

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 Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—

Quebec.—Mr. Mathew Enright, 24, Mountain St.
Sorel.—Mr. Robert McAndrew.
Three-Rivers.—Mr. John Keenan.
Terrebonne.—M. Prevost, Esq., N. P.
St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. Patrick Flynn.
Alexandria.—D. McGillis.
Oshawa.—Rev. Mr. J. B. Proulx.
Picton, C. W.—Rev. Mr. Lalor.
Toronto.—Mr. Thomas Hayes.
Norwood.—Rev. Mr. Bernard J. Higgins.
Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. Stuart McDonald.
Perth, C. W.—Mr. John Doran.
Bytown.—Mr. Ewd. Burke.
Carillon.—A. E. Montmarquet, Esq.
Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. Jas. Doyle.
Dundas County.—Mr. Alex. McDonald, (Ich).
Brantford, C. W.—Mr. John Comerford.
Eastern Townships.—Mr. Patrick Hackett.
Chambly.—Mr. John Hackett.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 20, 1850.

CATHOLIC AND GOVERNMENT BISHOPS.

The excitement occasioned by what the white-crawatted gentry term the "Papal aggression," has as yet by no means subsided in England. In the discussion of this, all other questions are, for the time, forgotten. Prussia and Austria may settle their disputes as best they may; Protectionists may harangue against Free Trade, and no man regardeth them. John Bull has fairly gone mad. A Cardinal's hat and a few Catholic Bishops have goaded the hoarse creature to desperation. He could stand the presence well enough of the old government Bishops, but real Bishops are more than he can possibly bear. We will not have this man to reign over us,—for "we have no king but Cæsar" is now, as it was 1800 years ago, the cry of those to whom obedience to Christ seems as a mean submission to a foreign power. Alas, how true it is that God, speaking thro' His Church, has long been a foreign power to England! and, naturally, the re-assertion of His rights must appear to those who acknowledge no king but Cæsar, no spiritual authority except that of the Queen, a most unwarrantable assumption. As in the days of that evangelical man, Titus Oates, and of poor Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, when all good Protestants went to bed under the firm conviction that they were to arise in the morning with their throats cut, so do their equally simple descendants seem to dread that some fine morning they may awake, but to find themselves converted to the faith of Christ. "Insolent aggression" is the mildest term applied to the acts of our beloved father, Pius IX., by which he has restored the Catholic Hierarchy in England. "Insolent aggression:" so of old it must have seemed, when the first bishop planted his episcopal chair at Rome, without the consent of Cæsar,—so it must have appeared to the Ephesians, when Timothy—to the Cretans, when Titus—were appointed bishops over them, without the permission of the civil powers. Still more "insolent" must have been the aggression of a Gregory, when he sent Augustin to the shores of Kent, and more impudent the assumption, when a Pope presumed to transfer the primacy from London to Canterbury. For, if a Pope in the xix. century has no right, then it is clear that in the seventh century, the Popes had not the right to transfer the primacy; and all the Archbishops of Canterbury downwards—Lanfranc, Thomas A Becket, and all—have been nothing more than pretenders to a dignity, to which they had no lawful claim. Whatever powers the Pope may have, are derived from God, and are the same now as they were 1200 years ago. Man did not confer them. Man cannot take away or diminish them; what is an usurpation now, was no less an usurpation then. We may be told that there is a difference betwixt the times of Victoria and of Ethelbert,—that now there does exist a regular apostolically-descended Hierarchy in England, and that then there was none. To this we answer, that the Catholic Church has never and never can recognize the claims of the gentlemen who are called

Bishops of the Church of England, to the sacerdotal character. With every respect for the individuals, as gentlemen of amiable lives and high literary attainments, a Catholic can see in them nothing more than laymen, although he admits their claims to be considered as the Government Bishops of a Church, not by God, but by law, established; and, therefore, out of respect to the feelings, or prejudices, of the members of this Church, the Pope has created Bishoprics, with new titles. As the *Times* says, the Queen of England can alone make a Bishop of the Church of England. Most true: and that because it is the Church of England. If it were the Church of Christ, the civil power would have no more to do with the making of Bishops, than had the Roman Emperors with the consecration of a Titus or a Timothy.

But it is now pretty generally admitted that the recent ecclesiastical appointments are in violation of no existing statute. Parliament will perhaps be applied to for the re-enactment of new penal laws. Should these pass, the triumph of Catholicity will be complete. They cannot be enforced, and Catholics, obedient in all things lawful, to the civil power, will hold them in derision, remembering that it is better to obey God than man. Elizabeth might threaten to unfrock the prelate that she had made, as, certainly, she had the full right to do; but all the Acts of Parliament that bigotry can pass, will never be able to un-consecrate a Bishop of Beverley or of Westminster, and any acts of violence exercised towards their persons will but increase the love and veneration which the faithful bear and will render to the true pastors of the true fold of Christ.

The no-popey agitation is beginning to produce the natural results. At Cheltenham, the Protestants have mobbed the Catholic chapel, and were only prevented from utterly destroying it, by the interference of the police. At Birkenhead, we regret to say, the Catholics have retaliated. Rendered furious by the insults heaped upon their faith, a numerous body of *navvies* have taken what the English papers term a sad revenge for the Protestant orgies. Several policemen, who in vain attempted to disperse the mob, have been severely injured, and peace was at last restored solely by the noble exertions of the Catholic Clergy. In the meantime, the Bishops have addressed pastorals to their people, earnestly exhorting them to peace and brotherly love. The Government Bishops, for their part, have not been idle. Meetings have been held in every part of the country, where a great deal of breath has been wasted, and many violent resolutions passed, to which, we think, Pius IX. will pay no very great attention. One protest, especially, by the Bishop of Oxford, is very funny, and puts one in mind of the cry of the fig vendor in Constantinople, and his solemn exordium—"In the name of the Prophet—Figs." In Scotland, the agitation is spreading far and wide, and all the old women have been very severe upon the Man of Sin, and the Son of Perdition. In a few weeks, it is to be expected that the present fury will abate. Common sense will assert its rights; and when the good people see that all they can say or do cannot prevent the establishment of a Catholic Hierarchy in England, or the spread of true religion, they will quietly put up with what they cannot help. "It is hard for them to kick against the goad."

THE MONTREAL GAZETTE AND THE NUNS.

Commenting upon the disgraceful riots which have lately occurred at St. Grégoire, and which all men equally condemn and deplore, the editor of the *Montreal Gazette* presumes to speak of the ignorance of the French Canadians generally. He should remember the old proverb that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones," and that it does not become a native of England or Scotland, the former, perhaps, the most uneducated, and the latter, certainly, with the exception of Sweden, the most immoral, of all European nations—to speak about the ignorance of the French Canadians, more especially when a great part of the property which the piety of their ancestors had consecrated to educational purposes, has been taken from them, under the pretence of the rights of conquest. If prudence would have commanded a discreet silence upon these topics, a regard to truth, supposing that the editor of the *Montreal Gazette* did possess such a commodity, would have prevented him from writing the following—

"The Seminaries of Quebec and Montreal received their enormous properties for the purpose of educating the people. The Jesuits received theirs for the same purpose. The numerous bodies of Nuns received theirs for the same end also. The amount of the grants was sufficient to have established schools in all parts of the country, as it always has been sufficient to support a large number of men and women. They, however, have preferred to expend the proceeds in raising enormous piles of building in the cities, and in living

together in communities, than to dotting the country with schools, and scattering themselves as local teachers in them."

We are well aware that amongst our Protestant brethren there prevails an immense amount of ignorance concerning the origin and the disposition of the property held by the Catholic religious corporations. But such ignorance is inexcusable and incredible upon the part of a writer in the public journals, and no amount of charity can prevent us from believing that the passage which we have just quoted was dictated by a mean jealousy of those establishments, whose supposed wealth the writer envies, and whose good works he hates because he cannot imitate. We intend to show the falsity of his assertions, and the malice of his insinuations. And first, we deny that the Seminary of Montreal (for to Montreal at present are our remarks confined) received its property for the purpose of education. The St. Sulpicians, as we have had occasion to shew before, have received gratuitous grants of *no property whatsoever*. They paid the full value for both the Seigneuries which they hold. One of the conditions annexed to the ordinance of 1840, is, that they shall support schools for children *within* the parish of Montreal. We have shown how nobly the gentlemen of the Seminary have fulfilled this obligation, having expended within the last nine years £21,141 for the purchase of sites for, and in building school-houses in Montreal, in which a gratuitous education is given to nearly 3000 children, at an annual expense of about £1500. The remarks of the *Montreal Gazette*, as applied to the Seminary of Montreal, are thus shewn to be deliberately false.

Of the other religious communities in Montreal, one only has for its object the giving of education—*La Congrégation de Notre Dame*. The others are, and were intended solely as, hospitals for the aged and infirm, as the Hôtel Dieu, the Grey Nunnery, and the Providence Convents, or for the reformation of abandoned women, as the Bon Pasteur. Now, of these none have ever received any grants of property from government. The property they hold, is, in every case, either the gift of private individuals, or purchased with monies, the fruit of the labor and economies of the inmates of the Convents. The Hôtel Dieu alone received from the Hundred Associates, in the person of Mdlle. Mance, about 1660, a grant of land, in lieu of a debt of 20,000L. due by the said Company to Mdlle. Mance, for monies lent, and the Grey Nunnery receives annually a small pittance from Government, in aid of the Foundling department of that hospital. Now, these are facts which we defy the *Montreal Gazette* or any one else to contradict. Let it, if it can, prove that any part of the property held by the religious communities in Montreal, is a grant of public property made either by the French or British Governments. And now a few words more about the Congregation, the only one of the communities established for the purposes of education. This community was founded in 1653, for the purpose of educating girls both in town and country. Its entire property consists of some land at the Point St. Charles and St. Paul's Island, purchased (1670) with monies, the private property of the Sisters before they joined the community. It is also with the sums of money which each Sister contributes upon her entry to the community, and termed dowry, increased by the generous gifts of some private individuals, and the proceeds of the labor of the Nuns, that the Convent was rebuilt in 1844, and the shops which hold of it. The community is composed of 148 professed Nuns and 24 Novices. Of these, 115 are actually employed as teachers in different schools, 79 in the 24 country Missions, and 36 in the schools of this city and its suburbs, in which a gratuitous education is given to all who present themselves. The number of girls thus gratuitously educated is 4500. The only assistance which this community has received from government has been the trifling sum of about £50 annually paid by the School Commissioners, in accordance with the provisions of the act. Here then is a plain statement of facts, giving the lie direct to every one of the *Montreal Gazette's* assertions. The property which the *Congrégation de Notre Dame* holds, is not a grant from any public property, and the Sisters do not live together in community, but are scattered over the face of the country as local teachers.

The other religious establishments having nothing to do with educational purposes, it is not necessary for us at present to go into any history of the origin or disposition of their property,—none of which was granted out of public property,—though we are ever ready to afford information when requisite. The right hand should not know what the left hand giveth, and our Catholic religious communities would fain do their good works in secret, that their Father who is in Heaven may reward them openly. Yet if they seek not publicity, nor sound a trumpet when they do alms, they shrink not from investigation of the most minute; they court not, yet they will not decline enquiry. The *Montreal Gazette* thought fit to attack them—let him—if he can make good his assertions or contradict ours. He can do neither, and must submit once more to be branded as a calumniator.

The *Montreal Witness*, in alluding to some remarks made by Dr. Brownson upon the notorious immorality of Protestant countries, asks us—what must be the immorality of Catholic countries in which horse-races, fireworks, and lotteries, are tolerated by the Church upon the Sabbath day? We believe that in the cant of the conventicle, the Lord's Day, or Sunday, is generally meant by the word—Sabbath. As the witness to the above-mentioned enormities is an anonymous correspondent of that very respectable,

—and remarkable for its love of truth,—paper, the *N. Y. Evangelist*, such statements are not entitled to much credit. However, we will accept them as if they were true, and ask of the *Montreal Witness* to prove the immorality of the acts described. We are no advocates of horse-racing, lotteries, or any kind of gambling, but fireworks we have been accustomed to look upon as pretty and certainly very innocent pageants. But, perhaps the immorality consists not in the acts themselves, but in the fact of their taking place on a Sunday. Now, as to the day, we defy the *Montreal Witness* to prove that any act, innocent of a Monday, is guilty when committed upon the Sunday, or to give any authority from the book he is so fond of pretending to understand, why the first day of the week should be observed as a day of abstinence from business or amusement. It will be no answer to say that, by the Mosaic law, the seventh day was sanctified unto the Lord. We are speaking not of the seventh, but of the first day of the week, and if the law is fulfilled by sanctifying one day in seven, according to the principle of Protestantism, that is, of private judgment, a man has a right to judge for himself which day of the seven he will sanctify. The Protestant will not surely be so inconsistent as to plead human authority. Next, we would remark, that the amusements, the indulging in which is pronounced immoral, were sanctioned, not by the Church, but by the Tusculan municipality. The commands of the Church, as to the time and manner of sanctifying one day in seven, are clear enough. If men break them, the fault is theirs. On the Sunday, the Church enjoins the assisting at the offices of the Church, and a total abstinence from all servile works. All acts immoral or tending to cause immorality are forbidden, not on Sunday only, but on every day of the week. But it behoves not the Protestant, who cannot produce any authority for the observance of the first day of the week, except the authority of a Church which he denies, to find fault with the manner in which Catholics spend that day. In this we see the old puritanical leaven bursting out. Morality, with the Puritans, consisted, not in the observance of chastity, temperance, and the weightier matters of the law, but in a fantastic and judaical observance of what they termed the Sabbath. To look gloomy, to abstain from all rational amusements, to sit out (by way of penance) three or four hours of a weary discourse delivered by one who, professing the right of private judgment and the absence of all human authority on matters of faith, yet has the consummate impudence to set himself up as a religious teacher—these constitute, in the eyes of many, the whole duties of man. Horrid creed! How many little children are driven to the verge of madness by these cruel Sabbaths! How many are taught to dread death, not because of the fear of Hell—their young minds are yet ignorant of vice—but from fear of Heaven, which they have been told is a *perpetual Sabbath!* Associating in their tender minds the idea of Sabbath with the days of wretchedness and gloom which they have undergone on earth, many are almost driven to sin in the hopes of escaping such a Heaven. Not so with Catholics. To those at least who observe the Sunday in the manner which the Church enjoins, it is a day of pleasantness, whose hours are hours of peace.

When the *Montreal Witness* shall have proved that acts, innocent on Tuesday, are unlawful upon the Sunday, we will give him our opinions respecting the offences alleged to have taken place by authority of the Tusculan municipality; and, in the meantime, we venture to doubt whether lotteries or fireworks, on a Sunday evening, are worse than the drunkenness and prostitution which, from "early dawn to dewy eve," disgrace the streets of Edinburgh and Glasgow, on Sundays perhaps even more than upon the other days of the week.

The *Pilot* is at us again, because of our remarks upon the "Godless Colleges," and our assertion that the system of mixed education, is education without religion. The learned editor has yet to learn that the "fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," which fear, certainly, cannot be inculcated in any educational establishment in which no religious education is given. We can easily understand that Protestants do not and cannot perceive the dangers to which the Catholic is exposed by the system of which the *Pilot* approves. Protestantism, which is a mere negation, runs no risk by coming in contact with other forms of negation. But, with Catholicity, which is an affirmation, the case is very different. The difference betwixt one Protestant and another, even down to him who denies the existence of a God, is only a difference of degree. But the difference betwixt the Catholic and the Protestant of any denomination, is a difference of kind. Hence the danger to which the former is exposed. Nor should Protestants wonder, if Catholics are averse to entrust the education of their children to schools over which their Church has not *supreme*, or over which Protestants have *any* control; there is in this nothing unreasonable; what they ask for themselves they are willing should be accorded to Protestants, with whose educational establishments they do not presume to interfere.

The *Pilot* thinks that the Church should not have supreme control over the education of her children. He may enjoy his opinion, but he should not attempt to force it down the throats of Catholics. All that we contend for, is, that Catholics be not compelled to contribute to a system which their Church and conscience condemns—a demand often made by the Dissenters in England. Any plea upon the score of necessity, which can be set up for compulsory