

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

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.

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.
All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.
Subscribers not receiving their papers regularly, are requested to make their complaints known to the Editor of the Journal.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1851.

Well. The new Protestant penal law has got safely through another important stage, its second reading in the House of Commons, and awful is the exultation of the rabid bigots of Exeter Hall. In their opinion, it is all up with Catholics; what can the Church do against a majority of 343 voices? But does it thence follow that Catholics should be disheartened? Should not this temporary triumph of ignorance, bigotry, and brutal obscenity, rather stimulate them to increased, and more active exertions? The passing of the second reading is but a small affair; the Bill has yet to go through the Committee, —a third reading—the House of Lords, where it will encounter opposition in all forms, and the thousand natural shocks that parliamentary measures are heirs to, ere the intended iniquity be fully consummated; and, if Irish Catholic members will but do their duty as brave and honest men, acting in the spirit of the recommendations of the *Tablet*, many a long day, many a long month, will elapse ere then, and very weary will the nation be of its ill advised attempts at penal legislation. With all its business delayed, its affairs in confusion, Protestants will begin to suspect that they are paying too dear for their whistle, and that the insulting, and persecuting of Catholics, is, in the long run, rather too expensive an amusement to be indulged in often.

But suppose the Bill to pass, with whatsoever additions the malice and dishonesty of evangelical rascality can suggest, what then? What shall we have lost? Nothing. But rather, much will have been gained to the cause of truth. For there will remain to us,

"The unconquerable will,
And courage never to submit, or yield"

the firm determination, not only never to obey, but always, in all places, and in the most ostentatious manner possible, to violate, and set at defiance, all human laws, which attempt to interfere with the free action of the Church, or to hinder our yielding the supreme allegiance we owe unto her, our spiritual mother, and to the visible head of Christ's Church upon earth, our beloved Pontiff, Pius IX. Protestant penal laws will be unto us as though they were not; or rather, we will treat them as something to mock at, as something towards which, by all our words and actions, we may manifest our contempt. Nor herein will we be wanting in our duty towards God, or man; on the contrary, we shall only be fulfilling our highest obligations. Our allegiance is due, first and above all, to God and to His Church; and the obedience which we pay to the laws of men, is but a consequence of our duty towards God. Our obligations to the civil, or temporal power, are derived from our obligations to the spiritual power, or authority of the Church; for she teaches us, first to fear God, and secondly, to honor the king or civil power. But if the latter, in an evil hour, unmindful of its subordinate position, think to say within itself—"I am; and besides me there is no other," or presume to lay its unhallowed hand upon the ark of the Lord, not only does it forfeit all right to our respect and obedience, but becomes immediately, and *ipso facto* entitled to our scorn and detestation. Its authority, which in all things temporal, is to be obeyed as lawful authority, because from God, when extended to things ecclesiastical or spiritual, is no longer authority, but becomes tyranny, and is therefore to be resisted, and set at naught. Prudence should indeed guide us as to the means of resistance we ought to employ; but that it is our duty to resist is clear—"For it is better to obey God than to obey man."

By the passing of the penal laws, the cause of Catholicity, the cause of the Church, which is the cause of God, cannot lose; for no weapons forged against her shall prosper, but will all be turned to the confusion and disgrace of her adversaries. The Church will lose nothing. She will be to-morrow what she was yesterday, and what she will be unto the consummation of all things. But Britain's government will lose—the affections and loyal devotion of ten millions of Britain's most faithful citizens, who from sincere well wishers to, and earnest defenders of, her government, will have been converted into its irreconcilable foes—foes not the less dangerous, because they will bide their time, because they will watch the favorable opportunity. But Catholicity will gain; gain in the avowal, thus publicly made, that Protestantism can only be maintained, by the employment of the same means, as those by which it was first established—cruel and unjust laws, enforced by brutal violence. And Ireland—Persecuted, but faithful Ireland, will be every way a gainer, if her people are but true to themselves, and know how to profit by the occasion now offered for throwing off the loath-

some Protestant yoke. Well does the *Tablet* point out what, in the present crisis, is the duty of every honest man, of every faithful Catholic:—

"The penal bill, it is understood, will now be held over till after Easter. In the meantime, what should be done? Without a doubt, in our humble opinion, the Bishops both of Ireland, England, and Scotland should petition the House to be heard severally by counsel at the bar against the bill; and the Catholic members should urge on a proposition to this effect as an amendment to the motion for going into committee whenever that is proposed.

"In the next place, we humbly submit to the Irish members that it is their especial business to organize to the progress of this bill through committee a more formidable opposition than they have yet put forward. We hear a good deal of pretended unwillingness to obstruct public business. But we tell the Irish members that so long as this infamous bill of persecution remains before the House, their constituents know nothing of any public business but the business of obstruction. Whether taxes are voted—whether mutiny acts are passed—whether appropriation bills get the due number of readings—how the colonies are governed—what becomes of the much-longed-for reforms of the law, the burthens on land, the duties on paper, the taxes on knowledge—of these, and a hundred other matters that might be suggested, the Catholic constituencies know nothing, and care nothing, so long as this bill of pains and penalties remains upon the table of the Commons House of Parliament, or, being enacted, remains un repealed.

"The business of the Irish members during the recess is to prepare and arrange every possible form and variety of amendment, and to be prepared, every member of them, to speak on every amendment. Suppose, for instance, twenty amendments were duly drafted, and twenty Irish members were engaged to address the House on the merits of each of them. Each amendment might be made to occupy at least one night, at a very moderate calculation and making no allowance for motions of adjournment. Supposing, then, that the bill were to occupy three nights a week, twenty amendments at one night each would occupy seven weeks of the public time, and constitute a very formidable amount of delay and impediment.

"Besides this, it is the duty of the Irish members to be obstructive in every other department of public business; to dabble in finance, law reform, colonial reform, foreign affairs, and to occupy the time of the House as much as possible with questions, motions, amendments, speeches, and the other manoeuvres of a Parliamentary guerilla. On this subject a word to the wise ought to be sufficient. When the Government employs itself in giving us, not protection, but pains and penalties for our religion, and threats of further penalties, if we do not consent to embrace damnation for our children, in such form as Lord John Russell chooses to set forth, we can have but one public function in the State, and that is—to obstruct."

Nor is this advice applicable to members of parliament alone. To every man does it apply, for every one can do something—no matter how humble his condition may be, he is still able to obstruct. The advice applies also to Catholics of all nations, of all origins; for Catholicity overrides all nationalities. The cause of the Irish Catholics, is the cause of all Catholics. To one and the same Church is their allegiance due; to the enemies of that Church is, therefore, the hatred of all Catholics due. We have read how the fanatics, the *Jabez Busters*, the *Mau-Worms*, the *Stiggins*, and all the canting hypocrites of London, have met together, to form, with the assistance of Mazzini, and his fellow cut-throats, a great anti-papal league, at which the Church "is to stand aghast." Shall then Catholics do nothing, whilst their enemies do rage so furiously together? Shall we stand all the day idle, that we may enjoy the high privilege of being the last devoured; or do we imagine, that when cruelty and intolerance shall have been triumphant in England, the Atlantic will be able to oppose an impassable barrier to their further progress? Or rather, should we not remember the good and wholesome proverb, "When rogues conspire, honest men should combine? And remembering, shall we not apply it? We call attention to the admirable letter of Dr. Cahill on our first page, and to those from a French Canadian and an Irish Catholic, upon our fifth, in which it is proposed to oppose a Grand Catholic league, to the further progress of the ruffian bigotry of our adversaries; not with the intention of depriving our Protestant brethren of one iota of their rights or privileges, for what we demand for ourselves, we desire to see accorded to all.—Absolute non-interference, on the part of the state, with the affairs of religion. This is all we demand. More it would be unjust—ridiculous—to require. Less we will not accept.

We hope, therefore, soon to hear, that not only in Great Britain and Ireland, but that throughout Europe, the United States, Canada—wherever religious freedom is prized, and tyranny detested, societies, as recommended by the Rev. Dr. Cahill, are in the process of formation, with the avowed object of repelling any attacks that may be made upon our holy religion, or upon the internal tranquillity of the Papal territory. In this great object, Catholics of all nations should unite; forgetful of difference of origin, they should remember only their community of faith: that Catholic faith which heeds not territorial boundaries, which knows not protocols, and which is not limited by international treaties. We call upon all Catholics, by the love they bear towards their Church, that Church for which our Saviour died, by the hatred which they ought to bear towards all her oppressors, to manifest by their actions, that love—that hatred; hatred, not to the individuals, for our religion teaches us to bless them that curse us, to pray for them that despitefully use us; but hatred of their power, hatred of their tyranny, and, above all, hatred of the hell-begotten system which could prompt the filthy calumnies of a beast like Drummond, and the applauding shouts which hailed the obscene wretch's utterance.

Do we want motives to stimulate us to action? What motives could we desire stronger than those we already possess? Have we not been branded as

"Papists rebels"—as "slaves of falsehood, superstition, and priestcraft"? Have we not seen our revered Prelates, the anointed of the Lord, exposed to the ribald mockery of a filthy crew? Have we not heard our Convents termed "brothels," and their chaste and timid inmates reviled as prostitutes? Have we not heard the name of the Immaculate Virgin, Mother of our Lord, assailed in Britain's high places with blasphemies which we dare not repeat? Nay, have we not seen her, to whom the Archangel Gabriel disdained not to pay lowly reverence, saluting her, "Hail Mary, full of Grace,"—of whom it was prophesied that the name should be called blessed throughout all generations,—who stood weeping at the foot of the Cross, and with heart transfixed with grief as with a sword, counted drop by drop, the shedding of that dear blood, by which our sins are washed away,—have we not seen Mary, whom we call "Mother mild," in default of a more endearing appellation, burned in effigy amidst the exulting shouts of a blasphemous rabble, viler than that which crucified her Son? And shall we hear, and see all this unmoved? Shall no voice be raised amongst us to express our honest indignation? If it be so, then indeed, must we be less than men, or more than angels. Do we not hear the clanking of the fetters which are forging for us, and can we not anticipate the other indignities to which we shall be exposed, if now, like recreant curs, we tamely submit to the malice of our adversaries? Are we prepared to kiss the hand which smites, to caress the foot which spurns us? Or shall we not, whilst respecting the rights of those who, differing from us in faith, enjoy, and are justly entitled to enjoy, every privilege that we demand for ourselves, openly and deliberately avow our intention to resist, and encourage our persecuted brethren to resist, peacefully and with legal weapons if possible, but still by every means which God has put within our reach, always, and at all hazards, to resist, every encroachment that may be made upon the undoubted rights and privileges of Christ's Church, from whatsoever quarter it may proceed. To this, which is the better, the manlier, and, therefore, in the long run, the safer course, we earnestly invite the co-operation of our brother Catholics, not of Montreal, or Canada alone, but of all nations. Opposed to us, are the powers and principalities of the world; but we serve a Master who bids us "Be of good cheer, for He has overcome the world." In Him will we put our trust. If God is for us, who shall be against us!

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE MEETING IN LONDON.

"The British organization of the Evangelical Alliance, have invited the Christians of the world to a Conference during the Industrial Exhibition in London. A Conference or Synod of the World's Christianity, is a fine idea, and we trust will be carried out in such a way as to produce some effect on the worldly masses in all lands."—*Montreal Witness*.

We think that the above is "an iligant idea intirely." Might we venture to suggest an improvement? Why not have an exposition of the Protestantism of all nations? For this purpose, it would be requisite that a Minister, or Elder at least, of every denomination, should, early in the ensuing month, be sent to England as a specimen, labelled—Methodist—Mormonist—Shaker—Congregationalist—Jumper—Baptist—Universalist—Presbyterian—Muggletonian, or Brownist, as the case might be. The only reasonable objection to our proposal, that we can conceive, would arise from want of space in the building devoted to the exhibition, and the want of time to construct another; but this difficulty might be obviated, by hiring for the nonce from the "Board of Ordnance" a lot of old sentry-boxes, in which the different specimens might be snugly esconced during the night, or rainy weather; in the day time, or when fine, they might be put out upon tubs, round the banks of the Serpentine, or under the trees in Hyde-park and Kensington gardens, with the clear understanding that not above three, or at most four of the representatives of the different sects should be allowed to hold forth at a time, lest the ears of the visitors should be stunned by the worse than Babel jargon of so many discordant professors. Such a display of the Protestantism, or cant of all nations, would prove highly attractive to the numerous benighted Catholics, who are likely to flock over to the exhibition, and who, coming from so many different portions of the earth's surface, speaking so many different languages, yet all professing *one* faith, could not fail to be much surprised, if not edified, and delighted with the "Variations of Protestantism."

The following is a condensed account of the judgment pronounced by the Lord Chancellor, in Miss Talbot's case:—

"The Lord Chancellor, in delivering judgment, observed that the prayer of the petition was limited to the removal of the young lady from the Convent—to allow Mr. C. Berkeley access to her at reasonable times—and that the costs might be paid out of the funds of the Ward. There were, moreover, allegations that Lord and Lady Shrewsbury had attempted to coerce her into a marriage against her will, and that she was sent to a Convent by way of punishment. There was an *entire absence* of evidence in support of this allegation, or imputation. There was also his own personal knowledge that it was false. He should be inclined to think that Lady Shrewsbury was a much better judge, than he himself could pretend to be, of what was fit for a young lady's education. Looking at Mr. Berkeley's petition, and the answer it had received, he felt bound to say that there was no evidence to support it—that it contained matter strongly reflecting upon other persons, which was, he was satisfied, unfounded. He (the Lord Chancellor) did not see any necessity for Mr. Berkeley giving his assistance in prosecuting the order; Mr. Berkeley's situation and character did not present him as a gentleman possessing any peculiar knowledge tending to

point him out as one fitted to give assistance. He did not think, therefore, that Mr. Berkeley should be allowed to assist in the prosecution of this order. With respect to allowing access, Miss Talbot was capable of judging for herself, who was agreeable or otherwise; and finally, the Ward having the protection of the Master, and he himself possessing sufficient knowledge of the case, he hoped to be able to make the arrangements conducive to the happiness of the young lady, even without the assistance of Mr. Berkeley!"

We publish below a letter from Miss Talbot, which shows what the young lady's feelings are towards the impertinent, and unmanly interferer with her private affairs, and also how false was the assertion, that any persuasion had been employed to induce her to become a postulant. The result has been highly satisfactory, as shewing the malignant spirit which actuates our enemies, and the groundlessness of the charges brought against our religious establishments. Miss Talbot (who has taken up her residence with the Countess of Newburgh, a Catholic peeress, and under the care of her old guardian, Dr. Doyle,) disowns the impertinent interference of her sweet step-papa, and requests of him, never to have the impudence to address her, should she ever have the misfortune to be in the same society with him; whilst the Lord Chancellor, by his judgment, implies that his affidavits are *false*, that he is a person unworthy of credit upon oath, and in every respect unfitted, by his situation and character, to interfere with the affairs of a young lady like Miss Talbot. May like shame and confusion of face ever be their portion who presume to lift up their voice against our Holy Religion, "per omnia secula seculorum, Amen!"

"Tuesday, Feb. 18, Taunton.

"My Lord—You will, of course, see what I have written in answer to Mr. Craven Berkeley's false statements, and I'm sure in such a case you will think it only just, for me to express myself, what is the pure truth, as I have done. It is scarcely credible how a gentleman can act as Mr. Craven Berkeley has done; for, I assure you, my lord, he was down here at the convent himself on the 14th of February. He then asked me a numerous set form of questions, as if he had some object in view, but wished to get a little information before hand; and, at his departure, he said he should come again, and bring with him a little half-sister of mine. No opposition was made, for how could we know how Mr. Craven Berkeley intended to act? But, after the manner in which he has spoken of the convent at Taunton, where I have spent the happiest days of my life, and where I have experienced for nine years the most unchanging kindness—how could I read his petition, and not feel a just indignation at such conduct? So that it is now, my lord, my own free and deliberate wish, never again to see Mr. Craven Berkeley. Should I meet him anywhere, he would not surely be the first to address me, and most assuredly, I should not. He has disgraced himself for ever in my eyes, and I should think in the eyes of every just and reasonable person. Believe me, my lord, it is I alone in this house who have shown any feeling of indignation; for all under this roof are too good to let any feeling rise but that which every one must naturally feel—compassion for so weak and dishonorable a man. This letter your lordship is at liberty to show to whom you please. I do not feel to have said more than I ought. I may have spoken strongly of Mr. C. Berkeley's conduct, but I have not passed the limits of truth and justice. I must add, that every word of this letter is from myself. I am alone while writing it; and, therefore, no one can allege that I have been prompted by any one: every word is the result of my own thoughts and reflection.

"Mr. Norris, whom I saw on Monday, told me of your lordship's wish that I should go up to town again and see a little more of the world. It will cost me much certainly to leave Taunton, where are all my dearest and truest friends; but your lordship acts for the best, and I would not therefore on any account oppose your wishes. After Easter I shall be ready to yield myself, and again enter a world whose charms I can never value.

"Thanking your lordship for the kind interest you have taken in my welfare, I remain yours respectfully,
"AUGUSTA TALBOT.

"To the Lord Chancellor."

In noticing the measure for the Reform of the Court of Chancery, the *Times* gives us some very *naïve* confessions as to the manner in which, and the reasons why, Ecclesiastical preferment in the Church by "Law established" is administered:—

"The measure proposed by Lord John Russell for improving the judicial staff in this court is one of many in which it is easy to see some merit, and not difficult to detect great objections. The only duty of which he would relieve the Lord Chancellor is the ecclesiastical patronage. This he proposes to vest in the office of which he is himself just now the illustrious occupant. To ordinary minds it is somewhat startling to hear one officer of the Crown proposing to take away from another officer the best part of his patronage; but as the ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown, in whatever hands it be vested, is *always administered* according to the politics of the Prime Minister, it may as well be vested in him at once, as in a lawyer of his own appointment. There are, indeed, theories showing the appropriateness of giving this patronage to the man whose official duties put him in direct communication with the Lord-Lieutenants and the magistracy, and whose legal practice must give him a wide acquaintance with the property and aristocracy of the country; but in matter of fact we believe that Crown livings and dignities have now for a long time been bestowed exactly as they would have been had they been vested in the Prime Minister—that is, with the same *exclusive regard to the political opinions of the clergymen preferred, or of their Parliamentary friends.*"

And of course, *without any regard to the moral, or religious fitness, of the individuals appointed.* To a similar state of degradation would the enemies of our holy religion reduce the "Church by Christ established;" they would be content to let Catholics have their Hierarchy, provided only that the state had a voice in the nomination of its members, and if Catholics would submit to see their revered prelates and pastors turned into mere government nominees, like custom-house officers, and clerks in the public offices. From such infamy, good Lord deliver us.