

REMITTANCES.
 ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.
 NIGHT 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, \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1855.

The America arrived at Halifax yesterday with Liverpool dates to the 23rd June.
 The allies had met with a severe check before Sebastopol. On the 19th June the French and English respectively attacked the Malakoff and Redan Towers, but were both repulsed with great slaughter. According to one account the British loss alone was not short of 3000, including among the killed General Campbell and upwards of fifty other officers.

THE COLONIST AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

We would call the attention of our Catholic friends in Upper Canada, to the following paragraph, which we clip from the Montreal Witness:—

"The Right of Committees to Require the Reading of the Bible in Schools.—The Supreme Court of Maine has pronounced in the case of 'Donohoe v. Richards,' and others, which was argued at Bangor last summer. The suit was brought in behalf of a girl attending one of the public schools of Ellsworth, against the School Committee of the town, for prohibiting her attendance at the school. The Committee had directed the English Bible to be read in the school. Several children of Roman Catholic parents, of whom the plaintiff was one, refused to comply with the regulation, and were prohibited from attending the school until they would comply with the rule."

And, but for the power that they enjoy, to a limited extent, of forming separate schools, this is the brutal tyranny to which the Catholics of Upper Canada would, ere this, have been subjected. They would first have been taxed for Common Schools, under the pretence that the faith of their children would not therein be tampered with; and next, their children would have been compelled to read Protestant religious books, and corrupt versions of the Bible, under pain of expulsion from the schools to the support of which the parents were compelled to contribute. This is a specimen of the justice we might expect from Protestants, were the latter as powerful here, as they are in the United States.

They are humble now; moderate and gentle in their demands. Their cry is for purely secular schools—non-sectarian schools—schools in which the distinctive dogmas of no particular religious denomination shall be taught—thoroughly secular schools, in which no religious exercises, no religious instruction, shall be compulsory upon any of the pupils; and to which the Catholic and Protestant parent may therefore send his child without fear of its faith being tampered with. Such are the professions of our "Liberal" friends; what is their practice when they have it in their power to oppress us, we may learn from the above extract.

They don't oppress us now, because they can't;—because we have a safeguard against their tyranny in our power of establishing those separate schools, which so much disgust our good Protestant friends, and which they are so anxious to do away with. It was thus that the Wolf, as recorded in fable, was so earnest with the Sheep to get rid of the nasty, useless Watch-dog, that kept ward over the fold by night. "What do you want a Watch-dog—big ugly beast—for?" asked the Wolf—"do you think I would eat you?" "What need is there for separate schools?" asks the Protestant. We reply—"Sir, our separate schools are our Watch-dog—whilst we have them, our children are safe from your clutches."

And so the Protestant Wolf grins, and shows his fangs. The Toronto Colonist is "free to confess that the new law is most distasteful to him." He would "warn," too, his Catholic fellow-subjects "in Upper Canada of the dangerous ground upon which they are trenching"—and that "it is by moderation and unobtrusiveness they will best hold the quiet and undisputed possession of their legitimate rights."—We exist then only upon sufferance; so long only, as we keep very quiet, very modest and very unobtrusive; so long as we bend low, and speak only in a bondsman's key. So long only shall we be permitted to "hold quiet and undisturbed possession of our legitimate rights." For there is, it seems, an organised band of rowdy ruffians who—so says the Colonist—might have been seen only a day or two ago marching through the streets of Toronto, and who will "form the nucleus of a ball which once taking motion must, in the intensity of its revolutions, crush for ever the hopes, the aspirations, and the very existence of Papacy in the Western Province." Our cotemporary "speaks large" about his ball; but there are many kinds of balls—footballs, to wit; and "in the very intensity of their revolutions" it is still the fate of such "balls" to be kicked.

At the same time we thank the Colonist for speaking out so plainly; and letting us know what are the

objects of his rowdy friends who march about Toronto. The Papacy however is a rock not so easily "crushed," nor do we think it has much to fear from the "intensity of the revolutions of the ball of which they are the nucleus." The Colonist, we suppose, as a Protestant, likes Scripture—what says he then to this one?—"The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."—St. Luke, xx., 17-18. The Colonist and his friends will do well to consider of it, before they attempt to "crush the very existence of the Papacy"—"*Durum est contra stimulum calcitrare.*"

Perhaps that which most disgusts the Colonist with the new School Law, is the power conferred upon any five persons, being heads of families; to convene a meeting for the election of Trustees for the separate school. "Is it possible?"—he cries out in the bitterness of his disgust—"that the gentlemen who voted for this clause could know the sort of persons of which this conclave might be formed in a rural school section of Upper Canada?" Why! the five persons may be actually Irish; mere Irish Catholics; and surely, adds the Colonist, "it is not pretended that he"—(an honest toiling Irishman with religious scruples)—"is a fit and proper person in whom should be vested so grave a responsibility." Of course not. Being merely a Papist, and an Irish Papist at that, he cannot be a fit and proper person to decide how his little ones shall be educated. This is a matter upon which he should defer to the better judgment of his wealthy Protestant neighbors. What right has a Popish Paddy to control the education of his children? Is not Canada a free country?—and are we not the nucleus of a ball destined in the very intensity of its revolutions to crush Popery and Paddyism? Therefore says the Colonist, "We are free to confess"—a vile phrase—"that, in sum and substance, the new law is most distasteful to us."

Another objection is, that the privileges which it confers are restricted to Catholic. But whose fault is this? Did Catholics so frame the Bill; or did they ever throw any obstacles in the way of Anglicans, or other non-Catholic sectaries, desiring separate schools for themselves and children? Is it not notorious that the restrictive clauses of which the "nucleus of the intensely revolving ball" complains, were imposed by Protestants—by the very men who have so long opposed the concession of "Freedom of Education" to Catholics? And if these things be so, is it not monstrous on the part of the Colonist to tax us with unjustly withholding from Protestants what we ask for ourselves. He says too, and says falsely "that there is in Canada no communion of Protestants who would deny to their fellow subjects of the Romish Church the privileges they would demand for themselves." What means then, we would ask, this clamor from the Protestants of Upper Canada against a school law, which does not even accord to the Catholics of that section of the Province, those privileges which Protestants in Lower Canada have always demanded, and freely enjoyed, without one word of opposition from the Catholic majority? There is a certain class of men, so the proverb says, "who should have good memories." The Colonist has apparently a very poor one.

He tells us that several Protestant sects—the Presbyterians and Anglicans—"would be untrue to their own principles did they not feel dissatisfaction at this new species of class legislation. Why is this? Has it then deprived these Protestants of any of their rights; or imposed any burdensome obligations upon them? Not a bit of it. It has only, to a certain extent, deprived them of the power of robbing and cheating Catholic parents for the support of a debasing, despotic and demoralising system of Protestant State-Schoolism. Are they dissatisfied because they cannot have separate schools as well as Catholics? If this only be the cause of their dissatisfaction, and it is a legitimate one, the remedy is in their own hands. Let them join with us in denouncing State-Schoolism—in asserting the inherent and inalienable right of the parent to control the education of his child; in repudiating the slavish and pagan doctrine that the child belongs to the State—and in proclaiming aloud that education is not the legitimate function of the Secular Government. Let them, with us, inscribe "Freedom of Education" on their banners: freedom for Catholics, freedom for Protestants, and "No State-Schoolism." They will, we think, find in us faithful allies; allies prepared to lend them all the aid in our power to accomplish their ends. We ask for ourselves only that which we are desirous to see accorded to others; that, which when, or where, we are in the majority, we cheerfully accord all to other religious denominations.

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

A friend writes to us as follows:—

To the Editor of the True Witness.

DEAR SIR—Allow me to direct your attention to a work on "The Continuity of the Church of England," by the Rev. Sam. Seabury, D.D., of New York; in which the writer contends for the validity of the Orders of, and true Apostolical Succession in, the legal establishment.

Dr. Seabury strives to make it appear that, in the reign of Queen Mary, the Court of Rome was prepared to recognise the validity of the Orders conferred according to the Ordinal of Edward the Sixth. In support of this position, he appeals to the facts, that, Pope Julius III., by Bull, granted certain dispensations to the people of England in the reign of Mary, in consequence of their willingness to be reconciled to the Holy See; allowing them freely "and without scruple of conscience" to retain the Church property confiscated during the plunders of the previous reigns, and which had subsequently fallen into the hands of the lay aristocracy—and that the same document recognised the validity of Anglican Ordinations, according to the new ritual. Dr. Seabury's words are:—"This Bull . . . puts no distinction between the

ordinations performed according to the Roman Pontifical, and those performed according to the ritual of the English Church; but provides that, when reconciled to the Roman See, and re-habilitated, shall be admitted, if worthy and fit in other respects, to preside as Bishops and Archbishops, &c. To remove all difficulties however, a dispensation is granted, under favor of which, presbyters, even though irregularly ordained (evidently referring to those ordained by the English Ordinal) might be reinstated, and serve in their order, and receive episcopal consecration, without receiving the priesthood anew; a plain recognition of the validity of their orders; since, had their orders been accounted null, a dispensation, which extends only to human, and never to divine laws, could not have supplied the defect."—p. 161, App. U.

Now, Sir, I have no doubt that this assumption of the Anglican divine is false; but still—for the benefit of any of our Anglican friends, of the High-Church school, upon whom the perusal of Seabury's arguments may have had the effect of confirming the delusion, that Anglican bishops and Anglican priests, are real bishops and real priests—please favor your readers with a few explanations on the subject at your earliest opportunity.—Yours truly, A PAPIST.

We comply with "A Papist's" request; which reduced to its simplest form amounts to a demand for an answer to the question—"Has the Catholic Church—the Holy See—ever recognised directly, or indirectly, the validity of Orders conferred according to the Ordinal adopted by the English Parliament in the reign of King Edward the Sixth?" We unhesitatingly reply—No; the Church has never recognised the validity of such Orders; and Dr. Seabury's assumption is false, and ridiculously false—as will be evident from his own statements and admissions.

He admits—and it is rare to find so much honesty amongst Protestant controversial writers—that a Papal dispensation extends only to human, and never to divine laws. It—the dispensation—therefore could never have been intended to supply the want of ordination, which is of positive divine precept; but merely to dispense with the observance of certain forms of discipline, imposed by the Church to prevent scandals, and to ensure good order and decency in the performance of the sacred offices. So far Dr. Seabury is perfectly correct. He errs in his assumption, that by the "irregular ordinations," to which the said dispensation extended, are to be understood ordinations according to the new-fangled and essentially defective Ordinal of King Edward the Sixth. These ordinations were not merely "irregular;" but, from a defect in the "essential matter and form" were utterly null and void; and as such, beyond the reach of any Papal dispensation. They were, in fact, no ordinations at all, and therefore not "irregular ordinations."

It is the opinion of the most eminent theologians that, not only the "imposition of hands," but the "porrection of instruments" as well, is an essential part of the "matter" of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Some have contended that the "instrumentorum porrectio"—is the essential "matter" of the Sacrament; but the other opinion, that both the "imposition of hands" and the "porrection of instruments" are essential to the "matter" is more generally held, and is supported by the stronger arguments.—*Bellarmin de Sac. Ord. c. IX.*

Now, in the Anglican Ordinal, there is no "porrection of instruments;" therefore their ordinations are essentially defective as to the "matter;" and are therefore null and void.

They are deficient also in "form." A priest is one who has the power, and who therefore has received express authority, to offer sacrifice. As Bellarmin observes:—

1. "In the ordination of priests two powers are conferred. One—that of consecrating the Eucharist; which is called '*potestas in corpus Christi verum.*'—The other—that of absolving from sin, which is called '*potestas in corpus Christi mysticum.*'"

2. "Because of these two powers, there are two principal ceremonies in ordination. One, in which the Bishop presents to the future priest the paten with the Host, and the chalice with the wine, saying—'*Receive the power of offering sacrifice, &c.*' The other, when after the Mass, the Bishop makes imposition of hands, and says—'*Receive the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins thou dost remit, &c.*'"

3. "Both these ceremonies are essential, as Scotus rightly teaches and explains. For by one, the one—by the other, the other, power is conferred."—*Bellarmin, de Sac. Ord. c. IX.*

Now, according to the Anglican Ordinal, no power is conferred, or so much as intended to be conferred, of "offering sacrifice." There is no "form" of words in which such power is pretended to be conferred; and, consequently, the Anglican Ordinal is deficient in essential "form." Therefore, as deficient in "essential matter," and in "essential-form," the Catholic Church treats, and has always treated Anglican Orders, not as "irregular," but as null and void.

When Cardinal Pole was despatched to England by Pope Julius, in the reign of Mary, as legate, he was authorised to examine into, and pronounce upon, the claims of every individual pretendant to the order of Priesthood. Upon the validity, or invalidity, of the ordination made according to the new ritual, the Sovereign Pontiff pronounced no opinion; and in the words of Dr. Seabury, his dispensation extended to those only who had been validly, though "irregularly ordained." It is the height of impertinence therefore, for Dr. Seabury to assume that this dispensation extended to those, who, after a careful examination into the circumstances of their case, were found not to have been ordained at all; because ordained according to a Ritual essentially defective both in "matter" and "form." And thus we see, that, whilst in the reign of Mary, some of the old clergy were allowed to retain their functions—great numbers, some as having contracted marriage, others as not having been ordained at all, were summarily dismissed, as intruders into the sacred office of the priesthood.

The answer then to our correspondent "A Papist," resolves into this—The Catholic Church—without pronouncing any opinion of the historical question: as to whether Parker was, or was not consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury according to the Ordinal of Edward VI.—esteems, and always has esteemed, Anglican Orders as null and void, because essentially deficient in "matter and form." Our correspondent will find the question treated at length by many Catholic theologians; and particularly, in a little work called "*The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined,*" by the Very Rev. P. H. Kenrick—to which we refer him.

YANKEE MORALS.—A few days ago a public prostitute of New York committed suicide, thus terminating an infamous life, by a sinful death. In other countries such events often occur no doubt; but the unfortunate victim is consigned to the earth, if not without tears, yet certainly without parade and ostentation. In the New World, they manage these things differently; and those posthumous honors which in Europe have hitherto been reserved for the illustrious, either by their virtues, or their intellectual endowments, are lavished upon the remains of the debauched courtesan. Nay! the sacred offices of religion are prostituted to do her honor; ministers, or so-called ministers, of religion tender their services for the occasion; and blaspheme the name of the Holy One, Whom they profess to call their Master, by invoking it over one who lived and died in glaring, obstinate rebellion against His laws. Such is Yankee morality! Severe only to the penitent, heart-broken Magdalen—the wandering lamb whom the Good Shepherd delighteth to take to his bosom; full of reverence for, and delighting to do homage to, the wealthy and hardened wanton. Bread and water, hard labor and solitary confinement, for the one;—massive silverplates, and wreaths of roses for the other.

Sarah Williams, one of the unfortunates of New York, as we said, put an end to her existence. Immediately the sympathies of Yankeedom were aroused. A public procession was decreed in her honor; the services of the Protestant Episcopal church were put in requisition; and the streets of New York, where the gentle Sister of Charity if recognised would be exposed to the brutal insults of zealous Protestants, were thronged with the excited and enthusiastic worshippers of opulent harlotry. We copy from the N. Y. Herald:—

"The funeral of Sarah Williams, one of the victims of the Clermont avenue suicide, took place yesterday afternoon at the Episcopal Church in Adelphi street. The excitement was intense, and long before the appointed hour, which was four o'clock, the street leading to the church was thronged with people, and the church and lecture room adjoining were filled almost to suffocation, hundreds not being able to obtain even standing room. The crowd in and about the building numbered about 2,500 persons. The remains of the deceased were conveyed to the church from the dead house in a magnificent hearse, drawn by two white horses, under the management of the committee appointed at a meeting of citizens of the Eleventh ward the night previous. The coffin was made of mahogany, highly polished, and lined with white satin. On the lid was a massive silver plate, containing the following inscription within a scroll:—

TO THE UNKNOWN,
 AGED—
 DIED JUNE 27, 1855.

The corpse was dressed in a handsome white merino shroud, her head being encircled with a wreath of red and white roses. After the services, the coffin was removed to the sidewalk in front of the church, where the assembled multitude was permitted to look at the corpse by marching round it in single file. After this ceremony was concluded, the funeral proceeded to the Cemetery of the Evergreens, where the remains were interred in a lot appropriated for the purpose by ex-mayor Stryker. The procession numbered about twenty-five carriages, volunteered by the citizens."

Dr. Meilleur has entered upon his duties as Post Master of Montreal. He is succeeded in the situation of Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada by the Hon. P. J. O. Chauveau.

Pic-Nic.—We understand that arrangements are being made for a grand Pic-Nic, under the management of the Young Men's St. Patrick's Association, and the St. Patrick's Society, to take place shortly, of which due notice will be given.

YOUNG MEN'S ST. PATRICK'S ASSOCIATION.—At the monthly meeting of this Association, held on the 3rd inst., the following persons were elected (the offices having been declared vacant at a previous meeting) viz. :—P. D. Quinn, 2nd Vice-President; P. J. Fogarty, Secretary; W. W. O'Brien, Assistant Secretary. On Committee—James Murray.

COLTON'S ILLUSTRATED AND EMBELLISHED MAP OF THE WORLD.—We have seen specimens of "Colton's Illustrated Steel Plate Map of the World, on Mercator's Projection;" and indeed they reflect great credit on the publishers. To commercial and business men, this map certainly would be of much value; and to Directors of Colleges and Schools, it would be very serviceable. The Map, in different parts, is illustrated by notes and remarks of Historical, Geographical and Maritime interest.

A serious fire occurred on Friday last at Toronto in the vicinity of the Catholic Cathedral; property to the amount of £4,000 was destroyed. Whilst the fire was raging, the Firemen fell a quarrelling; a savage fight ensued; and the Police, who attempted to separate the combatants, were set upon and beaten. Several of the latter are now lying in a very dangerous condition.

Bronson's Review received; notice postponed till our next.