

REMITTANCES
 ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, & WALES.
 SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on London, Dublin, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. The Bank of Ireland, The National Bank of Scotland, 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. . . \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

The True Witness.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 15, 1856.

TO OUR READERS.
 In entering upon the seventh year of our editorial existence, we may be permitted to refer the readers of the TRUE WITNESS to the Prospectus with which six years ago, we first had the honor of making their acquaintance; with this assurance, that, by every word, by every promise in that Prospectus do we still feel ourselves bound; and that it is our intention for the future, to adhere strictly to that line of policy which we have pursued during the past. Ever shall it be our constant study to leave no promises contained in that Prospectus unfulfilled—no pledge unredeemed.

We promised that the TRUE WITNESS should be strictly a Catholic, though not exclusively a religious journal—that it should not be a political paper in the ordinary acceptation of the term; but, that, eschewing mere secular politics, it should discuss in its columns such politico-religious questions only, as affected the well being and interests of the Church. To these promises, without boasting, we may affirm that we have faithfully adhered.

We promised that the TRUE WITNESS should never be a party or ministerial organ; that it should never be identified with any party whatsoever in the State—whether Whig or Tory—Reform, Liberal, or Conservative. We pledged ourselves that it should always be an independent paper: keeping aloof from all party squabbles, but asserting its right, on all politico-religious questions, to discuss freely the acts of Ministers and other public men, without fear or favor.—These promises have, in every particular, been fulfilled by the TRUE WITNESS.

If then for the past the TRUE WITNESS has been ever faithful to its engagements, and has strictly adhered to the path traced out for it from the commencement, we trust, that, without vanity, we may confidently appeal to our Catholic friends for their support for the future. They will admit that, situated as the Catholics of Canada are at the present moment—menaced as they are by the open hostility of their professed foes, and the more dangerous, because disguised, hostility of false friends—it is for their interest that they should have at least one journal, indifferent alike to the clamors of the first, or the blandishments of the other—incapable of being either intimidated or corrupted, bought or sold. Such a journal we may venture to promise them in the TRUE WITNESS; which, whatever else may be laid to its charge, will never expose itself, we do not say to the reproach, but—to the suspicion even of selling itself to the enemy, or of allowing itself to subsidize into the ignominious position of a "Government hack."

The TRUE WITNESS will still—as has hitherto been the case—be conducted entirely by laymen; and they are to be held responsible for every word that may appear therein. We do not boast of "knowing the minds of our Prelates," or of being in their confidence; and though it will ever be our ambition to merit such marks of their approbation, we have not the presumption to pretend to be in any sense their organ, or the recognised exponent of their views. We are thus particular, in order to avoid all possibility of misconception of our true position; and in order that no aspirations may be cast upon our revered Clergy, because of the particular views entertained, and opinions expressed by the TRUE WITNESS. At the same time, it will always be our pride to submit ourselves implicitly in all things to the expressed will of our ecclesiastical superiors. But here again we trust that our past, will be a guarantee for our future.

The terms of subscription to the TRUE WITNESS, will remain as at present. By the changes, which at a considerable expense we have made, we have been enabled to present our readers with as large an amount of interesting matter as almost any Catholic journal printed on this Continent; and it shall still be our constant study to obtain and retain their confidence, by our faithful and unsinching advocacy of Catholic rights, whenever, and by whomsoever menaced.

Delinquents are earnestly requested to remit the arrears still due to this office without delay.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.
 The Imperial Parliament was prorogued on the 29th ult.; the political news from Great Britain is devoid of interest. The weather during the last week of July had been most favorable for the growing crops; and the Broker's Circular exhibits a decided decline in the price of bread stuffs.

For lack of other matter, public attention has been greatly excited by the proceedings in the case of Archdeacon Denison, of Taunton. This gentleman preached a sermon some time ago, wherein he laid down the proposition, that, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ are indeed given to all; the worthy receiving them to eternal life: the unworthy, to eternal death. A very respectable grocer was much shocked by this Popish doctrine, in a Protestant church; and forthwith lodged a complaint against the preacher. After long delays, and much word fencing and hair splitting, Dr. Sumner was forced to institute legal proceedings against the Archdeacon of Taunton, which were brought to a close before Dr. Lushington on the 28th ult. Judgment was to have been pronounced on the 12th inst.; and the result was looked forward to with no little anxiety by the religious world. It is generally expected that the sentence will be, that the Church of England has no more any definite doctrine upon the Eucharist, than upon the Sacrament of Baptism; but that its ministers are at liberty to teach that the Zuinglian and the Catholic dogmas thereupon, though contradictory, are both equally true, or equally false. To outsiders, the whole proceedings are well calculated to afford a great deal of quiet amusement, at the absurdities of State-Churchism, or "religion according to law."

From Ireland, we learn that Smith O'Brien persists in his determination to keep clear, for the present, of politics. The following is the concluding portion of his letter to a deputation from the electors of Tipperary, requesting him to allow himself to be put in nomination for that county. Having stated his reasons for declining to comply with their request, the honorable gentleman proceeds to say:—

"Perhaps I should feel some compunction in thus refusing to re-enter the House of Commons, if I could persuade myself that in that sphere I could be useful to my country; but in 1843, after having attended Parliament with continuous assiduity during twelve years, I arrived at the conclusion that my time would have been much more usefully occupied, if I had remained in Ireland; and everything that has occurred since that period has confirmed rather than weakened this conviction.

"Under these circumstances I have no desire to recommence a career which would be fraught with unhappiness to myself and to many whom I love. At the same time, I propose to keep a vigilant watch over the legislation which may be brought forward for Ireland; and if at any time hereafter I may have reason to believe that my experience in public affairs can be rendered useful to my country, I shall not hesitate to offer such suggestions as the occasion may require. My opinion, if it be of any value, will be at least as potential when expressed in my native land, as it would be if delivered in the House of Commons. I cannot close this letter without reiterating my acknowledgments to yourself personally, for the friendly, faithful, and disinterested support which you gave me whilst I was the representative of your parishioners in the county of Limerick.

"Believe me,
 Very sincerely yours,
 "WILLIAM S. O'BRIEN."

Of the militia men convicted of participation in the Nenagh riots, one, Stephen Burns, has been sentenced to death, and five others to fifteen years' transportation. Burns was recommended to mercy by the jury, and the judge has transmitted this recommendation to His Excellency. The sentence is generally looked upon as severe.

From the Continent of Europe come tidings of insurrections, for the present fortunately repressed. In France there have been riots, attributed to the workings of the "Marianne," a secret revolutionary society; in Italy, a popular outbreak has been put down; and in Spain, by the latest accounts, the Queen's Government is everywhere triumphant. How long this state of comparative quiet may last is uncertain; but it seems but too clear that the spirit of '48 and '49 is again abroad, and that stormy days are in store for the Governments of Continental Europe.

A strange story—probably a hoax—appears in the N. Y. Herald, in the form of a communication from its Washington correspondent. The burden of it is, that the British Government, by way of counteracting the anticipated French interference with the internal affairs of Spain, has recommended to the Government of Queen Isabella, the sale of the island of Cuba to the United States. This is most likely a mere canard; but is of interest as showing how strongly the idea of the ultimate annexation of the Queen of the Antilles to the Model Republic is fixed in the mind of the American public. Another hint, significant we suspect of another filibustering expedition, was given by Governor Walker, the robber Governor of Nicaragua, at a great repast lately given in his special honor in Granada. The toast of "Christopher Columbus" was proposed by General Walker; and ushered in with the remark, that his ashes, which rest in the cathedral of Havana "should belong to America, and not to Europe." These remarks were received with enthusiastic cheers.

From Mexico we learn that the robbery of the Church goes on apace; and that, if any unfortunate ecclesiastic presumes to raise his voice against the iniquity, he is summarily silenced, by the simple process of banishment. This is what democrats and Protestants applaud as "civil and religious liberty."

Nearer home, rumours of an approaching dissolution are rife, and gather force every day.

There is said to be a split upon the subject in the Ministerial camp; whilst the Leader and other Upper Canada journals, speak confidently of a general election during the ensuing autumn. Meeting have been held in several parts of the country, for the purpose of petitioning His Excellency to dissolve the present Parliament. At Quebec on Sunday last a large open air meeting was held, in which the conduct of Ministers was loudly condemned, and a series of Resolutions, not complimentary to the honesty of our present government were assented to.

OUR POLICY.

OUR condemnation of the unparalleled treachery of the present Ministry, and the venality of their supporters, whereby the gallant efforts of our Prelates, Priests, and laity to obtain justice for themselves and their flocks upon the "School Question," have been rendered abortive, has laid us open, in a certain quarter, to the suspicion of being favorable to the pretensions of the political party known as "Rouges." "Would you then," we have been asked, "recommend an alliance of the Catholics of Canada with these 'Rouges,' the enemies of all religion?"

Gently, good questioner, we reply; define your terms: tell us what you mean by "Rouges;" and we shall better know how to answer you. However for all response we would refer our questioner to our issue of the 25th ult.; wherein, if he will do us the honor of reading our remarks upon the wisest policy of Catholics at the present juncture, he will see that, so far from recommending such an alliance as he speaks of, we expressly define that policy, as consisting in a firm, and uncompromising opposition to any and every party, to any and every Ministry, that will not accept "Freedom of Education" for all denominations, as the first condition of its political existence. Entertaining such sentiments, it should be clear that, so far from recommending a "Catholic-Rouge" alliance—or, indeed, any other Catholic-political alliance whatsoever—we deprecate all action whose tendency would inevitably be to identify the Catholic Church with any political party in the State. The true policy of the Church—in so far as she can be said to have a policy—is here, as it has always, and everywhere been, to keep aloof from party strife. Always and everywhere she is on the side of order, authority and liberty—for these are of God: always and everywhere she is opposed to confusion, anarchy and despotism, for these are of the devil.

To use all parties, in so far as they can be made useful, or subservient to the interests of religion and morality—to commit herself to, and compromise herself with none—has always been, and always will be, the only policy known to the Catholic Church. As Catholics, our great object—if possible and if the treachery of M.M. Cauchon & Co. has not rendered all future struggles hopeless—is to obtain for ourselves and children the recognition by the State of our inalienable right to the enjoyment of "Freedom of Religion," and "Freedom of Education"—or, in other words, the emancipation of education and religion from all State control. If either Reds or Blues will aid us in obtaining this our object, why should we hesitate to accept that aid? And so—should Reds, Blues, or any other color, oppose themselves to our just demands, then it is our duty as Catholics, without regard to party or any other worldly consideration, so to exercise our rights as citizens, as to hurl from power whatsoever party presumes to array itself in opposition to the Catholic Church. The policy, in short, of the TRUE WITNESS is that indicated in the already published correspondence on the "School Question" betwixt the Bishops of Canada, and the Ministry; and is fully set forth in the following extract from a letter of His Lordship, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Phelan of Kingston, to Att. Gen. Macdonald:—

"I trust"—says the reverend writer—"neither you nor the Ministry will be prevented from doing us justice by your allowing us the same rights and privileges for our separate schools as are granted to the Protestants of Lower Canada. If this be done at the present session we will have no reason to complain, and the odium thrown upon you for being controlled by Dr. Ryerson will be effectually removed. If, on the contrary, the voice of our opponents upon the subject, of separate schools is more attended to and respected, then the voice of the Catholic Bishops, the clergy, and nearly 200,000 of Her Majesty's loyal Catholic subjects, claiming justice for the education of their youth, surely the ministry that refuses us such rights cannot blame us for being displeased with them; and consequently for being determined to use every constitutional means in our power to prevent their future return to Parliament. This of course will be the disagreeable alternative to which we shall be obliged to have recourse, if full justice be not done us at this session with regard to our separate schools.

"THIS SESSION" has come and gone. Not only justice has not been done us in the matter of Separate Schools; but the present Ministry have formally declared that it is not expedient to allow the same rights and privileges to the separate schools of the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, as are granted to the separate schools of the Protestant minority in the Lower Province. Not only have the Ministry done nothing for us, but they have been exceedingly, insultingly, and most dangerously active against us. What remains for us then, but to carry out the policy so clearly laid down in the concluding sentence of His Lordship's letter? Must we not, if faithful to our lawful Pastors, oppose by "every constitutional means in our power," every party—and therefore the present Ministry)—which refuses, or hesitates even, to grant us, and that immediately, "full justice with regard to separate schools?"

What we say of the Rouges, we say of those who call themselves "Conservatives." In so far as the Rouges can be made useful to the obtaining of Catholic ends, we would use them, and no farther; in the same manner, in so far, but no farther, would we use the "Conservatives," or any other political party; but we would allow ourselves to be made a tool of by none. The only questions we have to ask ourselves therefore are—By what party, at the present moment, are the interests of religion and morality most likely to be promoted?—which of all the contending parties is the most likely to aid us in our battle for educational as well as religious liberty? If we may believe the accredited organs of the Upper Canada Conservatives, we have but little to hope for from them in this respect. Their Conservatism seems to mean the conservation of Protestant ascendancy as manifested in Upper Canada "State-Schoolism." Such at least seems to us the legitimate deduction from the following, which we extract from the political manifesto of the Upper Canada Conservatives, as given in their organ, the Toronto Colonist:—

"The great questions before the country are—an adjustment of the representation, or representation by population"—and "the preservation of our excellent school system."

If these are the principles of the Conservatives—the swamping of Lower Canada by Upper Canada votes, and the perpetuation of the existing unjust and tyrannical School Laws of that section of the Province—we see not how any honest Catholic voter can support a Conservative candidate.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW,
 JULY—1856.

In the number before us, we have articles, all written with the usual first-rate ability, on the following subjects:—

- I.—"The Church and the Republic."
- II.—"The Effects of the Reformation."
- III.—"The Unholy Alliance."
- IV.—"Reason and Faith."
- V.—"Pere Gratry's Logic."
- VI.—"Literary Notice and Criticisms."

The object of the Reviewer in the first article on our list is, to convince, if possible, his Non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, that the Catholic Church is not only not incompatible with their civil institutions, but necessary to their very existence; and that without the Church, those free institutions, menaced as they are, on the one hand by social despotism—whose tendency is to ignore the rights of the individual—and on the other, by the progress of an exaggerated individualism—the tendency of which is to deny the authority of the State—cannot much longer be maintained in their integrity. The problem which the American statesman has to solve is—how to reconcile the authority of the State, with the rights of the individual. This the Reviewer clearly shows can be done only by the introduction of a third term—"organised religion," or the Church—a Church independent of the State, independent of the individual, and therefore enabled to assign to each its due bounds. On the one hand, such an organisation asserts the authority of the State, on the other, the rights of the individual.

Now, Protestantism cannot do this. It invariably denies either the one, or the other; and thus gives us either despotism, or anarchy—both equally hostile to, and incompatible with, liberty, which is but another expression for submission to legitimate authority. At the present day however, the danger that chiefly menaces liberty proceeds from the tendency of modern democracy to ignore the rights of the individual; to deny to him any rights as man, and to assert the absolute right of the State—which again means only the will of the majority for the time being. It is to this tendency that we must attribute our "School Laws," our "Maine Liquor Laws," and all other statutes whose professed object is to reform society en masse. They are all based upon the false, impious, and anti-Catholic principle, that, against the State, the individual has no rights.—They all proceed from overlooking the truth, taught by Catholic theology, that man has rights; not merely as a member of the State, or national society; rights, not derived from the State or civil Society, but from God Himself; rights therefore, with which the State, without degenerating into despotism, cannot interfere.

It is then the Church, and the Catholic Church only, that can consistently, and without danger to Society, assert the "Rights of Man." The Church therefore is the only safeguard for individual liberty, at the present day, everywhere; but on this Continent especially, seriously menaced as it is by the aggressions of Protestant democracy. Just as in the seventeenth century Protestantism asserted the damnable and blasphemous doctrine of the "divine right of Kings," so, in the nineteenth, it asserts the equally blasphemous and slavish doctrine of the "divine right of peoples, or majorities." The Catholic Church alone teaches that neither kings nor peoples have any right to do wrong.

A brilliant sketch of the disastrous effects of the great apostasy of the XVI. century upon European civilisation, is followed by a review of the policy of the Western Powers of Europe.—The article on "Reason and Faith," however admirable in some respects, contains, towards its close, some remarks which cannot but prove offensive towards the Irish Catholics of the United States; a class of his fellow-citizens whom the Reviewer seems to take a strange delight in offending. He would attribute the cruel social persecution to which the Irish Catholics in the States are at present subjected, not to a hatred of Catholicity inherent in, and we fear inseparable from, the Yankee character; but to the vices of the Irish themselves. This theory may be very

acceptable to the "Know-Nothings;" but it is contradicted by facts, and by the Reviewer himself.

He tells us—and no doubt truly—that:—
 "Too large a portion of the vicious population of our cities have been born of Catholic parents, and ourselves been baptised by the Catholic priest"—p. 366.

And were it against the "vicious population of the cities" against the bad Catholics, or Protestantised Irish, that the wrath of the Know-Nothings was directed, we should be prepared to admit the truth of the Reviewer's conclusions. But it happens that these vicious rowdies, these Protestantised or de-Catholicised Irish, are the especial pets, and often the leaders, of the Natyve party; they are, not the victims, but the abettors of the persecution; which is directed, not against the "vicious population," but against the quiet, orderly, and law abiding portion of the Irish community; and that is so, not because they are Irish, but because they are Catholics. But here we must let the Reviewer speak for himself.

In an article published some few years ago in Brownson's Review, we find the following just appreciation of:—

"NATIVE AMERICANISM AND ITS OBJECTS.
 "The Native American party is not a party against admitting foreigners to the rights of citizenship, but simply against admitting a certain class of foreigners. It does not oppose Protestant Germans, Protestant Englishmen, Protestant Scotchmen, nor even Catholic Irishmen. It is really opposed only to Catholic foreigners. The party is truly an anti-Catholic party, and is opposed chiefly to the Irish, because a majority of the emigrants to this country are probably from Ireland, and the greater part of these are Catholics. If they were Protestants, if they could mingle with the native population and lose themselves in our Protestant sects, very little opposition would be manifested to their immigration, or their naturalisation. . . . But this they cannot do. They are Catholics, they adhere to the faith of their fathers. . . . Here is the first and immediate cause of the opposition they receive."

And if so, surely they deserve, not the reproaches, but the sympathies of the native-born American Catholic. But we will continue our extracts:—

But deeper yet lies the old traditional hatred of Catholicity. The majority of the American people have descended from ancestors who were accustomed to pray to be delivered from the flesh, the world, the devil, and the Pope; and though they have in a great degree rejected the remains of faith still cherished by their Protestant ancestors, they retain all their hatred of the Church. If they believe nothing else, they believe the Pope is Antichrist, and the Catholic Church the Scarlet Lady of Babylon. When the Catholic Church is in question, all the infidels and nothingarians are sure to sympathize with their Protestant brethren. Pilate and Herod are good friends, when it concerns crucifying the Redeemer of men. This is, perhaps, as it should be. Hence, the great mass of the American people, faithful to their traditions, are inveterately opposed to Catholicity; and it is this opposition that manifests itself in Native Americanism, and which renders it so execrable and so dangerous.

We presume there are few who will question this statement. The "Native Americans" with whom we have conversed, all, to a man, avow it, and the late disgraceful riots and murder and sacrilege in Philadelphia prove it. There no harm was done to Protestant foreigners. Hostility was directed solely against Catholics. They were Catholics, who were shot down in the streets—Catholic churches, seminaries, and dwellings, that were rifled and burnt. Even the most active members of the Native American party, if we may be pardoned the Hibernianism, are in many cases foreigners. The notorious ex-priest Hogan, a foreigner and an Irishman, deposed for his immoral conduct, is, if we are rightly informed, a most zealous Native, and has been lecturing in this city and vicinity in favor of Native Americanism; and we have heard no Nativist object to having men like him exercise the rights of an American citizen. The Orangemen, foreigners as they are, did the Natives substantial service in Philadelphia, as it has been said, and they threaten to do the same here, if occasion serve. All this proves that the opposition is not to foreigners, as such, but simply to Catholics, and especially to Irish Catholics.

Now, however, the Reviewer tells us—that the Irish are persecuted, not because they are faithful Catholics, but because they are bad Catholics, and lose themselves amongst their Protestant neighbors; because they are turbulent, quarrelsome and heedless of their religious duties; and that, "before we can blame the American people for their hostility towards us," we must do our duty and live like Catholics; that is, pursue the very line of conduct which—in his article on "Native Americanism"—the Reviewer tells us, had already provoked the hostility of the American people against Catholics. Strange doctrine this from one whom we have so long, and so profoundly respected. If the Irish live like Catholics, if they will not lose themselves in the Protestant sects by which they are surrounded, if they will persist in their faithful adherence to their ancestral faith, they are persecuted as Catholics; and if they complain of this cruel treatment, they are told—"Oh the fault is your own. You must do your duty, be Catholics, and live like Catholics, before you can blame the American people for their hostility towards you"—p. 366.

It is with pain that we are compelled thus to notice the anti-Irish prejudices in which, with the view no doubt of conciliating the anti-Catholic hostility of his Non-Catholic fellow-citizens—the learned Reviewer but too often indulges. God forbid that we should reproach him for his patriotism, or deem it a fault in him that he loves his native land, and is jealous of her good name.—We can make great allowances for the difficult and delicate position in which he is placed; and we can appreciate his motives in endeavoring to remove the prejudices of his Protestant fellow-countrymen against Catholicity, as a foreign or non-American religion. But what need is there for him to pander to the vile bigotry of his anti-Catholic fellow-citizens, by palliating their iniquitous treatment of a class to whom, under God, belongs the credit of being the builders of the Catholic Church in the United States?—and but for whom, there would be no Catholic churches or convents in Boston for the "Know-Nothings" to burn; no missionary priests in New England for the sons of the Puritans to tar and feather?

The other articles in the number before us are written with the Reviewer's usual ability. We read, and we admire his skill as a logician; and, in spite of the blishes which we have ventured to indicate, we honor the learned champion of our Church. But whilst thus rendering justice to his transcendent merits as a writer, as a scholar and theologian, we cannot but express our regret that he should impair his usefulness, by his wanton and