

FOR SALE,
DRAFTS at THREE DAYS' SIGHT, on Messrs. OVER-
END, GURNEY & Co., LONDON, from
ONE POUND UPWARDS,
Negotiable at any Town in Great Britain or Ireland.
HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacramento Street,
Montreal, Oct. 1852.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:
To Town Subscribers \$3 per annum.
To Country do. \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE
TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.
Anonymous communications can never be taken
notice of.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 28, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Her Majesty is said to be again in an "interesting situation." Parliament having been prorogued until February there is no political news of any interest from England. Lord Clarendon is spoken of as destined to supersede Lord John Russell in the Foreign Office. The elections, consequent upon the new ministerial arrangements, have generally resulted in favor of the government. Lord John Russell, Sir William Molesworth and Sir James Graham, have been re-elected unanimously. Mr. Gladstone, at the University of Oxford, has found an opponent in the person of Mr. Dudley Perceval, who comes forward as the warm opponent of Popery and of the authoritative claims of the Catholic Church; Mr. Gladstone's return is far from certain; his opponent had a majority on Thursday the 6th inst.; the poll might be kept open for several days longer. At Halifax, Sir C. Wood was opposed by another Non-Popery man, a Mr. Edwardes, who was however defeated by a small majority.

In Ireland the elections are likely to be far more interesting, nor will the renegades, who have basely accepted place, as the colleagues of Russell and Palmerston, be allowed to reap the reward of their almost incredible treachery, without a struggle. For the conduct of Mr. Keogh, the *Tablet* finds an excuse, in that he is a poor needy man, to whom the offer of a fixed salary was a temptation too powerful to be resisted. But there can be no excuse for Mr. Sadlier's treachery; he at least cannot plead poverty as an excuse for having sold himself for the vile pittance doled out to him as a Junior Lord of the Treasury; and it is to be hoped that his constituents will show their abhorrence of his dishonorable conduct by hooting him from the hustings when he again has the impudence to appear before them as a candidate for the suffrages of Catholic Irishmen. The position of the Irish Catholic party in the House of Commons was so magnificent—the success of the system of tactics, decided upon after mature deliberation, was so certain—the victory of the Irish Brigade in the overthrow of the Derby administration was so complete—that the friends of Ireland may well have been excused for believing that for her a new era was about to commence; had her representatives been but men of common honesty, justice for Ireland could no longer have been withheld. The duty, the policy, of the Irish Brigade were so clear—had they not marked it out themselves?—that no excuse can be offered for the miserable place-hunting deserters. "So help me God"—swore Mr. Keogh but a few weeks ago—never will I take office under, always will I oppose, any ministry which does not make the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, the granting of Tenant Right, and the removal of the burdens which press so heavily upon the poor Catholics of Ireland compelled to support a loathsome State establishment, part of their official programme; and so swore Mr. Sadlier, who now so contentedly puts up with the broken victuals, and official garbage contemptuously cast to him from the portals of Downing street. The tergiversation of these men is unaccountable; they had but to restrain their inordinate propensity for making themselves vile for a few weeks longer—to try and behave like honest men for the remainder of the Session, and the triumph of Ireland's cause was secure; they had turned out the Derby, their plain duty was at once to set to work to turn out the Aberdeen-Russell ministry; to make all government impracticable, and to put a complete clog on the wheels of the State machine until such time as every one of their demands had been complied with. This was the course which they had marked out for themselves, or rather which they pretended to have marked out, in order the more easily to gull the honest electors of Ireland. It is just to add that several of the members of the Irish Brigade have kept aloof from, and have loudly condemned, this wholesale political apostasy. Mr. Lucas in the *Tablet*, Duffy in the *Nation*; and the independent Catholic press throughout Ireland, have denounced it in no measured language. G. P. Moore, Esq., M.P. for Mayo, has published a letter calling upon the constituencies of Ireland to summon their representatives to declare themselves, as to whether they intend to abide by the pledges given, or rather sworn, at the late general election.

"Fellow-Countrymen—A great crisis has arrived—and a great question is before the country.
"Lord Derby's government has been dissolved by the Irish

party in parliament, expressing the united will of the Irish people.
"A new government has been formed, irrespective of the opinions of the Irish people. Certain Irish representatives have joined the government, and deserted their party; and the question arises whether the people approve of that junction and that desertion.
"The issue is simple, and capable of an easy solution. It is mere waste of invective to fall foul of the men who are accused of having betrayed the people; they have resigned into the hands of their constituents the trust that they obtained under false pretences; and those constituents, in the face and in the name of the people of Ireland, will have to pronounce a solemn verdict on their conduct.
"But it is otherwise with men who—without surrendering their trust to their constituents—may yet betray that trust with more unobtrusive treachery; and it is of the most vital necessity that a clear, comprehensive, and explicit declaration should be given by every popular Irish representative as to whether he is prepared to cross the House of Commons with Mr. Keogh, Mr. Sadlier, or Mr. Monsell—or to hold himself in independent opposition with the people.
"For my own part, I think my duty at once to inform my constituents that I see nothing in the constitution or the promise of the present government which induce me to give it my support; and that I hold the trust which the people of Mayo, at great sacrifice, have placed in my keepings, as pure as when they first confided it to my honor.
"G. H. MOORE.
"Moore Hall, Jan. 1, 1853."

Thus if the people of Ireland have been fooled, insulted, and betrayed, by the treachery of Keogh, Sadlier, &c., they have still a remedy in their own hands; they can still prevent the traitors from inflicting fresh injuries and additional outrages upon the country that fondly confided in their honor, and integrity. It seems further, by some extracts, which the *Tablet* gives, from a pamphlet entitled "*Ireland Imperialised*," and addressed by Mr. Keogh to Lord Clarendon, in 1849, that the former gentleman has long been meditating the ruin of Ireland's nationality; that he has for years been scheming how best to betray her cause—for we find him, in 1849, recommending as the *panacea* for Ireland's sufferings, the "eradicating all vestiges of Ireland's pseudo-nationality," and the "transferring the government of Ireland from Dublin Castle to the office of the Secretary for the Home Department."
It is stated that Mr. Kirwan's sentence has been commuted to transportation for life. This is the counterpart of the conduct of our executive in the Berubé case. Conscious that the evidence on the trial was not sufficient to authorize the finding of a verdict of "Guilty"—afraid to do right, for fear of awakening a popular outcry—they have compromised matters, by remitting the sentence of "Death," and inflicting the milder punishment of transportation; and thus, as in all compromises, have failed in giving satisfaction to any one. As in the case of Berubé, the convict was either guilty of murder, or guilty of no crime at all. By remitting the sentence of "Death," the government have clearly pronounced him "Not Guilty" of murder; why they have sentenced him to transportation for life is not so clear. Since the trial, additional particulars have come to light, irreconcilable with the hypothesis of Mr. Kirwan's guilt; and the worthlessness of the testimony of the principal witnesses for the prosecution has been well established.

From France the news is totally destitute of interest. A supplement to the *Moniteur* of the 5th instant, announces that the Russian minister had delivered his credentials to the Emperor. In Sardinia, the Bill for abolishing the Christian Sacrament of Matrimony, and putting in its place a system of legalised concubinage, has been withdrawn. The following is an extract from a letter from the Father of the Faithful to the King of Sardinia, upon this important subject:—
It is a dogma of Faith that marriage was elevated by Our Lord Jesus Christ to the dignity of a Sacrament; and it is a point of the doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Sacrament is not an accidental quality, superadded to the contract, but that it is of the very essence of marriage, in such sort that the conjugal union between Christians is not legitimate unless in the Marriage-Sacrament, out of which there is nothing but a mere concubinage.
A civil law, which in supposing the Sacrament divisible from the contract of marriage for Catholics pretends to regulate its validity, contradicts the doctrine of the Church, usurps its inalienable rights, and, in practice, places in the same rank concubinage, and the Sacrament of Marriage, by sanctioning both the one and the other as equally legitimate.
The Austrian Government has expressed its regret, to the British ambassador, for the outrage lately inflicted upon the person of the Vienna correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*. The whole affair seems to have originated in a misunderstanding between the head of the Police department, and some of the subordinate officers, one of whom has been severely censured for his conduct, by his superiors.
The steamer *Arctic*, from Liverpool, arrived at New York on Wednesday. The Oxford election was still undecided, and Mr. Gladstone's return doubtful. It is reported that the courier Madaia—who, with his wife, was imprisoned for disseminating irreligious and seditious publications, and *not* for reading the Bible, as falsely stated by the Evangelical press—has lately died at Florence. There is no political news of any importance.

"MY CHILDREN" AND "OUR FATHER."
In striking and very pleasing contrast with the style of the *Globe*, the *Examiner*, and some of the other Protestant journals of the Upper Province, does the *Montreal Herald* review the lately published "Correspondence betwixt His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, and the Chief Superintendent of Common Schools." "By what right are they"—Catholics—"to be deprived, if they separate, from participating in one portion of the taxes to which they contributed equally with the rest? In this there is strong argument appealing to common sense and justice"—that is, supposing that the right of Catholics to have separate schools at all, can be established.—With much good sense, then, the *Montreal Herald* discusses the principle of State-Schoolism, going straight to the point at once; and, instead of quibbling about petty details, boldly asserts the "pretensions of the State as educator"—well aware—that this is the one thing which it behoves the advocates of

State-Schoolism to do—that if they can succeed in showing that it is the right of the State to educate, they will have established the duty of the subject, no matter of what religion, to pay for, and to accept, such education as it may seem good to the State to give—that separate schools should be at once put down—and that the complaints of the Catholic clergy, and laity, of Upper Canada are unfounded, and unworthy of attention. In fact, make good the "pretensions of the State as educator," and the *Montreal Herald* clearly sees that the right of the State, to educate as it thinks fit, will have been made good also. This then is the question—"Has the State any right to exercise control over the education of its subjects?" In support of the affirmative, our cotemporary argues:—"I must see"—says the State—"that my children have sufficient knowledge to enable them to avoid starvation themselves, or spoliation of others; that they be sufficiently acquainted with their rights, and their duties, to protect their liberties against usurpers, while they yield obedience to the laws, which they themselves make for their mutual protection; finally, that they shall be so far well informed as to be capable of activity in commerce, ingenuity in arts, and constant progress, instead of retrogradation; in one word, that they may be industrious, peaceable, moral, literate, wealthy, and improving, like the Americans, rather than idle, dissolute, unlearned, pauperised, and perishing, like the Mexicans. You may believe the Mexicans to be the best Christians. Well, make my children as good Christians as you please; but I know the Americans are the best citizens. I shall do my duty."
The Italics are our own, and we have italicized the words "my children," because in them lies the whole gist of the argument. "That the child belongs to the State," is the starting point of the advocates of State-Schoolism. "The education of the child does not belong to the State,"—says the freeman, the parent, and the Catholic;—"the child, and the care of his education, belong to the family and to the Church of God; the child does not belong to the State, and over his education the State can have no legitimate control." Hereupon issue is joined—"To whom does the child belong?" Not till we shall have obtained the true answer to this question shall we be able to appreciate the arguments for, and against, State-Schoolism.

It is only by the assertion of one particular theory of government that the advocates of State-Schoolism can logically and consistently represent the State as having the right to address its subjects as—"My Children"—and that theory of government is—the "Paternal" theory. When they make the State address its subjects as—"My Children"—they, by implication, assert, that the relative positions of State and subject are those of parent and child—meaning of course by the State, not a vague abstraction, but the representative of the State in its collective capacity, or Civil Magistrate. Now as rights and duties, parent and child, are co-relative, it follows that, if the State has the right to address its subjects as "My Children"—it must be the duty of the subject to address the State as—"Our Father, who art at Quebec, or Toronto"—as the case may be—and hence it follows that the rights of the State over all its subjects must be, as the rights of the father over his son—and the duty of the subject towards the State, as the duty of the son towards his father. Upon no other hypothesis can the term "My Children"—as employed by the State, to designate its subjects—be for one moment justified.
Now will the friends of State-Schoolism accept and assert this "Paternal" theory of government, with all its consequences? for if they accept and assert one, they must—that is, if they have any regard for logical consistency—accept all. Are they prepared to renounce the modern doctrine that the "right of the governor is derived from the consent of the governed?" for most assuredly the right of the father to command, is not derived from the child's consent to obey. Will they assert that the State is as irresponsible towards its subjects, for the manner in which it exercises its authority, as is the father towards the child? If they are not prepared to do this—if they are not prepared to assert the "Paternal" theory of government, and therefore to deny that the "authority of the governor is derived from the consent of the governed"—if they are not prepared to assert that the duty of the subject towards the State is as the duty of the son to his father—if they are not prepared to place "Our Father, who is in Heaven," on an equality with "Our Father, who is in Heaven"—they cannot be allowed to put the words "My Children," into the mouth of the State, when addressing its subjects; and with the abandonment of these parental "pretensions" must they also abandon the whole of their argument for the "pretensions of the State as educator," based upon these most monstrous and unfounded "pretensions."

The education of the child does not belong, of right, to the State, or temporal power. The functions of the State lie, not in the moral, or spiritual, but solely in the material order. It may legislate for roads, and pass turnpike acts; it may superintend drains and sewers; it may come into back-yards, clean out our cess-pools, and make Police regulations—but legitimate jurisdiction in any higher order it has not. The claim of God over the child is absolute. The claim of the Church over the child is unlimited. The claim of the parent over his child is valid—for to him has the care of the child been entrusted. To God, and to His Church, is the parent responsible for the education he gives his child, and woe to him if he forget that responsibility; but to the State he owes no account whatever; for as God has not commissioned the State "to teach"—as not at its hands will He require the child—so neither can it have any legitimate pretence to interfere with his education.—This pretence is, we know, often set up in the modern Protestant, as it was in the ancient Heathen, world; a clear proof of the essential similarity betwixt ancient Heathenism, and modern Protestantism. Both

deify the State; both ignore God, the Church, and the rights of the parent. In Pagan Rome, incense was burnt upon the altars of Cæsar, and the "*Divæ Romæ*" was worshipped as the tutelary Goddess of the Republic. In modern Protestantism, the State addresses its subjects as "My Children," and thus claims from them the honor due only to "Our Father." But, as in the early days of Christianity, Catholics refused to be guilty of this damnable Stateolatry, and refused to acknowledge the divinity of Cæsar, so also will they to-day resist the equally blasphemous "pretensions of the State as educator"—by fair and gentle means, by argument and entreaty, if these means be sufficient—by other means, if necessary.

THE GREAT QUESTION.
The discussion of the great question, the only question which Catholics can discuss with Protestants.—"What means did Christ appoint for the transmission, and perpetuation of His doctrines, pure and undefiled, to, and amongst, all generations, until the end of the world?" has had the effect of eliciting the following important admission from our opponent of the *Montreal Witness*:—"That there was once a body of men on earth, divinely commissioned to teach the human race. And of course, if divinely commissioned, then fully endowed with every requisite for enabling them perfectly to fulfil that divine commission; therefore infallible, not in virtue of their humanity, but in virtue of the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost. Assuming this admission as a fresh starting point, we may proceed to the discussion of the question next in logical order—"Is there still on earth a body of men, divinely commissioned to teach the human race; and of course, if divinely commissioned, then fully endowed with every requisite for enabling them perfectly to fulfil that divine commission; therefore infallible, not in virtue of their humanity, but in virtue of the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost?" Before citing the Catholic argument in favor of the existence of such a body, we would notice, and dispose of, an objection brought forward by our opponent, founded on the "ridiculousness of pointing out any set of men now existing as inspired."

By the word "inspired," the *Montreal Witness* either means, or does not mean, precisely the same thing as we mean by the words "supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost." If he does not mean precisely the same thing, and as we only affirm "the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost," of "any set of men now existing," we cannot be required to show that there is on earth "any set of men inspired"—as he understands the word "inspired"—if on the other hand he does mean by the word "inspired" precisely the same thing as we mean by the words—"supernaturally assisted by the Holy Ghost"—we deny that there is any "ridiculousness" in asserting the continual existence, on earth, of a body of men divinely commissioned to teach—therefore endowed with every requisite for enabling them perfectly to fulfil that divine commission—and therefore infallible, not in virtue of their humanity, but in virtue of the "supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost."

If it be "ridiculous" to assert the existence of such a body, it must be because the antecedent improbability of such an existence is so great as to amount to positive certainty; for it cannot be "ridiculous" to assert the existence of the "possible," or what may exist. But what has existed is not an "impossible" existence; now the *Montreal Witness* himself admits the existence, upon earth once, of an "inspired" or supernaturally assisted body of teachers; therefore, the existence of such an "inspired" or infallible, because supernaturally assisted, body of teachers, is not an "impossible" existence, and therefore it cannot be "ridiculous" to assert its present existence. Hume himself, Ultra-Protestant as he was, would have admitted the "possibility" of proving miracles, by human testimony, viz:—the resurrection of the dead—had he once admitted the "possibility" of such a miracle; but evangelical Protestants in their zeal against Popery are far more sceptical than Hume, and deny the "possibility" of that which they themselves admit, not only to be "possible," but actually to have "been." In a word, our cotemporary's objection amounts to this—"The actual is impossible—that which has been, cannot be"—and it is "ridiculous" to assert its "existence."

Again, if there ever was on earth a divinely commissioned body of teachers, it cannot be ridiculous to assert its present existence, unless it be certain that that divinely given commission has been divinely rescinded; unless it be certain that the supernatural element, which once existed in Christianity, has been eliminated. This, as we have often had occasion to remark, is the fundamental idea of Protestantism, which underlies all its theosophic systems; with it, the manifestation of the divinity in Christ was but a transient theophany, to be obscured within one, or at most, two generations. "The Holy Ghost died long ago, with the last of the Apostles, and was buried at Ephesus," is the Protestant Confession of Faith. For, if He be not dead, where would be the "ridiculousness" of asserting His continual presence, and assistance, with the Church? and if continually present and assisting, how can the Church fall—how could she ever have fallen, into error? The theory of the corruption of the Church thus necessarily presupposes the withdrawal, or death, of the Holy Ghost.

But we have the right to ask of our logical opponent—"If it be 'ridiculous' to assert the continual existence of a divine commission which you admit once to have been given, and, for one generation at least, to have been acted upon, it must be because that divine commission has been so publicly and authoritatively rescinded that it would be absurd to deny its abrogation." When? How? And by whom was the divine commission to teach, rescinded? Ere you