

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.
The Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
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. \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The steamer *Indian* arrived in port on Wednesday. Her news is unimportant.

There have been public meetings at Boston and in New York, in which the assault of Mr. Brooks upon Senator Sumner has been denounced as "murderous, brutal, and cowardly." It is said that the House of Representatives of which Mr. Brooks is a member, have adopted a Resolution for his expulsion.—There is no doubt however that he will be again returned; as, by the Southern men, his attack upon the Massachusetts Senator is loudly applauded as a noble chivalrous feat. Excitement upon the slavery question and the Kansas disturbances in the United States, is very great. There is in short every prospect of a "jolly row" betwixt the Northern and Southern States. Mr. Crampton, and the dismissed Consuls left New York on the 4th inst., by steamer *Canada* for England.

In another column will be found a letter from a correspondent upon the subject of Mr. Drummond's proposed amendments to his "Religious Corporations" Bill. We say Mr. Drummond's amendments, though perhaps it would be more correct to call them Ministerial amendments; and to treat the entire Bill as one which has been introduced with the sanction of the late, and is destined to receive the support of the present, Ministry. One thing at all events must have struck the readers of the *Journal de Québec* as ominous—we mean the mysterious silence held upon the subject by that journal, once so honest, bold, independent, and truly Catholic in its tone;—so ready to denounce every measure insulting, or menacing to the interests of the Church; but now alas! so servile; and in its style, as subdued as the most abject of those ministerial lick-spittles who write for their daily pittance of broken victuals. Men already speak of the *Journal de Québec*, as they have long spoken of the drivelling *Minerve*.

Apocryphos of the *Journal*, there is a strange on dit in circulation, not very creditable to its Ministerial editor. When Mr. Drummond's amendments made their appearance, the *Journal de Québec*—as from its honorable antecedents might have been expected—fully realised the hopes of its friends, by speaking freely and strongly against the obnoxious clauses.—Since then, however, it is said that the Commissioner of Crown Lands has interfered; and from his bureau in Toronto has issued instructions to his Quebec collaborateur, that account for the change of which we, in common with all the old friends of the *Journal*, have such good reason to complain, and which we fear must be attributed to the corrupting and deleterious influences of Ministerial existence. It is with pain that we have been compelled to come to this conclusion; for we could not readily bring ourselves to believe that the once ardent champion of the rights of the Church in Canada, had subsided into a mere hireling—a tame "Jack-in-Office"—whose highest ambition is to retain his portfolio, and whose political creed may be summed up in the short but expressive formula—"I believe in sticking to my quarterly salary."

Without however analysing too closely the causes of the disgraceful apostasy of the once respected editor of the *Journal de Québec*, there can be no reason to doubt of the fact of that apostasy; or of the fact that, yielding to the clamor of the factious demagogues of Upper Canada, the entire Ministry are prepared to outrage the liberties of the individual, and to sacrifice the interests of the Church, rather than risk the loss of office. Whatever they may be in private life, it is clear that they are, as politicians, without principle, without honor, and unworthy of the confidence of any honest Catholic.—It is also certain that, unless the Catholic constituencies of Lower Canada bestir themselves in the matter, the Bill, with its most obnoxious clauses, will become part and parcel of the law of the land; a law indeed, which, even if enacted, it will be easy to evade, but of which it would of course be far better to get rid at once, by the exercise of our Constitutional privileges at the polling booths. It is always a misfortune, always dangerous to the cause of morality, when human Legislatures enact laws which no honest man feels himself bound in *foro conscientie* to obey; which every one knows he has always the right, and as a Christian may often be bound, to disobey. Of this nature are all laws prohibiting individuals from giving of their own to God, and the service of the poor. To such laws we owe no respect, no obedience; and were it for no other reason, we

should feel called upon to raise our voices against all such legislation—because the surest method of indoctrinating the people with a contempt for all law, is to inscribe upon the Statute book, laws which impose no moral obligation, or are not binding in *foro conscientie*.

It is with much pleasure therefore that we give insertion to the communication above alluded to; as showing that amongst our Irish Catholic population, at least, a strong feeling of generous indignation has been aroused by the scandalous attempt of a corrupt Government, to deprive the individual of his natural, and therefore indefeasible, right to do what he will with his own; and to give, sell, or bequeath, it to whom, and as he pleases. This attack, though apparently directed only against the Church, is in reality an attack upon all personal liberty, and upon the rights of property. If in any one instance the State has the right to say to the individual, you shall not leave more than a certain per centage of your property for any particular purpose—not in itself, or essentially evil; if it has the right in any one instance to limit or define the right of the individual, (being of sane mind,) to do what he will with his own, provided of course that he thereby inflicts no injury upon the rights of others—it (the State) must have the same right in all cases, and to any extent; nor is it possible logically to defend the proposed amendments to the "Religious Corporations" Bill, without laying down the principle that to the State belongs the right of dictating to all its subjects the terms in which their Wills shall be drawn up—or, in other words, without denying the fundamental principle of all personal liberty—that, as against the State, the individual has the right to do what he will with his own—provided always that he transgress not the limits of the natural law, or devote his property to an object *malum per se*—e.g., to the erection and endowment of brothels or houses of debauch. In such cases, and in such cases only, would the State have the right to set aside or disregard the intention of the individual, respecting the disposal of his own, unencumbered, private property.

It is upon these grounds, that as laymen, we oppose Mr. Drummond's Bill. We assert that the "right of testament" is a natural right; a right that we hold, not in virtue of any positive enactment, but as inseparable from the very nature of private property. To deny this, or to assert that in any conceivable instance, the State has the right to interfere with, or to set aside, the disposition that the individual makes of his own, is to deny "private property," and to assert "Communism." The fundamental principle of the "No-Slavery" agitation on this Continent, is, that the individual has a natural, inherent, and indefeasible title to his own labor—and consequently to the profits of his own labor—a title of which the State therefore has no right to deprive him. Now, however, the pretended friends of civil and religious liberty in Canada tell us, that, if a man by his own honest labor has created for himself a fortune, he has not the right to dispose of, or bequeath, it as, and to whom, he will. What is this but to assert that the State has the right to step in, and deprive the individual of the fruits of his own toil and honest exertions? wherein in principle, does such legislation differ from the Slave laws of the Southern States, which say to the black man—"you shall work, but over the profits of your work, you shall have no control?" If there be one proposition in political economy self-evident, it is this—that the right of the individual to dispose as he will of the profits of his own labor, is as his right to dispose as he will, and to whom he will, of his labor itself. If therefore the State has no right to prescribe to the individual upon what terms he shall dispose of his labor, it is self-evident that it has no right to prescribe to him the conditions upon which he shall dispose of the fruits of that labor; it can have therefore no right to say to him—you shall not give more than 25 per cent. of your property to any particular purpose. A man's property is but his labor capitalised; and over the disposition of his labor the individual has the inherent and indefeasible right of absolute control.

Since writing the above we have read in the *Courier de St. Hyacinthe* full confirmation of our worst suspicions against M. Cauchon of the *Journal de Québec*. This political Iscariot has sold himself to the enemies of his Church for a paltry mess of Ministerial pottage; and, owing, as he does in a great measure, his elevation to the patronage and countenance given him by the Clergy of Lower Canada, he takes the first opportunity that presents itself to show his gratitude to his patrons and benefactors, by grossly insulting them. We trust that the Catholic electors before whom he will have shortly to present himself, will give him to understand their candid opinion of his mercenary and dishonorable conduct.

The question at issue betwixt the TRUE WITNESS and the Protestant, is a very simple one; and may thus be stated:—

"Did Christ establish or appoint a Church, or body of men, to teach all nations, and with which He promised to be present all days even to the consummation of all things?"

If He did so appoint such a Church, or body of teachers—of two things one. Either that Church must be in existence now—or His promise has failed; and Christianity itself is but "an idle fiction," unworthy the serious attention of any rational being.—But, if, as the Catholic contends, the Word of Christ cannot fail—and if there be in existence now a society by Him commissioned to teach, and by His presence continually assisted—then we still maintain that, in implicitly submitting to the teachings of that society or Church, man makes the best and highest use of the reason with which he has been endowed by his Creator.

The Protestant may call our argument, for the continued existence of a body of divinely appointed

teachers—(to which we give the name of Church)—"an idle fiction," if he will; for it is easier to call names, than to controvert our logic. Fiction, or no fiction, however, we still maintain that it is impossible to prove from any reliable, cotemporary history of Christ, that He Himself appointed any other means for promulgating and perpetuating amongst all nations, and to the end of time, the knowledge of the doctrines by Him revealed to man; doctrines by Him revealed, because undiscoverable by human reason, and because hidden from the beginning of the world. If the Protestant objects to this, and as no one can be called upon to prove a negative, it is for him to shew that Christ did appoint some other channel, or medium for transmitting to all subsequent generations a certain knowledge of the contents of His Revelation.

"Did the Apostles," asks the Protestant, "say—you must receive our statements because 'the Church' has so decreed it? Did they not appeal to the Scriptures; and did they not desire that by these, and these alone, all their teachings should be tested?" No, certainly not. The Apostles required their hearers to receive their statements because they were themselves the Church—in the sense in which we use the word Church; because they were the divinely appointed teachers of all nations, to whom, and to whose authority, all men were bound to submit themselves. Neither did they appeal to any Scriptures, or writings, by which their teachings could be tested—for the sufficient reason that no such Scriptures or writings were then in existence. To what Scriptures, for instance, could St. Paul have appealed as a test of the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Divine Personality of Christ, or the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son? To what pre-existing Scriptures could the Apostles appeal in support of the doctrines embodied in subsequent centuries in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds? or in that shorter symbol commonly known as the Creed of the Apostles? They might indeed, and no doubt did, when disputing with hearers of their own nation—who received, as of divine authority, the Scriptures of the Old Testament—appeal to the prophecies contained in those Scriptures in support of their assertion, that Jesus in spite of His humble exterior, was the Messiah therein spoken of, and had fulfilled all that was therein predicted. But to assert that they appealed to those Scriptures in support of the truth of their peculiar teachings—and in their days there were no other sacred writings to appeal to—is tantamount to asserting, that the peculiar doctrines of Christianity are contained in the Old Testament, which is absurd; as in that case there would have been no need of another revelation by Christ. That the New Testament does not contradict the Old, is no doubt true, as both are from God. But it is equally certain that the former contains much important doctrine that is not to be found in the latter; and as in the days of the Apostles, the latter only was in existence, or recognised by any portion of their hearers as of divine authority, it is also self-evident that the Apostles could not, even when preaching to the Jews, have appealed to the Scriptures as the test of the truth of the peculiar doctrines by them taught.

If it was thus with the Jews, how must it have been with the Gentiles, who, until converted to Christianity, recognised no Scriptures whatsoever, as of divine authority? To what writings could the Apostles, or primitive teachers of Christianity, have referred the men of Athens, or of Corinth, whilst still heathens, as tests of the truth of their Apostolic teachings? Besides, the writings, or scriptures, themselves, require some one to vouch for them, that they are of divine authority; and until the Church, which our cotemporary calls "an idle fiction," had decided what writings were of divine authority, it was impossible for any uninspired person to know with certainty what writings he was to receive as a test of Christian doctrine. "I would not believe the Gospel," says St. Augustine, "unless the authority of the Church" (the "idle fiction" of the Protestant) "moved me thereto." Alas for St. Augustine!—Alas for the Scriptures!—Alas for Christianity itself then! if the Church, upon whose authority alone the Christian Scriptures can be received as of divine authority, be, as the Protestant says, but "an idle fiction!" We exhort our cotemporary then, in no unfriendly spirit, to examine well the grounds of his faith; to look closely to the foundations of his belief; for if these be in an unsound condition, he need not be surprised if, ere long, the whole superstructure come toppling down. He will tell us perhaps that his faith is based on the divine authority of certain writings, which he calls, *par excellence*, the Scriptures. But on what authority do these rest, except the authority of the Church, which, speaking by the voice of her Pastors in Council assembled, has declared certain books, selected out of a large mass of other writings, to contain the inspired Word of God? And if the Church be but "an idle fiction"—if it be unbecoming the dignity of an intelligent being to accept implicitly the authority of that Church—may it not chance that the writings or scriptures to which the Protestant refers us, are themselves but "an idle fiction?" even as is the Church from which we receive them, and whose authority alone can move us to accept them as the Word of God!

We are pleased to see by the Boston papers that Mr. Charles Ferguson, the distinguished performer on the Irish pipes, now in their perfected form, known as the "Union Pipes," is about to visit Montreal.—We have had the pleasure of hearing Mr. Ferguson's pibroch discourse "sweet music" in New York on more than one occasion; and each time with renewed gratification. We are quite sure that his unrivalled performance on this charming instrument will be productive of pleasure to every genuine lover of music.

We have much pleasure in laying before our readers the following Pastoral from His Lordship the newly consecrated Bishop of London:—

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE FIRST BISHOP OF LONDON, C.W.

PETER ADOLPHE PINSONNEAULT, BY THE GRACE OF GOD, AND THE APPOINTMENT OF THE HOLY SEE, FIRST BISHOP OF LONDON.

To the Clergy and Laity of our Diocese, health and blessing.

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST—

It has pleased His Holiness Pope Pius IX., by his Apostolic Letters of the 21st of February last, to separate from the See of Toronto the most western portion of Upper Canada, and to erect it into a new Bishopric.

Our common and most beloved Father, the Supreme Pastor of the Catholic world, considering the vast extent of territory heretofore placed under the jurisdiction of our venerable brother the Rt. Rev. Dr. de Charbonnel, has graciously vouchsafed to grant the request of the late Council of Quebec, by erecting the new See of London, and appointing us First Bishop of the Diocese of London, and Suffragan of the Metropolitan See of Quebec.

A sense of propriety forbids us from alluding to our own urgent exhortations, previously made, that the choice might be made to fall upon one better qualified to bear the responsibility, and to fulfil the heavy duties of that awful charge; but we may venture to tell you candidly that when the Apostolic Letters, bearing the will of the Head of the Church, were delivered into our hands, we retired to kneel in prayer and to relieve our feelings, and pressing them with deep reverence to our lips, in proof of submission to the Supreme Pastor, bowed our head to receive the yoke of the Lord, saying, with our holy Patron St. Peter,—*"At thy word I will let down the net."*

For though saddened, and all but disheartened, at our physical and moral deficiencies, and fully conscious of our unworthiness for this high dignity, yet are we much consoled and upheld by our obedience to, and our faith in, the following words of the Bull of our Canonical Institution:

"Therefore, having assumed, with prompt devotedness the yoke of the Lord imposed upon your shoulders, endeavor to govern and administer with such fidelity and prudence that the Church may rejoice, and that you may deserve to receive more abundantly the favor and benediction of the Apostolic See and ours." Bearing also in mind the words of the Apostle,—*"Behold! I cannot speak, for I am a child. My heart is troubled within me. Fear and trembling are come upon me."*

And yet, dearly beloved brethren, so deeply did we feel our inability, that up to the moment of our receiving the Apostolic Letters, fear and trembling, anxiety and doubt, with many other conflicting thoughts, well nigh overpowered us; indeed, we had no rest but in pouring out our heart before the Almighty, and *"praying to our Father in secret."* How many times, in our dismay, did we not cry to the Lord God,—*"Behold! I cannot speak, for I am a child. My heart is troubled within me. Fear and trembling are come upon me."*

Whence, therefore, our sudden change? Whence our present resignation—nay, our firm confidence, our fond hope? Is it that we do not form a just estimate of our new situation? Can it be that we are blind to our many deficiencies? or that we purposely overlook them, as well as the trifling difficulties we shall have ere long to grapple with? Not so, beloved brethren; we need not be reminded that the Diocese of London is but in its very infancy; whilst we its first Bishop,—besides being utterly destitute of all worldly means, and deficient in many other ways,—labor moreover under the disadvantage of being entirely unknown to you all; our very name—for aught we know—telling against us.

Again, we are deeply sensible of the difficulties we shall encounter even at the very outset; and we anticipate a thousand others yet unknown, against which we must be prepared to struggle in the administration of our high office. Nay, we clearly foresee that difficulties of all kinds will soon thicken around us; that we shall be troubled with doubts, thwarted in our undertakings by the "enemy," yea even by "false brethren,"—involved in cares, bowed down with unceasing anxieties, and finally pressed on all sides and hemmed in, as it were, with most painful trials. In a word, we see surging up from afar the threatening tide of many and various tribulations,—*"combats without, fears within,"*—which shall possibly try both our mind and heart to the very utmost.

No wonder if we should quail before this sad prospect, which, we apprehend, is not overdrawn; and yet, beloved brethren we dare contemplate it even without a shudder, and—unheeding this gloomy future—we remain undisturbed in our confidence, unmoved in our hope.

God forbid we should be presumptuous and ever forget our own weakness?—"far from me be this sin." How then, can we be so sanguine, and whence the secret of this our present fortitude?

Behold! Our most beloved Father Pius IX. stands before us, his hallowed face beaming with a heavenly benevolence; with that bright and sweet countenance—upon which we gazed with rapture some years ago—he looks down upon us; and methinks whilst his hand, which holds the keys of Peter, is uplifted to bless the New Diocese of London and its first Bishop—thrilling words fall from his lips which bid us to be of good cheer, and impress upon us the noble duty of generously corresponding to his sacred call, and if need be, of sacrificing our very life for the Church and the salvation of souls;—and lo! all the gloomy shadowings of our future prospects fade away as the morning mist before the rising sun.

Such is the bright vision conjured up in our mind by the Letters of the Holy Father, such the soul-inspiring instruction we derive from them.

Indeed in perusing them with deep reverence, a new light shines at once into our mind; the sphere of our ideas is enlarged; new and higher thoughts spring up and drive away the overwhelming anxiety which was preying upon our mind; our soul, soaring in the highest regions of faith, is filled with heavenly fortitude: and now, with a deep but calm earnestness, we stand prepared to confront the stern realities of our awful charge, and cheerfully enter into the feeling which prompted the Apostle to exclaim,—*"I fear none of these things, neither do I count my life more precious*