

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 20, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The only noticeable event, in the world of English politics, is the return of Lord Palmerston to office, with, of course, the understanding that henceforward the foreign policy of Great Britain is to be carried on in accordance with the views of the Home Secretary. War is now looked upon as inevitable; and the Northern powers, alarmed, at the imperious tone of Russia, seem inclined to join the coalition against her. The Porte still professes its willingness to treat, upon the basis of the evacuation of the Principalities, to which it is not likely that the Czar will consent. Meantime, the war continues without, since the disaster of Sinope, any important results. The blockade of Sebastopol by the allied fleets is spoken of; but it is not likely that during the winter months, and in such a stormy sea as the Black Sea, an operation of such a nature will be undertaken.—Great discontent prevails throughout England, at the underhand part which Prince Albert is accused of playing in the British Cabinet; to his influence is attributed the vacillating policy of the Aberdeen Ministry, whose position is certainly not improved by the singular revelations made in a late trial at Dublin, in which their Irish Lord of the Treasury, Mr. Sadler, cuts a very melancholy figure. Dr. Cahill has addressed a very powerfully written letter to Prince Albert on the present aspect of affairs, which we will publish in our next.

Garvazzi is on his way to Europe; Kossuth has suddenly left London for Constantinople. There is meaning in these movements; there must be cannon where the vultures are congregating; there must be villainy toward—throats to be cut, priests to be murdered, churches to be burned, convents to be pillaged, and governments to be overthrown—when we see the champions of rascal democracy thus flocking together. They scent the carcass from afar.

The bold and successful stroke of Louis Napoleon, on December 2nd, 1851, defeated the hopes of the anarchists, and compelled them for the time to desist from their infernal machinations against the peace of Europe. But their plans were postponed only, not altogether abandoned; they were deferred until a more convenient season, which they deem now to be at hand; and truly—for a general war must inevitably entail another Hungarian, and Italian insurrection.

It is this which gives its peculiar interest to the otherwise uninteresting quarrel between Russia and Turkey. With neither of these Powers can the Catholic sympathize. If one is anti-Christian, and the persecutor of the followers of the Cross, the other is no less anti-Catholic, and is inspired with an equal hatred to the Church of Christ. In no country in Europe has the great Protestant principle—of the supremacy of the temporal over the spiritual order—been so fully carried out as in Russia. The Czar is, in fact, the English Sovereign in theory; absolute head of the Church; supreme governor in all things, whether Civil, or Ecclesiastical. The triumph of such a power, cannot but be productive of many trials, many persecutions, to the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, infidel Turkey is known to be favorably disposed towards the revolutionists of Europe; and it is not difficult to see what a powerful diversion in her favor would be caused by another outbreak in Hungary; to be followed of course by an insurrection in Lombardy, and a social convulsion throughout the Italian peninsula. Between the triumph of Russian Protestantism, and Protestant Demagoguism, there is little to choose; but perhaps, of the two evils, the second would be the greater.

Left to her own resources, the fate of Turkey would not be long doubtful. Sinope is not far from Stambul, nor would the fortifications of the Bosphorus present any insuperable obstacles to a fleet of war steamers bound for the Golden Horn. On land, the raw levies of the Turk would have but little chance against the soldiers, who, at Friedland and Borodino, proved themselves worthy to cross steel with the legions of Napoleon. One campaign would settle the war, were the other Powers of Europe to withhold their interference.

Whilst the governments are deliberating how, and where, to interpose, there is too much reason to fear that the revolutionists are acting, and that measures are already concerted to light once more the flames of rebellion in the Austrian provinces, and thus to put it out of her power to lend the assistance of her arms to Russia. It is hinted too, in certain quarters, that these designs, if not countenanced, will at least not be opposed by the Western Powers; though it is certainly most improbable that Louis Napoleon will lend himself to such a revolutionary policy. He has, since his advent to power, been a powerful supporter of the cause of order and good government; to him, under God, it is owing that the machinations of the anarchists, in 1852, were rendered abortive, and European society preserved from the deluge with which it was threatened. Remembering then his antecedents, and grateful for the services which he has rendered, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that the Emperor of the French approves of the designs of Kossuth, Garvazzi, and Mazzini. But that these worthies are bent upon mischief, and that this is what is meant by the sudden movements of the former two, is beyond a doubt.

REPUBLICANISM.

The TRUE WITNESS would beg leave to correct a misapprehension of the *Montreal Herald*. The TRUE WITNESS is not hostile to, and has never di-

rectly, or indirectly, pronounced any censure upon, republicanism. To attack, or censure, republicanism, is to denounce all good government; for no government is good which is not republican; and government is only good in so far as it tends to republicanism, or the common weal. Every government, whose object is the public good, is republican, no matter the form in which it is administered. Whether it be monarchical, or polyarchical—whether the office of chief executive magistrate be hereditary, or elective—is of little, indeed of no consequence, provided it fulfill the true end of all legitimate governments—viz., the Commonwealth, or Res-Publica. In European nations, compelled from the vicinity of rival and hostile powers to keep on foot large military establishments, we certainly prefer the monarchical form of government; and think that the Commonwealth requires that the office of chief executive magistrate, to whom the command of that military force must be entrusted, should be hereditary, in order to prevent the evils which would inevitably accrue if it were left open to competition, and were thus held out as a prize to the successful Captain, or ambitious statesman. Large standing military establishments entail the necessity of hereditary monarchy; and therefore, as a consistent republican, we would advocate hereditary monarchy in Europe as the form of government best adapted to promote and secure the stability of the Commonwealth, or Republic.

On this Continent the case is different, and the hereditary principle may be safely dispensed with, though certainly its absence is by no means of the essence of a republic. As yet the United States have no powerful neighbors to guard against; have no need of a standing army, and their military establishments are so trifling as not to be worth mentioning. But if the President were Commander-in-Chief of a permanent military force of some 500,000 men, the office could not long remain elective, in the popular sense of the word. Either the holder of the sword would make his office permanent in his own family; or else it would fall, as it did in Rome in the days of the Cæsars, into the gift of the prætorian cohorts, by whom, it would be conferred upon the successful general, or else put up to public auction. Thus must it ever be with great military powers, in which the liberty and happiness of the people, or in other words, the republic, or common weal, can only be secured by the establishment of the hereditary principle.

But as the principle of an elective head of the executive is the principle legitimately established in the United States; as it fully answers the true purpose of all legitimate government, viz., the republic; and as all attempts to overthrow the settled and legitimate form of government are invariably injurious to the common weal—the Catholic, upon the same principles as those on which he would advocate hereditary monarchy in Europe, would, if in the United States, defend the settled order of things, viz., an elective executive; not as more favorable to the republic than the other; but as the legitimate form of government, which every good citizen is bound to respect, in obedience to the laws of God and of the Church.

Now by applying these principles to Ireland we can easily explain the conduct of the Archbishop of New York, and his subscription of \$500 to the Irish popular cause. The object of the British government of Ireland is not republican, or the common weal of the people. On the contrary, its avowed object has been for 300 years, the exaltation of one class of the community, and that the minority, at the expense of the other, or great majority. The British government of Ireland has been, and is, essentially evil, because anti-republican; but anti-republican, not because monarchical and hereditary, but because anti-Catholic; but because its object has been to promote Protestant ascendancy, and to depress the Catholic. Now, just as we are called upon, on republican principles, to support the hereditary form of government where it is the established legitimate form, and to support the elective form where the latter is established and legitimate, so also are we at liberty to oppose any form of government, whether hereditary or elective, which is not republican; that is, whose sole object is not the common weal. Not indeed always by an appeal to arms, though even arms are sometimes lawful; and never by evil means, such as assassination, and the means recommended by the demagogues of the XIX. century; but still, as Catholics, we may safely assert the right of the subject to oppose every anti-republican government, so long as the object of that opposition is not the overthrow of government, but only to compel it to fulfil its sole legitimate end, viz—republicanism, or the common weal. For this legitimate purpose, His Grace of New York contributed his subscription to the Irish popular cause, not as the enemy of the hereditary form of government, but as the friend of republicanism.

We have ventured upon this exposition of our political principles for two reasons. Firstly, because it is often asserted that Catholicity is unfavorable to republicanism—than which nothing can be more untrue. Secondly, because of the ridiculous error into which many shallow pated coxcombs of the present day fall, and from which our cotemporary the *Montreal Herald* does not seem to be perfectly free—viz., That republicanism means only, a government of which the office of chief executive magistrate is not hereditary—instead of a government whose one object is the good of the governed, or commonwealth.

We are happy to see that in fighting for Freedom of Education, and Free Schools, against the monstrous tyranny of State-Schoolism, Catholics are likely to have the support of the more respectable portion of the Protestant community. The *Patriot* has an excellent article upon the subject; in which he points out that the despotic system advocated by Mister George Brown, and the Radical snobs of

Upper Canada, would, if carried into effect, bear as heavily upon Protestants in the Eastern section of the Province, as upon Catholics, in the Western. It is for the interests of Protestants, as well as Catholics, to resist every attempt to enforce the loathsome tyranny of "State-Schoolism;" and by every honest Catholic it will be made a test question at the next general election. Let no Catholic vote be given, on any pretence, to any man, who will not pledge himself to support the principle that no man should be compelled by law to pay for a system of education or of religion—for a school or church—to which he is conscientiously opposed. If we cannot have "Separate Schools" perfectly free from all State control—"Free Schools" in fact, as well as in name—then let us have entire separation of School and State.

We would remind our readers that the Annual *Soirée* of the Young Men's St. Patrick's Association will take place on Tuesday next; and that the Committee of Management have spared no pains to make this one of the most attractive public reunions of the year. The Band of the gallant Cameronians will be in attendance; refreshments have been furnished by Mrs. McConkey; and there is no doubt that the *Soirée*, this year, will be, what it always has been hitherto, the merriest *Soirée* of the season.

The *Pilot* of the 14th states—that the present Mayor has refused to allow his name to be again brought forward as that of a candidate for civic honors. At a numerously attended meeting, of both French and Irish citizens, held on the 12th ult., a requisition was adopted, calling upon Dr. W. Nelson to allow himself to be put in nomination for the Mayoralty. Since then the friends of M. Fabre have induced that gentleman to come forward as a candidate for the same honors. Captain McGrath is spoken of as the popular candidate for Griffintown.

The Annual Report of the St. Patrick's Catholic Institute at Quebec, discloses a very flourishing state of affairs. The Society has a Reading Room well stocked with the periodical literature of the day, and to which a library will shortly be added; lectures also are occasionally delivered before the members. The funds of the Society are in a healthy state; the receipts being £137 10s 4d, against an expenditure of £86 13s 4d; thus leaving a balance in hand of £50 17s 0d. These facts speak well for the energy of the Irish Catholics of Quebec. The following are the names of the officers for the year 1854:—

Michael Connolly, President.
Lawrence Stafford, 1st Vice-President.
William Quinn, 2nd Vice-President.
Charles T. Colver, Recording Secretary.
Matthew Ryan, Corresponding Secretary.
John P. O'Meara, Treasurer.
Wm. T. Burke, Assistant Rec. Secretary.
John Lane, Jr., Assistant Cor. Secretary.
COUNCIL.—Messrs. J. Sharpley, J. O'Leary, T. J. Murphy, J. Foley, W. McKay, M. Mernagh, P. Whitty, J. Lilly, J. Madden, and M. O'Leary.

The Court of Queen's Bench for the district of Quebec meets to-day; and we would recommend our Irish Catholic friends to keep a close look out on the formation of the Jury Panels; as, after the revelations of last July, we may be sure that the Protestant Sheriff will not shrink from any act of rascality, in order to procure the conviction of innocent men, his religious and political opponents. The administration of justice at Quebec, so long as Mr. Sewell has any part therein, is a disgrace to a civilized community; and can be looked upon by Catholics, only with suspicion and contempt. Be on your guard then, Catholics and Irishmen of Quebec; for you know, by sad experience, that, in so far as your Sheriffs are concerned, your Courts of Law are administered by dishonest, and unscrupulous knaves; men who will shrink from no act of meanness in order to carry out their dirty ends.

"A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

We have seen that the whole question of human merit, resolves itself into the question of human responsibility. Merit, in the Catholic sense, consists in man's hearty, and voluntary co-operation with the Grace of God; without which indeed, he can do no work meritorious of a supernatural reward; but with which, he is able, if faithful, to fulfill all justice; and thus to merit that reward which God has of His free grace offered to man as the reward of his obedience. In that heaven is propounded to man as a reward, it is clear that man must merit, ere he can obtain, it.

But to merit, or demerit, man must be responsible; and to be responsible, man must be a free moral agent; and therefore is it, that Protestantism, in order to disparage good works done by the justified man in connexion with Christ, is obliged to deny the meritoriousness of such works; and this again compels Protestantism to deny man's responsibility, which it does, by depriving him of all moral freedom, and by likening him to a stone, or stick, to the inanimate, unconscious, purely passive, and therefore perfectly irresponsible, branch of a tree. This singular doctrine is put forward by Protestants as conducive to the greater glory of God, and the humiliation of man, whom it deprives of all power of meriting, and from whom therefore it requires not any good works.—Yet its origin is to be found in the corruption of the human heart, and in the natural aversion of man to the doctrine of the cross; it is, if rightly considered, but an apology for idleness, and self-indulgence.—Man can not merit; therefore, concludes the Protestant—what need is there of mortifying the flesh, with the lusts thereof? Let us eat, and drink, for to-morrow we die. Setting out with high pretensions to spirituality, Protestantism is found, upon careful examination, to be but the expression of the lowest, and grossest carnalism. It is the protest of the hog in its sty against short commons, and hard work; it

is as the voice of many swine exclaiming against cleanliness, and the intolerable hardship of soap and brushes. "What need is there of scrubbing us?"—says the hog—"What need is there of good works, fasting, and self-denial?" asks the Protestant.

"Shall I then?"—exclaims the Protestant—"attempt to add to Christ's merit by lacerating this poor sinful body? No! for by His stripes, and not my own, am I healed. Shall I pierce myself with spikes and thorns for the purpose of helping to satisfy divine justice? No! for He was wounded for my transgressions. Shall I chastise my sinful flesh? Shall I macerate this polluted clay?" "No."—p. 259.

No, indeed Mr. Jenkins; we are very sure that, until you become Catholic, you will not. Your sinful flesh is too dear to you, for you to lacerate it; and you have no doubt a very tender regard for your polluted clay; mighty little fear is there that you will chastise it. But not thus spoke the Apostle, St. Paul; his doctrine was not that of Mr. Jenkins; for St. Paul—he was a benighted, superstitious Papist to be sure—for St. Paul expressly says:—

"But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection; lest perhaps when I have preached to others, I myself should become reprobate."—1. Cor. 9. 27.

Clearly St. Paul was not a Methodist, and knew nothing of the blessings of sanctuary privileges, which supersede all necessity for good works—fruits of penance, fasting, and chastising the body.

And truly, in the Protestant system of Justification, as there is no need of any of these things, so in it there is no place even for good works. Protestantism requires no moral change in man as essential to his Justification. The justified man, considered in himself, is no whit better, or less a sinner, than the unjust, or unjustified, man. God beholds him in a different light, and sees him through another medium; but the man himself is the same as ever: impure, unclean, and unjust. Justification, according to Mr. Jenkins, is defined as—

"A blessing, which has no reference to any other change than that which is relative."—p. 223.

It requires, or involves no change in the sinner; it is—

"A change which alters merely the position, or relation of a sinner to his God; he was guilty, he is now accounted righteous."—p. 224.

And of course, if God will account a man righteous, who is not righteous, there can be no necessity why man should strive to be righteous. Such conduct, upon his part, would clearly be a work of pure supererogation; not only useless, but insulting to God, Who, by some strange process, not easily reconcilable with any ordinary ideas of truth, or honesty, is willing to account man what he is not. Here again we have an appreciable practical result from the different meanings which Catholics and Protestants attach to the word Justification. As, according to the Church, God accounts no man just who is unjust, as He can never account a lie, so He cannot account the unrighteous man, righteous. To be just in the eyes of God, according to the Catholic, man must be just; to be accounted righteous, he must be righteous; and to be righteous, he must bring forth the fruits of righteousness, i.e. good works. We need hardly add, that the Church calls those works alone "good," which are consummated in a real vital communion with Christ.

But if God will only account man for what he is, what room is there for the exercise of His mercy? Does not the Catholic system exalt the merits of man, and dim the brightness of the attributes of the Merciful One? Does it not require of man a degree of excellence, unattainable by him in this mortal life? No indeed; for, in opposition to the Pelagian, the Church teaches that it is only by the free, and perfectly unmerited Grace of God, that man is able to do one single work meritorious of a supernatural reward—because, in opposition to the Lutherans and Calvinists, she teaches that, with that Grace, none of God's commandments are impossible to man.—But God has commanded man to be holy; therefore man can be holy, not indeed, as Moehler beautifully remarks, by himself, but in himself. And thus we see, how in the Catholic system of Justification, whilst to God alone the glory is given, yet a place is assigned to the works of man, from whom an active co-operation with the proffered Grace of God, is constantly demanded, in order that he may merit that eternal reward which, only by God's free grace, he is able to merit at all. In fine, the Catholic doctrine is this—that Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law—though not from the obligation of fulfilling, or satisfying, the law—that He has purchased for us the power, which of ourselves we have not, of satisfying that law; but that He has not purchased for us leave to disobey, or neglect that law; or, in other words, immunity to sin, in order that Grace may abound.

Thus we see that, in the Catholic system of Justification, whilst good works are constantly demanded of man, and whilst merit is attributed to them, there is no room for man's boasting, or self-glorification; but, on the contrary, that all tends to the honor and glory of God alone; Who, in crowning man's best works, crowns His own free gifts. The language of the Council of Trent is nowhere more explicit than on this point. Though of ourselves we can do nothing, says the Council, yet with Him who strengthens us, we can do all things. Thus man has not wherein to boast, but all our glorying is in Christ; in Whom we live, and merit, in Whom we satisfy, and bring forth worthy fruits of penance, which derive all their efficacy from Him, are by Him to the Father presented, and through Him, by the Father accepted.—*Sess. XIV., c. 8.*

Having now stated the Catholic doctrine of Justification, having shown the place in that system which good works occupy, and how, and in what sense, the Church calls them meritorious, we shall proceed to the examination of the propositions which Mr. Jenkins