

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES
 SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on
 The Union Bank of London, London.
 The Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
 The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
 By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
 St. Sacramento Street.
 Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
 TERMS:
 To Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum.
 To Country do, \$2 1/2 do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1856.

To OUR CITY SUBSCRIBERS.—We wish to inform our City subscribers that no person is authorized, from this date, to collect any money due to this Office, or to give receipts. The publisher, Mr. J. Gillies, will call upon the City subscribers himself in a few days for the subscriptions due.

No news of the steamer up to the time of going to press, so that we are as much in the dark as ever as to the result of the Paris Conferences. From the fact, that the story about troops for Canada is formally contradicted, it may be inferred that, in Great Britain, at least there is little or no interest felt in the American Question. Some of the American papers may perhaps still continue to talk big about it, but no one on the other side of the Atlantic seems inclined to take any notice of their bluster.—They have something of more importance to attend to. The owners of the Pacific have, it is said, given up all hopes of that vessel; but it is still possible that the crew and passengers may have been picked up by some of the ships now over due.

Noticing the defeat of the "Maine Liquor" Law in the House of Assembly, by the Lower Canada vote, the Ottawa Citizen breaks out in the following strain:—

"It is remarkable that, in that section of the Province where the people are the most temperate, the cause of temperance should be opposed by those who are generally supposed to speak the sentiments of the people."—Ottawa Citizen, 22nd inst.

It would be "remarkable" were it otherwise.—Does our cotemporary fancy for a moment that a Law, prohibiting the use of alcoholic liquors, would be acceptable to, or approved of by, the people of France, Italy, or Spain? Only by a community wallowing in the slough of drunkenness, could such a law be enacted; for it amounts to a confession that moral influences have lost all control over the majority of its members. We in Lower Canada, where, as the Ottawa Citizen truly says, the people are more temperate than in the Upper section of the Province, are not prepared to make such a disgraceful admission.

There is something amusing too, in the coolness with which, in common with all "Maine-acs," the Ottawa Citizen assumes that, to oppose the "Maine Law" is to oppose the "cause of temperance!" that every one who will not repeat his *shibboleth*, or bow down before the image which he has set up as his Temperance God, is a gluttonous man and a wine bibber, the friend of publicans and sinners! Might we take the liberty of, in all charity, insinuating to our cotemporary that this "stand-aside-for-I-am-holier-than-thou" style of meeting the arguments of the opponents—not of "Temperance," but of a particular Law, is not calculated to improve his position in the eyes of impartial judges. We know many, hundreds indeed, of exemplary persons, not only temperate, but abstemious, who never touch fermented liquors in any shape, who are strenuous opponents of the "Maine Liquor Law"—because they believe, what all experience has proved, that such Legislation is certain to do more harm than good;—because it is based upon a false principle, contrary to reason, to revelation, and dangerous to civil freedom.

The advocates of prohibitory legislation argue somewhat in this wise:—

1. That intemperance increases and diminishes, directly, as the supply and use of alcoholic liquors.
2. That by penal enactments the State can diminish that supply and use; and therefore, to the same extent, can diminish drunkenness.
3. That a law totally prohibiting the supply and use of all alcoholic liquors would effectually prevent intemperance.

We reply:—

1. That it is false that intemperance varies directly as the supply and use of alcoholic liquors. The countries whose people are proverbially the most temperate, are those countries most abundantly and cheaply supplied with alcoholic liquors; and where such liquors are most constantly used by the great mass of the people. France, Italy, Portugal and Spain are abundantly supplied with intoxicating liquors; such liquors are constantly used, at all their repasts, by almost all classes of the community; yet it is rare to meet with drunkards in Italy, France, or Portugal; and an intoxicated Spaniard is a *rara avis*. Therefore intemperance does not increase or diminish directly, but rather inversely, as the supply and use of alcoholic liquors.

Or we might give another illustration of our meaning. A grown up man, with plenty of money in his

pocket, is not likely to make himself sick with buns and tarts in a confectioner's shop. A school boy, to whom buns and tarts are rarities, will almost invariably eat himself into an indigestion whenever he has the chance.

2. It is false that, by legislation, the State can diminish the supply of intoxicating liquors, when there exists a strong and general demand for such commodities. This has been repeatedly proved—as in Ireland and Scotland, where the only effect of liquor legislation was to call into being hosts of smugglers, and illicit distilleries; as in those States of the neighboring Republic which have adopted the "Maine Law;" and where, in spite of that law, intoxicating liquors are as easily procured as ever.

Having then established the falsity of our opponent's premises, we are surely at liberty to contest his conclusions.

On the other hand, we contend that the use of alcoholic beverages is perfectly legitimate; sanctioned by the law of God, and by the example of our Saviour Himself. As Christians therefore we deny the right of the State to prohibit that which God has sanctioned—to call that unclean which He has Himself cleansed—or to pronounce that evil, which He hath blessed. We protest against all legislation that prohibits the use of any of God's creatures, as essentially evil.

As freemen, we deny the right of the State to enact sumptuary laws in any form; or, directly or indirectly, to prescribe what we shall, or shall not, eat and drink. As a financial question, the State has of course the right to legislate in the premises. It has also the incontestible right to repress all evils accruing from the abuse of alcoholic liquors. "Finance" and "Police" are of the domain of the State. But it has no rightful independent "Moral" jurisdiction whatsoever; and the assertion on its part of any claim to such jurisdiction, is an arbitrary assumption, which it behoves every freeman to resist.

And lastly, as "Friends of Temperance," we oppose the "Maine Law," because, though it may make hypocrites, and encourage smuggling, we do not believe that it can promote temperance;—because we believe that, to reform Society, we must begin—not by reforming Society *en masse*, but—by reforming the individuals of whom Society is composed.

Lastly—the "Maine Law" is indefensible, unless it can be shown that it is absolutely necessary for the cause of Temperance. But the Spaniards, the Italians, and the people of many other nations, are proverbially temperate without a "Maine Law." Therefore a "Maine Law" is not absolutely necessary—for men *are*, and therefore *may be*, sober without such a Law; and if not absolutely necessary, it can not be defended even upon the tyrant's plea of necessity, and is therefore indefensible. Perhaps the Ottawa Citizen will urge the "moral inferiority" of the Anglo-Saxon, Protestantised, races of North America, to the Catholics of Spain and Italy. We admit that "moral inferiority" of course; but as we assert that even the former, in spite of their present degradation, are susceptible of a moral culture, which shall raise them to a level with the latter, so we would rather trust to moral and religious influences for repressing intemperance, than resort to a legislation which, as Catholics and as freemen, we are compelled to condemn, because dangerous to our rights as citizens, and because involving a principle revolting to our faith as Christians.

"MUMMERIES OF POPENRY."—Under this head the Christian Guardian—Methodist—classes those services with which, during "Holy Week," the Catholic Church commemorates the sufferings of Our Blessed Lord and Redeemer—His last supper with the twelve—His betrayal by Judas—His agony and bloody sweat in the garden of Gethsemane—His scourging—His crowning with thorns—His Cross and passion—His cry of anguish unfathomable, "Eloi, Eloi, Lamma Sabathani"—His death and burial; and finally, His glorious Resurrection. These are the "Mummeries" at which this scurrilous fellow vents his puny witticisms.

"Christ our passover is sacrificed for us"—says his version of the Bible—"therefore let us keep the feast"—1 Cor., v. 7, 8; which being interpreted, Methodistically, means—"therefore let us not keep the feast"—an "imaginary, holy week"—a mere "Popish superstition!" Or if we at all observe it, let us keep it with the old leaven of malice and wickedness—with rancorous abuse of Catholics, and blasphemous sneers at the sufferings of Him Whom those superstitious Papists adore! Such at least seems to us the commentary put by the Christian Guardian upon the words of the Apostle.

The universality and antiquity of these mummeries, and of the observance of this "imaginary holy week" even the Christian Guardian will hardly be bold enough—spite of his impudence and the gross ignorance of his fellow-sectaries—to deny. Even the Christian Guardian must be aware that one of the first disputes that disturbed the harmony of the early Church, was as to the time of keeping this "imaginary holy week;" not as to whether it should be kept, but simply as to the proper time of keeping it. Hence, in the second century, the famous contest betwixt Victor and some of the Prelates in Asia, and the celebrated correspondence of St. Irenæus with the Sovereign Pontiff. It would be no easy matter for the Christian Guardian to produce, either from the Bible or the history of the primitive Church, as good authority for abrogating the Jewish Sabbath, and observing the first day of the week in lieu thereof, as we can adduce for the observance of our "imaginary holy week."

Having then explained what we commemorate in our "imaginary holy week," and indicated the authority on which we keep it, it is surely unnecessary to trouble our cotemporary with the reasons why the observance of the Festival of St. Patrick's Day has

this year been postponed until after Easter. We honor the memory of the Saints, true—but as the servants of Him to Whom all our homage is due, and in Whom all our worship terminates. It is because the Christian Guardian cannot, or rather will not, see that the devotion of Catholics to the Saints, to the servants of Our Lord, to His Blessed Mother, is only relative, and always referable to Him Whose creatures they are, that he is perplexed at the postponement of the Festivities of St. Patrick's Day. But after all, why should he trouble himself about this? What has he to do with St. Patrick, or any of the Saints, who were all Papists to a man?

"An Experiment" upon the forbearance of Catholics, with the result of which the Quebec Gazette professes itself satisfied, has just been tried at Quebec in the Lecture Hall, St. Anne's Street. The subject chosen for the evening's entertainment was the "Immaculate Conception" of the Blessed Virgin; and it would appear from the report as published both in the Quebec Gazette and Colonist, that the lecturer treated it, if not very learnedly, at all events decently, refraining from obscenity, and gratuitous insults. In this there is something both novel and satisfactory.

The doctrine of the Church, the Lecturer, said—of course, Protestant Lecturers always do—was "contrary to reason and common sense"—we copy from the report of the Gazette—adding "that he was willing to listen to any layman or priest who was prepared to assert that what he alleged was incorrect." As a humble layman we are quite willing to break a lance with this champion of Protestantism.

The doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" of the Blessed Virgin is not, we say "contrary to reason or common sense;" because, neither from reason or common sense, can we learn that any are "Conceived Maculate." That the tender infant comes into the world with the stain of Original Sin, and a child of wrath, is a doctrine which, whether it be deducible from revelation or not, is certainly not one which we could acquire from reason or common sense. The contrary therefore to that doctrine—even if asserted of all of Adam born, instead of the Mother of God only—is certainly "not contrary to reason or common sense."

It is also a doctrine held by many of the most intelligent of Protestant sects; by all who glory in the name of "Liberal Christians," and who altogether reject the doctrine of "Original Sin" as "contrary to reason, common sense" and revelation. These hold that all are "Conceived Immaculate" in the sense in which the Catholic Church teaches that the Blessed Virgin was "Conceived Immaculate." It cannot therefore be "contrary to reason and common sense" to predicate of one, that which numbers of Protestants—in every respect Mr. Carden's equals—predicate of all.

On the contrary, rejecting Revelation, rejecting the infallible teachings of the Catholic Church, we should at once reject the doctrine of the "Maculate Conception" of any child of woman born, as "contrary to reason and common sense;" as repugnant to, and incompatible with, our natural ideas of God's goodness and justice. The mystery, that which it requires an "Act of Faith" to believe, that which transcends "reason and common sense" is—not that the Blessed Virgin was in her "Conception Immaculate" but—that any are otherwise. Were Mr. Carden acquainted with the first laws of logic he would see that, until "reason and common sense" can establish the doctrine of the hereditary transmission of "Original Sin" to the newly conceived infant—or in other words, the doctrine of the "Maculate Conception"—the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" of the Blessed Virgin is not "contrary to reason or common sense." Now we defy him from these alone to prove the former doctrine, or that of the "Maculate Conception" of any descendant of Adam.

This doctrine is taught by Revelation. We Catholics, believe it, because, and only because, and only in so far as, the Catholic Church, speaking by the mouths of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and of her Prelates in Council assembled, teaches us it. It is a mystery; perhaps of all mysteries the most difficult to accept, the most difficult to reconcile with human reason—which it transcends, though it does not contradict. We believe it then only because we believe the Church that teaches it to be infallible. Mr. Carden assumes that she is fallible; may err, and has erred. Were he by his arguments to convince us of her fallibility, what does he think would be the result? That we should therefore believe in the "Maculate Conception" of the Blessed Virgin? If he does, he is most grossly and most ludicrously mistaken. Were we once to reject the teachings of the Church as the only infallible guide in the supernatural order, we should as a natural consequence of our Protestantism reject, or Protest against, the doctrine, not of the "Immaculate" but of the "Maculate Conception," as "contrary to reason and common sense;" and should assert the "Immaculate Conception" not of Mary alone, but of all the human race. Again we say, we defy Mr. Carden to prove, from "reason and common sense," that either Mary, or any one else, was "Conceived Maculate;" and if he cannot do this, what nonsense must he not have talked, and his gaping audience applauded, when he told them that the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" was "contrary to reason and common sense"!!!

PROTESTANT LOYALTY.—Our Protestant friends of Upper Canada are ever making a boast of their "loyalty." As a significant comment upon this, the Toronto Colonist of the 20th inst. gravely informs us that if the Seat of Government were "placed in Lower Canada, Upper Canada would rebel." From this we may form a correct estimate of the value of "Protestant Loyalty."

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY.

We are happy to have in our power to announce that this Society is now fully and most admirably organised. On Monday evening last, the members proceeded to the election of office-bearers for the ensuing year, when the following gentlemen were chosen:—

- President—H. Howard, Esq., M. D. (elected unanimously.)
 1st Vice-President—Marcus Doherty, Esq.
 2nd Vice-President—Alex. M'Cambridge, Esq.
 Treasurer—Francis F. Mullins, Esq.
 Cor. Secretary—Patrick J. Fogarty, Esq.
 Rec. Secretary—Thomas C. Collins, Esq.
 Asst. Sec. Secretary—William W. O'Brien, Esq.
 Physician—Dr. Hingston.

The Chaplains are of course the Reverend J. J. Connolly, and the Clergy of the St. Patrick's Church. The following are the names of the gentlemen who compose the Committee of Management:—

- Messrs. Patrick Brennan, James McShane, Sen., Patrick Mohan, Patrick Ronayne, Edward Murphy, Patrick Larkin, John Phelan, Terence Moore, Edward Gorman, John Houlihan, Joseph Cloran, Thomas Patton, Neil Shannon, James E. Mullin, Thomas McCrady, William Price, Michael Dowling, and Daniel Lanigan.

Grand Marshal.—John McDonald, Esq.
 Assistant Marshals.—Messrs. Francis Maguire, John Charles, Michael McShane, and Dominick Moore.

Whilst to all true Irish Catholics, these appointments have given general satisfaction, it is not strange, and indeed hardly to be regretted, that they have offended some two or three disappointed Orangemen, or bad Catholics, who are so close akin to Orangemen, that it is not easy to distinguish the difference. These gentry have made the columns of the Commercial Advertiser the channel for pouring forth their complaints against the Society; and still the burden of their song is, that, faithful to its principles, it is essentially and wholly a Catholic Society; and that it will admit neither Protestants nor Freemasons into its ranks. This is a compliment of which a St. Patrick's Society may well be proud.

For St. Patrick was himself a Catholic; a Papist, a believer in, and assiduous promulgator of, the errors of Romanism; and, as a worshipper of the Body and Blood of Christ under the species of bread and wine in the Adorable Sacrifice, was of course, according to the teachings of Protestantism, an idolater. How ridiculous then would it not be for Protestants to seek admission into a Society bearing the name of, and honoring as its patron, one whom, if consistent, they must look upon as an idolater, and a promulgator of error? And, if ridiculous on the part of Protestants to seek admission into a St. Patrick's Society—a society designated by the name of a Popish Saint—how monstrous would it not be on the part of Catholics to accede to their ridiculous request? A "St. Patrick's Society" is not only a national, but a religious Society—or why the name of "St. Patrick?" Of an "Irish" or "Hibernian Society," Catholics and Protestants might indifferently be members; but the latter would be as much out of their element in a "St. Patrick's Society," as a Turk in the "Society of Jesus."

No! If Irish Protestants want to form themselves into a Society, they are welcome to do so; but then let it be under a proper designation. Let them form themselves into a "Lord Castlereagh's Society," or a "Major Sirr's Society;" for these names would be eminently appropriate for Irish Protestant associations, and no Catholic, we are sure, would feel desirous of obtruding his presence upon them. Besides, have not Irish Protestants Orange Societies already? Are not these enough for them, without their seeking to force themselves into Catholic Societies, such as those bearing the glorious name of St. Patrick must be, if true to their principles? No! No! It is impossible to serve God and mammon; to be at one and the same time a member of a St. Patrick's Society, and a Protestant.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY AT QUEBEC.—The Irish Catholics of Quebec celebrated the Anniversary of their Patron Saint by a Soirée in the Hall of the St. Patrick's Catholic Institute, at which the Rev. Mr. Nelligan, and others of the Clergy assisted. A pleasant evening was passed with music, speeches, and patriotic sentiments.

LITTLE STORIES FOR LITTLE BOYS IN PARLIAMENT—IN WORDS OF ONE, TWO, AND THREE SYLLABLES. BY MRS. PARTINGTON.

"Lit-tle John-ny Cam-er-on was a ve-ry good boy, and he did go to a high church. And he did tell the other boys in school all a-bout a ve-ry bad boy whose name was Pad-dy Pope; and how he hit an-oth-er ve-ry good boy call-ed Cor-ri-gan. And all the boys were ve-ry an-gry with that naugh-ty boy Pad-dy Pope.

"So when the ho-ly-days had come, and the school had bro-ken up, lit-tle John-ny Cam-er-on was in-vit-ed by the o-ther boys to a ve-ry grand sup-per, where he talk-ed so pret-ty a-bout that bad boy Pad-dy Pope, and look-ed so nice and clean in a new white chok-er, that all the boys took a great fan-cy to him, and gave him a ball, and some sweet O-range sy-rup, and lots of soft saw-der. Now, who would not like to be a good boy, like lit-tle John-ny Cam-er-on, who told a-bout that bad boy Pad-dy Pope—and who got such a pret-ty ball, and such nice O-range sy-rup?"

To CORRESPONDENTS.—"An Upper Canadian" received too late for this week, will appear in our next.