

REMITTANCES
ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, & WALES.
 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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 19, 1855.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The steamship *Canada*, from Liverpool 6th Jan., arrived here this afternoon.

The news from the seat of war is unimportant, except that the Allies had, on the 28th December, 200 guns in position and ready to open fire on Sebastopol, and after a bombardment for 48 hours it was expected that the place would be stormed. General Canrobert writes "we shall soon be able to take the offensive. We make good our losses more promptly and solidly than the enemy can. We are full of confidence."

Negotiations at Vienna had been postponed for 14 days further, to give the Russian Minister Gortschakoff, an opportunity to communicate with his Government. Although peace was supposed to be altogether improbable, it was not thought to be wholly impossible.

Consols had further declined, and closed on Friday at 90 for money.

PROTESTANT MISREPRESENTATIONS.

The *Church Journal*, one of the leading organs of the Anglican sect in the United States, thinks it his duty to help his readers to a clear understanding of the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception;" this is the more urgent upon him, in that he is scandalised at the amount of ignorance upon this question which prevails amongst his brother Protestants. "We have received," he says—"several communications which satisfy us that there is more ignorance afloat on the subject of the new Roman Dogma than we had supposed possible." After such a pompous exordium, we naturally expected to find the *Church Journal* free from that gross ignorance which he so justly condemns in others. And yet, a few lines lower down, we read:—

"Our church, while teaching, with universal Christendom, that the Mother of Our Lord was a pure virgin, has never asserted—nay abhors—the false dogma which would make her, equally with her Son, to be pure by nature, and therefore needing no Saviour." *Church Journal*.

Thus our erudite cotemporary—who rebukes the ignorance of others—gives his readers to understand that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, as lately defined, teaches—1st—That Mary was immaculate, or "pure by nature;" 2nd—that, she stood in no need of a Saviour; and therefore, as needing nothing, so also receiving nothing from, or in virtue of, the merits of the Redeemer. If there be meaning in words, this is what the passage cited above clearly implies; and as we should feel loth to attribute wilful falsehood to a journal so respectably conducted as the *Church Journal*, and one whose articles are generally characterised by a freedom from abuse and ungentlemanly personalities, we must in charity hope that he has not read the definition of the dogma which he denounces as "contrary to all revelation and reason;" or that, having read it, he is himself under the influence of that gross ignorance which, in his opening paragraph, he so forcibly rebukes. We therefore commend to his attention the words of the Sovereign Pontiff in which the dogma is defined:—

"It is an article of faith that the Blessed Virgin Mary—by the instant of her conception, by the special privilege and Grace of God, and in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ the Saviour of the human race—was preserved from all stain of original sin."

Thus, by this definition, the Church expressly teaches that the Blessed Virgin was conceived immaculate, or pure, by a special grace—but if pure, "by grace," then not "by nature"—as is most falsely, but we trust most ignorantly, affirmed by the *Church Journal*. Again, it is also expressly asserted in this definition, that this "special grace" was accorded to the Blessed Virgin, solely "in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ." Who was thus as much the Saviour of the Blessed Virgin as He is of any others of the redeemed; as it is solely in virtue of His merits as Redeemer of the human race, that she was, by the grace of God, exempted from the stain of original sin, or that they are numbered amongst God's elect.—Well! therefore, and with good cause, might Mary exclaim—"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour;" and thus the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as defined by the Pope, is not opposed to Revelation.

But, according to our cotemporary—"to assert that the Blessed Virgin was herself immaculately conceived is contrary to all reason." Nay, good *Church Journal*; if human reason is to be the final arbiter on this question, the decision will be in favor of the poor Baptist; Reason, without the aid of revelation, would pronounce that all are immaculately conceived; and would condemn "as contrary" to its promptings, the assertion that the newly conceived babe is tainted with sin, and comes into existence responsible for an act of disobedience in which it had no part.—Reason alone is an unsafe guide in these matters; if to it alone we trusted, we should feel compelled to assert, not the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, only, but of every child of Adam. Thus

neither "by Revelation" nor "by reason" is the dogma, as defined—not by the *Church Journal*, indeed, but—by the successor of St. Peter—contradicted.

We can certainly see nothing repugnant, either to reason or Revelation, in the doctrine that St. John the Baptist was cleansed from the stain of original sin in his mother's womb, and that he was therefore born immaculate. The Protestant sect also to which the *Church Journal* belongs, still retains amongst its Festivals, that of the *Nativity* of St. John the Baptist—thus admitting—unless it professes to honor that which is defiled with sin—that the Baptist was, in his "Nativity," Immaculate. But this Immaculate Nativity was as much a miracle, as such an act of "special grace," and as much in "virtue of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race," (and therefore the Saviour of St. John as well as of His Blessed Mother)—as was the Immaculate Conception of Mary. To be conceived Immaculate, is no more out of the ordinary course, is no more wonderful, no more contrary to Revelation, than it is to be born immaculate—as is conceded by the Anglican Prayer Book, which, in the Baptismal service, declares that all men are, both "conceived and born in sin." Now, as our Anglican friends make an exception in the case of St. John the Baptist—declaring in the words of the Collect appointed by Parliament to be used on the Festival of his Nativity, that he was "wonderfully born"—they admit, in spite of the declaration of the Baptismal service, that John was not born in sin; and that therefore his Nativity was Immaculate. Why then should it seem to them repugnant to Revelation, to admit that the Mother of God was not conceived in sin; and that therefore her Conception was as Immaculate, as was the Nativity of the Precursor of her Divine Son? To admit the one, and deny the other, upon the pretence that the latter is opposed to Revelation, is but to imitate the hypocrisy of the Pharisees of old, who strained out the gnat, but swallowed a camel.

And if, from Revelation we appeal to reason, it does certainly seem "contrary to the latter" to admit the Immaculate Nativity of the Baptist; but to deny the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. Reason tells us, that, if for the greater honor and glory of Christ, and to confer additional lustre on the inauguration of the Messiahship, it were requisite that St. John the Baptist—who, in comparison with Mary, was called upon to play but a very subordinate part in the work of man's redemption—should be born immaculate—much more was it fitting and requisite, much more was it necessary, that she—who stood in so much closer a relationship with Christ, who bore Him in her womb, and for whose consent, for whose "Fiat" the Angel Gabriel had to wait ere the "Incarnation" could be commenced—should be conceived immaculate. Again we say, that, if the Anglican admits the Immaculate Nativity of St. John the Baptist, it is unreasonable on his part to object to the Immaculate Conception of Mary, as contrary either to reason or Revelation. And if for the sake of erasing this difficulty, he denies the Immaculate Nativity of the former, then—as his sect, by command of Parliament, honors with a special Festival that Nativity—he must admit that "the Church, as by law established," honors that which is not immaculate, which is therefore tainted with sin, and loathsome in the eyes of God; and that therefore his sect is not the Church of Christ, but rather the synagogue of Satan.

One word as to the antiquity of the dogma which our cotemporary sneers at as the "new Roman Dogma;" but which, if he knew anything of ecclesiastical history, he could see was a dogma, not peculiar to the Latins, and of immemorial antiquity in the East. From the earliest ages, the Church has sanctioned the celebration of the "Conception" of the "Virgin" as a religious festival; and as even in the Anglican calendar, this festival still holds its place—though, for it there is no special service as there is for the "Nativity" of the Baptist—Anglican Protestants cannot deny the antiquity and once general celebration, of the Festival of the Conception. But as the Church never sanctions the celebration of a religious Festival in honor of that which is defiled with sin, or which is not Immaculate, it is a logical deduction from her sanctioning the celebration of the Festival of the Conception, that she believed that Conception to be Immaculate; and thus we conclude that the belief of the Church—both in the East and in the West—in the Immaculate Conception is as old, at least, as the celebration of the Festival in honor of the Conception. This argument is decisive, not indeed as to the truth of the dogma, but as to its antiquity and universality. As, from the celebration of the Festival of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, we are compelled to conclude to the belief of the Church in the Immaculateness of his Nativity, so also must we conclude, from the celebration of the Festival in honor of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, to the belief in the Immaculateness of that Conception; unless indeed we are prepared to assert that the Church honored that which she believed to be defiled with sin, and therefore loathsome in the eyes of her Divine Spouse. From enunciating such an absurdity, such a palpable contradiction in terms, even Protestants would shrink.

To return to our erudite cotemporary of the *Church Journal*—who "wonders that a Church which so highly honors Epiphanius, both as a Saint and Theologian, should give so little heed to his solemn

* Majora privilegia creduntur concessa Beatae Virgini, quam aliis, ut Jeronimo et Joanni Baptistae, qui fuerunt sanctificati in utero.—S. Thom. Sum. pars. 3. q. 27.
 † Festum non celebratur, nisi pro aliquo sancto.—S. Thom. Sum. p. 3. q. 27.
 ‡ The Church celebrates—besides the Nativity of our Lord—the Nativities of the Blessed Virgin and of St. John the Baptist, because of these only were the Nativities Immaculate. Of the other Saints, she celebrates the anniversaries, either of their martyrdom—*die natales*—or conversion.

testimony." May not this wonder proceed from our cotemporary's ignorance of the writings of Saint Epiphanius? just as, in charity we trust, that his assertion, that Romanists hold that the Virgin was "pure by nature," proceeded from his gross ignorance of the definition given by the Sovereign Pontiff. Had our cotemporary studied St. Epiphanius, had he even paid any attention to the passages which he quotes from the writings of that Father, he would have perceived that St. Epiphanius "the Saint and Theologian" clearly asserts the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. In the words of the *Church Journal* he "gracefully compares her to Eve, the Mother of all living;" and by all the old writers, Mary is spoken of as the second Eve. But the soul of the first Eve came from the hands of its Creator, Immaculate; therefore, unless the soul of the second Eve was created in a like state—unless Mary, as well as Eve, was free from all taint of original sin, the "graceful comparison" of St. Epiphanius would be but a silly mockery; and the language of all the Fathers, who liken Mary unto Eve, but sustain baldersdash—intolerable even to a Protestant audience—and Lord knows there is scarce any amount of trash that they are not prepared to swallow, nor any absurdity too gross for their acceptance.

EDUCATIONAL CONVENTION.—A body so called—that is, so self-dubbed—is in the habit of meeting in the rooms of *L'Institut Canadien*, for the purpose of devising a new educational system for the Catholics of Lower Canada. When we mention that, most prominent amongst these agitators is a certain M. Cyr, a person very well known for his Anti-Catholic prejudices—our readers may be able to judge what confidence Catholics should place in, or what countenance they should give to, such a movement.

It is, in plain English, merely an attempt on the part of a few demagogues and anti-Catholics, to enforce the same tyrannical and irreligious system of education on the Catholics of Lower Canada, as that which presses so cruelly upon our brethren of the faith in the Upper Province. Now, the best, because the shortest, method of dealing with these gentry is, simply to tell them at once that, as Catholics, we will not submit to their dictation—that we need not their advice as to how to educate our children—that when proffered, we scout it with contempt, as a monstrous piece of impertinence on their part—and that if we had any doubts as how to act, the simple fact that they—that the Doutrés, the Cyrs, &c., &c.—recommend one course of action, is sufficient to determine us, and every sound Catholic and honest French Canadian, to adopt the very opposite.

How our children, how the children of Catholics, should be educated—is a question with which these men can have no possible right to meddle; it is a question which, morally and intellectually, they are utterly incompetent to answer. Hitherto Upper Canada has been the field on which we have had to fight the battle of "Freedom of Education;" but signs are not wanting which indicate that the scene of combat will, ere long, be transferred to the Lower Province; and that here too we shall have to contend for the principle—that the State has no more right to tax the individual for School, than for Church, purposes; and that if it does tax its subjects, it must give to all, schools of which all can make use, without doing violence to their conscientious scruples—no matter how unreasonable these scruples may appear to the ruling powers.

"Freedom of Education" is our motto, as is also "Freedom of Religion." By "Freedom of Education" and "Freedom of Religion," we deny not the right, nay the duty, of the State to make material provision for the support of education and religion—of Church and School—within its bounds. By these words we mean the perfect immunity of education and religion, of both Church and School, from all State control. As against the State, in these matters, the rights of the Church, nay of every individual parent, are good; and any attempt upon the part of the State—no matter whether exercised in the name of King or People—to enforce of itself a religion or an education, a Church or a School, upon its subjects, is a usurpation of power not rightfully belonging to it, and which therefore we are not only not bound to obey, but are at liberty to resist by all means sanctioned by the Church. "State-Schoolism" and "State-Churchism"—that is, the assumption by the State of the right of control over either School or Church—are alike odious, alike incompatible with civil and religious liberty. Now, we perceive clearly, both from the language and the antecedents of the most active members of this "Educational Convention," that the design of the movement is, to make the State, or Civil government of Canada, supreme, in both sections of the Province, over the schools and educational institutions of the country. This design it is the duty of every Catholic, of every lover of liberty, to counteract; and for this purpose it would certainly appear as if some Catholic organisation, capable of exercising a direct and powerful influence on all political questions in which the interests of religion or education are concerned, were highly desirable at the present juncture, or rather, indispensably necessary.

The Quebec papers announce the death of Judge Paquet in the 64th year of his age.

Our best thanks are due to our active agent for Aylmer, Mr. James Doyle.

Remittances in our next.

The Official Gazette offers a reward of £50 for the discovery of the persons concerned in the assault upon Louis Poissant, on the 31st of October last.

The City Council have voted the sum of £250 for the relief of the poor during the present inclement season; when work is so scarce, and provisions so dear. This sum will be devoted to furnishing soup to the poor; and for this purpose four depots have been formed—at the Providence Convent and Grey Nunnery; for the Quebec suburbs—at the Widows' Asylum, Visitation street; and, for the other end of the town, at the St. Joseph Convent in Cemetery Street. We trust that these provisions will meet the wants of the poor, and we are certain that, in the distribution of the relief, no distinctions of creed or country will be allowed to interfere.

Our attention has been directed to the following statement in the *Montreal Witness*, to which we have been requested to reply:—

1. "That a few Sabbaths ago—the Irish endeavored by force, to remove a French priest from the altar or pulpit," in St. Anne's Church, Griffintown. —*Montreal Witness*, Jan. 17.

Our reply shall be short.—No Irishman, nor any one else, ever endeavored to remove, by force, a French, or any other, priest, either from altar or pulpit of the church in question. The statement of the *Witness* is but an ordinary Protestant lie.

2. The *Witness* adds—that the result of this attempt "to remove by force," &c., was "a general fight between the Irish and the French Canadians," in which "several persons were injured, one severely."—*Id.*

Our reply again shall be short. As no attempt was ever made, by any person "to remove by force" any priest either from altar or pulpit, so no "general fight" ever arose in consequence of such an attempt; and so also, no persons were injured in a fight which never occurred. We trust our readers will pardon us the pains we have been at to give the lie to one who is a notorious liar.

THE 5TH OF NOVEMBER.—In memory of the glorious battle of Inkermann, in which the blood of Catholic soldiers was so freely shed in the cause of Great Britain, it has already been proposed that the lying and insulting Service in the Anglican prayer-book should henceforward be disallowed. A Clergyman, writing on this topic in the *Times*, observes that this might the more easily be accomplished, seeing that "the use of the service for the 5th of November is not sanctioned by Act of Parliament," and that, in consequence, every government clergyman making use of it, does thereby violate the provisions of 13th and 14th Charles II., commonly known as the "Act of Uniformity;" and exposes himself to the penalties enacted against every minister of the Church of England who shall worship God otherwise than as provided for "by Law." Another curious fact connected with the "Church As By Law Established," is brought to light by the Very Rev. E. Tighe Gregory, of Kilmore. Complaining of the unauthorised services in which the clergy of the establishment are wont to indulge, he particularly enumerates the "sanciful church consecration forms" invented and adopted by some prelates, and for receiving converts, used by some fervid clergyman, and all the occasional forms, which are mere Acts of Council; on the very last occasion of which there was not one bishop of the church present; while two Roman Catholic members of the Council were, and appended their names to an "Order for Observance" in all Protestant churches and chapels."—*London Times*.

MILITARY HISTORY OF THE IRISH NATION, COMPRISING A MEMOIR OF THE IRISH BRIGADE IN THE SERVICE OF FRANCE; with an appendix of official papers relative to the Brigade, from the Archives at Paris. By the late Matthew O'Connor, Barrister-at-Law. Dublin, Hodges and Smith.

We have been favored with a copy of the above book by Messrs. Sadler, & Co., and have great pleasure in recommending it to our readers as one of the most interesting volumes that has for years come under our notice. It was published in Dublin as the title specifies, by the eminent house of Hodges and Smith, publishers to the University, and was sold at nine shillings sterling, (or 11s 3d of our money); but one of the firm of Sadler & Co., on a recent visit to Europe, purchased all that remained of the edition, and the work is now offered to the public at a reduced price. The appendix alone is worth the price of the whole book.

Although a work of general interest, especially at the present time, when Irish valor is again reaping a harvest of glory, this work will have a peculiar interest for the Irish people. It is written with the avowed object of vindicating the military character of their nation, as will be seen by a reference to the first paragraph.

"A French writer, whose cursory remark has grown into a sort of historical apothegm, observes that 'the Irish who show themselves the bravest soldiers in France and Spain, have always behaved shamefully at home.' Remarking on this, the historian of the Brigade goes on to say:—

"Had the lively M. Voltaire condescended to read the annals of an obscure people, shut out by distance and insularity from European history, he probably would not have indulged in this disparaging contrast; for he would have found Irish valor the same at Clontarf, at the Black Water, and at Aughrim, as at Luzara, Cassano, and Fontenoy; the same at Dunboy and Limerick, as at Guillestre, Embrun, and Cremona; therefore, although my chief object in these Memoirs is to preserve the remembrance of my gallant countrymen, whose valor, when proscribed at home, shone with such distinguished lustre in foreign service, I have judged it right to couple the Memoirs of the Brigade with a short review of the military achievements of the Irish at home and abroad, during the century of active service that preceded its formation." Such is the object of this work; and although we have as yet only glanced through its pages we can