

REMITTANCES  
TO  
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, NOV. 9, 1855.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Odessa has again been spared the long threatened bombardment; but Kinburn, a fortress which commands the mouths of the rivers Bug and Dnieper, has been taken, together with a large quantity of guns and ammunition. A few days after this success, the Russians blew up the fortifications of Ochelakoff on the opposite bank of the Dnieper to Kinburn; thus leaving the way open for an attack upon the important station of Nicolaieff. From the Crimea we learn that the Russians are strengthening their defences at North Sebastopol; whilst the French and Sardinian troops were advancing towards, and had approached within five miles of, Bakhiserai; so that a great battle was looked upon as inevitable within a few days. The Russians are said to be pushing forward large reinforcements towards the menaced points.

The Catholic world will learn with regret that F. Lucas, Esq., the well known and talented editor of the *Tablet*, is dead. Parliament has been prorogued until the 27th of December. Both in France and Great Britain the "Food Question" is attracting much attention. A great "Bread Demonstration" had taken place in Hyde Park; and the scarcity of provisions was exciting general uneasiness; in France indeed serious disturbances are anticipated, in spite of all the efforts of the Government to meet the wants of the people. There are still rumors of fresh negotiations for peace, and of proffered mediation from Austria and Prussia; but in England the war-spirit is strong as ever, and a reply to an address to Her Majesty from the City of London, would seem to indicate the determination of the British Government to carry on hostilities with renewed vigor.

The most gratifying item of news from the Continent of Europe is the report of the bold and truly Catholic attitude that Austria is assuming towards the petty despot of Sardinia, and his tyrannical and faithless Government. From this it would seem that the former Power is yet destined to take an important part in the game of European politics; and we trust that she may have in her behalf the prayers of all Catholics throughout the world, in her contest with the "Liberals" of Piedmont; who, like all other "Liberals"—always and everywhere—are the most persevering and the most dangerous enemies of civil and religious liberty.

The *British Colonist* of Toronto discourseth upon "National Education":—

"Any system of national education, to be workable and efficient to its intent, should place an implicit integrity—an uncompromising unity—arbitrary and imperative—not admitting of modification, and accommodating expedients, but following the hard line of a truthful purpose; and above all, and before all, and most imperative of every other consideration, that it be based upon the fundamental principles of Christianity."

Though somewhat obscurely worded, we must give our cotemporary credit for laying down, as an essential of all "national education," that "it be based upon the fundamental principles of Christianity." But the question then arises—what are "the fundamental principles of Christianity," as distinguished from the "fundamental principles" of natural religion, of Judaism, Mahomedanism, and of modern Deism? Christianity is a *super-natural* religion; whose "fundamental principles" therefore are not discoverable by natural reason, and can be known in so far only as they form the subject matter of a supernatural revelation. The "fundamental principles" of Christianity are therefore evidently the *peculiar dogmas* of Christianity; those dogmas which distinguish Christianity from every other form of religion that has at any time obtained in the world; and therefore *not* those which Christianity has in common with any non-Christian religion.—Now, what are these dogmas? and who shall decide upon them? And yet, until this is decided, all "national education," based upon the "fundamental principles of Christianity," is impossible—though, according to the *Colonist*, no system that is not based upon these "principles" can be workable or efficient, or therefore worth paying for. Evidently therefore the first thing to be done is, to settle what are the "fundamental principles" or peculiar, characteristic, dogmas, of Christianity; for we must settle firmly our basis, ere we attempt to raise the superstructure.

But amongst Protestants, professing Christianity—there are no universally acknowledged "fundamental" and, at the same time, essentially Christian "principles"—that is, principles which all Christians hold, and which are held by none but Christians. For, if

they are held by Jews, Turks, or Deists, they are not essentially Christian principles. The only religious principles common to all Protestant sects, are the principles of natural religion. These indeed Protestants hold in common with Catholics, with Jews, with Mahomedans, and with Deists; because natural religion is the common heritage of all men.—But Christianity is a system of *super-natural* religion; and its "fundamental principles" are therefore principles not known to any natural religion; not even to the religion of old revealed to the Children of Israel. We may therefore safely conclude that—as there are no "fundamental principles of Christianity" universally recognised by all professedly Christian denominations—it is impossible to establish "any system of national education" that shall be "workable and efficient to its intent."

If we are to have a system of "national education" at all, then of two things one. Either we must have a system that is not based—and which therefore if honest, will not pretend to be based—upon the "fundamental principles of Christianity"—or, the State itself must take upon itself the very difficult task of deciding for all its subjects what are these "fundamental principles." The *Colonist*, for instance, and the sect to which he belongs—whether it be the Anglican, Methodist, Mormon, or Presbyterian, we know not—may have their peculiar opinions as to what constitute the essentials or fundamentals of Christianity. But whatever their opinions, it is certain that they differ widely and irreconcilably upon these points, not only with all Catholics, but with many thousands, and tens of thousands of their own Protestant brethren. Now, in such a case, what is to be done? Is the State to assume that the opinions of the *Colonist*, and his coreligionists, are the truth; and are therefore to be imposed upon all other denominations of Christians?—or shall it decide the former to be in error; and adopt the confessions of some of the latter as the only true essentials, and fundamentals, of Christianity upon which the "system of national education" is to be based? But if neither of these, then must the State cease to attempt erecting a "system of national education" upon the "fundamental principles of Christianity."

But no system, not so based, is worth having, says the *Colonist*. Granted—and the conclusion is evident—that—as in the present state of society, a system of national education "based upon the fundamental principles of Christianity" is impracticable—and as no other system is worth having—the best thing that the State can do is to abandon all attempts to impose upon the people a "system of national education" at all; but, whilst tendering impartially its assistance to all denominations, to leave all perfectly at liberty to decide for themselves what are the "fundamental principles of Christianity" upon which they shall proceed to erect, each their own educational systems. In a word, we advocate the "denominational" as opposed to the "national" system; not as the best conceivable, but as the only system practicable.

Our argument is, we know, unanswerable; and the only way that our cotemporary will attempt to meet it, will be by shifting his position—from the "fundamental principles of Christianity" to the "fundamental religious principles" common to all men, whether Christians, or Non-Christians; and which of course all Protestants hold in common with one another, and with Catholics. But these—as we have before shown—are the fundamentals of natural religion, and therefore, not of Christianity. For Christianity is not a natural, but a *super-natural* religion; and its fundamental, essential, or characteristic principles are those which distinguish it from all, and which do not connect it with any other, religious systems upon earth. If hard pressed, it would soon appear, that the *Colonist* would be content to accept a "system of national education" based upon the "fundamental principles"—not of Christianity or *super-natural* religion, but—of "natural religion"—or, Deism.

It is in no captious spirit that we enter into this discussion with the *Colonist*; for there is much truth, much good taste, and sound sense in his article upon the subject of "*Common Schools, and Religious Training*," much with which we heartily agree, and which we are most happy to transfer to the columns of the TRUE WITNESS. Nothing can be more to the purpose than the following, upon the results of Godless State-Schoolism in the United States—and—we regret to say it—in Upper Canada as well:—

"It is far too much the prevalent fashion of Canadians, who comment upon public schools, to refer unceasingly to those of the United States, entering into a labyrinth of statistics, or lauding the excellence of their system; for what purpose other than to mystify and encumber our own arrangements it is difficult to conceive. One would imagine there must be somewhere in Canada a man, or men, if more than one be needed, capable of concocting a workable system of popular education, without borrowing from the questionable tenets and lax morality of our neighbors. But, indulging this prevalent propensity, what do we find amongst them, as an example of the success of their now long established school systems? Are they as a people, better taught—are their men of letters riper and more able scholars,—is the standard of education higher than in other countries,—are their habits more refined—do the arts and sciences find a more genial soil—has morality there a higher code—or religion a stronger influence and wider diffusion? To all these queries we unhesitatingly answer, No. In scholarship, in literature, in philosophy, in morality, and in religion, their standards of excellence are, in comparison with older countries, unquestionably low. Do we seek the productions of their common school system; we find only a bald practical utilitarianism, destitute of those softening influences of a mental culture based upon the sacred principles of religious training. It is not extravagance, or injustice to assert, that in no country in the world can there be heard a greater amount of profane language than is in common use among the youthful portion of the American population; and, it is much to be feared, that the rising

generation of Canada cannot be acquitted of a strong prevalent tendency to this disgusting and horrible evidence of a low morality. Our streets, our wharves, our steamboats and our cars, are all polluted with the odious habit of blasphemy; and urchins not yet in their teens, make the side walks ring with curses and profanations, that leave no doubt, in the sober mind, of a widely spread depravity and growing demoralization. Nor are our public schools exempt from this leprosy of youthful habit. Examples are neither few, nor infrequent, of the deep solicitude, of parents upon the score of contamination of habitual swearing among the pupils."

And again he says:—  
"It would seem then that, true to nature, these fruits are but the natural undeviating results of the seed we sow. Godless schools do no produce pious men; nor chalk and the black board, inculcate moral precepts. What obtains from this system in the States is rife here; the fundamental principles of a christian instruction are abjured. The present moral state of that particular section of the population which may be supposed to form four-fifths of our schools attendants, is most conclusive evidence that where godliness is neglected, impiety and immorality walk hand in hand."

A perfectly true picture we have no doubt, though a very sad one, of the morals of the youth in the Upper Province; and which fully demonstrates the worthlessness of any system of education that is not based upon religious principles. The *Colonist* has, we admit, fully made out his case as against the present educational system of Upper Canada; and has proved it to be thoroughly defective and demoralizing. What shall we put in its place, though? The *Colonist* replies—a "system based upon the fundamental principles of Christianity." But this we have proved to be impossible—because, not only Catholics and Protestants, but Protestants and Protestants disagree amongst themselves, as to what are these fundamentals—some confounding them with the fundamentals of mere natural religion—others again finding them only in those mysterious dogmas which distinguish Christianity from all other religions. What then shall we do? Shall we leave the youth of our country to grow up in worse than Heathen ignorance, like the brutalised masses of America, England and Scotland? of whom a description will be found in another column; or, abandoning the absurd theories of the advocates of the "national system" shall we try what can be done by the Church, when untrammelled by the fetters of the State?

For it is as Catholics—as children of the Church—that we speak. And as Catholics we heartily denounce, repudiate and condemn—as far as we ourselves are concerned—every system of education that is not based upon the "fundamental principle" of Christianity. With all Catholics that one "fundamental principle" is—that Christ Himself appointed or instituted ONE Church for all time, and for all nations; to which He, promising His continual presence and assistance, gave the commission "go, teach ye all nations." Here then is our basis—our "fundamental principle of all Christianity"—the only basis upon which we will ever attempt even to raise any superstructure. That basis is the one ONE Catholic Church, "which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth"—1. Tim. iii., 15.

The Governor General has taken advantage of the opportunity offered to him by the presentation of an address from the City of Toronto, to explain away the offensive remarks contained in his Hamilton speech, and upon which we commented in our last. It is true that His Excellency does not deny the words generally imputed to him by the press, both of Upper and Lower Canada—"because"—as he says in his reply to the Toronto Address—"I do not know what they were." But he disclaims any intention of insulting the French Canadians and other Celts, by asserting the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race:—

"I had hoped"—said His Excellency at Toronto—"that every word that I had uttered, and every act I had done, since I set foot in Canada, might have guarded me against the charge of intending on any occasion to cast a slur on our brethren of Lower Canada, by asserting the superiority of one race over another. God forbid that I should do so? I disclaim in the strongest manner any such meaning."

The above, which we copy from the *Montreal Herald* of Tuesday, is, in so far as the Governor himself is concerned, quite satisfactory; and after such a frank and gentlemanly disclaimer of any intention to offend, it is impossible for any one with the feelings of a gentleman to feel offended, or to attribute to His Excellency the design of wounding the feelings of any portion of Her Majesty's Canadian subjects. As between the Governor and the Franco-Canadians, there can be no cause for the slightest soreness of feeling for the future.

But how is it, as between the Celtic races of Canada, and the organs of public opinion in the Upper Province? If the Governor asserted, and asserts, no superiority for Anglo-Saxonism, it is not so with the latter; nor do they hesitate—not only to endorse every word and sentiment attributed to His Excellency at Hamilton—but they also take no pains to conceal their intention to draw therefrom very practical conclusions. Taking as their major premise, that the voice of the superior race should be dominant in the Legislature—and for their minor, that the Anglo-Saxon is that superior race—they logically conclude to the propriety of immediately giving to the latter—or, in other words, to the constituencies of Upper Canada—that preponderance in the Legislature to which their natural and inherent superiority over the Franco-Celtic population of Lower Canada justly entitles them. This is the meaning of the *Toronto Leader's* appeal to the manifest destiny of the Celtic race—viz.,—to be absorbed, or swallowed up, by their superior Anglo-Saxon neighbors;

and this is why the Governor's speech at Hamilton has been invested with so much political importance. "Representation by Population" is fast becoming the political war cry of the Upper Province; and there can be little doubt that—if the Union of the two Provinces continues—it will ere long become a *fait accompli*. So only will the object of that Union—which as the *Leader* tells us, is the absorption of the Franco-Celtic race, or the destruction of French Canadian nationality—be brought about. Such then being the openly expressed sentiments of the Upper Province, it is not difficult to see what should be the duty of the Lower, and what is the policy which the latter should oppose to the aggressive, all-absorbing designs of the other.

But this question of "Representation by Population"—which must be the inevitable consequence of the superiority asserted by the press of Upper Canada for the Anglo-Saxon race—is more than a political question—it involves more than the fate of parties or races; it is a question which immediately and intimately concerns the interests of the Catholic Church, and her institutions, ecclesiastical, charitable, and educational, in Canada. As the *Toronto Mirror* of the 2nd inst. well puts it—this agitation for "Representation by Population" implies:—

"A change in the Representation—by which the constitutional rights of French Canadians will be swept away for ever; and with them that civil and religious liberty which is generally enjoyed by the Catholics of United Canada at the present time."

The absorption of the French Canadian distinctive nationality—the destruction of their constitutional rights—and the suppression of Popery—these are the consequences which, in no very ambiguous language, the *Leader* and other Anglo-Saxon organs of Upper Canada see looming in the future, as destined shortly to be realised "if the Union lasts." It remains then for the French Canadians, and indeed for all Catholics, to decide whether that Union shall last.

HOW PROTESTANTS ARE MADE.

To a well regulated mind it is always highly interesting to be able to trace the process by which, from the most unlikely materials, the ingenuity and industry of men are able to educe the noblest triumphs of art. It is something even to know how a pin is made; how it is brought to a point, cut to a certain length, and how a head is put to it. These may be trifles; yet even these are not to be despised; though the complicated and stupendous mechanism of the chronometer, or the steam engine, is, of course far more worthy of the attention of the lover of science.

But to see a Protestant made! To be as it were, admitted behind the scenes! to be introduced into the very sanctum of the artist's studio! to be allowed to witness the whole process; to count, as it were every stroke of his hammer, and every chip of his chisel, as out of the rude and unpromising block of Catholic marble before him, he brings to light the lovely features of a genuine and thorough Protestant.—This is a spectacle upon which angels might gaze enraptured; it is a privilege almost too high to be accorded to flesh and blood; and one which from the very rarity of its occurrence should be the more highly prized. "An honest man" says the poet "is the noblest work of God." A sound Protestant is of course the greatest work of—well never mind whose work he is—let us see rather the process by which it is accomplished.

To make a Protestant—the real article—you must, as Mr. S. Glass would say, first catch your Catholic.—There is an old Spanish proverb which says that, "to make a devil you must first catch an angel." So with the process under review. You need never expect a tip top article of Protestantism, unless the stuff it be made of originally belonged to the Church. But we cannot give a more vivid idea of the entire process of "making a Protestant" than does our old friend Nick Kirwan, whom we will let speak for himself. It is to be premised, that in his case the raw material was furnished in the person of an old Irish Catholic apple-woman at New York; and that "the result"—in the very words of Nick—"was entirely satisfactory"—the production of an article, in fact, fit to be exhibited on the platform at Exeter Hall, or from the pulpits of the members of the French Canadian Missionary Society.

Nick Kirwan had resolved—so he himself tells the world in the columns of the *New York Observer*—to test for himself the progress of the New Reformation in America, and to ascertain personally to what extent the de-Catholicising, or Protestantising process had obtained amongst his own countrymen, resident in New York. For this purpose the holy man, "drest in his Sunday's best"—just as the old song describes another "old gentleman" of a similar persuasion to have once sallied forth to see how things went on in the upper world—Nicholas, we say, went forth into the high-ways and bye-ways of the great city. Here "a fit opportunity soon presented itself of carrying his resolution into effect." But here we must let Nick speak for himself:—

"I was conversing with a friend in his counting room, when an Irish woman presented herself with her basket of apples. She was large and well developed, with a fine broad face, and an eye full of life and fun, and an accent which bore testimony that she was from Connaught. When others refused to purchase, I went to her basket, and asked,—  
"How do you sell your apples?"  
"Three for two cents, sir; they are as fine russet apples as you ever tasted."  
"Have you a family?" I said.  
"Yes, your honor, indeed I have seven children, all yet young; and my husband, John, is no better than he ought to be, poor man."  
"But do you not find it hard to support them by selling these apples three for two cents?"  
Indeed I do, sir; but then, what can I do?"  
"Why, charge three cents for two, and you will