

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.,
 Montreal, Oct. 1852. St. Sacrament Street.

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. . . \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE
 TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 15, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The European journals are for the most part still taken up with Biographical notices of the great Duke, whose death is deplored throughout the British Empire as a national calamity, and as the loss, not of a man only, but of an institution, of part of the British constitution, of the only power which could, on all occasions, mediate acceptably betwixt an exclusive aristocracy, and a turbulent democracy, softening the stubborn resistance of the one, and moderating the impetuosity of the other. The funeral will not take place until after the meeting of Parliament, which is positively announced for the 11th of next month, immediately after the return of the Royal Family from Scotland. Though nothing has as yet been formally announced, it is believed that the remains of the Duke will find their final resting place alongside of the hero of the Nile, and Trafalgar, beneath the dome of St. Pauls, which will thus be honored by the ashes of two of Britain's noblest children. It is to be hoped that the tomb of the Duke may not be profaned by any of these architectural and monumental deformities of—British Lions—Weeping Britannias—Victories with wings and short petticoats—and Fames, blowing penny trumpets—which English Protestants are so fond of sticking up in their heathenish-looking places of worship, and which have made English taste, and Protestant temples, the laughing-stock of the civilized world. The vacancies occasioned by the death of the Duke of Wellington have been filled up as follows: Commander-in-Chief, Lord Hardinge.

Master Gen. of Ordnance, Lord Fitzroy Somerset.
 Military Secretary, Colonel Wood.
 Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, Earl Derby.
 Constable of the Tower, Lord Combermere.
 Colonelcy of the Grenadier Guards, Prince Albert.
 Colonelcy of the Fusilier Guards, Prince George of Cambridge.

The Derby government has received a very pretty snubbing in the person of Sir Henry Bulwer, the British agent for exciting insurrection on the Continent of Europe. Sir H. Bulwer must needs have the impertinence to obtrude his uncalled for remarks upon the Roman government; but the Cardinal of State treated him very cavalierly, telling him that England had quite enough to do to mind its own affairs, without meddling with those of its neighbors. The British envoy is said to have expressed a wish that the Court of Rome would receive an accredited agent from England, with a higher title than that of Consul: To this it was replied—"that it would be time to discuss such a question when a Papal Nuncio was admitted to the Court of St. James," and that as to Mr. Freeborn, the British Consul at Rome—the Pontifical government was perfectly indifferent whether he were recalled, or maintained. Sir H. Bulwer put forward some demands for the documents relative to the convict Murray, who is under sentence of death for murder. The Secretary of State very plainly told him that his demands should not be complied with. "A judgment," he said, "has just been given in England (the Achilli trial) which had astonished and afflicted them; but notwithstanding that astonishment, they did not pretend to interfere with a sentence pronounced by the courts of a regular and independent government. Theirs also was a regular and independent government, and they therefore denied to any other government the right of questioning, or interfering with it; the sentence against Murray was a legal sentence, and there it must rest. At Rome the result of the interview between Sir Henry Bulwer and the Cardinal Secretary of State, was regarded as very satisfactory; perhaps a different view of it may be taken in Downing Street.

Louis Napoleon is continuing his tour throughout France, and from the language of the addresses presented to him, and of his replies, the re-establishment of the Empire and the Napoleonic dynasty, may be looked upon as a fixed fact, to come off most probably before the close of 1852; perhaps on the anniversary of the day of Austerlitz. At Lyons, the language of the President was very explicit. There was a great festival in honor of the inauguration of a statue of Napoleon, who, it seems, was very fond of the Lyonnese, and told them so upon some occasion or other, which this statue is intended to celebrate. Upon this occasion, the nephew, in presence of the image of his great uncle, is reported to have said that "if the modest title of President could facilitate the mission that was confided to him, and from which he had not shrunk, he would not, from any personal interest, desire to change that title for that of Emperor. Let us, then, offer on this stone our homage to a great man." This speech was received with enthusiastic applause, and cries of "Vive

l'Empereur." The tone of some of the French journals is warlike, and the probabilities of an English invasion are again, especially since the great man's death, the subject of discussion. The re-establishment of the Empire, politically, would necessitate the re-establishment of the Empire, geographically, that is, with what are called its natural limits—the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees—this would inevitably lead to a European war, and where is he who alone could have taught how to bring that war to a successful issue? Alas for England!—she has not got the Duke of Wellington, but she has got Cobden, and Frenchmen know it.

The harvest has been generally got in, and is spoken of as rather under an average crop. Labor was very scarce, and indeed the men for the militia were not obtained without difficulty. The drain of men from Great Britain and Ireland is becoming serious.

Great discontent is felt in the Australian colonies, at the renewal of the transportation system. Meetings of the colonists have been held to remonstrate against this infamous usage, and to insinuate quite gently, that rather than submit to it they will proclaim their independence. The Australians will be as good as their words—more power to them.

By the steamer *Franklin* we learn of an attempt on the Prince President's life. An infernal machine designed to kill the Prince, had been seized at Marseilles. It was thought there was yet another, and that a conspiracy to murder the President was extended throughout the Province of Vars, set on foot by the Socialists. One hundred of these gentry have been arrested. It was expected that the Empire would be proclaimed on the 15th inst.

"CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE."

In replying to the strictures upon the TRUE WITNESS contained in the *Canada Temperance Advocate* of the 1st instant, we wish our cotemporary clearly to understand that we do not intend to follow his example—of imputing evil motives to those who differ from him in opinion as to the merits of the "Maine Law." We give our cotemporary credit for being perfectly conscientious in his advocacy of that law; we believe him to be, a sincere friend of temperance, vividly impressed with the evils of drunkenness, ardently desirous of finding an efficacious remedy for these evils, but unable to find in the world in which he lives and has his being, any such remedy save in legislative interference; we respect his motives, but differ with him as to the mode by which the moral reformation is to be brought about.

Were our cotemporary a Catholic, our task would be an easy one; for, as we have remarked before, Catholics have certain first principles in common, by the application of which they can solve every conceivable political or social problem.

But Catholics and Non-Catholics have nothing in common to which they can alike appeal; they can never arrive at the "*Deus vult*," which is the highest reason, because they have no common means of arriving at a knowledge of that Divine Will; they can never get beyond the "*populus vult*," and the will of the people is no reason at all. In arguing with a Non-Catholic, therefore, the Catholic must argue as he would argue with an amiable and highly intelligent heathen; as he would have argued with a Cicero, or with some of the great men of Pagan antiquity, who had naught save the last faint glimmerings of the primeval revelation to guide them in their researches after truth.

The advocates of the "Maine Law" apparently forget that it is for them to prove that their measure is just, necessary, and likely to be beneficial in its results; that it is for them to show cause why the measure should pass, and not for its opponents to show cause why it should not pass? It is enough for the latter to refute the arguments which the former adduce, and therefore the TRUE WITNESS has confined itself to the task of pointing out the fallacies contained in all the arguments brought forward in support of the "Maine Law," all of which arguments are based upon the principle—that the use of alcohol is *malum per se*, and that the State has the right to prohibit it, as supreme moral law-giver.—We have contended that the use of alcohol is not *malum per se*,—that, as the functions of the State are wholly and solely in the temporal order, it has no moral or spiritual jurisdiction whatever, and that therefore it has no right to interfere with, or to lay any restrictions upon, the importation, sale, or manufacture of spirituous liquors, except for revenue purposes. If our opponent asserts that the use of alcohol is *malum per se*, we challenge him to prove it; if he asserts that the State has moral and spiritual jurisdiction, we call upon him to show whence this moral and spiritual jurisdiction is derived: the *orzes probandi* rests with him. Be it understood that in denying to the State any moral or spiritual jurisdiction, we are speaking of the State in its abnormal condition, divorced from, and professing to be independent of, the Church, and not of the State in its normal condition as ancillary to the Church; it is all moral and spiritual jurisdiction, independent of the Church, that we deny to the State.

We will now examine the exceptions taken by the *Canada Temperance Advocate* to our articles upon the "Maine Liquor Law." These are that we have—"shamefully distorted" the 11th section, by representing it as giving power—"to any scoundrel of a common informer—such common informer being a voter in the town or city where the complaint is laid—to subject any citizen, to whom the said rascal of a common informer may owe a grudge, to a domiciliary visit from the police"—that we have denounced the wholesale condemnation of the use of alcohol as *malum per se*, as blasphemous "and as a revival of the damnable heresies of the Manicheans"—and thirdly, that we have falsely assumed that it is "the de-

mand which causes the supply, and not the supply which causes the demand." We will endeavor to reply to every one of our opponent's exceptions.

We repeat it—that by the 11th section of the "Maine Liquor Law," as quoted by our opponent, power is given to any scoundrel of a common informer—who, it may be remarked, is invariably an uncommon liar, and an object of scorn and loathing to every honest man—such common informer "being a voter in the town or city,"—to subject the private dwelling house of any decent citizen, to whom the said rascal of a common informer may owe a grudge, to a domiciliary visit from the police. Here are the words of the Act, as quoted by the *Canada Temperance Advocate*. After providing that, if any three common informers "being voters in the town or city," shall make complaint under oath or affirmation "that they have reason to believe, and do believe," that spirituous liquors are kept "in any store, shop, warehouse, or other building or place," a domiciliary visit may be inflicted—the Act continues, "But no dwelling house in which, or in part of which a shop is not kept, shall be searched, unless at least one of said complainants shall testify to some act of sale of intoxicating liquors therein, by the occupant thereof, or by his consent or permission, within at least one month of the time of making said complaint." Now, if words have not lost their meaning, the above quoted passage implies that, whilst the oath, or affirmation, of any three scoundrels of common informers, that they believe—fortho!—that spirituous liquors are kept and intended for sale, shall be sufficient to subject any dwelling-house in which, or in part of which, a shop is kept, to a domiciliary visit—the oath or affirmation of any one scoundrel of a common informer that liquor has been sold in any dwelling-house, "in which, or in part of which a shop is not kept," shall be sufficient to subject any private dwelling-house to the same abominable intrusion; and thus the sanctity of the house of any honest man can, as we said before, be violated, his honestly acquired property confiscated, and he himself subjected to fine and imprisonment, at the will of any rascal of a common informer. Such laws as these may do for the State of Maine—for the State of Maine is a democracy, and democracy and liberty are, as all history shows, incompatible; they may suit a democratic community,—for democracy utterly debases men; renders them incapable, and unworthy of freedom, and fit only for the yoke and the lash; but they would never be tolerated, and could never be enforced; amongst a free, and a liberty-loving people; amongst men, whose boast is that their houses are their castles, and who would defend the sanctity of their hearths, if necessary, with their hearts' blood. We deprecate therefore the introduction of any such laws into Canada, because they would never be submitted to except by men intended by nature for slaves; with common informers and domiciliary visits, the freest community on earth would soon be reduced to the condition of Rome in the days of Tiberius.

We are Catholics, and therefore we reiterate our denunciation against the wholesale condemnation of alcohol, and its use, as *malum per se*; we assert that such wholesale condemnation is blasphemous, and a damnable heresy; in fact, that it is nothing short of Manicheism. "How do you prove it?" asks our opponent. Simply enough, we reply. It is blasphemous, because, if the Scriptures be true, Jesus Christ habitually made use of alcohol, and was reproached as a "wine bibber" for so doing; now to assert that that, of which Jesus Christ habitually made use, is *malum per se*, is, to accuse the Son of God of sin, and to take part with His persecutors who crucified Him betwixt two thieves. It is a damnable heresy, because it is Manicheism: Manicheism consists in asserting the positive nature of evil, in opposition to the Catholic doctrine that evil is the negation of the good; Manicheism consists in asserting that any thing that is, is *malum per se*.—Because everything that is, must be either creature, or creator; if evil, and creature, then the work of the Evil Principle; if evil, and not-creature, then Evil-creator—that is, the Evil Principle Himself. Hence it is impossible to assert the existence of anything *malum per se*, without asserting the fundamental error of the Manicheans,—that there are two Principles—one the Author of good, the other the Author of evil—unless indeed our Non-Catholic cotemporary is prepared, with Luther, Melancthon, and the heresiarchs of the XVI. century, to maintain that: God is the Author both of good and evil. It is enough for us as Catholics to know that alcohol is God's creature; and that all that God has made is good, though; as a free agent, man is able to, and alas! too often does, pervert these good creatures to his own destruction, abusing, instead of using, them; but this does not prove that what God has made is *malum per se*, but only that the heart of man is very corrupt.

We hardly know whether we ought to treat the last objection brought against the TRUE WITNESS—that we falsely assume "that it is the demand which causes the supply, and not the supply which causes the demand"—seriously, or as a rare, and exceedingly quaint jest. The *Canada Temperance Advocate* solemnly assures us that he protests against our false assumption—"that the demand causes the supply"—and as it is not in its columns that we should expect to find a joke, we will therefore give our cotemporary the benefit of the doubt, and assume that he seriously contends that it is "the supply which causes the demand." This, if true, is in the language of Horace Mann—"as great a discovery in political economy, as steam is in physics," and will no doubt effect a thorough and radical change in all the operations of the merchant and the financier. The world has hitherto been given over to delusion to believe a lie: men have hitherto, in all the affairs of life, acted upon the false principle "that it is the

demand which causes the supply;" they have been all wrong, and trusting to blind guides like Adam Smith, Ricardo, McCulloch, and writers upon political economy, might have gone blundering on for ever if the *Canada Temperance Advocate* had not come rather late in the day, to set them right. Had our Statesmen only heard of this discovery in time, what evils might they not have averted? When the people of Ireland were crying out for food, they would have answered—"Foolish men, it is the vast supply of food you have already got which causes your inordinate demand for more; diminish that supply, throw your meal into the sea, and cast out your potatoes to rot, and the demand will soon cease, when the supply, the cause of that demand, is removed." Or they might reply to the demand of the Australian colonists for labor—that is because they have so large a supply of labor already that they are so clamorous for more. Oh! what bright prospects to the poor and needy does this discovery of our "Maine Liquor Law" men open up; no need of hunger now, or poverty, for these proceed, not from the demand for, but from the over supply of, food and riches. In winter we may expect to see arrive large cargoes of snow and ice, to meet the demand of our frozen Canadians, and in summer the furrier will bring forth his boas and costly stock of furs. In the market, provisions will become dear as they become abundant, but cheap as dirt in seasons of scarcity. One thing only puzzles us, and that is to discover, if the supply causes the demand—what it is that causes the supply? According to the old theory, we could trace the genesis of supply from demand—of demand, say of intoxicating liquors, from the corrupt heart of man—the corrupt heart of man, from the fall of Adam—of the fall of Adam, from the rebellion of the free will of the creature, against the will of the Creator: we had at least a logical process by which, from the first cause, we could explain the existence of the demand; but 'tis all but an idle dream; it is not the demand which causes the supply, but the supply which causes the demand—what then we would ask, causes the supply? or does it exist without any cause? We should be much obliged to our cotemporary, if he would solve these little difficulties for us in his next issue, and assign a reason or cause, for supply, into which the idea of demand does not enter. We say this, not to throw any discredit upon our cotemporary's axiom, "that it is the supply which causes the demand," but because supply is a fact which stares us in the face, and we have not as yet been able to account for the existence of a fact without a cause.

We would willingly rest our case here, and we assure our cotemporary that, if he can succeed in proving the truth of his grand discovery in political economy—"that it is the supply which causes the demand"—we will cease from our opposition to the "Maine Liquor Law," and become one of its warmest advocates. He will have, we foresee, some little difficulties to contend with at starting, such, for instance, as to explain why coals are not sent to Newcastle, where the supply of coals is great, and where, if his theory be true, the demand for coals ought to be prodigious.

The *Canada Temperance Advocate* concludes by asking—"How the enactment of a prohibitory measure is calculated to prove injurious in practice?" By offering a premium to smuggling, illicit distillation, and sly grog-selling. Men will never be brought to believe that the provisions of a "Maine Liquor Law" are binding on the conscience: the temptation to violate them will be great, and the facilities for violating them will always be still greater. Thus a disregard for law will be engendered, and men will learn to look upon its violation as of small moment, provided it can be done without detection. This is no mere theory of ours: it is a simple statement of facts, that have occurred, and which, whilst human nature remains unchanged, will occur again. The "Maine Liquor Law" is not new: a very similar measure, differing slightly in detail, but identically the same in principle, has been attempted and abandoned in England. We quote from a work on the statistics of drunkenness, by J. G. Millingen, M.D., Surgeon to the Forces, &c. &c. We commend the extract to the attention of our opponent, as he may be sure that what has been, will be:—

"Every act of interference, either from individuals, or on the part of the Legislature, has proved not only abortive, but has increased the evil it was intended to remedy. The imposition of heavy duties only threw the distillation of spirits into the hands of illicit speculators, instead of respectable capitalists; and as McCulloch justly remarks—'superadded the atrocities of the smuggler to the idleness and dissipation of the drunkard.' During the latter part of the reign of George I., and the earlier period of George II., gin-drinking was so prevalent, that it was denounced from the pulpit and the press. At length Ministers determined to make a vigorous effort to put a stop to the further use of spirituous liquors, except as a cordial or medicine. To accomplish this end, a duty of twenty shillings was laid on spirits, exclusive of a heavy license-duty to retailers, while a fine of £100 was levied on all defaulters. But instead of the anticipated effects, this Act produced results directly opposite: the respectable dealers withdrew from a trade proscribed by the Legislature; and the sale of spirits fell into the hands of the lowest and most profligate characters. The officers of the revenue were hunted down by the populace, and did not dare to enforce the law: and Tindal, in his Continuation of Rapin, says—'within two years of the passing of this Act, it had become so odious and contemptible, that policy, as well as humanity, forced the Commissioners of Excise to mitigate its penalties!' During these two years, twelve thousand persons were convicted of offences connected with the sale of spirits, WHILE NO EXERTION COULD CHECK THE TORRENT OF SMUGGLING, and Seven Millions of gallons, illicitly distilled, were annually consumed in London and its environs. Our present consumption (in 1839) of British, Colonial and Foreign spirits is immense; but not equal to what it was at the period alluded to."

The facts given above may be verified by consult-