

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.
 TERMS:
 To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
 To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 21, 1851.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The English papers are for the most part filled with accounts of the arrival and reception of Kossuth at Southampton—of how the illustrious exile looked; and what he had on; and what kind of a nose he has; and what he said; and what he did; and how he shed tears at the proper places; and how he cheered up again, and was cheered—and how the Mayor of Southampton came forth to meet him, glorious in a blue coat, with official brass buttons; and how the Mayor behaved himself like a Mayor—and how the Hungarians kissed and slobbered one another—and how John Bull made a great fool of himself, as he usually does upon such occasions, John not shining in the sentimental line at all—and how the whole affair was very well "got up," very touching indeed.

Kossuth has evidently made a strong and favorable impression. A Democrat at Marseilles, he talked a good deal of Red Republican fustian. At Southampton, he took the Mayor's hands in his, and squeezing them affectionately, declared "that he felt himself free." And then, still further to ingratiate himself with his auditory, he blessed the Queen, and d—d the Pope, and poured forth a volley of abuse and blackguardism upon Catholicity in general, and the Jesuits in particular. Now, the rest of the acts of Kossuth the patriot, and how, some years ago, he was guilty of some very dirty malversation of public trusts, are they not written in the columns of the Times London newspaper?

A correspondent of the Times, signing himself "A Fly to Humbug," writes a letter to the Times on the character of Kossuth, of which the following is the substance:—

"It is amusing to observe the way in which the charges made against the character of M. Kossuth are met by his thick-and-thin supporters of the Republican press. Here is one of their many explanations of the Zemplin affair:—

"The prosecution brought by Austrian malevolence against Kossuth was the malversation in his younger days of an orphan or education fund, something like St. Cross, and like hundreds of our own institutions. Perversions of such funds to private use were, unfortunately, as common under the old government of Hungary as under our own constitutional régime; and Kossuth did what every Hungarian does, but quickly redeemed the fault by voluntary retribution."

"What, then, this immaculate patriot was guilty of malversation after all! Not, to be sure, of his orphan wards' money, but only of an orphan or education fund." That is, M. Kossuth was guilty—and guilty, be it remarked, on the confession of his admirers—of public instead of private wrong.

"Nor to any mind does it much mend the matter to say that this was an Ecclesiastical malversation. Many may think that only makes it worse, for there is an old English proverb, and I dare say an Hungarian one to match it, which sums up private iniquity as follows—'He is bad enough to rob a church.'"

"But the last portion of this exculpation is the best. So Kossuth did what every Hungarian does? What is this but rolling a whole nation in the mud to white-wash an individual? With all due deference to your contemporary, I decline to believe all Hungarians argue, because M. Kossuth, at one period of his life, was unable to keep his fingers out of the orphans' fund."

"But it is replied, 'He quickly redeemed the fault by voluntary retribution.' Did he? How very good of him; when found out, he restored the orphans' money; what noble, disinterested conduct, only equalled by that of a pickpocket! I once saw caught by a policeman in the act of abstracting a gentleman's handkerchief. Would you believe it? The fine fellow actually replaced the dirty piece of cambric into the gentleman's pocket, with these noble words, 'There, now, it is back again; let's say no more about it!'"

By way of keeping alive a sound Protestant feeling, and resuscitating the No-Popery cry, which was rather beginning to flag, a little plot, in the Maria Monk line of business, has been got up; but has turned out a total failure. The principal actress was a young lady, of the name of Adams, a prostitute, of decidedly evangelical principles; of such principles at least, as are chiefly acquired in the conventicle, and which consist, not in loving God, but in hating, and telling lies about His Church. It does not yet appear, whether this exemplary young person was actuated solely by zeal for the holy Protestant faith, or whether she was merely the tool of some *reverend gentlemen*, as in the case of the Canadian heroine; but, at all events, Miss Adams presented herself before Mr. Paynter, a magistrate, and deposed that she had just effected her escape from the Convent of the Good Shepherd, at Hammersmith, where she had been forcibly detained for three months, fed on bread and water, besides having been robbed of her clothes, and of a remarkably fine head of hair. A summons was issued against the Nun complained of, and the case was heard on the 22nd ult. Upon investigation, it was proved that Miss Adams had been received as a penitent into the convent, on the day immediately preceding that on which she represented herself as having

made her escape, by climbing over the garden walls; that she had been admitted upon the recommendation of the Rev. Mr. Connolly, a Catholic clergyman, whose compassion had been excited by the girl's story, of her having just quitted a house of ill fame, and being desirous to abandon her evil ways. The Rev. Mr. Connolly gave her a trifle of money, and a letter to the Superior of the convent; but, upon trial, it was found that the pretended penitent's conduct was so disorderly, that the Nuns were obliged to dismiss her the very next day. Thus the charge completely broke down; the Protestant press can make nothing of it. The Spectator says:—

"The whole of the girl's statements were shown to be false. The magistrate suggested an indictment for perjury; but the chaplain of the asylum interceded for her, urging that the exposure, and her own conscience, would sufficiently punish her. Mr. Paynter in justice to the Ladies who conduct the establishment, held firmly to his opinion that the girl should be criminally prosecuted; he committed her on the charge of perjury, and remanded her for a week."

Thus it appears, that this interesting young creature, whose only fault has been to love "not wisely, but too well," the principles of the glorious Reformation, is to be made a victim to her zealous protest against Popery; and that the name of Miss Adams, prostitute and perjurer, is to be added to the Protestant martyrology, and to figure in company with those of Cranmer, Titus Oates, Bedloe, Maria Monk, and the other saints,

"Lies scattered on the Alpine mountains cold,"
 &c. &c. &c. "Whose bones,
 &c. &c. &c."

The dismantling of the Crystal Palace, is proceeding rapidly on the British side; the foreigners are not so expeditious, the endeavor to make sales, inducing them to be more tardy in their proceedings. The distribution of prizes has caused much grumbling. There is little more of interest in the English papers, which are for the most chiefly taken up with cases of murder, principally infanticide.

In Ireland, the rage for emigration continues unabated; but the proselytising gentry are beginning to relax a little in their songs of triumph. The Irish are not converted yet, and it is now pretty clear that the Second Reformation, was brought about solely by the necessities of poor Paddy, obliging him "to borrow the loan of the Prodhendant faith till the new prates came in;" and that the conversions were more to be attributed to an empty stomach, than to a change of heart. We read in the Economist:—

"The harvest of 1851 has been completed. A large portion of the potato crop has been irretrievably lost, but this casualty is more than balanced by the abundance of all other kinds of green crops; and cereals have upon the whole turned out tolerably fair, while the grain markets are gradually rising."

Louis Napoleon has managed to rake a ministry together at last; but the general aspect of affairs in Europe is decidedly warlike. The following is the opinion of the Spectator, of the political condition of the continent:—

"The movements in Germany are suspicious. The frontier garrisons towards France are about to be reinforced, and the armies of the principal states placed on a war footing. The avowed cause of this is the unsatisfactory aspect of French politics. Professions of a strictly defensive policy are made; but the experience of the last seventy years has taught us how easily aggression, under the pretext of averting an attack, may be sophistically represented as a purely defensive act. Yet a combination of the three great Northern Powers against France, as the centre of revolutionary movements, would be more likely to accelerate than retard a general European outbreak. Russia alone appears (and may appear only from our ignorance of her internal relations) in a condition to act energetically and efficaciously; and the game of Russia is to engage Europe in broils that may prevent interference with her own ambitious encroachments on Turkey. Austria is all but bankrupt; the excess of expenditure over income steadily increases, and the state currency appears to have reached the lowest state of depreciation. Prussia has stretched her financial resources almost to breaking. Dissatisfaction with the existing order of things is extending through the minor states of Germany, (Cassel, for example, Baden, and Hamburg,) even more on account of the pecuniary extortions to which they have been subjected for the maintenance of Austrian and Prussian armies, than from purely political feelings. A league of the Despotie Powers against France might again, as in the first revolution, combine the French people in a war of retaliation. In that case, the French armies might once more be in possession of Berlin and Vienna before the Sovereigns of Germany could agree among themselves who should lead the confederated armies."

The following, from the Times, presents a sad picture of the state of Good Hope, and of the imbecility of the present rulers of the colonial empire of Great Britain:—

"A more frightful scene of devastation was never beheld during the terrible struggles which took place between the early settlers in America and the fierce nations by whom they were surrounded than that which South Africa now presents to view, with an English general for its governor, and an English army for its defence. The colonial papers thus describe the destruction going on in the colony:—

"Above Graham's Town to the Orange River, a distance of 300 miles, the whole line has been devastated—sheep, cattle, horses, all swept away or destroyed; the whole border being marked by the ruins of fired farmhouses, the once happy homes of a peaceful, industrious people. Lower Albany with some little exception, had until last week escaped the ravages. But these 'wolves' having been unearthed by the troops in British Caffraria have rushed hither, and already we have the dismal tidings of burning houses and beggared families."

"From this we learn that the Governor having taken himself headlong into what is called British Caffraria, a newly occupied territory,—left the settled colony unguarded. The wily foe took advantage of the blunder, and, being a more expert general than Sir Harry Smith, has employed the Governor's manoeuvre against himself with tenfold effect, and has spread ruin and desolation over the fairest part of the colony.

This disaster, be it remembered, did not occur at the outbreak of the war, but at least eight or nine months after that event. Now, eight months in these days of rapid communication were amply sufficient to enable us to have sent a sufficient force to the Cape,—if our rulers had really understood the danger and known what force was needed. But Lord Grey, wrapped up in the contemplation of his own exclusive wisdom, would listen to no advice, and refused to take any warning. When the news of the outbreak arrived he supposed it would at once be suppressed. Now that vigor and promptitude and fertility of resource were needed, he thought the height of wisdom was to sit with folded hands and do nothing. But, at length, disaster having succeeded disaster,—confusion, and desolation, and ruin being to be seen in every part of the colony,—what then does the noble Secretary for the Colonies? Nothing. He looks on in bewildered imbecility, and betakes himself, as the Court Newsman informs us this morning, to his seat in Northumberland. The lesson read us by the last Caffre war has been entirely forgotten. The fierce and wily character of the foe, which that war had made manifest, was supposed to be wholly changed, and childish antics and ridiculous mummery were thought the proper instruments to employ, in order to counteract the machinations of the deadly and vindictive hatred burning in the breasts of the native tribes by whom the colony is surrounded. Behold the result! A protracted war, a ruined colony, a disgraced commander, a baffled army, a heavy bill of costs behind all! Such are the admirable consequences of the unrivalled skill in colonial government of our present Colonial Secretary! The day of payment must come. Will Parliament make that day, a day of reckoning also?"

A PLEA FOR SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

"A willing obedience to the laws, and a generous loyalty to the sovereign, will be the inevitable results of a thorough Catholic education."—Address of his Lordship the Bishop of Toronto to the Catholic Institute of that city.

We have often argued that, if Catholics are to be taxed by the State for the support of schools, it is the duty of the State to supply Catholics with schools, to which they can send their children, without doing violence to their religious convictions. We have claimed separate schools for the education of our children, as a right; not as Catholics, but as taxpayers—not on account of any excellence of our dogmas, but merely, as money's worth for our money. We have made it purely a question of Pounds, Shillings, and Pence. "If you take our money," we say to the State, "give us schools of which we can make use. If you don't like to give us separate schools, don't take our money, for that is mean, and rascally."

We have always taken this high ground, that Catholics, if they are taxed, have the right to demand separate schools, and that if separate schools are refused, why then, that Catholics must no longer be compelled to pay school-rates. But there is another, and a lower ground, which, without endangering our position, we can afford to occupy. We demand separate schools for the education of our children, not only as a right, not only as that, which it is the duty, but as that which it is the interest of the State to accord; and by so doing, we are aware that we have a greater chance of success—because we know that Catholics are always more likely to obtain a favorable hearing when they appeal to the interests of Protestants, than when they merely appeal to their opponents' sense of justice. It is the interest, as well as the duty of the State, to allow the children of Catholics to be educated in separate schools, because, in such schools alone, can they receive a thorough Catholic education.

It is the interest of the State, or community, that all the members of which it is composed should pay a willing obedience to the laws, and should be loyally submissive to the sovereign power, whether that sovereign power be represented by a Monarchical form of Government, as in Great Britain, or by a Republican form, as in the United States. A willing obedience to the laws, a loyal submission to the sovereign, or legitimate power, will be the inevitable result of a thorough Catholic education. Therefore, it is the interest of the State, or community, to allow its members to receive a thorough Catholic education—which can be given in separate schools alone,—that is, in schools entirely under Catholic control.

A sincere Catholic must always be a good; that is, a loyal citizen. A Protestant may be, a true Catholic must be so. By a good citizen, we mean something very likely, quite different from what a Protestant understands by the same term. By a good citizen, we do not necessarily mean, a clever lawyer, an eminent statesman, a skilful captain, an enterprising speculator, or a great developer of the material resources of his country; we mean a man, who respects, and obeys legitimate authority for the sake of God; not from any motives of self-interest, but for conscience' sake, and as knowing that all power is from God—that is, all legitimate power—and that he who resists it, resists the will of God, and purchases for himself God's wrath, and everlasting damnation. An obedience of this kind, and proceeding from these high motives, can be inculcated by Catholicity alone, because Catholicity alone deals with man, as with a being in the moral order, and with a supernatural and eternal destiny. The will of God, and obedience to His commands, are the reasons she assigns for all she inculcates; thus ever holding out to man, God as man's final cause, the object of all his actions, and teaching, that the sole end for which man was made, was, that he might know and serve God here on earth, in order to see and enjoy Him in Heaven, for all eternity.

Man, according to Catholic teaching, has no other destiny. It is not so with Protestant teaching, which propounds to man, the gratification of self, as the end of all his labors. Protestantism deals with man, as with a being in the material order, and with a natural, and temporal destiny; it holds out motives for loyalty, and, obedience to authority; but then, they are mo-

tives of interest only. Resistance to the laws results in anarchy—anarchy is fatal to thrift, and to the acquisition of property. Man is to obey the laws, according to Protestantism, not for God's, but for his own sake; the deduction is, that when men do not feel that it is their interest, it is not their duty, to obey the laws. If, at any time, Protestantism attempts to insist upon the duty of obedience to the laws, it can do so only by exalting the authority of the State above the authority of God, and by denying the existence of what is popularly termed the "Higher Law." Thus, in the XVII. century, Protestants were obliged to have recourse to the doctrine of the divine right of kings, in order to oppose the arguments of the rebellious spirits, whom the great ecclesiastical rebellion of the preceding century had evoked; in the United States, at the present day, the Protestant supporters, of the supremacy of law, and of the Union, against the treasonable designs of the Free Soilers, can assert that supremacy, only, by denying the supremacy of the Higher Law. Catholicity alone can reconcile absolute submission to the law of God, with absolute submission to the law of the State, and that by teaching us that the authority, both of the Church and of the State, are from God, and are to be obeyed, not for man's sake, but for God's sake—not only because it is man's interest, but because it is his duty to obey legitimate authority. How can Protestantism preach the duty of obedience to authority? Why, the very first principle of Protestantism—that on which it mostly prides itself, that on which alone all its thousands, and tens of thousands of sects will agree—is, rejection of authority—rejection of the authority of the Church, and the recognition of the principle, that every man is his own supreme judge on all questions of faith and morals, and that every man's conscience or prejudice, is to be unto him a Higher law, at whose dictates he may, nay ought, to set the laws of the State at defiance. Protestantism cannot therefore, claim any respect for an authority which may thus be set aside; and all history shows us that the rejection of the authority of the Church, has always, sooner or later, been followed by the rejection of the authority of the State. But Catholicity, which always preaches submission to authority—to the authority of the Church—to the authority of the State—must, if her teaching he sincerely followed, produce good—that is, loyal citizens; and all history proves that it has been, and is so.

We do not deny, that Catholics, roused to desperation by the long continued brutality of their persecutors, have risen up in arms against them; persecution will drive wise men mad; and we admit that persecution has sometimes, as in the reign of the cruel sturmpet Elizabeth, and in that of her drunken successor, driven Catholics to rebellion. We do not pretend to assert that Catholics will obey, or have any respect for the edicts of the civil power, when that power arrays itself in opposition to the Church, and presumes to exalt its ordinances above the law of God, as revealed through His Church; because all such exercise of authority is illegitimate, and illegitimate authority is despotism. To acknowledge despotism as authority, would be a treason to liberty, and, in this case, to the authority of God Himself; so far from being an obedience acceptable to Him, it would be an act of rebellion, because He has commanded us not to give the things which are His unto Cæsar. But we appeal with all confidence to history, in confirmation of the loyalty of Catholics, in all cases where their supreme allegiance to God and His Church, was not interfered with. In England, in seasons of peril to, and rebellion against, the monarchy, the Catholics, though they had little reason to love the laws that made outcasts of them, and no interest in supporting them, always appeared as the firm supporters of law and order. In the Great Rebellion, numbers of them rode side by side with Rupert and his gallant cavaliers; and out of five hundred loyal gentlemen, who lost their lives in the Royal cause, upwards of one-third were Catholics; and whilst Catholics were thus proving their loyalty, the Puritans of Scotland were doing their best to render the very name of Scotland infamous, throughout all generations, by an act of treachery, of which profane history affords no counterpart, and to which the only parallel is to be found in the history of the betrayal of our Lord and Master, as recorded by the Evangelists—When all others, when his very children had deserted him, the gallant and loyal Catholics of Ireland gathered round their lawful sovereign, and yielded not, until that monarch's ignominious flight, and the bayonets of foreign cutthroats and mercenaries, had consummated the misery and degradation of their native land. As in France during the first Revolution, so in France, and throughout Europe at the present day, the Catholics are ever foremost as the supporters of law and order, against the assaults of the anarchists. A Catholic, Red Republican, or Socialist, is an inconceivable anomaly; and if Europe can yet be saved from the revolutionary horrors that threaten it, it can be done, only, under God, through the exertions of the Catholics, who, whilst learning the duty of submission to the authority of the Church, have been taught, at the same time, that it was their duty to yield a willing and generous obedience to the authority of the State, for God's sake. Nor need we cross the Atlantic to find examples of the loyalty of Catholics. As in a monarchy, the Church proclaims the duty of monarchical loyalty; so in a republic, she proclaims the duty of republican loyalty, or obedience to the legitimately constituted authorities, in the exercise of their functions. Hence we never hear of a Catholic Free Soiler in the United States—or of Catholics, combining to violate pre-existing contracts, or associating in order to prevent, by brutal force, the execution of an obnoxious law, under pretence of obeying a Higher Law. No—these treasons against order, against liberty—which cannot exist without order—are the characteristic results of Protestant teaching, which, by inculcating the duty of resisting the authority of the Church, is