

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool. HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., Montreal, March 1853. St. Sacrament Street.

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 . . . \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.
 All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.
 Anonymous communications can never be taken notice of.
THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On the evening of the 22nd ult., the Canada "Clergy Reserves" Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords. Dr. Phillips moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, but at the suggestion of Lord Derby ultimately consented to withdraw his motion. Ministers have again sustained a defeat in the Commons, upon the motion of Mr. Gibson, for the repeal of the duties upon "stamps, advertisements and paper." Mr. Gibson was supported by the greater part of the Irish members, and, upon a division, ministers found themselves in a minority of 31—the numbers being—200 and 169. These repeated defeats, though upon questions of minor importance, together with the opposition to, or rather, want of enthusiasm for, the Budget, have given rise to rumors of an approaching dissolution of Parliament.

A vigorous opposition to Mr. Gladstone's financial scheme is anticipated. To the Irish members it is particularly objectionable, on account of the proposition contained therein, to extend the Income Tax to Ireland; and we may consequently soon expect to see the Irish Brigade voting, side by side, with the Disrealites, against the Aberdeen ministry. The editor of the Tablet announces the determination of the party with whom he acts, to use every opportunity that presents itself to save Ireland from the curse of an income tax, and the injustice of the present budget; he anticipates that firmness and union, on the part of the Irish members, may have the effect of inducing ministers to abandon the most obnoxious portions of their financial scheme without a contest. Monday the 25th ult., was the day fixed for the debate, when it was expected that Disraeli would avenge himself upon his old opponents; a defeat, and consequent resignation, of the ministry are looked upon as by no means improbable.

The tone of the last debate in the House of Lords, upon the Maynooth question, clearly shows the motives by which the opposers of the grant are actuated. They have nothing to say against the morality or discipline of Maynooth—they know that the Catholic College of Maynooth cannot, like the great Protestant educational establishments of England, be taxed with those abominations which have lately been denounced, not as exceptional, but as the general practice, at Oxford and Cambridge. They know that the inmates of the former are not like, the inmates of the latter, notorious for their unbridled licentiousness, and their precociousness in vice; and that the result of an impartial enquiry would be to place the purity of manners at Maynooth in startling contrast with the habitual debauchery of the frequenters of the Protestant Universities. It is not, therefore, any doubts as to the excellence of the educational system pursued at the former, that cause the present outcry against it: it is but the expression of impotent malice of the desire to wreak, upon Maynooth and its Popish Professors, that vengeance which the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill has not enabled it to inflict upon the Catholic Bishops of England and Ireland. The Earl of Winchelsea, in the speech by which on the 18th ult. he prefaced his motion—"for a committee"—of which he was to appoint one-half the members—"of enquiry into the system of education pursued at the College of Maynooth"—made no secret of his motives. The noble Earl could not say a word against that system, further than that its tendency was to make Papists, and not Protestants, and that it did, what it professed to do. But Maynooth deserved to be abolished because the Pope had restored the Catholic Hierarchy of England, and because the Legislature of England was unable to prevent, or punish, this aggression:—

"Between two and three years ago the Pope of Rome had dared to offer an insult to, and to make an aggression on, the throne of this realm, and on the authority of this great Protestant country, such as had never been offered in the history of mankind by one friendly country to another. The Pope had dared to issue a Bull, by which he established a Catholic Hierarchy in the British dominions, and divided our country into territorial districts among his episcopacy, for the avowed purpose of establishing the canon law in this realm. His lordship then dwelt with great vehemence on the insult offered to the Queen and to the country by the assumption of territorial titles by the Catholic Bishops in England; on the statute passed shortly afterwards to avenge and punish that insult; on the difficulty of proving any violation of that statute, and on the still greater difficulty of punishing any violation of

it, when proved; and concluded by lamenting that that statute, though ostensibly and purposely violated, continued to be flagrant set at nought, and trampled under foot."

Into the argument of "Papal Aggression" Lord Aberdeen declined entering. The noble Lord might have rejoined that Lord Winchelsea, and his brother bigots, had no one to thank but themselves for the "violated laws" over which they now lament; that they had been warned in good time that if they would make fools of themselves by legislating against the Catholic Church, they might make up their minds to see their laws "studiously and ostentatiously violated, flagrantly set at nought, and trampled under foot." "I believe," said Lord Aberdeen, "that Maynooth has nothing to fear from an enquiry. I believe that any enquiry will redound to the advantage and the credit of that institution; and I am aware that the persons most nearly interested, not only do not object to, but court, and pray for, investigation into the discipline, and management of the institution." His Lordship pointed out how vain it would be to expect that an investigation entrusted to such men, as the mover of the resolution and his friends, would be carried out in a fair or impartial manner; he would, therefore, as he had no objection to an enquiry, move in amendment that—

"A humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be graciously pleased to issue a commission to enquire into the management and government of the College of Maynooth, the discipline and the course of studies pursued therein; also into the effects produced by the increased grants conferred by parliament in 1845."

After an animated discussion, this amendment was carried by a majority of 110 to 53. On the motion of Sir B. Hall, a select committee of the House of Commons has been appointed to enquire into the particulars of the alleged malpractices of the late Board of Admiralty.

The return of Mr. Keogh for the borough of Athlone, is looked upon as certain. At the nomination of candidates, a large body of Catholic Clergy appeared upon the platform, as the supporters of the Solicitor General; whilst Mr. Norton was but thinly accompanied, and could hardly obtain a hearing. The rival candidates blackguarded one another copiously. Mr. Keogh was excessively indignant at the attempt made some time ago to arrest him. "I recollect Ireland in the days of my youth, when no man calling himself a gentleman would endeavor to have another arrested"—and hereupon he launched out into sarcastic allusions, to Mr. Norton's career at Demerara as judge, and to his domestic concerns. The latter gentleman was not slow to retaliate. He denounced Mr. Keogh as a man "dishonoured by the Clergy and the press—as one who never joined a party but to desert it—who never made a pledge but to violate it—whose life was a living lie—and who was covered with every perfidy with which a man could be covered." After this exchange of compliments, which of course are to be taken in a "Pickwickian" sense, a show of hands was called for, and declared to be in favor of Mr. Keogh. The result of the polling is not yet known.

The tranquillity in France remains still undisturbed. The refusal of the Pope to come to Paris is attributed to the influence of Austria; and in consequence the feelings of France towards the former are anything but friendly. The Dutch seem inclined to make as great fools of themselves as did John Bull a few years ago. They feel it a hard thing to bear—that a country, so thoroughly Protestant as Holland, and whose merchants are renowned throughout the world for their readiness, to trample on the cross, to deny and blaspheme the name of Jesus, and in short, to submit to every conceivable humiliation and indignity for the sake of trade—should once again be claimed as subject to the Holy See. An anti-Papal aggression movement has been got up; and numerous petitions against Popery—against allowing Catholics to regulate their own ecclesiastical affairs, and in favor of Religious Liberty! have been poured into the Chambers. The former ministers have yielded to the storm, and tendering their resignations, have been succeeded by others more notorious for their Anti-Catholic prejudices; the Ambassador also, at Rome, has been recalled. It is too late, however, for Dutch Protestantism to protest. The thing is done, and cannot, by any power or authority on earth, be undone. Holland and England are, once more, component parts of Christendom—have both been restored to the rank of Catholic and Christian countries; and painful though, at first, it must be to their Protestant feelings, the sooner the people of both countries recognise and submit to, a fact, which they cannot deny, and against which it is vain for them to struggle, the better for them; their writhings, and belowings, and No-Popery antics, would but excite the contempt of Catholics, were it not that all feelings of contempt are lost, in regret for their obstinacy, and wonder at their almost incredible folly.

By the Herrmann, we learn that the Canada "Clergy Reserves" Bill, has, after a warm debate, passed through committee in the House of Lords by a majority of forty. It is expected that the ministry will be able to carry their Budget safely through the House of Commons. On the 25th, the proposed alterations in the Income Tax were taken into consideration.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON THE PROPRIETY OF PROHIBITING SUNDAY LABOR, IN THE PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS OF THE PROVINCE.

(Printed by Order of the Legislative Assembly.)
 This Committee was appointed in September last, and was composed of the following gentlemen:— Messrs. Brown, Malloch, Polette, Dumoulin, Cartier, Sanborn, and Patrick; its object being to determine, how far, without detriment to the interests of the Province, public labor, especially in the Post-office,

and upon the Canals, might be suspended upon Sundays. For this purpose the Committee prepared a series of questions, which they proposed to the witnesses examined before them; the latter consisting of gentlemen connected with the Public Service of the Province, and of others, who, from their situation, might be supposed competent judges of how far the public business, and commercial interests of the community, would be likely to be prejudiced, by the total cessation of all labor throughout the whole of the Sunday. As might be expected, great difference of opinion, as to the propriety of such a measure, existed amongst the witnesses; but upon the whole, the majority, in point of numbers, were decidedly in favor of a general stoppage of all business upon the Lord's Day. In the minority, however, we find the names of several gentlemen whose opinions are entitled to attentive consideration.

The "Report" itself is drawn up with some appearance of moderation, and clearly recognises the difficulties which have hitherto rendered the "Sunday Labor" question so embarrassing to human legislators. "They felt"—say the Committee—"all the difficulty of legislating on such a subject. They were deeply sensible that, to the Christian, the Commandment of Scripture for a strict observance of the Lord's Day, must always be a final and unerring rule for his personal guidance; but, they felt at the same time, that the Legislator has no right to interpret Scripture for the community, and that the moment he assumes that province, and proceeds to enforce his views by the strong arm of the law, the door is opened to evils of the worst character, and the conscientious scruples of the subject, on matters of religion, are in danger of being set at naught."

With the opinions here expressed, we cordially concur; and from them, as our premises, we deduce the following conclusions:—That,—for "the Christian," to whom the Divine Law "must always be a final and unerring rule for his personal guidance," all human legislation, for the observance of the Sunday, is perfectly needless; and that for a merely human legislature, destitute of any distinctive religious character, to attempt to enforce Christian observances, upon the Non-Christian, is a gross violation of the "rights of conscience," as held, and interpreted by Protestants. For such a legislature, the only consistent course is, to sit still, and confess its incompetence, lest, "by enforcing its views by the strong arm of the law, the conscientious scruples of the subject on matters of religion should be set at naught."

That it is the duty of the Civil power to enforce the Laws of God, as revealed through the Church, is an axiom which no Catholic will ever attempt to deny. But then the Civil power must be in its normal condition, ancillary, and subordinate, to the Spiritual; it is only in this condition that the Civil power can have the right to enforce the observance of Christianity upon its subjects; for only in this condition can the Civil power, or legislature in its corporate capacity, know what Christianity truly is, or be entitled to the name of Christian. A legislature which can lay no claim to any special or distinctive religious character, can have no right to prescribe any special religious observances. Its first duty should be to abstain altogether from legislating upon religious subjects; above all should such a legislature be careful not to throw any impediments in the way of its Christian subjects, either by compelling them, or by holding out to them strong inducements, to violate the precepts of their religion. Non-interference in spirituals is therefore the duty of all Non-Catholic legislatures, and governments—that is, of all legislatures and governments which are not professedly, and distinctively, Catholic—and this, simply because the Temporal power can exercise no legitimate, independent Spiritual jurisdiction.

The Committee have therefore done wisely in refraining from insisting upon any compulsory legislation for the purpose of enforcing Sabbath observances; and in recommending only such alterations in the existing laws, as shall have the effect of leaving every one at liberty to observe the Sunday as a day of abstinence from all servile work. The government has no right to force its subjects, or its immediate servants, to do violence to their religious convictions; and has therefore no right, *except in cases of great necessity*, and to avoid serious inconvenience, to compel them to labor on the Sunday, or on any of the other Christian Festivals which the Church, guided by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, has sanctified, and set apart, as days, holy, and to be observed unto the Lord. Independently of the duty of the Civil power to abstain from compelling any of its servants to violate the precepts of the Church, it is but just on its part, for it to grant them, if possible, the whole of the Christian Festival, as a day of respite from toil. Had God Himself not spoken, were the Church silent on this point, the laws which govern man's physical being would assert their claims to his obedience; man animal, as well as man spiritual, requires the Sabbath's rest.

The danger is lest, forgetting that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, and that its duty is, merely to enforce the precepts of the Church, but not to enact precepts of its own—the Civil power render the observance of the Lord's Day a burden, instead of a relief, to the community, by imposing restrictions upon all innocent amusements; thus giving us, instead of the Christian Sunday, a wretched caricature of the Jewish Sabbath. This has hitherto been the result of all Protestant legislation upon this delicate subject; and some traces of the disgusting old Puritanical spirit which found vent in the "Blue Laws" of Connecticut, do we find in some passages of the evidence quoted in the "Report." One witness, for instance, being asked if he has any suggestions to offer, answers:—

"Yes; pass a severe law; . . . inflict heavy fines, and severe confinement."—p. 36.

And these heavy fines, and severe confinement, were to be awarded, not only for "creating disturbances, and being about grog shops and taverns," but for "men and women strolling about amusing themselves" on Sunday "at various games"—for "boating, shooting," and even for "bathing after 8 A.M." The Committee had the good sense however not to embody this worthy gentleman's suggestions in the Resolutions which form the basis of their "Report;" they contented themselves with making the following recommendations:—

- "1. Resolved—That in the opinion of this Committee, abstinence from labor on the Lord's Day is necessary to the moral and physical well-being of mankind.
- "2. Resolved—That the liberty of abstaining from labor on the Lord's Day is a natural right of man; and that any law or practice which compels him to labor on that day, except in a case of evident necessity, is wrong and hurtful, and ought to be abolished.
- "3. Resolved—That it is the high duty of every Government to set an example to the people under its rule, by the careful avoidance of all that is unjust or conducive to immorality; and that the compelling of its servants to labor on the Lord's Day, under the penalty of dismissal, being unjust, hurtful to the public morals, and uncalled for by any public necessity—such practice ought not to exist.
- "4. Resolved—That no Letter-delivery should be made at any Post-office on the Lord's Day.
- "5. Resolved—That no Mail should be made up at, or despatched from, any Post-office on the Lord's Day.
- "6. Resolved—That any Mail despatched from any point on Saturday, but which shall not have reached its destination by Sunday should be stopped and held over until Monday morning, at the first of the following places which it shall reach on Sunday, namely: Chatham, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, Quebec and River du Loup.
- "7. Resolved—That all the Canal-locks should remain closed from Saturday at midnight until Sunday at midnight.
- "8. Resolved—That a Report founded on the foregoing Resolutions be prepared and presented to the House, with the evidence as arranged.
- "9. Resolved—That a Bill framed to carry into effect the foregoing Resolutions be prepared and submitted to the House with the Report."

The principle embodied in the second of these Resolutions is a just one—That every man has a right to abstain from labor on the Lord's day. And that no man has the right, and that therefore no one should have it in his power, to compel his brother to violate the precept of abstaining [from all servile work on Sundays and other Holydays, is a proposition that most Catholics will readily admit. But, at the same time, it must be remembered that the precept does not imply that *all* labor upon Holydays is evil. If necessary—if of such a nature that it cannot be desisted from, without inflicting serious injury upon the community—then most certainly it is not prohibited; for the seasons of sacred rest were appointed in mercy towards the children of toil, and not as an additional burden to crush them beneath its weight. Sailors work on the Sunday; without sin, they make, trim, or shorten sail, and perform their ordinary occupations on that day, when it is necessary for them to do so; although if *all* labor were sinful on the Sunday, this too would be sin. To be consistent, the sticklers for "Sabbath observances" should denounce the sinfulness of the seafaring man's occupation, because, although *when at sea*, it is necessary for the preservation of his life that he should labor on the Sunday, it is in most cases, the result of the exercise of his own free will that he happens to be in that predicament; he might, had he so chosen, have stopped on shore, and pursued some other calling which would not have required of him to break the Sabbath. The Sabbatarians will argue that, commercial intercourse, and the mutual interchange of dry-goods are necessary to the happiness of man—that to sustain commercial intercourse betwixt remote regions, there must needs be, ships sailing, and sailors working, on the Sabbath day—and will therefore conclude that, as commercial intercourse cannot be suspended, without serious inconvenience to the world, the sailing of ships, and the working of sailors, are perfectly lawful even on the Sabbath day; thus may they be compelled to admit the principle insisted upon by the defenders of Sabbath labor in the Post Office on Sundays. The difference is not one of principle, but merely of degree. Both admit that, necessity—that, serious public interests—may legitimatise Sabbath labor—they differ only as to the *amount* of necessity that is requisite to give legality, and disagree as to where the line betwixt "necessary" and "not necessary" shall be drawn. The pious shipowner, anxiously expecting his cargo of Spring goods, sails his ships, and compels his hired servants to work on the Sunday, because he feels that his trade requires it; but he has assuredly no right to judge harshly of the anxious wife, or perhaps widowed mother, if she sees no harm in the State requiring its Post Office employes to deliver to her, on the same day, the long expected letter, destined to assure her of a husband's welfare, or the safety of a well beloved son. The dry-goods of the former are not more precious to him, or deserving of more consideration by God, than is the much coveted epistle of the other; and it is rank hypocrisy on his part, whilst exacting Sabbath labor from *his* servants, to denounce, as unchristian, the precisely similar conduct on the part of the government towards its "employes."

The answer is—that it is lawful for Christians to do on the Sunday, that which cannot be left undone without serious loss, or inconvenience. The Sabbath rest was intended as a blessing, and not as a curse—to be a source of comfort to man, and not the cause of additional suffering—to be looked forward to with desire, not to be dreaded as a nuisance,—whose close should be regretted, and not hailed with delight, as it too generally is in Puritanical countries, famous, or rather infamous, for their "Sabbath observances." It may be very profane to allude to it; but it is no less true, that your Puritan Sabbath is felt by most Protestants to be an intolerable bore, if not worse;