



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. III.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1853.

NO. 24.

DISCOURSE BY ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.

(From the New York Herald.)

Sunday evening the Most Reverend Archbishop Hughes preached an able and eloquent discourse in the church of St. Francis Xavier, in Sixteenth street. The edifice was densely crowded. The Archbishop took his text from the fifth chapter of St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy, and the eighth verse. "But if any man have not care of his own, and especially of those in his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

It is very seldom, said he, that even in the Holy Scriptures we find consequences apparently so harsh as resulting from the neglect of an ordinary duty. The Apostle makes use of language which at first would seem to be unintelligible. If there be anything in which men are liable to be indifferent, it is in taking care of their own—first of themselves, and next of those who are precisely in the situation that is here alluded to; and yet the Apostle does not hesitate to suppose that that duty could not be neglected; nor does he hesitate to denounce the consequences of its neglect in language more severe than it is easy to find throughout the pages of the Holy Scriptures. Many persons believe that it is an exaggerated form of expression, but I cannot apply any rule of criticism to the words of the Apostle. St. Paul does not write about the things of this world to provide for the settlement of children. St. Paul is not interested in men who have households, that they should be well furnished, for that would be unworthy of his inspiration; but he writes to a convert from Paganism or Judaism, to the faith and religion of Jesus Christ. The Most Rev. Archbishop, at great length, proceeded to explain the duties incumbent upon parents in attending, with scrupulous care, to the religious education of their children at an early age, and went on to say—We are living in a country and placed among denominations entirely disagreeing with ours, both as regards the theory of religion and the mode in which God would have it preserved; nor yet are they agreed among themselves; so that while the State has paid attention to the education of our future citizens, the State has hitherto, by necessity or choice, but unwilling or unable, to admit the most essential element of Christian knowledge into the teachings of our schools. She professes to teach no religion, and yet she is offended if we say this is a retrograde step towards the barbarism of Pagan ages. She is rampant if we say this. But she will have no sectarianism, and it so happens that in the relation of creeds in this land, there is no Christianity left if you exclude all sectarianism; and therefore, to exclude all sectarianism is to exclude everything that pertains to be Christian in the whole length and breadth of this land. The State has imagined that this would satisfy our fellow Protestant citizens, and certainly it ought; but if the Apostle is to be relied upon, this will not satisfy us. They have thrown overboard the idea of a perpetual and true religion in the world—they have rejected the idea of a church as a divine corporation, instituted by Christ to preserve those truths which were sent from Heaven for the benefit of the child. They imagine that religion has become an individual affair, and hence one of their great principles is that all men should search the Scriptures. And by the very word search do they not intimate that they have it not? If they were possessed of this religion, would it be necessary to search for it? For, if it be religion, it must be something revealed, and not discovered by long and deep mystic study. We regard it as a published outward fact, but they as an individual concern. Another principle of their religion is that God, from all eternity, has predestined certain specific individuals to come into the world, and, having been predestined, that they shall be effectually called, and this being the stern—but as they suppose—and I will not question their right. The just and merciful ordination of God of course man cannot resist, no matter whether religiously educated or not. It is his privilege, they say, to choose his religion, or to choose any religion, and whether he be educated or not, if he happened to be of the number of those whom God has ordained from all eternity, he cannot disappoint himself of the result of that eternal decree. Hence, therefore, with them it is an easy matter to send their children to schools—even Pagan schools, for upon this hypothesis it cannot interfere with the end of their creation. We, therefore, complain that they will not condescend, in their public administration of this important trust of education in which we are supposed to contribute our share of the expense, to look at the subject from the same point at which every Catholic must regard it. If they cannot accomplish that object which the Catholic parents find it incumbent upon themselves to insist upon, let them relinquish it, and say, "this system suits us, and to a certain extent is in harmony with our religious convictions; but we will not impose up-

on you the means that would be necessary to educate your children, and deny the common right to have them educated according to your own convictions. We will not tax you at all, and if we do in the aggregate, in which the parents all agree in the same faith, then we shall give you a portion, simply reserving to ourselves the right to say you shall not waste the public money in the mere inculcation of your specific doctrine of truth." This would be reasonable, but it is certain that no State can ever release parents altogether from the obligation of educating their children in a Christian manner; and it is certain that in our State it is, if anything, less possible than elsewhere. I can imagine that in a State where there is only one religion, you can well organise a system of public education, and either leave out religion, or introduce it, which no one will object to; but in a community made up of such schools of doctrine as ours, it would be utterly impossible, perhaps, to introduce religion into schools in which sections are represented, without introducing at the same time sources of strife that would render the management of the schools utterly impracticable. I do not now enter into the questions how far under these circumstances the State has the right to tax citizens, and against their will enter so deeply upon that sacred ground, which is well secured by the constitution, viz:—Religious rights and freedom of conscience, and which freedom of conscience ought to leave a clear way for Christian Catholic fathers to have their sons and daughters educated as their conscience dictate, provided they do it at their own expense. I enter not upon that question, but I say that education, even of the secular order, accomplishes its end better when administered wherever it is possible under the sanction of religion. Why is this? Because the church regards man not as a being of time, but it takes the whole man—his whole destiny, body and soul, time and eternity—and so when she establishes a school, how does she regard the pupil? Why, her first and great principle is to prepare him not only for this State, but for the high destiny which is to be an everlasting citizen of the immortal realms of his God. The Church, therefore, in her teaching, lays the groundwork of good citizenship. She has some lever upon which to act, if she teaches the child not to lie, and at the same time teaches him that God abominates liars, and has denounced threats against them. So with regard to every virtue, especially those that have a social tendency, there is a groundwork of faith and religion laid down, which the State can never provide, for the State and all the States of the universe cannot make a man honest, or an honest man. The Church can do both. Him whose education she has presided by, she can train up in honesty; and if at any time he should fall away, she has the power, by invisible means, to bring him back to the path he has deserted. The State can do neither. It can punish a rogue, but it cannot make an honest man, nor an upright citizen; and even that punishment it cannot always accomplish, and still less will it be able to do so, when a future generation shall have taken the place of that which now exists. Men of highly cultivated minds, and knowing all arts and artifices, now escape from exposure, and the State has not even the power to punish a rogue, but only the rogue who has not the cunning to evade her jurisdiction. Can this State expect the future generations will be as upright as their predecessors? I tell you that the great men of the country and their associates, although they differed widely from any thing that is Catholic, nevertheless, they believed and acted upon the principle, that where there is no religion, no faith, no belief, as the basis of morality, civic integrity, and high-minded and disinterested patriotism, are not to be looked for as a general rule. Sufficient evidence can be adduced that the State is not rendering a service to mankind in establishing schools, and permitting religion to come to the door, and there stop and not enter. I would commend to your attention the obligations which are imposed upon you by your parents of transmitting your faith to your children, and then to see whether the State aid you or not, how best you can discharge these obligations. The Church has invariably kept this in view. When there was but one religion, although human science had not so large a scope for the exercise of its power, and although even the knowledge of religion might be limited, yet it was as much a matter of course as food being provided for your children, that they should know all the mysteries of the Christian faith, and that they should practice them, so far as depended upon their parents. This was perfectly well understood, and at the same time when, from distress or other circumstances, the parents were unable themselves to fulfil the requirements of education, then it happened in the beautiful economy of our common faith, that men and women of the highest education were prepared to devote themselves to the task—not for the salaries that this world could give them, but for the love of God, and

for the love of those young souls who had been brought into being, and who might otherwise be left ignorant of the divine inheritance of faith. They devoted their whole lives to the tedious and slow wasting occupation of teaching, and teaching that which is true, to promote the glory of God and the welfare of their fellow beings. These things have existed, and although it is impossible that we can have them to any great extent, yet I am happy and proud to witness the evidence of your sympathy upon the subject, and the time is coming, and not, I believe, far distant, when every Catholic parent, rich and poor, will have the opportunity of having his sons and daughters educated in schools in which the State may not say to religion—that is the Catholic religion—as was said to the ocean—Thus far shalt thou come and no farther." The infusion of religion into education will assist science, for religion will purify and elevate the ideas of the student, and will make a cultivated intellect a blessing to the age, and not a curse as it now is. Religion will sanctify all which would otherwise be wasted, for I confess that all science, apart from religion, however useful it may be, is of the smallest possible account. The State, in proposing education, takes man by sections, and degrades him down to the race of certain useful domestic animals, the breed of which is to be improved by premiums from the State authorities. It looks at man, and values him for what? For his immortal soul. Not in the least, for it has nothing to do with his immortal soul. It values him for his usefulness—he is to be a useful, rational intellectual animal, and, in the space between the period of his acquired education and his death, by his knowledge and his enterprise, and devotion to his own interests, he is to accomplish, successfully and powerfully, any enterprise he may undertake, and thus become, through the medium of selfishness, an example of activity, the result of which must be beneficial to the whole community at large. I defy any man to say that the State has raised its soul, if it has a soul, to a higher consideration of education than that; and I ask, if the dignity of man is not offended by such an estimate? Therefore it is evident, that although we may have tolerated the practice of seeing Catholic children go to these schools, because necessity has required it, that Catholic parents should be upon their guard, and exert themselves by every means to supply what has been denied them in the schools; for experience has taught and proved that the teaching even of the pastor once a week is counteracted by the unteaching and the negativeness the children acquire during other six days. This is beyond a doubt, for it is matter of boast with many of those men who are advocates of this public school system, that it is wasting away the growth of the Catholic Church, and that it is impossible for the Catholic Church to succeed in this country, because what they call their republican American education destroys the influence of Divine faith, whether derived from the public teachings of the Church, or from the piety and parental affection of the domestic circle. They boast of it; and have we a right to deny it is so? There can be no doubt of it. But we tell those gentlemen also, in return, that the same ruin is overtaking their own children. I could prove by indisputable facts that there is a falling off—I will not say from Catholicism—but from Christianity, that is quite perceptible in tracing the progress of these schools. I quote one single instance from reliable authority. Nearly the whole class by which the Protestant ministry was formerly supplied has disappeared altogether; and although they have places and pensions in theological seminaries, they cannot find candidates to accept them—although they have education and position offered to them, the race of pious young men, as they used to be called twenty years ago, has died out, and this fact is acknowledged. They know not what is to be the consequence if Providence should not raise up candidates to continue their ministry. What is the effect of these schools but to create an absolute indifference as to all divine revelation! A negativeness. It may not strike the observer so immediately, because there is still a tone in the country, a vague respect and a vague reverence for the Bible; but then, this reverence, you will find, even among those who are appointed to teach its meaning, amounts to nothing but whatever you please. Each one is the judge—each one is to search—there is no clerical teaching out of the church; and the fact is, they have departed from whatever was possibly affirmative in their creed, to such an extent that now there is scarcely a single doctrine which they would think it worth while to defend; and if they did, they could not defend it, because all authority is lost, except the authority of the Bible, and the authority of the Bible is precisely an authority for or against, as every man thinks proper to attach a meaning to the words he reads. The race of pious young men is disappearing; and is it to their gratification if their children are thus falling away into indifference and scepticism

—is it a compensation to them that Catholic children are involved in the same ruin? If they understood the question as we do, I am satisfied they would unite with us by every means by which we could prepare for the duties of civil, social, and domestic life, those children who, in the providence of God, are consigned to be brought up in the faith and under the care of their parents. Then you would retain good citizens to the State, and true Christians to the church, and the race of mockers at religion would soon be diminished. Then your house would become respectable. Then your age will become revered: whereas, if this system goes on for half a century longer, with the impulses so natural to the spirit of this country, children, before they are fifteen years of age, coming from these schools, will forget the endearing name of father and mother, and look upon their parents as only their fellow citizens—nothing better than themselves. Domestic reverence for all authority disappears with the contemptuous regard that the public by its great influential opinion has expressed upon education; and, for this reason, I say to you that I thank God that you have manifested so numerous and so zealously your sympathy with the undertaking of a Christian Catholic school for your children in your neighborhood. I hope the time is coming when they will be multiplied, and be at least as near the church to which you bring your offspring to consecrate them to God in Holy Baptism. You must have a care of your own, and especially those of your household, under the penalty which I pray God in His infinite goodness to avert from you.

ORANGISM AND RIBBONISM CONTRASTED.

(From the Dublin Weekly Telegraph.)

The Orangemen endeavor to draw a contrast between themselves and Ribbonmen. We, on the contrary, assimilate the two—the Orangemen being, in our estimation, more criminal than the Ribbonmen; but the Ribbonmen being more odious to us than the Orangemen. The Orangemen are the greater criminals of the two, because they have, as leaders, men of rank, of intelligence, and of education; whereas the Ribbonmen are composed, with scarcely a single exception, of the most miserable, the most ignorant, the most destitute, and the most depraved individuals. The Ribbonmen are more odious to us than the Orangemen, because, not being Protestants, they are considered to be Catholics, and their crimes are converted into a reproach upon our religion, and from which they are, because they are members of a secret society, outcasts—as much outcast as an Achilli or a Cavazzi.

Let it not be supposed, then, for a single instant, that, in exposing the crimes of the Orangemen, we sympathise in the slightest degree with the Ribbonmen, to whom the Orangemen declare they are adverse. In our estimation, the only difference between an Orangeman and a Ribbonman is this—that the one is an assassin with a purple cravat, and the other an assassin who wears a green cravat: both are a disgrace to Christianity; both a dishonor to the nation that has given them birth.

The Orangeman claims, however, a superiority over the Ribbonman. The Orangeman brags of his Protestantism, and boasts of his loyalty, and in the Address of the 1st of Dec., 1852, he makes use of these words:—

"The great truth begins now to be understood, that Orangism is distinguished from societies to which, in former years, it was compared, by its abstinence from crime and disorder, and its happy influence on the country. Wherever the Orange Institution prevails in strength, peace and prosperity abide under its protection—our gracious Sovereign is honored—her laws are obeyed—her subjects, of all denominations, have protection for life, liberty, and possessions."

In these assertions are to be found the vindication of the continuance of the Orange society to this day; and we are challenged to look to the past history of Ireland in order that we may, if possible, discover any deeds which connect the name of the Orangemen with deeds of violence and of bloodshed.

Our search shall be brief; our references not many; and our authorities shall all, with a single exception, be Protestants. To these we intend to confine ourselves in our publication of this day. We mean, for the present, merely to refer to the years 1795, 1806, 1808, 1814, and 1821.

The Orangemen say, in 1852, that "wherever the Orange Institution prevails in strength," that there "peace and prosperity abide under its protection." Let us see what was the opinion of Lord Gosford and the Armagh magistrates on the 28th of December, 1795, when the following description of the conduct of the Orangemen was given, and unanimously assented to:—

"It is no secret that a persecution, accompanied with all the circumstances of ferocious cruelty, which have in all ages distinguished that dreadful calamity,