

REMITTANCES

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, MAY 4, 1855.

Subscribers changing their places of residence are requested to give the necessary information at this office.

THE TORONTO CHURCH AND THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

"We are most sincerely convinced that our Lord, and His Apostles, founded only one Church, eighteen hundred years ago; that it was an outward and visible society, consisting of good and evil; and that it was ruled by our Lord's appointed servants.

"We believe that against this visible organisation, the gates of Hell were never to prevail; that with its Ministry our Lord was to be always, even unto the end of the world; that, consequently, it must be in existence now; and that, if we can identify it, it is most plainly the duty of all Christians to unite themselves with it."—Toronto Church.

The above is an extract from the Anglican organ of Upper Canada, forming part of an article in which our cotemporary seeks to convince the Christian Guardian—Methodist—of the sin of schism; and though coming from a Protestant source, in it there is not a word to which the Catholic will not heartily subscribe. It places the controversy, as between Catholic and Protestant, Romanist and Anglican, in its proper light. Asserting the unity and indefectibility of the Church, or "One outward and visible society," established by "our Lord Himself eighteen hundred years ago," and proclaiming the plain duty of every baptised person to unite himself with that One society, with which our Lord is, and ever has been present, and against which the gates of Hell can never prevail—it, by implication, asserts the infallibility of that Church, or outward and visible society, though not the impeccability of its members; and thus, whilst utterly renouncing the right of "private judgment," lays down the Catholic principle, that we are not to judge the Church by the doctrines it teaches, but to assume the truth of our dogmas from the authoritative teaching of the Church—as that "ONE outward and visible society—founded by our Lord eighteen hundred years ago—ruled now by our Lord's appointed servants—and against which the gates of Hell have never prevailed;" and to which ONE society, all baptised persons throughout the world—in Spain or England—in Asia, Africa, America, or Europe—whether subjects of a monarchy, or citizens of a republic—are in "plain duty" bound to submit themselves. We admit the Anglican's premises; we admit also the validity of his conclusions, and their force as urged against the Methodist. For applying his principles, the Church continues:—

"In looking for this organisation, we are unable to give any great amount of consideration to the claims of modern Methodism, notwithstanding the excellence of many individuals who have embraced its tenets.—Because, to our mind, it is at once apparent that it cannot possibly be that Divinely organised, and immortal society which was founded by our Lord and His Apostles eighteen hundred years ago; for the simple reason, that, however excellent its objects, it is purely a human institution, founded by Mr. Wesley about a hundred and twenty years ago."—Church.

Admit the premises, and the conclusion is inevitable. Did it not, however, strike our cotemporary that, by merely changing a word or two—by substituting Anglicanism, for "Methodism"—Henry the VIII., for "Mr. Wesley"—and, three hundred, for "a hundred and twenty," the argument might be applied as effectively by the Romanist against "The United Church of England and Ireland, As By Law Established"—as it is by the Anglican, against the "Methodist Church As By Mr. Wesley Established?" It is thus that the Christian Guardian replies to the argument of the Toronto Church:—

"As the Church has made only one application of this argument, we shall assist him by reminding him, that with equal force it may be said, the Episcopal church of England cannot be the church founded by our Lord and His Apostles eighteen hundred years since; for the simple reason that it is purely a political institution, founded by the British Parliament about three hundred years ago: and having a temporal Sovereign for its head. If the Church's application of this argument is good, ours is equally forcible."—Christian Guardian.

Our Lord and His Apostles founded ONE Church, or "outward and visible society," eighteen hundred years ago. Not several Churches—one for Judea—another for Greece—a third for Italy—and a fourth and fifth for Spain and Gaul; but ONE Church for all nations—infallible, because of our Lord's continual presence with it—indestructible and immortal, because of His promise that the gates of Hell should never prevail against it. This ONE society exists now.—How, and by what notes shall we distinguish it from

all other societies calling themselves Church, or Churches; so that we may unite ourselves therewith? Bossuet, in his famous "Conference" with M. Claude of Charenton, assigns these notes, or marks, of the ONE true Church with his usual clearness and precision:—

"We have only to ascertain which is that Church—or outward and visible society—of which it cannot be said that it has formed itself by separation from any other society—which is to be found prior to all separations—and from which all other existing societies have separated."

By applying the above tests, we shall be quickly in a position to judge betwixt the claims of Romanism and Anglicanism, to the title of the ONE Catholic Church; and to decide upon the question, as stated by our Anglican cotemporary—Is that ONE outward and visible society, known in history as the Roman Catholic Church, which is to be found in every part of the world, and under every form of Government, and which recognises Pius IX. Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, as its head under God upon earth—or is that other, and totally distinct, outward and visible society, known in history as the United Church of England and Ireland, which exists, and can exist, only in the British dominions, and which recognises Queen Victoria successor of Henry VIII. as its head under God upon earth—the ONE outward and visible society founded by our Lord and His Apostles eighteen hundred years ago; and to which it is the "plain duty" of every baptised person in the world to submit himself? Both cannot be: for two distinct, separate, and mutually antagonistic, societies cannot be one society. The question does not seem a very difficult one to settle, for him who approaches it in good faith, and without prejudice.

The Roman Catholic argues, that the outward and visible society, known as the "United Church of England and Ireland," and which acknowledges Queen Victoria as, under God, its supreme head upon earth, is not the ONE outward and visible society founded by Christ Himself, and with which all Christians are bound to unite themselves. Because:—

1st. That society, with which only we are bound to unite ourselves, is "ruled only by our Lord's appointed servants, with whom He promised to be ever present;" and it does not appear, from any reliable historical documents, that our Lord ever appointed the Sovereigns of England to bear supreme rule, or to have any, the least, jurisdiction in His Church; or that the promise of His continual presence can be so interpreted as to apply to the members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and the majority, for the time being, of the House of Commons.

Because:—
2nd. The outward and visible society now existing under the name of the "United Church of England and Ireland," was once merged in, and formed an integral and undistinguishable portion of, that other society known as the Roman Catholic Church, against which, according to Anglicans, "the gates of Hell have prevailed;" and therefore it cannot be that ONE immortal society against which the gates of Hell never were to prevail.

Because:—
3rd. The said society formed itself by, and in virtue of, an act of separation from another pre-existing society; and, according to the marks laid down by Bossuet, it is impossible that a society which owes its distinctive existence to an act of separation from another pre-existing society, can be the ONE original society founded by our Lord Himself.

And because:—
4th. The outward and visible society known as the "United Church of England and Ireland," and which recognises Queen Victoria, as, under God, its supreme head, having been "Established by Law" since the XVI. century, has not been in existence eighteen hundred years; and therefore cannot by any possibility be the ONE visible society "Established By Our Lord Himself and His Apostles, eighteen hundred years ago."

Many other reasons might we assign; but these, we think, are sufficient to justify us in refusing to recognise in the "United Church of England and Ireland—by Law established"—the ONE outward and visible society—established by our Lord and His Apostles eighteen hundred years ago—ruled by our Lord's appointed servants—against which the gates of Hell were never to prevail—with which our Lord promised to be ever present—which was, therefore, is, and ever must be, infallible, immortal, indefectible; and with which it is the "plain duty" of all Christians—Englishmen and Russians—Irishmen and Brazilians—Greeks, Spaniards, and Scotchmen—to unite themselves, if they wish to save their souls.—God has not been pleased to appoint one Church as the means of salvation for the subjects of Queen Victoria, and another Church for the subjects of Napoleon III. If, then, the "United Church of England and Ireland" be indeed the ONE society spoken of by our Toronto cotemporary, the duty of all Christians, throughout the world, to unite themselves with it—to submit to its authority in matters of faith and discipline—and to acknowledge Queen Victoria as, under God, "Supreme Head and Governor" of the ONE outward and visible society called the Church of Christ—is, no doubt, "plain." What our Anglican friend however has not succeeded in making "plain," is, that the said "United Church of England and Ireland" Established by Law, is the "ONE outward and visible society" established eighteen hundred years ago by our Lord and His Apostles. When the Toronto Church shall have done this, but not till then, may he expect both Romanists, and Methodists, to tender it their spiritual allegiance.

In conclusion, let us submit to our Toronto cotemporary, a little difficulty into which the perusal of his article, on the Church, and—the "plain duty of all Christians"—has thrown us; and which, we trust, he will solve.

According to the Toronto Church's theory, there must have been in existence, at the commencement of the XVI. century—ONE outward and visible society—founded fifteen hundred years before that period, by our Lord Himself and His Apostles, and ruled by His appointed servants—with which ONE outward and visible society our Lord was then; and ever had been, present—against which the gates of Hell had never prevailed—and with which it was the "plain duty" of all Christians to unite themselves; and from which therefore it was inexcusable for any one to separate himself, on any pretense whatsoever. Now, here is our difficulty. Either that great religious organisation, known in history as the Roman Catholic Church—and which, with the exception of the Greek Church, was the only society then existing that so much as professed to be that "ONE outward and visible society," or Church founded by our Lord Himself—was what she professed to be, or she was not.

I. If she was—what judgment must we pass on those who separated themselves from the Roman Catholic Church?

II. If she was not—what other "ONE outward and visible society" then existing, was?

III. To what ONE, pre-existing, outward and visible society did the Reformers, who separated themselves from the ONE great religious organisation, or society, called the Roman Catholic Church, unite themselves? We pause for a reply.

A rather lively controversy has for some time been carried on betwixt our respected cotemporaries, the Boston Pilot, and the Catholic Citizen of Toronto, on the advantages offered by British North America to the Irish emigrant. Whilst the latter very justly, we think, calls the attention of the Irish Catholic to the superior merits of Canada, the Boston Pilot, with a very pardonable enthusiasm for the honor of his native land, insists upon giving the preference to the United States. The question is a very interesting one; and highly important, not only to the emigrant, but to the fortunes of Catholicity in the New World. To us it seems to resolve itself into the question—"In which country—the Canadas or the United States—will the Irish Catholic immigrant find the greater facilities for practising his religion, and transmitting to his children his ancestral faith?" Viewed in this light—remembering how numerous are the defections amongst her Irish children settled in the United States, that the Church has had to deplore—looking too at the irreligious and anti-Catholic system of education which almost universally obtains in the neighboring Republic, and at the anti-Catholic bigotry of the different States' Legislatures—we heartily coincide in opinion with the Catholic Citizen, that the United States do not, at the present moment—hold out many inducements to the Irish Catholic emigrant who desires above all things to serve God, and to bring up his children as good Catholics.

But the Boston Pilot, shirking somewhat the religious side of the question, appeals to national and political prejudices. "It is Paradoxical—very"—says our Boston cotemporary—"that people who have heretofore been most clamorous in their denunciations of British tyranny, British hatred of Catholicity, British hatred of the Celtic race, should now be foremost in the same movement to place that same religion, and that same race, under the beneficent rule of the same tyranny." It seems to us that the "Paradox" consists in the false stating of the question by the Boston Pilot; and that upon the same principles as those upon which "British tyranny," &c., have been denounced, "American tyranny, American hatred of Catholicity, and American hatred of the Celtic race" might be denounced in still stronger terms.

In truth however, the hatred, whether of Britons or Americans, towards the Irish Celt has its origin entirely in religious, and not in any national or political differences; and instead of "British tyranny," "American hatred," &c., we should read "Protestant tyranny, Protestant hatred," &c. We should then have merely to decide whether American Protestantism is one with whit less hostile to Celtic Catholicity, than is British Protestantism. Unless the Boston Pilot can answer this question in the affirmative, his allusions to "British" hostility are perfectly irrelevant.

Yet, even upon secular and political grounds—abstraction being made of the religious element—we contend, in common with many other of our Irish Catholic cotemporaries, that here in British North America, with its modified monarchical institutions, the immigrant, whether Celt or Saxon, Catholic or Protestant, will find himself in possession of a far greater amount of freedom, personal and political, than he would, if settled in the United States; and that, because of our British connexion, and the wholesome restraint which our monarchical institutions—sadly impaired as they have been—still impose upon democratic despotism. We desire to say nothing against the political institutions of our neighbors; but we may be pardoned if we give the preference to our own, as giving to those who live under them, more ample security from mob violence and mob persecution, than can be enjoyed under the more popular system of the United States—a system, which however beautiful in theory, in practice but too often degenerates into the most absolute despotism that the world has ever witnessed. Law in the United States, is no longer the synonym of right. It is but the expression of the will of a brute majority for the time being; and he who is subject to the Will of any—save God—whether it be to the Will of one, or the Will of a million, is a slave. In Russia he is the slave of a monarchical, in the United States of a polyarchical, despotism. Of the two, the latter is the more cruel, the more hopeless, and the more debasing.

But to the Irish Catholic, the political aspect of

the question, is less important than the religious; and if he is truly wise he will be guided in the choice of his future home, by spiritual, rather than by temporal, motives. He will therefore, doubtless, call to mind, that the "tyranny" and "hatred" to which the Boston Pilot refers, are of Protestant, and not necessarily of British origin; and that—in that he has been evil treated—it has been, not as an Irishman, not as a Celt, but as a Catholic, and as a Papist. So true is this, that the worst enemies of Ireland and Irishmen have ever been, not Britons, but Irishmen—traitors to their country, because first of all apostates from their country's faith. Hence the proverb, "If you want to roast an Irishman, you will always find a dozen Irishmen ready to turn the spit." Orangemen and Protestants, whether Celts or Saxons, are the real tyrants of Ireland, and the implacable enemies of all true Irishmen. The curse then of Ireland is not British connexion, but "Protestant Ascendancy,"—and the latter is, as the Boston Pilot must admit, and as all the Acts of the different States' Legislatures testify, rampant throughout the great Republic.

And we would ask again—amongst whom, in what class of society, does the anti-Catholic, and therefore anti-Irish, prejudice, chiefly obtain? We hesitate not to answer—Not amongst the aristocratic classes of Great Britain, and the supporters of monarchical and aristocratic institutions. These may be bad enough; but they are not the prime movers in the anti-Catholic crusade; and their sin consists chiefly in this—that they so widely echo the brutal howl, and but too faithfully reflect the rabid bigotry, of the Protestant middling and commercial classes, and of Protestant democracy. Neither monarchy nor aristocracy is so hostile to Catholicity—and therefore to the Irish Catholic—as is democracy or modern liberalism. It is the Protestant democracy of Great Britain that speaks by the mouth of a Spooner and a Chambers; just as on this Continent, it is Protestant democracy that wrecks churches, burns convents, passes "Church Property Bills," and inspires the gallant "Smelling Committee" of the Massachusetts Legislature.

But whatever the faults of the British Government in the Old World, and from whatsoever causes proceeding, how, would we ask, has it treated its Catholic subjects in the New? For this after all is the real question at issue. And here again we hesitate not to reply that, if its conduct has not been altogether irreproachable, it must still—we do not say compare, but contrast most favorably with the Government of the United States. If, for instance, the Irish Catholics of Upper Canada have still grievances to complain of in the matter of education, those grievances are as nothing, when compared with those under which their fellow-countrymen and co-religionists labor in the land of civil and religious liberty: and, such as they are, they proceed from, and are perpetuated by, not the British Government and its agents—but from, and by, the anti-Catholic rancor of our half-Yankeefied Canadian Protestants, and the obstacles which Protestant democracy opposes to the good intentions of a Government which, we sincerely believe, is desirous of acting equitably towards all its subjects. It is not—we repeat it advisedly—it is not from our British connexion, from British monarchy, or British aristocracy—that the grievances of the Catholics of Upper Canada proceed. If, in that section of the Province, Catholics have still to complain of a most iniquitous school system, we must blame—not Lord Elgin, nor the present Governor-General, nor even Sir A. McNab and his colleagues—but our Canadian Protestant demagogues; whose scarcely concealed policy is to establish "Protestant Ascendancy" in this country, by assimilating all our institutions, social and political, to those of the model republic which the Boston Pilot holds up to the admiration of the intending Irish Catholic emigrant. Now, as "Protestant Ascendancy" is the real curse of Ireland, and not "British tyranny" or "British connexion"—and as in fact, the permanence of our British connexion is, humanly speaking, the best safeguard against "Protestant Ascendancy" in Canada—there is no "Paradox" in the advice given by the Catholic Citizen and his cotemporaries, to the Irish emigrant casting about him in search of a home. We recommend Canada, because, thanks to our British connexion, and our numerous French Catholic population, the curse of "Protestant Ascendancy" in Canada, is at present impossible. The "Paradox" of the Boston Pilot is a "Paradox" to those only who allow themselves to be blinded by a morbid hatred of Great Britain—or rather, of Great Britain's monarchical and aristocratic institutions; and who falsely attribute to those causes the anti-Catholic legislation which still disgraces her Statute Book. Recent events have however shown that Protestant republicans, and Protestant democrats, are far more dangerous enemies and bitter persecutors of Catholics, than Protestant Monarchs, or Lords and Barons—and that democratic Protestantism is a more loathsome tyrant even than British aristocratic Protestantism. Now as it is as Catholics, and not as Irishmen, that Celtic Papists are persecuted, it stands to reason that they have far less to dread from "British tyranny" in Canada than from "Yankeefie tyranny" in the United States. Our advice then to Irish Catholics is—stop at home in Ireland if you can. If you must emigrate, select for your future home that country which is least subject to Protestant influences.

CHILD MURDER IN PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Our readers will find, by referring to the TRUE WITNESS of the 2nd and 9th of March, a translation of an interesting article on the "INSTITUTE OF THE HOLY CHILDHOOD"—a Catholic society expressly founded for rescuing the children of heathen China from the cruel fate to which they are exposed by their