

REMITTANCES

TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES
SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Union Bank of London, London. Dublin. The Bank of Ireland, Edinburgh. The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacrament 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. . . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1856.

We wish to inform our City Subscribers that Mr. Hilliard has been appointed Collector for the True Witness; and is authorised to receive all sums due to this Office. We hope that our subscribers in the city will be prepared for him; and that after his circuit is completed, there will not remain one unpaid subscriber in Montreal. Adopt as a rule—"It is much easier to pay six months than twelve months;" if this be followed, we will have little reason to complain of delinquent subscribers.

It is a rule amongst rogues, when engaged in the perpetration of any villainy, to see that all their accomplices are as deeply dyed with guilt as themselves. Not only do they draw solace from the reflection that they are no worse than others, but they derive a certain amount of confidence from the consciousness that their "pals," being equally obnoxious to the law, they have little to fear from the "peaching" of the former. Though not reduced to writing, or embodied in any code, it is beautiful and instructive to observe how universally this rule obtains, in all lands and amongst all classes. At Botany Bay, as in Toronto—amongst the members of a Liberal Canadian Ministry, as amongst the light-fingered gentry who tread the classic Courts of the "Old Bailey," and whose acts are duly recorded in the Newgate Calendar.

Thus Mr. Drummond congratulates himself upon the fact, that his late colleagues in office, are every whit as bad as he is himself—that they are all tarred with the same brush—and that if he is a traitor, so are the other members of the Ministry. We copy from the Parliamentary Report:—

"Mr. Drummond said—There was another Bill on which his reputation was at stake, and respecting which he had been attacked in the most fiend-like manner: he alluded to the General Corporations Act; and with regard to that, he would like to ask the Government whether they were prepared to carry it through or not?"

"Mr. J. A. Macdonald replied, that it would be carried through, just as he (Mr. Drummond) had left it."

"Mr. Drummond said, that he would not then stand alone as guilty of the deep treachery that he had been accused of with regard to his Church. No man respected the priesthood more than he did, and no man had stood more firmly by them; and now, because he wished to put all things of the kind on such a footing as would put an end to any jealousy, he was told that he was a traitor. He was glad that the Government would not shrink from the consequences of carrying out a measure of which they had all approved."

Upon the above we will take the liberty of offering a few remarks.

1. Mr. Drummond tells us that he "respects the priesthood;" we conclude therefore that he does not believe that they are in the habit of exercising an undue influence over the minds of their dying penitents, in order to induce them—the latter—to make an improper disposition of their property, to the advantage of ecclesiastical bodies, but to the detriment of the next of kin. Even an Ex-Attorney General could hardly respect a priesthood guilty of such conduct; and Mr. Drummond greatly respects the priesthood of Canada.

But it is only upon the supposition that the said priesthood are in the habit of unduly exercising their influence over the minds of their dying penitents, that the restrictive clauses introduced by Mr. Drummond and his accomplices, can be defended as necessary; and it is only as being necessary, that they can be defended at all. Now by professing "respect for the priesthood," Mr. Drummond virtually admits that his restrictive clauses are not necessary; and therefore fully ratifies the verdict that has been pronounced upon him, and his brother traitors in the Ministry, by the independent Catholic press of both Upper and Lower Canada.

2. Mr. Drummond tells us "that no man has stood more firmly by the priesthood than he has." We tell him, on the contrary that he has never hesitated to betray the interests of the Church and of the Catholic priesthood, whenever he could do so with profit to himself, or whenever it seemed to him that adhesion to his old professions would expose him to the assaults of his present friends. We tell him that he has betrayed the interests of the Church, and of his constituents on many an occasion—and that it is owing to his treachery, and double dealing, that the School question of Upper Canada is still in a state so unsatisfactory to the priesthood, whom he, good honest man, respects so highly, and by whom he has stood so firmly. But to come to the facts.

The School Bill which, through the foolish and misplaced confidence of the Catholic clergy and laity, was, in 1853 entrusted to the care of Mr.

Drummond, would—if that gentleman had been allowed to have had his own way, never have been brought forward at all. Disgusted at this treachery, Colonel Taché, threatened to lay it before the Legislative Council, if Mr. Drummond persisted in his refusal to introduce it to the other House. Thus spurred on, Mr. Drummond did introduce his Bill, which progressed favorably to its third reading; when in concert with Mr. Langton, our "firm supporter" of the "respected priesthood," introduced several amendments which neutralised all the good that the Bill was otherwise calculated to do.

Not content with this act of treachery, this same Mr. Drummond, together with his colleagues, refused to support a short Bill lately introduced by Mr. Bowes—the object of which was to repair the gross injustice under which the Catholics of Upper Canada still labor. In justice, however, to Mr. Drummond, we must admit that in this matter, the conduct of M.M. Loranger, Masson, Cartier, and Cauchon, was as anti-Catholic as that of the great "respector of the priesthood." From such friends—"Liberate nos Domine."

3. Mr. Drummond tells us that, in introducing his grossly insulting amendments to his General Corporations Act—amendments which, as we have already shown, he himself admits he does not consider necessary—he was actuated by the desire of "putting all things on such a footing as would put an end to any jealousy"—in other words, with the object of pandering to the unprincipled clamor of Protestant demagogues against the religious institutions of the Church. In this, we have no doubt, Mr. Drummond told the simple truth. He does not believe his restrictive clauses necessary; he does not venture to assert that they have been called for by any action on the part of our priests or nuns: he does not venture to defend them as just, or in accordance with the natural law, which gives to every man the right of doing what he will with his own—but he excuses himself upon the plea that he hoped to allay the jealousy of the enemies of the Church—a jealousy which he himself tacitly admits to be destitute of any reasonable foundation. Thus Mr. Drummond stands self-condemned; for this is just what his "fiend-like" assailants say of him—that he introduced his amendments, as a sop to the Protestant canaille of Upper Canada, and not because he believed them to be either necessary or just. Thus also does Mr. Drummond, by his own avowal, fully justify the worst suspicions entertained of him and his accomplices, by all honest Catholics throughout Canada.—We believe that he, and they, are destitute of any fixed or honest principles—that to secure themselves, they are prepared, as soon as a moderate amount of pressure is brought to bear upon them, to sacrifice the rights of the Church to the clamors of Protestant fanaticism—and that upon the same plea as that which they offer to-day for insulting the Church in the person of her Ministers—viz., "the putting an end to jealousy"—they would to-morrow offer up to the same senseless jealousy, the property of our Convents, Colleges, and ecclesiastical institutions generally through the Province. If the desire to allay "jealousy" can be admitted as a justification of dishonesty in one instance, it may in a thousand; now it is certain that Protestant "jealousy" is as strongly excited against the property of the Seminary in Montreal, of the Hotel Dieu, and of the Grey Nunnery, as it is against the right of Catholic laymen to dispose by testament of their property for religious, educational, or charitable purposes. Why then is not Mr. Drummond consistent? Why, if so anxious to "put an end to jealousy," does he not introduce a Bill for confiscating the entire property of the Catholic Church throughout the Province? For until this is done, that "jealousy" will never be put down; or the blatant beast for whose stinking breath Mr. Drummond entertains such profound respect, be silenced.

Lastly—Mr. Drummond rejoices that his old colleagues are as vile as he is himself. We fully appreciate the man, and can therefore easily understand whence this gladness proceeds. Alone amongst honest men, Mr. Drummond would, no doubt, feel ill at ease; he is at home and amongst friends, with the Cauchons, and the rest of that "clique."

Why do the clergy of the Anglican sect keep aloof from their brother Protestants, members of the Bible Society?—asks the Church of the 23rd ult.—"Why do not the bishops and clergy of the Anglican church generally, heartily sanction and support the Bible Society?"

Because—answers the Church—because they believe that the Bible must be interpreted by the "Prayer Book"—as set forth by Act of Parliament; and because Anglican ministers cannot meet the ministers of other Protestant sects on the platform of the Bible Society, and acknowledge the latter as lawful ministers, or indeed as sound portions of the One Apostolic Church. In other words, because, as gentlemen, they cannot be "hail fellow, well met," with all the tag-rag and bobtail of the conventicle.

The Bible and Prayer Book teach that Christ and His Apostles instituted only one Church, and one three fold ministry—that separation from the former is the sin of schism—while for men to take upon themselves the functions of the latter without being duly ordained thereto—is a most serious and dangerous error.—Church.

Very true, Mr. Anglican. But unless you are prepared to show that the Society known in history as the "Church of England as by Law Established," of which the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland is Supreme head upon earth, is the "one, only Church" instituted by Christ and His Apostles," we see not how you will improve your position, by the enunciation of such doctrines. It is certain that in the first, second, and third centuries, for instance, no such Society as the present "Church of England as by Law Established," was in existence. The presumption is

therefore very strong that it was not instituted by Our Lord Himself; and the presumption is therefore equally strong that its members are guilty of the "sin of schism," in that they are separated from the "one, only Church," or Society, instituted by Christ; and which, if there be a visible Church, must have had an unbroken visible historical existence from the first century to the nineteenth. No Society, or Church, of which this cannot be predicated, can by any possibility be the "one, only Church," with the "threefold Ministry," that was instituted by Christ Himself, and His Apostles.

Our Protestant cotemporary not only repudiates the fundamental article of the Protestant Faith—that which, if not universally, is most generally, accepted by all Non-Catholic sects as the one bond of union betwixt them—that King James's Bible is the "religion of Protestants"—but he asserts the Popish principle that "the Church hath authority in Controversies of Faith." Granted again. No doubt the Church, the "one, only Church" instituted by Christ and His Apostles" has such authority; but it is equally certain that the society known in history as the "Church of England and Ireland as by Law Established," has no such authority; and cannot therefore be the "one, only Church" instituted by Christ and His Apostles.

The "Church of England," or the visible society, "Established by Law," and of which Queen Victoria is the Supreme Head upon earth, has, and can have, no authority in matters of faith; because it is, by its own admission, fallible, and therefore liable to err in its judgments upon matters or controversies of faith. A fallible society, aided by the strong arm of the law, may indeed forbid discussion, and in so far put an end to controversy; but, in that it is fallible, it cannot produce conviction in the minds of those to whom it addresses itself; and unless it can do this, unless it can influence the hearts of its hearers, it can have no "authority" in the domain of faith. A fallible Church may indeed "silence" controversies; but can never "settle" them; and though in externals—in controversies of discipline, or of ceremonies—its judgments may be accepted, it will ever be unable to claim the submission of intelligent beings to its dogmatic decisions, or to elicit from them an act of faith.

The "Church of England" has no authority in controversies of faith, because, if it had, it would long ago have exercised that authority to settle the controversies by which it is rent asunder. In the Gorham controversy, for instance, if conscious of having authority from God, it would have spoken out boldly; and not have abandoned its right and duty of deciding a vital point of the Christian faith, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If conscious of "having authority in matters of faith," it would have exercised that authority, and have silenced Mr. Gorham by its dogmatic decision, as did the real Catholic Church in the fourth and fifth centuries, when an Arius and a Nestor raised "controversies of faith" within her borders. In that the "Church of England" did not exert its authority to settle the Gorham controversy, we must therefore conclude to one of two things. Either that the said Church is conscious of having "no authority in controversies of faith;" or that believing itself to have that authority, it was guilty of a dereliction of duty in the Gorham controversy, by failing to exercise it, when imperatively called upon to do so. Accept either hypothesis, and it is clear that the Church of England is not the "only—one—Church" having "authority in matters of faith" instituted by Christ Himself and His Apostles"—and separation from which, necessarily involves the "sin of schism."

Our Protestant cotemporary will perhaps be better able to understand our meaning by help of an illustration. What, for instance, would he think of an able-bodied man, correctly, not to say classically, arrayed in the costume of a policeman; with an elaborate hat, and coat cut most accurately upon the Corporation pattern—who should stand the quiet and mute spectator of a street row, though called upon by the bystanders to interfere for the preservation of the peace? Would not the Church conclude, and conclude justly, either that the said able-bodied man, in spite of his baton, his glazed hat, and the profuse eruption of metallic buttons upon his single-breasted coat, was at best but an impostor, or sham policeman? either one who had no authority to put down the row; or, if holding such authority from the Corporation, guilty of a gross dereliction of duty; therefore untrustworthy, and utterly incompetent to act as a conservator of the public peace? The conduct of the so-called "Church of England, as by Law Established" since the XVI. century, has, in "controversies of faith," ever been that of our friend the sham policeman. Occasionally it may have tried to look big and bluster; but by so doing, it has gained nothing save a laugh of scorn or pity from the spectators. Even the little boys in the streets set its authority at defiance; and irreverently make faces behind the back of Mr. Bumble, the parochial beadle, terrible indeed in gold-laced cocked hat, but decidedly shaky in his limbs, and scant of breath.

On more than one occasion we have raised our voices in protest against the aggressions of that fanatical spirit of Protestantism, which would deprive the people of Canada of their weekly Festival, or Sunday Holiday, in order to impose upon them the intolerable burden of a Puritan Sabbath. We have done so, not because we esteem lightly the Christian obligation of observing the first day of the week; but because all experience shows us that the effect of Puritanical legislation upon the subject has been prejudicial to the interests of morality and religion; and that if the laboring classes are deprived of all innocent amusements upon the only day of the week upon which they can amuse themselves at all, they

will inevitably fly to sinful and demoralising pleasures for their Sundays' recreation. Fortunately for Canada, the Catholic element is yet too strong for the introduction amongst us of the Scotch Sabbath, with all its incredible absurdities, and unmentionable abominations.

Not so however in England; where the Ministry have been compelled to succumb to the threats of the Scotch members of Parliament; and, in degrading compliance with the grovelling superstition of these contemptible fanatics, have consented to deprive the people of London of the harmless pleasure which they have long derived from the performances of the military bands in the parks on Sunday afternoons. The bands are silenced; the parks are for the most part deserted; whilst the Puritans and the grog-sellers of the metropolis rejoice from their pulpits and behind their bars, respectively. The great advocates of Sabbatarian restrictions are, it seems, the organs of the evangelicals, and of the "Licensed Victuallers" of London.

From this we may learn a profitable lesson—that, if we desire to put down Sunday dram drinking, we must not deprive the laboring classes of all other Sunday amusements. Of the thousands, and hundreds of thousands of quiet, well behaved men, women, and children, who have been robbed of their rational, and not only innocent, but elevating recreation on Sundays, not one has, in all probability, become an afternoon Church goer—not one seeks to console himself for the loss of his music, by subjecting himself to the lingering torture of a Puritanical sermon, barbarously snuffed through the nose. The people have been baulked of their weekly amusement, but the Rev. Mr. Stiggins has not gained a soul to his congregation; the parks have indeed been emptied, but the conventicles have not in consequence been filled. The devil, and the grog-sellers have, as yet, been the only gainers by the movement.

But the end is not yet; and already there are signs that the people are not disposed to put up quietly with the despotism of the saints. The first Sunday after the silencing of the music was a wet day; and to that circumstance may be attributed the comparative tranquillity of the metropolis. "As it is," says Wilmer and Smith's European Times, "the anger is suppressed, not extinct, and it is more than probable that the unseemly riots which occurred last year, will be renewed with greater intensity until the concession is restored. We are only at the beginning of these troubles, and the Premier has the satisfaction of knowing that he has been chiefly instrumental in fanning the flame which now rages so fiercely in the bosoms of the great mass of the middle classes in London." The general opinion seems to be, that after a few rows, and a good deal of ill feeling, the Government will be at last obliged to repeal the obnoxious restrictions; and to restore to the people the privileges of which, in an evil moment, and listening to the sickening cant of the Puritans, it has sought to deprive them.

The Weekly Register, which in common with the great majority of the London press, denounces the Sabbatarian movement, as alike oppressive and impolitic, tells the following story; which is so beautifully and so truly illustrative of Scotch Puritan morality, that we cannot forbear laying it before our readers:—

The late Mr. Pugin, travelling one Sunday by railroad, was shocked by the filthy and degrading conversation of two gentlemen whose accent clearly indicated from which side of the Tweed they came. Unwilling to hear, and unable to get away, he leant out of the window, and whistled to drown their voices. His companions looked at each other aghast, then whispered, and finally remonstrated that they were sure he must have forgotten it was the Sabbath, or he would not have whistled; and begged that he would desist for the sake of their feelings.

"Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees . . . ye are like unto whitened sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outwards, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness."

THE "MONTREAL WITNESS" AND MR. DRUMMOND.—Mr. Drummond's new friends, though they ought to be delighted with their cheap bargain, are at times hardly complimentary in their language.—If they applaud the treachery, they can hardly conceal their contempt for the traitor, as may be seen from the following explanation volunteered by the Montreal Witness:—

"The Romish papers ask indignantly—How is it that the obnoxious provisions of the bill did not exist in its original form, but were added only at the second reading? and draw the inference that the amendments are not the result of conviction on the part of Mr. Drummond, but the consequence of Protestant pressure from without—a mere cowardly and pitiful subserviency to Mr. Brown, and the 'parasitical drawlers.' But we would suggest another more charitable, more orthodox, and more probable explanation of a fact, which indeed took all parties by surprise. It is well known that a Roman Catholic gets along very well with his church and with his conscience, provided he annually, at Easter, makes a clean breast of his sins, receives priestly absolution, and partakes of the sacrament. Then he is white-washed for a whole year, at the expiration of which, the same process must be gone through over again. Indeed, the external profession of religion for a great many educated Romanists, is entirely confined to the season of Lent and Easter. Mr. Drummond" who is as good a Catholic as any of our public men, wanted to go through the usual routine. His amendments, if offered during Lent, might have withheld from him priestly absolution, and thus endangered his soul; consequently the original bill went through its first reading in a rather inoffensive shape. After Easter the Minister could with security carry out his views. He mustered courage, brought in the amendments, and has now before him a whole year to make his peace with the church. Had not Lent and Easter come this year fully one month earlier than usual, the bill might have had a different issue."

In the above we know not which is the more worthy of our admiration—the profound theological knowledge displayed by the editor of the Montreal Witness—or his contempt of the shuffling and tergiversation of Mr. Drummond, and his colleagues.—Neither Protestant nor Catholic doubts that they are hypocrites and traitors.

* Every bit as good—but "bad's the best."