

FOR SALE,
DRAFTS at THREE DAYS' SIGHT, on Messrs. OVER-
END, GURNEY & Co., LONDON, from
ONE POUND UPWARDS,
Negotiable at any Town in Great Britain or Ireland.
HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacramento Street.
Montreal, Oct. 1852.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:
To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annua.
To Country do. . . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 19, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The following circular has been addressed by the
Chancellor of the Exchequer to such members of the
House of Commons as are supposed to be inclined to
support the Derby Ministry:—

Downing Street, 18th Oct., 1852.
SIR.—The meeting of Parliament has been fixed for Thurs-
day the 4th November, when the House of Commons will im-
mediately proceed to the choice of a Speaker, and to the
consideration of business of the highest importance. I take
the liberty of earnestly requesting your presence on that day,
and, I trust, you will also excuse my expressing a wish that
you would let me know whether it will be consistent with
your convenience to attend at the opening of the Session.—I
have the honor to be, Sir, your faithful and obedient servant,
B. DISRAELI.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer is known to be
a famous conjurer, but what new trick he is about to
exhibit for the amusement of the people of England
—whether he will perform the *quart bottle feat*, or
the pea and thimble feat, or walk along the ceiling,
head downwards, or swallow his own words—is as yet
a great Asiatic mystery. It is expected, however,
that the Queen's Speech will contain a full and dis-
tinct recognition of the principles of Free Trade,
and a candid avowal of the impracticability of a re-
turn to Protection, in which case a coalition between
the present Ministry and some of the leading Peel-
ites is probable; it is said that some of the members
of the present government are prepared to vacate
their places for this purpose. The ministry it is rum-
ored have it in contemplation to introduce a
measure for depriving the Catholic Clergy of Ireland
of their rights as citizens, and for checking the
growth of Popery, in her Majesty's dominions.
Troubles are crowding thick and fast upon the State-
church; the government Bishop of Exeter has been
sadly ill-treated by the evangelical, or low-church
rabble of his diocese, on account of his declaration
in favor of the legality of "confession and priestly
absolution;" he was hooted and assailed with every
debauching epithet that his evangelical adversaries could
devisely: the church at Eldad in which Mr. Prynne
officials, has been repeatedly attacked, as has also
poor Miss Sellon's Protestant convent. A great
Anti-Tractarian agitation, the result of which will be
the annihilation of the High Anglican party in the
State-church, and a long list of conversions to
Catholicity, may therefore be expected.

The Sovereign Pontiff has been pleased to invest
his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin with the Pal-
lium, by the hands of his Lordship the Bishop of
Pittsburg. The investiture took place in the Cath-
edral Church of Dublin, on Sunday the 24th ult., and
was a most magnificent and imposing ceremony. The
Bishop of Pittsburg preached the sermon customary
upon these solemn occasions, after which the Arch-
bishop of Dublin gave to the faithful assembled his
episcopal benediction. The Sovereign Pontiff has
also confirmed the election of Dr. Dixon to the
Archiepiscopal See of Armagh, and has been pleased
to confer upon his Grace the Primacy of all Ireland,
the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill notwithstanding.

The great event of the week in Ireland has been
the meeting of the Conference for "Religious Equal-
ity," on the 28th ult.; the meeting was numerously
attended, and the resolutions, as will be seen, are plain
spoken and intelligible, striking at the roots of the
monster grievance of Ireland—the State-church:—

1. That the public opinion of this country demands for all
classes and denominations of Irishmen complete religious equal-
ity in the eye of the law; and will not willingly tolerate in any
religious denomination, civil power, pre-eminence, or ascen-
dency over any other.
2. That the settlement of the Church question on the basis of
perfect equality is essential to the establishment of that entire
equality, civil and religious, which alone can or ought to pro-
duce content.
3. That the present Irish Church Establishment is at once a
badge of conquest and a legalized robbery of the Catholic popu-
lation, which, while it insults and wrongs the people, convulses
society, and impresses the Catholic people with a belief that the
legislature which sanctions its continuance is hostile to the peace
and prosperity of this kingdom.
4. That in order to prevent any misapprehension as to our
objects, this conference deems it right most emphatically to de-
clare and put on record that our sole object is to remove from
this country the intolerable grievance of religious inequality;
and though on grounds of justice the Church of the majority of
the people might claim at least a share in the redistribution of
the overgrown and mis-applied Ecclesiastical revenues of this
country; yet, in our unanimous opinion, our representatives in
parliament should not, on our behalf, or on behalf of the
Catholic Clergy and laity, urge such a plan upon the legisla-
ture; that the mode of accomplishing our object is of very se-
condary importance, and that we shall be content with any
sensible application of the Church revenues which shall be at
once just and reasonable and for the common good of all classes
of the community.
5. That all laws which impose penalties on the Ecclesiastics
of any Church, or prohibit the performance of spiritual func-
tions, or the exercise of Ecclesiastical rights, order, or jurisdic-
tion, are inconsistent with the constitution of these realms, or
require peculiar oaths or tests from the members of any reli-
gious persuasion—practically declare the parties affected
thereby to be inferior in the eye of the law to their fellow-
subjects, and ought to be at once absolutely and uncondition-
ally repealed.

6. That religious equality is inconsistent with the exclusion
from public offices of any subject of the crown, because of his
religious faith, and that all such exclusions should be at once
abolished.

7. That we consider it the special duty of the Irish Liberal
members of parliament to urge upon the attention of the legis-
lature at all convenient times the grievances endured by the
poor and friendless Catholics in all parts of this empire, so far
as these grievances depend upon bad laws or a bad adminis-
tration of them; and that in order to enable the members of
parliament efficiently to discharge their duty in those matters
we respectfully request of the Catholic bishops and clergy at
home in Great Britain and in the colonies to supply, at their
earliest convenience, the statistical and other information,
without which it will be impossible to have the claims of these
unprotected classes adequately laid before parliament.

8. That George Henry Moore, Esq., M.P., be requested to
place a notice on the books of the House of Commons in refer-
ence to the Irish Church question and to bring same forward at
such time, as on consultation with his colleagues and the other
Parliamentary friends of religious equality, may seem most
suitable.

9. That Mr. Keogh be requested to prepare a bill or bills, for
the absolute and unconditional repeal of all laws that impose
penalties, prohibition, tests, or oaths interfering with that per-
fect religious equality which all her Majesty's subjects have a
right to enjoy.

10. That in the opinion of this Conference, all members of
Parliament returned by Liberal Irish constituencies, should
continue independent of, and in opposition to, every Govern-
ment which will not make the concession of perfect religious
equality, as explained in the foregoing resolutions, a part of its
policy.

11. That in the opinion of this Conference, it is absolutely
necessary that the people of this country should immediately
give public expression to their strong disapproval of the relig-
ious inequalities under which they labor, by petition to Parlia-
ment from every parish in Ireland.

12. That this Conference hereby resolves itself into a perma-
nent committee, to carry the resolutions this day adopted, into
practical effect.

The tenth "Resolution" is the most important of
all, and if honestly carried into execution cannot fail
of the desired effect—the procuring the repeal of all
the obnoxious laws of which the Catholics of Ireland
complain. In seconding this "Resolution," in a
speech of great ability, Mr. Lucas did not shrink
from asserting his determination, to adhere to the
principle therein contained, and of carrying it out to
the fullest extent. To every ministry—whether
Whig or Tory—Conservative or Anti-Conservative
—Protectionist or Free Trade—which does not make
the repeal of all the Anti-Catholic statutes a part of its
policy—he and his colleagues will offer an uncompro-
mising opposition upon all questions, and, to the
utmost of their power, render all government impossible
until the just demands of the Catholics of Ireland
be complied with. This is the only true policy of
the Irish Catholic members: if the Imperial Parlia-
ment will persist in refusing to Catholics, perfect
equality in all respects with their Non-Catholic fel-
low-citizens—it must be made to pay for its bigotry:
it must be content to see all legislation impeded, and
the whole machinery of government obstructed and
brought to a stand still, no matter how pernicious this
obstruction may prove to what are called the inter-
ests of the British empire. May God give to the
Irish Catholic members of Parliament grace to ad-
here inflexibly to the course of policy indicated in the
tenth "Resolution," and to treat with contempt all the
clamors of their enemies about "factious opposition."

John Bright, Esq., M. P., has addressed a long
letter to Dr. Gray, upon the question of "Religious
Equality," congratulating the Irish members upon
having grappled with a question "which must be
settled on some just basis if Ireland is ever to be
tranquil and content. The case" continues Mr.
Bright, "of the Catholic population of Ireland is so
strong, so unanswerable, and so generally admitted,
that nothing is wanting to ensure its complete suc-
cess but the combination of a few able and honest
men, to concentrate and direct the opinion which
exists." Mr. Bright then proceeds to discuss how
the revenues of the State-church shall be applied,
whenever that curse of the country, that libel upon
humanity, that disgrace to religion, and standing in-
sult to God and man—shall have been abolished—
whether they should be restored to the original owner
—the Catholic Church—or equally distributed
amongst the different denominations, in proportion to
their numbers. Mr. Bright takes as his starting
point—"That henceforth there must be no Church
in Ireland, in connection with the State;" to this
proposition it is impossible to conceive that the Non-
Catholic sects, dissenting from the Parliamentary
church, will offer any serious opposition. The learned
gentleman then proceeds to develop his scheme for
the application of the enormous revenues which this
Parliamentary Church has so long unjustly enjoyed
—according to Mr. Bright:—

The Parliament Church has a revenue of £500,000,
representing, at 20 years purchase, a capital sum
of £10,000,000.

The other Non-Catholic sects have a revenue of
£40,000, representing a capital sum of £800,000.

The Catholic Church has £26,000 per annua, re-
presenting a capital sum of £520,000.

Mr. Bright proposes that a commission be formed
to acquire and "hold in trust" all the property now
held by the Parliament Church, until, as the livings
and benefices fall vacant, it becomes possessed of
the whole £10,000,000; granting at the same time
every facility to the landed proprietors of buying up
the tithes; that this commission be empowered to
appropriate certain portions of this fund "as a free
gift" irrevocable by the State, to the Catholic Church
—and to the Presbyterian, Anglican, and other Non-
Catholic sects—of course the Maynooth grant, and
all other special grants to be withdrawn; that of this
sum of £10,000,000—one million should be given to
the Catholic Church, two millions to the Non-
Catholic sects, and that the remaining seven millions
should be devoted to purely Irish purposes—for the
general education of the people and the creation of
free libraries in all the towns of Ireland. Though
Mr. Bright's scheme holds out but a scanty measure
of justice to the Catholics of Ireland, to whose Church
of right, the whole £10,000,000, now enjoyed by
the Parliament church, belongs, and though the ap-
propriation of any part of that sum to the establish-
ment of a Non-Catholic system of education is what

Catholics will never consent to—yet the abolition of
Parliamentary-churchism in Ireland will be such a
blessing to the community, that Mr. Bright's letter
will be generally well received, and some of its recom-
mendations will very probably be acted upon; at all
events the Establishment will soon be made to dis-
gorge some of its ill-gotten wealth. As the property
of the Establishment was acquired by robbery—as
by brute force it was taken from the Catholic Church,
to which it rightfully belonged, and given by the State
to the church which Parliament created—that State-
created, and plunder-endowed church can have no
cause to complain of being harshly dealt with, if its
creator should resume what it gave; and having re-
cognised, and pleaded, the right of the State to set at
naught the intentions of the original donors of the
church property, and to divert the revenues arising
from that property, to purposes which the donors
never contemplated, the State-church cannot deny
the right of the State, to amend, alter or revoke al-
together, its own acts. Mr. Bright anticipates the
cry of spoliation, but he, and the "Religious Equal-
ity" conference, are well prepared to meet it.

A Berlin journal places a speech, delivered some
time ago by Louis Napoleon before the Chamber of
Peers, in amusing contrast with the pacific oration
lately delivered by the Prince President at Bourdeaux.
On the former occasion Louis Napoleon said:—
"The Emperor, my uncle, chose rather to part
with throne and empire, than to allow himself to be
bound by treaty within narrow frontiers—frontiers
which daily expose France to foreign distrust and
menace, as we now see. Not a day of my life
passes in which his example and teaching are not
present to my mind."

The frontiers of France remain the same as when
the speech, of which this is an extract, was delivered,
and so no doubt does the policy of the future Emperor,
viz., war with England, and the natural limits of the
Empire.

The steamer *Atlantic* brings a few days later
news. The policy of the Derby ministry is still a
matter of conjecture; but the impression is general
that they will desert all their old principles, and come
out strong as Free Traders.

Great preparations are being made in Paris for the
approaching ceremony of the restoration of the Em-
pire. The report that Louis Napoleon is about to
be married to the Princess Vasa gains ground.

THE "MAINE LIQUOR LAW."

In replying to the *Canada Temperance Advo-
cate* and the *Montreal Witness*, it can hardly be
expected that we should go over the old ground
again; we have given our opinions as to the merits
of this measure, and we have seen nothing in any
of the arguments of our opponents to induce us to
alter or retract them. Of our opponents themselves
we would speak with respect, as of men actuated by
the purest motives—as of men whose objects are ob-
jects which every honest man, every Christian, must
have at heart—the suppression of the beastly and soul-
destroying vice of drunkenness, and the extermina-
tion of those accursed dens of iniquity and de-
bauchery which pollute our soil, and infect our moral
atmosphere with their abominations. Would to God,
we say, that these places could be suppressed; if by
the strong arm of the law, by the vigilance of the
police, they could be put down, and their keepers
brought to justice, and subjected to severe, and cer-
tainly well-merited punishment, we should rejoice as
sincerely as the warmest advocate of the "Maine
Liquor Law." But we have opposed that measure,
or rather the chief argument by which its supporters
seek to recommend it, because that argument involves
a principle theologically false—"That the use of al-
cohol, in any form, as a beverage is essentially evil;"
and we have opposed it, because we believe it to con-
tain a political principle which, if carried out, would
prove fatal to the best interests of the Church and
society, fatal to religious and civil liberty. We
have opposed it as Catholics and as freemen; because
it enunciates a damnable heresy, in order to establish
an odious social despotism.

There is no mistake about the language of the
"Maine Liquor Law" men; they have the honesty to
avow their Manichean principles, and to put them
prominently forward as the reason for enacting their
law. "The use of alcohol," says one, "as a bever-
age, is injurious to all our best interests, for time and
eternity." The *Canada Temperance Advocate*
says, p. 319—"the use of alcoholic drinks is *malum*
per se, and that therefore the manufacture and sale
ought to be prohibited;" again on the same page he
repeats the same doctrine—"it is this product" [al-
cohol] "when used as a beverage that we consider
malum per se . . . the traffic in liquor is *malum*
per se." It is this doctrine that we have opposed,
and will, please God, always oppose, whenever, and
under whatever disguise we meet with it; it is this
doctrine which is the fundamental principle of all the
arguments adduced in support of the "Maine Li-
quor Law," and which compels the Catholic layman
to refuse it his support, no matter how good its ob-
jects, or the intentions of its authors; it is this abo-
minable and blasphemously heretical doctrine which
has compelled His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec
(we say this advisedly) to refuse his signature to the
"Maine Liquor Law" petitions, when solicited to
give them the sanction of his name. We denounce
the abuse of alcohol as strenuously as any Protest-
ant; we know no language too strong to be applied
to the vice of drunkenness—a vice which on earth
degrades man below the level of the beasts of the
field, and which, if not timely repented of, will con-
sign his soul to hell for all eternity; but there we
stop; we cannot condemn the use of alcohol as es-
sentially evil; because we are Catholics, and the
Church teaches no such doctrine.

their people to temperance, and when by way of set-
ting a good example, the Catholic clergy of Lower
Canada almost universally renounced the use of al-
coholic beverages, they at the same time were most care-
ful to impress upon their hearers—that the use of
all such beverages was not evil—was no where for-
bidden by the written Word of God, or by the
teaching of the Church—and was therefore to the
Christian man—so long as it did not become to him
an occasion for sin, by excess—perfectly lawful—
that if, for the glory of God, and for the sake of
strengthening his weak brother, any man thought fit
to deny himself the use, he did a good work, pleasing
unto God, useful unto man, and which would most
assuredly obtain its reward; but never did the
Church teach that such abstinence was obligatory
upon those who could use without abusing. Thus
the Catholic Church, speaking as the Holy Ghost
gives her utterance, enjoins temperance always, upon
all—applauds, encourages, and prays for blessings
upon, those generous spirits whom a zeal for God's
glory, and charity towards their brethren, induce to
renounce the perfectly legitimate use of alcoholic be-
verages; but she prohibits the use of these bever-
ages to none who can use, without abusing them.
Hence, as Catholics, we conclude—that, as the
Church—which is the supreme moral and spiritual
authority upon earth—has pronounced the use of al-
coholic beverages lawful, and has not deemed it ex-
pedient to prohibit that use in order to put a stop to
the abuse, so neither should the State—a far lower
authority, and whose functions in the moral order
can only be legitimately exercised, when exercised as
ancillary to the Church—presume to legislate against
the use of alcoholic beverages upon the pretence that
that "use is *malum per se*." This argument can be
appreciated only by the Catholic; it is worthless
against the Non-Catholic who denies the sole authority
in the moral and spiritual order which the former re-
cognizes, and betwixt whom and the Catholic there
can therefore be no "first principles in common" in
the moral and spiritual order.

With the Non-Catholic we argue that, as the State
has no right to legislate upon false pretences, it has
no right to prohibit the use, manufacture, or sale of
alcoholic beverages, upon the pretence that they are
essentially evil—for we assert that such use, manu-
facture and sale are not essentially evil.

We prove our assertion by appealing to the Bible,
not as the word of God, nor as an inspired work, but
simply as a true history of events that have occurred.
We appeal to the conduct of Jesus Christ, and ar-
gue that, unless He did evil, the use, manufacture,
and consequently the sale of alcoholic beverages are
not essentially evil. Christ moved amongst all classes
of men, conforming to their customs; He was an
invited guest at the rich man's banquets, as well as at
the frugal board of the humble artisan; He habitually
partook of all kinds of meats and drinks, lawful to
the Jews, and we know from history that the Jews
habitually used wine at their repasts; we may there-
fore anticipate that He in this also conformed to the
customs of those with whom He moved, especially as
the contrary is never mentioned. We have accounts
of our Saviour's life by which our anticipations are
confirmed: Christ used wine at His repasts; He
blessed it, and He gave it to His disciples. In St.
Matt., xi. 18, 19, our Saviour alludes to this custom
of His, and to the hostile remarks made thereon by the
Jews—"John came neither eating nor drinking, and
they say he hath a devil. The Son of man came eating
and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous,
and a wine-bibber." (Prot. Ver.) From
this it is clear, that the Son of man came eating and
drinking in a very different manner from John the
Baptist, who led the life of an ascetic; for we can-
not suppose it to mean that John did, literally and
altogether, abstain from all kinds of food. In what
this distinction between the dietary habits of the Son
of man and the Precursor consisted, we are told in
the latter part of the verse—"behold a wine-bibber"
—the reproach of the Jews would have been as
meaningless as it was malicious, if our Saviour had
not habitually used wine, like the generality of His
countrymen at their repasts. But Christ made wine
out of water; and whether we look upon the change
as noumenal, or as merely phenomenal—as implying
the annihilation of the substance of water with its
accidents, and the creation of the substance of wine
with its accidents—or as merely the transfer of the
accidents of wine to the substance of water—the
moral value of the action remains the same; and this
miraculously made wine our Lord caused to be
handed round to the guests—although from the words
of the master of the feast, it is clear that previous to
this they had been using alcoholic beverages. If
we turn to the Old Testament we see that by the
Law of Moses, the use of wine was expressly sanc-
tioned. Not to multiply instances we will but cite
—Numbers, vi. c., in which the rules for the Nazarite
—or the person who had vowed a vow unto the Lord
—are laid down. During the days of his vow he
was to abstain from grapes, moist or dry, from vine-
gar, wine, and the use of the razor; but when the
days of his vow were accomplished, we read he was
to make certain offerings, and—"after that the Na-
zarite may drink wine."—20. v. Thus whether we
turn to the founder of Judaism, or of Christianity, to
the son of Amram, or the son of Mary, we find the
use, and as a logical consequence, the manufacture,
and sale, of alcoholic beverages, formally sanctioned:
we have therefore the right to conclude that that
which the two greatest legislators of the human race
have sanctioned; cannot be essentially evil.

We have hitherto argued that the State has not
the right to prohibit the use, manufacture or sale of
alcoholic beverages, upon the pretence that they are,
or that their use is, essentially evil. But there is
another argument which the "Maine Liquor Law"
men might have employed; and which, as involving no