

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAUGHTS 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, Gilfillan & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacrament Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The third reading of the Income Tax Bill has been carried by a majority of 185 to 55; some additional clauses were added to the Bill on the motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and it was then finally passed. In announcing the resignation of Messrs. Keogh, Sadler & Co., last week, we gave these gentlemen credit for a good deal more honesty and manliness than they really possess. The resignations were indeed tendered; but as a sham only, by way of keeping up appearances, and were withdrawn almost as soon as tendered. The dog has returned to its vomit; the washed sow to its wallowing in the mire; and Irish members of Parliament, calling themselves Catholics, submit to the ineffable degradation of holding place under a Johnny Russell administration. The best part of the joke is, the correspondence and explanations that passed between these upright Irish representatives and their ministerial chief. In accusing Irish Catholics of disloyalty, "Lord John Russell is to be understood in a Pickwickian sense, and the sentiments complained of are not shared by the other members of government." This is the sum and substance of Lord Aberdeen's explanation, which is received by the needy and unscrupulous place hunters, as very satisfactory indeed, and with the assurance that they will continue to draw their salaries, and put up patiently with Lord John Russell's insults to their religion, as usual. Truly these men are meek, and as such ought to inherit something handsome.

The agitation against the "Ladies Bedrooms Inspection Bill" is rapidly gaining ground throughout the British Empire. A requisition, signed by Lords Kenmare, Southwell, Bellew, and by Catholic gentlemen of all ranks, and of every profession, has been put forth, calling a monster meeting for Monday the 15th inst., to protest against the meditated outrage upon liberty and decency. Throughout England and Scotland also, meetings with a similar object are about to be held; and there are good reasons for hoping that the excitement will be so general and so strong, that the measure will be dropped. In the present critical circumstances, with the danger of a European war imminent, the British legislature will see that it is not prudent to alienate the affections of eight million of British subjects for the sake of pandering to the depraved tastes of a few Exeter Hall fools and fanatics. It is indeed difficult to conceive how any men, not utterly destitute of every gentlemanly feeling, can for a moment entertain the beastly propositions of Mr. Chamber's Bill—a Bill which authorises the irresponsible nominees of a Protestant government officer, to break into any young lady's bedroom, thrust out all her attendants, all witnesses, all friends, all protectors, all relatives and guardians, and then and there, to put such immodest questions to his victim, and take such indecent liberties with her, as in his brutality he may think fit; with the power moreover—if she should manifest any maiden unwillingness to answer his filthy queries, or should resist his beastly advances—to send her for six months to the House of Correction to herd with thieves and prostitutes. This is the treatment with which the Catholic ladies of England are menaced; and the unmanly ruffians who advocate it, call themselves friends of "Civil and Religious Liberty." They have not the courage to propose that the exercise of the Catholic religion be proscribed by statute; or that the old Protestant laws, for racking, burning, hanging, and cutting the bowels out of Popish Priests guilty of saying Mass, should be revived: this would be too bold and manly a line of conduct for the Spooners and Chambers of the XIX century. The latter are as intolerant, as cruel, and as dishonest, as their Protestant predecessors, but they have not the same audacity in their villainy. So instead of legislating directly against Catholicity, they attack it indirectly, by passing laws subjecting its female professors, to such beastly and unmanly insults, as no woman with a spark of modesty or decency about her, will ever submit to. By these truly Protestant means, the modern Protestant gentlemen of England hope to banish all Catholic schools, hospitals, and charitable asylums from the realm, and thereby put a stop to the alarming increase of Popery, which, if not checked by legal enactment, must soon carry every thing before it. But we cannot believe that this most monstrous measure will ever pass into a law, or that, if passed, it can ever be enforced. We all know how—in the days of Richard II—a "commissioner," who availed himself of his "privileges as a public officer" to put certain extraordinary questions to an English maiden, was treated by an indignant father. The old spirit which nerved the arm of that stout Anglo-Saxon blacksmith, is not dead amongst the Catholics of England—there are still fathers and brothers who will defend their daughters and sisters from pollution, even at the risk of their lives.

The Eastern question seems as far from a satisfactory solution as ever. The utmost that can be said is, that it is hoped that peace may still be preserved; but the fact that war is not only probable, but at this moment apparently inevitable, cannot be concealed. By the *Baltic*, we learn that after a few

days' delay, Russia had reiterated her demands upon Turkey, accompanied with the threat of forcibly occupying the Danubian principalities if these demands were not complied with. The most cordial understanding seems to prevail betwixt the French and English governments, and the fleets of both nations are in the vicinity of the Dardanelles, ready to act as circumstances may require. Russia is augmenting her armaments, and has a large naval force, ready for service, in the Black Sea. It is generally considered that the invasion, by the last named power, of the Danubian principalities will be the signal for a general war.

Mr. Drummond was applauded for saying, in his place in Parliament, on the occasion of the Garazzi riots at Quebec, that it was perfectly lawful for a citizen to defend his house, and to fire upon, and shoot, any person attempting by force to break in. The thesis—"that under certain circumstances, there is no more sin in shooting a fellow creature than in shooting a mad dog"—in the mouth of an Attorney General condemning an attack upon a Protestant place of worship, is a highly laudable thesis, but is a "murderous doctrine" if asserted by a Catholic, of Catholic places of worship, according to the wisecrack of the *Montreal Herald*; who, however, very prudently abstains from entering into any discussion, or stating under what circumstances the TRUE WITNESS asserted the right of every man to use force in repelling outrage and aggression. We are however quite prepared to maintain our thesis, not by appealing to the law of God—for in matters involving an appeal to that law, the TRUE WITNESS and the *Montreal Herald* have no first principles in common, and do not recognise any common means of ascertaining what that law is, or where it is to be found—but by appealing solely to the openly expressed opinions, and the recorded actions, of Protestants themselves. We have thus, quite recently, the publicly and deliberately expressed opinions, of no less a person than the Attorney General for Canada East: and we have little doubt that, if the editor of the *Montreal Herald* were to see a scoundrel breaking, or attempting to break, into the bedroom of his daughter, in order to take indecent liberties with her, he would very soon give practical testimony to the lawfulness, under "certain circumstances," of shooting a fellow creature as he would a mad dog. In fact, that it is the duty of the parent to watch over, and defend at all hazards, the purity of his child, is what no reasonable man will venture to deny; and if the father has reasons to believe that that purity is about to be assailed by indecent actions, or proposals, it is his duty, a duty that he owes to God, and from which no human enactments can absolve him, to risk his life in repelling the assault, no matter from what quarter, or with what pretended authority armed, it may come—God will hold him responsible for the soul of his child. Far be it from us, however, to advocate recourse to force, except in the last extremity; when submission would cease to be a duty, and compliance with the edicts of man would become criminal. The parent has the right to say—"No man shall have a private interview with my daughter. If he has aught to say to her—ought to ask her—let him say it in the presence of her legitimate guardians, and of one of her own sex—let her be examined before the tribunals of her country, openly, and in the face of day." This he has a right to insist upon; and no human legislation can deprive him of this right, for it is based upon the duty, which, as a father, he owes to his God, of watching over the purity of his child. But how, or by what means, he is to enforce this right we do not pretend to determine. The curious will find some speculations of St. Augustine in his work, "*De Civitate Dei*,"—Lib. 1, c. 17, upon the lengths to which it is lawful to go in the defence of chastity; but, as a general rule, the Catholic Church teaches that submission is more excellent than resistance—that it is not enough for the Christian to abstain from sin, but that he must also practise heroic virtue in imitation of his Divine Master—and that, though self-defence is not forbidden, it is more blessed to submit to injuries, persecution, and outrage—so long as submission does not imply criminal compliance—than to use force even in self-defence. But this does not affect the proposition that, under "certain circumstances," it is lawful to use force in repelling outrage and aggression, and in defending life and chastity.

Upon the grounds, however, of self-defence, the *Montreal Herald* prudently declines to meet us. He dare not openly declare that there are "no circumstances" under which it would be lawful for a Christian to defend, even to the shedding of blood, himself, his wife, sister, or daughter, from outrage; nor can he preach the doctrine of non-resistance without thereby formally condemning almost every act of every Protestant sect, since the XVI century. He therefore adopts the more convenient process, of wilfully misrepresenting an adversary whom he can not refute; a process, it must be admitted, far more natural to him, and quite in keeping with the ordinary conduct of the editor of the *Montreal Herald*. "His hypothesis is"—says our unscrupulous cotemporary—"that any human being who refuses obedience to the Church of Rome forfeits his right to existence, and becomes as dangerous to society as a mad dog." To this we content ourselves by replying that when he made the above assertion, the editor of the *Montreal Herald* stated that which he knew to be false; as he did also when he stated that, either Dr. Brownson, or the TRUE WITNESS, had stigmatised all Protestant marriages as concubinage: the only hypothesis upon which we can acquit our cotemporary of deliberate falsehood is, that he is too stupid to understand the plain meaning of words.

And there are grounds for this hypothesis in the article at present lying before us. It is, for instance,

difficult to imagine that any one, intellectually above an idiot, would be guilty of enunciating the following absurdity:—

"Protestantism is the recognition of one supreme and only law, which is contained in, what Romanists as well as Protestants acknowledge to be the revealed word of God."

That a protest can affirm anything, or that a negation can be the logical subject of any predicate, is a discovery in logic, scarcely equalled by the subsequent discovery in theology, that Romanists—we suppose by this phrase our cotemporary means Catholics—and Protestants acknowledge something in common to be the "revealed word of God." Catholics we know—and it is in this that Catholicity essentially consists—recognise the revealed word of God, as contained wholly in the teaching of One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church; whilst Protestants—and it is in this that Protestantism essentially consists—reject, deny, or protest against, this teaching. On the other hand, Protestants, in so far as any Protestants recognise any "revealed word of God" at all, pretend that it is contained in a book, published by her Majesty's authority, but for which Catholics entertain no more respect than they do for the Koran, the Book of Mormon, or Johanna Southcote's ravings. So far then from there being any thing in common betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism, one is the direct contradictory of the other.

But is it the fact that Protestants do recognise any "revealed word of God" at all? or that, if they do, they recognise it as contained in any book, or "written law?" That individual Protestants may do so, we readily admit; not in virtue, or as the logical consequence however, of their protest against the Catholic Church; but that all, or even the majority of intellectual Protestants do so—or that any do so in virtue of their protest, is notoriously false. The theory of the inspiration of the "written law"—to which we suppose our cotemporary alludes—the theory upon which alone that "written law" can be called the "revealed word of God"—is scouted by all the most eminent Protestant theologians of the present day, in Europe and America, in England, Germany and the United States. The Tubingen school of divinity, comprising all the most illustrious names of which European Protestantism can boast, hesitates not to treat the greater portion of that "written law" as a forgery of the second century. In America, not a single Protestant divine of any intellectual distinction, will now-a-days assert its inspiration—and whilst some of the most eminent amongst them, for their talents and eloquence,—as the Rev. Theodore Parker—reject all idea of a "revealed word," other Protestant sects—as the Mormons for instance—assign to King James' "word of God" an authority far inferior to that which they claim for Joe Smith's "word of God." Some Protestant sects, carry their protesting principles a good deal farther. Here for instance is an account of a great Protestant Convention held the other day at Hartford; and though it be the custom of some of our Protestant cotemporaries to sneer at their more logical and consistent co-religionists, we can see no reason why the proceedings and resolutions of the Hartford Convention should not be treated with as much respect as those of the Assembly of Protestant Divines at Westminster, or of any other Protestant Synod whatsoever: in either case they are but the expression of the "private judgment" of fallible individuals. The first speaker at this Hartford Convention was a Mr. or a Rev. Mr. Andrew Jackson Davis—we suppose he has as good a right to tack *Rev.* to his name as another. This gentleman, after protesting like a thorough Protestant, against the authenticity of the Bible and the Christian religion, gave utterance to the following noble, and essentially Protestant sentiments in favor of "liberty of conscience," and the "right of private judgment":—

"We pray and work for liberty, for human love, and the kingdom of heaven, which must necessarily come after all sectarianism is forgotten."—George Brown could not have spoken better—"I would say"—continued the Rev. A. J. Davis—"we should free ourselves from the sectarianism of the Church, from the mythology of the Bible, and from the shrines of superstition and bigotry. Reason is the sovereign of the soul, and truth is the sovereign of reason."

The next speaker, a Mr. W. Freen—we don't know whether to call him Reverend or no—came out equally strong in favor of "private judgment":—

"I have no respect for the Bible as a book; I shall reject what I conceive to be untrue, and uphold what I think true."

The following resolution was carried—and surely no Protestant who asserts "liberty of conscience" and the "right of private judgment," can find any thing therein to condemn:—

"That the Bible, in some parts of the Old and New Testament, sanctions injustice, concubinage, prostitution, oppression, war, plunder and wholesale murder; and therefore the doctrine that the Bible, as a whole, originated from God, is false and injurious to the social and spiritual growth and perfection of man."

Biasphemous as all this must appear to Catholics, we quote it, because the *Montreal Herald* appeals frequently to the fact that the editor of the TRUE WITNESS had the misfortune to be born a Protestant; and because the religious sentiments contained in the above speeches and resolution, are almost precisely the same as those which, as a Protestant, the said writer held. The *Montreal Herald* taxes us with being a "Protestant convert to Romanism" or Catholicity; a fact which we admit, and for which we thank God. The editor of the TRUE WITNESS was a Protestant, and as a Protestant, he claimed, and exercised to the fullest extent, the right of "private judgment"; and so doing came to the inevitable conclusion—that, if his Protestantism were true, Christianity itself must needs be an almighty sham—that, if within a few years after the departure of its founder, Christianity went all to the dogs, and to use the words of the Anglican homilies, the whole world—man, woman and child—relapsed, for eight hundred years and more, into a state of damnable idolatry, it must have been, from the beginning, a precious lum-

bug, and most decidedly not of divine origin, or entitled to the respect of any intelligent being—and that, if the author of a religion would not, or could not, take the necessary precautions to preserve it from such error, he must be deficient, either in goodness or in power, either in intelligence or in virtue, and in neither case worthy of honor or love from man. In a word, common sense convinced the writer—as it must every intelligent Protestant, capable, and not afraid, of exercising the "right of private judgment,"—that it was impossible to deny the indefectibility of the Christian Church, without denying the divine origin of Christianity—and that to admit the fundamental principle of Protestantism—the general corruption of the Church,—was in fact to reject the Christian religion altogether. We trust we may be pardoned these purely private details, upon which we should not have presumed to touch, but for the personal allusions of the *Montreal Herald*, and its ridiculous assertion that "Protestantism is the recognition of one supreme and only law." Were this true, the writer would have recognised this "one supreme and only law" which, as a Protestant, and in consequence of the dictates of his "private judgment," he rejected with contempt, and protested against. The *Montreal Herald* then must be in error, either in its definition of Protestantism, or in its accusation against the editor of the TRUE WITNESS of being a "Protestant convert to Romanism."

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Montreal, June 22nd, 1853.

Sir—The following choice morceau appeared in the *Gazette* of Saturday, the 18th instant:—

"With our French Canadian fellow-subjects we have had no religious differences. There has been the religion *Canadienne*—ours, the religion *Anglaise*, which, like any other distinctive manner or fashion of our race, they deemed might for us be natural and appropriate, though by no means to be adopted by themselves."

That, surely, is rich! The religion of the Canadians is "*la religion Canadienne*," not the Catholic religion, which is, in all countries, the same, but a sort of religion peculiar to the soil,—a religion of Canadian growth. But what follows is still better: "*La religion Anglaise* which, like any other distinctive manner or fashion of our race," &c. Then the "*religion Anglaise*" is a mere matter "of fashion, like any other fashion peculiar to the English race." This sentiment is worthy of a man who deems religion of secondary importance. Then again, according to the *Gazette*, the "*religion Canadienne*" is nothing better. If Canadians permit their religion to be treated in this manner without a retort, it is plain that all the religion they possess is not worth much; that, like the "*religion Anglaise*," it is a mere matter of fashion, as changeable as the form of their dresses.—God preserve us, Irish Catholics, from such a humbug as the "*religion Canadienne*," or "*religion Anglaise*," of the *Gazette*. After such grand lucubrations, there cannot be much danger to public morals, and to society, in allowing the contributors to the above journal all that they contend for, under the title, "liberty of speech." However, what they contend for, under the title "liberty of speech," cannot be so safely allowed to Gavazzi, Jenkins, Taylor, Wilkes, Campell & Co., as the harmless inventors of "*La religion Canadienne*." It is not for liberty, but for an unbridled license of speech, they contend; it is this that has been practised, by the last four above-named worthies, prominent leaders in the French Canadian Missionary Society, for years. Their addresses teemed with slanders against the morals of Catholics, their clergy, and their virtuous nuns, and this with the view to produce in the public mind contempt for the Catholic religion, its practices, and its members. Every one in Montreal can attest the truth of what I assert. But as if all this was not enough, they were not ashamed to invite a fomentor of sedition, a rebel, the notorious Gavazzi, amongst us, in order to give a greater semblance of truth to their infamous slanders. This is what the *Gazette* calls "liberty of speech," but I call licence. The standard of morals, in a country where such unbridled liberty of speech, as that practised by Gavazzi and the Swiss missionaries, is permitted, must be low indeed. Plutarch observes that "Agesilaus, censuring the forward license of those who inhabited Asia, the manners of that nation being corrupt, was wont to say, 'that those amongst them, who had been immoral, were free; on the contrary, that those who had been virtuous were slaves; because where every thing was allowed, virtue was held in abhorrence.'" Does the *Gazette* then contend for a principle reprobated by the pagan Agesilaus? and are we to believe that that wise Greek had more virtue than an English Protestant?—Yet this is what must be conceded by those who adopt that Editor's principle as to liberty of speech.—He may talk about Catholic intolerance. Let him show us where or when have Protestant governments ever left the Catholic Church unfettered? Let him tell us was there much toleration in the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill? Is there much toleration in the Bill of Mr. Chambers for the inspection of Nunneries and Catholic houses? What is the amount of toleration given by the "Swiss Radicals" to the poor Catholics of Friburg? We would thank the *Gazette* to reply to these queries, before he says any more in defence of the Protestant "acum" that went armed to Gavazzi's lecture, piously thirsting for the blood of their Catholic fellow-citizens; and who, coming out of the church, fired on the people without any necessity, after they had been driven away by the police from the vicinity of Zion church, against which not a stone was cast, nor any assault made; and this is what the *Gazette* calls "victoriously repulsing the mob." Such language is like the crowing of a cock after swallowing a worm. In this day's issue the same journal says:—

"In Ireland; the addresses of the Bishops and Priests are fierce denunciations of the Saxon, and hatred of the Protestant system."

All this we know to be a lie; but even if it were true, we see no reason why we should love the Protestant system; nor do we think ourselves under any special obligation to be grateful to what some are pleased to call our "paternal Saxon rulers."

AN IRISH CATHOLIC.

We would venture to dissent from some of the views implied by our correspondent. We cannot, for instance, agree with him as to the propriety, or policy, of putting, in a mixed community like ours, any restrictions upon what is popularly termed "li-