwithstanding its strong position was not in a condition to make a very protracted defence. There have been disturbances at Naples, and a strong popular manifestation against Gavazzi, who has been appropriately nominated to preach in favor of the Revolution, and to whom the pulpits of the Catholic churches have been thrown open. Since the days when a prostitute was installed as "Goddess of Reason" on the High Altar of Notre Dame, a more hideous prostitution or defilement of things sacred has not been witnessed, than that afforded by the spectacle of a Gavazzi in the pulpit of a Catholic Church. It is probably this outrage upon religion and morality that has elicited the hostile manifestations of the Neapolitan populace. The official report of the vote for annexation in Sicily gives the following as the result—Ayes, 432,054; Noes, 667.

The position of the Sovereign Pontiff remains unaltered, the presence of a powerful French force putting an attack upon Rome at the present moment, out of the question. The ultimate designs of Louis Napoleon no man may fathom, nor is it given to mortal to discern the "idea" with which he is possessed. It may be, probably is, Sardinia; it certainly must be a substantial slice of territory somewhere; for it is not easy to believe that Louis Napoleon should have deliberately formed the resolve of compromising himself with the Church, and provoking the enmity of the Catholic world, merely for the sake of giving France a formidable rival to the South of the Alps, and a dangerous competitor for naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. He has an object in what he is doing, and that object will most likely display itself in the shape of a heavy bill of costs charged to Victor Emmanuel and which the latter will have to pay. We have not, we may be sure of it, arrived at the last act of the drama.

In other respects, the European news is unimportant. Austria sulks behind the ramparts of her famed fortresses, and will not, at present, come down and fight, seeing that she has no help to expect from Northern Powers. Great Britain is earnestly addressing herself to the task of completing her National Defences, and of constructing impregnable, iron sheathed moveable batteries—having on hand also two very troublesome "little wars"—one with the Celestials, and the other with the insurgent chiefs of New Zealand. The former has been signalled by the capture of the Chinese forts, and a barren victory, which the Chinese of course represent as a defeat.—The French and English representatives were about proceeding to Peking, but without the army, to conclude another absurd treaty. They will be represented, as the Times observes, as penitent rebels, humbly suing for pardon and peace at the foot of the Imperial Throne, and the whole work of threshing the Chinese will have to be done over again.

The excitement in the United States on the "Secession" question seems to have somewhat abated, though the tone of some of the Southern States is still loud and blustering. There is not, however, as yet, any valid reasons for expecting an immediate rupture of the Union.

SEVERING THE TIE.—Such are the terms in which the Toronto Freeman of the 8th inst. announces to the world the breaking up of the monstrous and unnatural alliance betwixt a section of the Catholic community of Upper Canada, and Mr. George Brown with his "Clear-Grit" followers. That sooner or later it would come to this we long ago predicted; that the union never would be consummated we foresaw from the first day on which it was bruited; nay even when the banners were published, we still persisted in our belief that the ill assorted match would be broken off. We did not allow ourselves to be deceived by the endearing epithets lavished upon one another by the contracting parties during their moments of fond dalliance. Though in public they hugged and exchanged

vows of mutual, never ending fidelity, we knew what such lovers' vows were worth—we knew that the course of true love, even, never yet ran smooth, much less then the course of interested, mercenary kitchen love, such as obtains betwixt the policeman on his beat, and the too susceptible cook, or betwixt the reckless political adventurer and the needy place beggar.—How then, we asked, can the loves of George Brown and his *kantholic* inamorata have a happy ending? And yet perhaps, in the severing of the last link of the tie that bound frail fickle George Brown to his betrothed, those loves have had the happiest ending that could have befallen them.—A consummated union could only have been productive of shame, and misery; and would have given to the world a deformed scrofulous progeny, a disgrace to its parents, and a curse to society.

Most thankfully therefore, do we receive the intelligence that the projected match is broken off, and that the "loves of the angels" of Upper Canada are at an end forever. Seen no longer through that delicious but deceptive halo which love ever casts around its object, the features of George Brown now appear to his late dupe in their natural and most repulsive aspect. Passion has subsided, reason asserts its sway, and the result is announced by the Toronto Freeman—who in the following terms bids a long last farewell to the gay Protestant deceiver:—

SEVERING THE TIE.—We have more than once protested against what we must designate the scathed and ill-mannered flings of the *Globe* against every thing Catholic. It is our painful duty to undertake again the disagreeable task of calling our contemporary to order. From time to time, we have overlooked much that was offensive and reprehensible in the columns of the *Globe*, in consideration of the very great and favorable contrast it has presented of late days to its former self, in tone and temper. Our forbearance, under trying and vexatious provocations, was, moreover, superinduced by a wish to give the *Globe* a fair opportunity of wiping out the deep, black stains it had contracted by its having been so long steeped in the slough of fanaticism, and of ridding itself of those unhappy propensities it has to damage and destroy the cause which it pretends to espouse.

It has been our disposition and desire, in common with the great majority of our co-religionists, to forgive and forget many injuries, to brook even a large amount of opprobrium, with the view to conciliate those who professed to espouse the same political views with ourselves, in the hope that, sooner or later, a common zeal for the common good might bring about community of sentiment, and a better state of feeling between Catholics and that class of so-called Reformers represented by the *Globe*. But, we must confess, with sorrow and disappointment, that our expectation has been illusory. There is not the most remote prospect of change or amendment. On the contrary, every day reveals a fresh disposition to outrage, deliberately, our most sacred feelings, and remorselessly sport with our most delicate feelings.

Ah! cruel Geordie, thus to trifle with a gentle and loving breast, thus deliberately to outrage its most delicate feelings, thus ruthlessly to trample under foot the affections of the fond heart which loved thee alas! not wisely but too well! Oh! unhappy Freeman that thy passion, thy devotion to Geordie Brown should have met with no better return than this! After all the "opprobrium you have had to brook," after all the indignities to which you have had to submit, after having kissed so often and so ineckly the foot that spurned you and your race as "*Dogans*," after all the humble pie you have had to eat—what a bitter reflection it must be, that the sole reward for all your sacrifices of honor and principle, for all your humiliations—is to have had your most delicate and sacred feelings daily made sport of by him to whom you had prostituted yourself. Are there not here good grounds for an action of damages, for broken heart, blighted name, and unrequited affections, against the wretch who has thus dared to trifle with your love; who has plucked the rose and inhaled its fragrance, but instead of cherishing it in his bosom, has disdainfully cast it aside to fade away and rot? Under such afflicting circumstances, we cannot presume to offer the common-places of consolation to the bereaved one, who now perhaps, that her eyes are opened and are no longer blinded by the mists of passion, must herself see reason to thank God for being well quit of a bad bargain. No! we will not condole with, we will congratulate heartily, our contemporary upon what has occurred; for therein we see cause rather for hopeful rejoicing, than for mourning.

Not for mourning certainly; for how can any Catholic regret a rupture with Mr. Brown—a politician who, in the words of the *Freeman*, "seeks to open the flood gates of intolerance, and let loose the pent up Uites of bigotry, to sweep away the very vestiges of every Catholic institution throughout the land."

Who (we still quote from the *Freeman* of the 8th inst.) has

"again and again declared himself opposed to our Separate Schools, our Colleges, and Usurtable Institutions" who, "again and again has given his ultra-Protestant supporters the assurance that he had not abated one iota of his antipathy or opposition to everything Catholic."

And with whom therefore—as long ago we pointed out to the *Freeman*, when the first symptom of coquetting with George Brown began to manifest themselves—it was impossible that Catholics could have any alliance, or semblance even of alliance, without a total dereliction on their part, of all honor and of all principle. With the man who "seeks to sweep away every vestige of every Catholic institution throughout the land," with the enemy of all our educational and charitable establishments—with the man who boasts that he has never abated "one iota of his antipathy and opposition to every thing Catholic," it is impossible that the honest Catholic can have anything in common. The open enmity of such a man we can well afford to despise, but his blandishments, his treacherous caresses would be fatal; and therefore the TRUE WITNESS has always insisted that an alliance of Catholics with George Brown and the "Protestant Reformers" was both impolitic and degrading. Impolitic, because the avowed object of George Brown and his party is to "sweep away the very vestiges of every Catholic institution throughout the land"—or in other words, to establish "Protestant Ascendency" throughout the Province; degrading, because it was impossible that any Ca-

tholic could become accessory to such an anti-Catholic policy, unless he were actuated by the most sordid or mercenary of motives. Upon this point there seems to be no longer any difference betwixt ourselves and our Toronto contemporary. The latter says:—

"In view of these repulsive symptoms which by degrees have been developing themselves to an alarming extent, and in consideration of no disclaimer against the intolerance of the *Globe* having appeared from any, even the moderate, section of Reformers, we feel ourselves called upon to put our coreligionists on their guard, by advising them not to commit themselves to any party, until a more satisfactory view of the future platform of the Opposition, and Ministry, be afforded. As things now stand, we have little faith in either." The Italics are our own.

Premising that the "repulsive" features of George Brown and the Protestant Reformers have always been as plain to us, as they now are to the *Freeman*, we would observe that the latter has in every respect adopted the policy which without the slightest deviation from its course, the TRUE WITNESS has invariably advocated. We have no faith in any political party in Canada, whether they be "*In*" or "*Out*." The standard of political morality is so low in this country that at the best we are always reduced in the necessity of choosing betwixt two evils; and such being notoriously the case, we have always insisted that Catholics, in their religious capacity, should never identify themselves, or their Church, with any political party, but should content themselves, without contracting any party obligations, with giving their support to that section of the body politic, which, for the time, should approve itself the best disposed to accede to their just demands, and to respect the rights of their religious, charitable, and educational institutions. Loyal and obedient subjects Catholics must be, because Catholics; Conservatives also, in the sense that Conservatism implies respect for vested rights, and opposition to revolution; Liberals likewise, inasmuch as their religion teaches them to do to all men as they would that men should do unto them; but further than this, there is nothing in their religion which imposes upon them the necessity of marching beneath the banners of any political party.

So far then the *Freeman* and the TRUE WITNESS seem at last to be at one, and for the interest of our cause, that cause which we will assume that both have at heart, we pray that that unity may continue. Still, as of old, we propose our policy as the best adapted to promote Catholic interests, though worthless towards procuring for any of its individual followers, Government situations, or political advancement of any kind. That policy consists in a cordial union betwixt Catholics of all origins; betwixt French Canadians, and Irish, betwixt the Catholics of Upper Canada and the Catholics of the Lower Province. To promote and cement this Union, it is essential that, on the one hand the Catholics of Lower Canada should by all legitimate and constitutional means endeavor to protect their brethren of the West from the hostility of the Orangemen, and the enemies of Separate schools; and on the other hand, that the Catholics of Upper Canada should cordially co-operate with their coreligionists of the East in opposing to the death every attempt that may be made, upon any pretence whatsoever, to increase the influence of Upper Canada in the Provincial Legislature. We ask them to fight with us against Representation By Population, whilst we should engage ourselves to stand by their sides in their struggle for Freedom of Education, and religious equality. These are the terms of a union which would be honorable and profitable to all parties concerned therein; honorable, because it demands as a preliminary no sacrifice of principle; profitable, because if carried out, it would secure the autonomy of Lower Canada, place the Catholic Separate Schools of Upper Canada beyond the reach of George Brown's malice, bind Irishmen and French Canadians together in a holy league, and ward off the dangers with which both are menaced by "Protestant Ascendency," and Orange fanaticism.

—UN PETIT MAL POUR UN GRAND BIEN.—

—This, by the enemies of Catholicity, is said to be a maxim of the Church. To "do evil that good may follow," that "the ends justify the means" are popularly believed by Protestants to be principles of morality laid down by the Jesuits. The truth however is, that whilst even in theory, these maxims, these principles find no place in Popish ethics, and are repudiated by the Church, they form the very basis, as it were, of Protestant daily practice.

Take the invasion of the Kingdom of Naples, for instance, by the armies of the King of Sardinia, without the slightest pretended provocation on the part of the latter, without even a previous declaration of hostilities on the part of the former—nay, whilst he was actually receiving at his Court the accredited ambassador of the Prince upon whom he was waging war.

That this implies a violation of all laws of political morality—and the laws of morality are as obligatory upon the community as upon the individual—no one will ever venture to deny.—"Unquestionably," says the *Times*, "the conduct of Piedmont, if judged agreeably to the notions of old international law, is indefensible." So too the *Montreal Gazette*:—"The fact is, the invasion is in distinct violation of all international law; nor amongst the most ardent advocates of revolutionary principles, have we as yet encountered one with the temerity to deny that the action of Piedmont, for whose success the Protestant world prays with such invocations or imprecations as it best can utter, is in violation of international law, and indefensible upon any principle of international comity known to, or recognised by civilised communities.

Therefore of two things one. Either the international law of Europe and Christendom is not based upon the principles of eternal and immutable justice, but is a mere arbitrary arrangement or convention entered into betwixt nations and their representatives, without any reference to right and wrong, to justice and injustice; or else the invasion of Naples by Piedmont is a violation of the principles of eternal and immutable justice, and can be defended only upon the

maxim that the ends justify the means, and that it is lawful to do evil that good may follow.

He who, to avoid the consequences of admitting the injustice of Piedmont's invasion of Naples, and Victor Emmanuel's hostilities against the troops of its King—King not only *de jure* but *de facto*, so long as he remains in his dominions at the head of his regular army—adopts the first hypothesis—that the international law of Christendom is not based upon the principles of eternal and immutable justice—that the laws which prescribe and define the duties and rights of communities as towards communities, have not their roots in these fundamental ideas of right and wrong, which all men possess intuitively, and which underlie all codes which prescribe and define the duties and rights of the individual man as toward his brother—be, we say, who adopts this hypothesis has against him all the philosophers, all the Jurists of ancient and modern times, and if consistent in his error will at last find himself stuck fast in the slough of political atheism.—Common sense teaches, and by the lips of all people and of all ages, proclaims, that the same moral laws which oblige individuals, oblige States; that truth and justice, that right and wrong, are not mere empty names, or arbitrary arrangements, but actualities having their foundations far down, and in the law of God; and that their violation, whether by the individual or by a community, is simply a sin. We all feel this, we all admit this when our passions or prejudices are not concerned. Protestants all recognise that the partition of Poland was a sin, because in violation of that code which we call the law of nations. But if that law be but an arbitrary arrangement, if it has not essentially a moral basis, how could its infraction in the case of Poland have been a sin?

But he who admits that international law has a moral basis, and is therefore as binding upon communities as the moral law is upon individuals—and who recognises therefore that by its violation of all international law Piedmont has been guilty of an infraction of the moral law, of that code which should regulate the intercourse of nations as well as of persons—can only defend the conduct of Victor Emmanuel upon the plea we have already assigned—*viz.*, That the ends justify the means; that it is lawful to do a little evil for a great good. It is because these principles are abhorrent to the Catholic, and in direct contravention of the moral code in which he has been brought up, that he cannot sympathise with Victor Emmanuel, even though he may entertain no respect for the administrative system of Naples which the Dictatorship of a filibuster has for the moment superseded.

It is not lawful to man to do evil, however slight, that good, however great, may follow.—But the invasion of Naples by Victor Emmanuel is in violation of all international law, and therefore of the eternal principles of justice, if international law be at all in conformity therewith; and is therefore evil, because every violation however slight of the principles of justice, is evil. No matter therefore what benefits may accrue, or may be expected to accrue, from the invasion of Naples by Piedmont, the Catholic cannot but condemn, cannot but withhold his sympathy from its author, cannot but hold in scorn and detestation the morality of its abettors and eulogists.

And it must be remembered that it cannot be pleaded in extenuation of the armed interference of Victor Emmanuel, that the Kingdom of Naples was in a state of anarchy, and that he took up arms in the cause of order, and to extinguish the flame of intestine discord. Francis II if left to himself, if betwixt him and Garibaldi no foreign powers had interposed, was fully able to give a satisfactory account of the filibuster. At the battle of Voltorno Garibaldi was utterly routed, as the *Montreal Gazette* recognises, and but for the assistance tendered to him by the Sardinian troops and the British navy, the career of the filibuster would have been brought to a termination as inglorious as that of Walker. By Piedmontese troops, and by the crews of Queen Victoria's men of war, was the battle of Voltorno converted into a defeat of the royal cause. But for them Francis II would now be in peaceable and undisputed possession of the throne of Naples; and with these facts patent to the world, no one can pretend that the invasion of Naples was justified by its internal condition and the inability of its sovereign to re-establish order, and to maintain peace.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW FOR OCTOBER 1860.—The time was when we always looked forward to the issue of this periodical with anxiety, and hailed its appearance on our table with delight; certain, that from a careful study of its contents, we should derive much enjoyment, and more profit. It is indeed not too much to say that there is no lay Catholic publicist in this Continent who is not indebted, and deeply indebted, to Dr. Brownson; that no man has labored more strenuously, more ably, and more successfully, for the diffusion of sound principles than has the illustrious Reviewer; and that he has long and deservedly been looked up to, as the most powerful lay writer of whom the Catholic Church in America could boast—as one whom we all would do well to imitate, but whose many excellencies scarce any could hope to rival, none to surpass.

We say "*time was*" when we felt thus towards the *Review* and its editor, for we must confess that, in common with very many of our co-religionists, once like ourselves ardent admirers of the great Doctor, we are oftener pained than delighted, surprised than edified, by the general tone which of late Dr. Brownson's *Review* has seen fit to adopt, when treating of the great social and political problems of the day.—We do not say that the editor is actually unsound in the faith, or that he has any intention of forsaking the Church whose zealous and able champion he long has been; but we do say, that of late he has adopted towards the Church and her Pastors, a sneering, censorious, nay almost dictatorial tone—the tone rather of a reformer, than of a champion; of a severe judge, rather than that of a docile and loving child. We detect this tone in his manner of treating the

Catholic educational institutions of his native land; we are painfully struck by it whenever he alludes to the Irish Church and the Irish clergy; and it grates still more harshly on our ears when he attempts, or seems to attempt, to justify the sinful rebellion of the Pope's subjects against their legitimate Sovereign, and to extenuate the guilt of Italian revolutionists. We recognise still the same powerful original thinker, the same clear vigorous writer, but nowhere now do we find the same genial generous soldier of the Cross whom we once so much admired—nay, we may say, loved. If, presenting himself to the Church he were now to crave her maternal blessing, hardly could that mother discern him; reversing the words of Scripture we may almost say of him—the hands are perclence still as the hands of Jacob, but the voice is as Esau's voice.

It is a painful thing to find fault, particularly with one who has rendered such signal services to the good cause; it is no doubt presumptuous on our part, to criticise, or find fault with one like Dr. Brownson; yet we cannot but express our honest opinion of his writings—though in so doing we should expose ourselves to the reproach of being one amongst those pigmies who quarterly make onslaught upon the *Review* and its giant editor. It may be that we have misapprehended him, and that the fault, lies, not in his mode of treating Catholic subjects, but in our incapacity to seize his meaning. We sincerely trust that it may be so.

And yet after careful unbiased perusal of the last issue of the *Review*, and indeed of several of its immediate predecessors, we cannot but be painfully conscious of the censorious, carping spirit in which the *Reviewer* speaks of the Catholic educational institutions of his native country. Granted that these institutions are not all that the Catholic could desire; that they are in many respects imperfect, and do not realise the ideal of their critic—still it is but fair to ask—do these defects proceed from the ill-will, the incapacity, or the neglect of the rulers of the Church? or are they the consequences of, and at present inseparable from, the political and social condition of the Catholic laity and clergy of the United States? Hardly will the *Reviewer*, or any one who is acquainted with the zeal, learning, and virtues of the Bishops and Clergy of the American Church venture to adopt the first hypothesis; and if it be to the other that the defects in the educational establishments of the United States are owing—why does not the *Reviewer* say so? why does he still keep harping upon those short-comings, as if for them the rulers of the Church were responsible? Instead of finding fault because some things—very desirable things perhaps—have been left undone, would it not be better employed in recounting and giving God thanks for the many and great things that have been done, and thereby stimulating his coreligionists to still greater exertions?

So too, whilst we can fully appreciate the motives of the *Reviewer* for opposing an exaggerated traditionalism, and for asserting the prerogatives of reason in its own order, that is in the natural order, we see not why he should urge against Catholics, the reproach of de-throning reason, in order to make way for the principle of authority. He speaks too as if authority and liberty were mutually antagonistic; the one the contradictory of the other, and as if Catholics generally, when sincere, supported authority at the expense of liberty.—

"But practically Catholics, when sincere and pious Catholics, tend by their spirit and disposition to favor authority, and hence when revolutions in favor of liberty are undertaken must Catholics oppose them."—p. 412.

But if we have rightly understood Dr. Brownson upon this same subject, authority and liberty are not only not necessarily antagonistic or opposed to one another, but are one and the same thing, or rather different expressions for the one thing. Liberty we have always understood, in so far as man is concerned, to consist in submission to legitimate authority; and the *Reviewer* has often asserted the principle, that is only in so far as men are so subject, that they are really free. Revolt against legitimate authority is as fatal to liberty as submission to illegitimate authority or despotism; and hence sincere Catholics, because they love liberty, invariably oppose revolutions against legitimate authority.—The *Reviewer* admits, may "assert," p. 477, that the exercise of the extreme right of a people to revolt and depose their sovereign must, as involving a spiritual question, be "subjected to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, since it involves the spiritual question, whether the oath of allegiance has, or has not, ceased to bind, of which he—the Pope—is the divinely appointed judge"—and therefore we may add the divinely assisted and infallible judge. But when this judge has not decided against the sovereign, or has decided in the latter's favor, then certainly the presumption is that revolt against authority involves a spiritual offence; and it is in these cases of revolt, but in these only, that "sincere Catholics" have betrayed that disposition to uphold the principle of authority against the right of revolution, which causes so much uneasiness to the *Reviewer*.

Again his logic seems at fault when, having admitted the Pope as the "*divinely appointed judge*" in cases as betwixt rulers and their subjects, he proceeds in the following strain:—

"But here is a grave difficulty in the question between the Roman people and their sovereign, because the two powers are united in the same person, and the judge is a party in the case."—The Pope in his Allocutions and Encyclicals on the subject, appears to have pronounced in favor of the Sovereign, against his subjects. Has he pronounced judgment only in his capacity as temporal Sovereign, or in his capacity as Sovereign Pontiff? If the former, he has only judged in his own cause, and what right has he to judge in his own cause, that the people have not to judge in theirs? If the latter, what surety is there that his judgment is free from bias, and that he has not used his spirituality to sustain his temporality, since the judgment is in a case where we can claim neither for him nor for the Church the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost?"—p. 477.

"What surety that his—the Pope's judgment is free from bias?" Why this surety we reply—That he is a divinely appointed, therefore a supernaturally assisted, and therefore an in-