

## 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.

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1851.

We almost regret that want of space prevents us from publishing the greater part at least, of a lengthy letter, addressed to Lord John Russell, and signed by *John of Toronto*, the said magic characters, being intended to denote, no less a person, than Dr. Strachan, Her Most Gracious Majesty's Bishop of Toronto. We say we regret being unable to reproduce it; for the tender yearnings, and longing aspirations; after an extension of the provisions of the Penal Laws to this colony, which it contains, would, we think, amuse our Catholic readers, and excite their gratitude towards the august individual, who manifests such regard for their welfare; and surely, if a brave man, struggling with unmerited adversity, be an object upon which the Immortals look with admiration, then *John of Toronto*, struggling with his vanity, wounded by the audacious aggression, of that *bête noir*, the Pope, and at last yielding to the dictates of common sense, as portrayed in this letter, must present a spectacle, upon which our readers might well desire to gaze. Thus it came to pass, in *John of Toronto's* own words. Shortly after Her Most Gracious Majesty, in virtue of that spiritual authority, conferred upon her by—Lord knows whom, had been graciously pleased to erect Toronto into a Protestant Episcopal See, and to cause to be consecrated, and appointed thereunto, a Protestant Bishop, His Holiness the Pope, in virtue of that spiritual authority, which has been transmitted to him from the Prince of the Apostles, had the presumption to create a See of Toronto likewise, and to appoint as Pastor thereof, a real Catholic Bishop, with the title of, Bishop of Toronto. Hereupon, the Queen's John was very angry, and thought of complaining to those high ecclesiastical dignitaries, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the President of the Red Tape, and Sealing Wax Office. But *John of Toronto* bethought him, of what befell poor dear Dr. Broughton of Australia, in similar circumstances, and what fun was made of the honest man's complaints; he reflected,—that a part of the contumely, and derision, which were lavished upon an Anglican Bishop at the Antipodes, might also fall to his share; and that it was better to bear patiently the ill he had, than fly to others which he knew not of. Dr. Strachan was quite right: and if his prudent determination has robbed the public of much amusement, it has certainly spared His Lordship a good deal of ridicule. *John of Toronto* is very well as he is. In so far as the Queen can make a Bishop, or an Act of Parliament supply the want of Apostolic orders, *John of Toronto* is a Protestant Bishop to all intents and purposes. Not a Catholic Bishop indeed, for that is a very different thing. Bishops in the Catholic Church derive their authority from Christ, and not from the Queen; they are distinguished from other men, by something more than an apron, or a large salary; for instance, a Catholic Bishop is distinguished by not being a creature of the Government, but by being a descendant of the Apostles; by having no connection with the State in spirituals, and by not allowing the dogmas of his Church, to be set aside, by some treasury clerk; or her Articles of Faith to be drawn up by some Downing Street underling. Protestant Bishops, and Catholic Bishops, have each their own sphere of activity, far removed from one another, they need never come into collision. But it is not so much with *John of Toronto's* wounded dignity, that we have to do, as with some very curious mis-statements respecting the amount of property at the disposal of the Catholic Church for educational purposes, and which we here present to our readers. The object of Dr. Strachan is to show cause why the Anglican Establishment should not be despoiled of the Clergy Reserves; and that the Catholic Church, from her great wealth, is a far more fitting object of robbery than the Church of England in the colonies. For this purpose he gives us the following, as the amount of property at present disposable by the Church for educational purposes:—

In regard to education, the means at the disposal of the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Canada, are not merely ample, but munificent, as appears from the following table, quoted from Smith's History of Canada, Vol. 1, Appendix 6:

	Acres of Land.
Ursulines, Quebec, . . . . .	164,616
Ursulines, Three-Rivers, . . . . .	30,909
Recollets, . . . . .	945
Bishop and Seminary at Quebec, . . . . .	693,324
Jesuits, . . . . .	891,845
The Sulpicians, covering the whole island and city of Montreal, considered worth nearly a million, . . . . .	250,191
General Hospital, Quebec, . . . . .	28,497
Do, do, Montreal, . . . . .	404
Hotel Dieu, Quebec, . . . . .	14,112
Sœurs Grises, . . . . .	42,336
	2,117,179.

Had we found the above in some of the usual

no-popery journals, in the columns of the *Montreal Witness*, or some of the other evangelical papers, we should have treated it with the contempt, with which we generally pass over the silly falsehoods of the conventicle. But when John writes lovingly to John, when Toronto cries aloud to Whitehall, and confidential epistolary communications are interchanged betwixt Anglican Bishops and Lords of the Treasury, we may be pardoned if we devote a few lines to pointing out some of the misrepresentations which they contain.

Dr. Strachan is, or at least ought to be, well informed upon the subjects upon which he writes: he is an old resident in the country, and it therefore can hardly be supposed to proceed from ignorance, that he puts down 892,790 acres of land, the confiscated estates of the Jesuits and Recollets, as at the disposal of the Catholic Church, for any purpose whatsoever. It was not honest of *John of Toronto* so to do, neither was it prudent; for the falsity of the assertion is so glaring, that we do not think that he will be able to find two individuals in the colony, silly enough to believe him. We do not think that there is a man, woman, or child, who is not aware, that for many years, the Jesuit and Recollets estates, have been claimed by, and are at the sole disposal of, the Government. But perhaps His Lordship proceeds upon the principle, that in warring against the Church, in defense of the Protestant faith, and Protestant altars, all weapons are lawful. Let us examine some of the other items in this list of property, which, according to *John of Toronto*, the Catholic Church has at her disposal for educational purposes. Here we find, the property of the Grey Nuns, of the General Hospitals at Quebec and Montreal, and the Hotel Dieu at Quebec, marked down as disposable for the purposes of education. Now again we say, that from his long residence in the country, Dr. Strachan must be well aware, that the above mentioned property is specially devoted to the entertainment of hospitals for the sick, and asylums for the aged and infirm; and that the Catholic Church has no more power to divert the funds accruing from these properties, to purposes of education, or any other purpose, foreign to the intention of the founders of the communities to which such property belongs, than His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Montreal has to appropriate to the use of the Anglican Church, the funds belonging to the English Hospital in Dorchester Street. It is therefore with regret, that we again find ourselves compelled to tax Dr. Strachan with deliberate misrepresentation. And here we must pay a compliment to his vast arithmetical acquirements. His schooling has not been thrown away upon him, and it is a pleasant thing to see the complete mastery he possesses over the mysteries of the multiplication table. Multiplying the aforesaid 2,117,179 acres, over the greater part of which the Church has no control whatever, by 6s. 8d., the average value of land, His Lordship discovers, that a capital sum of upwards of £7,000,000, which, at 6 per cent., yields an income of £42,000, is at the disposal of the Church in Lower Canada for educational purposes. Joe Hume could not sum up the "tottle of the whole" with more skill, and might envy His Lordship his wondrous powers of calculation; but we think that he would laugh at His Lordship's logic. Dr. Strachan confounds (we can hardly believe through ignorance) the ownership in certain Seigneurial and Feudal rights, arising from, and out of land, with the ownership of the soil itself; he argues as if the Seigneur, were the proprietor of the land; an argument fully as absurd, as it would be to maintain, that because the Corporation of Montreal is entitled to receive the amount of assessment, levied upon the property of the city, the said Corporation is therefore owner of all the houses in the city, and of the land upon which they are built. The Ecclesiastical Corporations are *Seigneurs*, and not proprietors of the lands of which their Seigneuries are composed; that is to say, they own the *cens et rents*, the *lods et ventes*, and other trifling *Feudal rights* arising from, and out of the land, but they have no right of ownership over the land itself. It is almost unnecessary to continue the subject: a moment's reflection must suffice to convince any unprejudiced person, of the essential difference between a *Seigneur*, and the *Proprietor* of the soil; but to make it more clear, we will take a case in point—that of the Seigneurie of Montreal. It is thus spoken of by Dr. Strachan: "The Sulpicians covering the whole island and city of Montreal, considered worth nearly a million." There may be some obscurity as to the writer's meaning; but the impression that this extract is calculated to convey, to people unacquainted with the real state of the case, is—that the city and island of Montreal, belong to the St. Sulpicians, as a kind of freehold; and that the value of their interest therein may be estimated at about a million. Let us look to the real facts of the case. With the exception of about fifteen hundred acres reserved by the St. Sulpicians for their own use, for a garden, a small farm, and as pleasure grounds, they, the Sulpicians, although *Seigneurs* of, do not own one acre of land in the island of Montreal. What they do possess, are merely the Seigneurial rights, amounting, at the present moment, to barely £8,000 per annum; and they have as little right of ownership over the land itself, as has *John of Toronto* himself. We have always endeavored to speak of the Anglican Church and her members with respect, and never to allow our religious differences to blind us, to the many excellencies which adorn her prelates and clergy. We have not, and we hope never will, confound them with the tagrag and bobtail of the conventicle. We have never spoken one word against their rights, or advocated the spoliation of the property set apart by the State for the support of their clergy. It is therefore with surprise that we have of late observed the unfair and ungentlemanly spirit which pervades the

\*What the deuce are they?—Printer's Devil.

writings of the Anglican party in Upper Canada. That they should hate the Church is natural; but that, for the gratification of that hatred, they should ally themselves with men, who have nought in common with them except hatred of the Catholic Church, is highly impolitic; and this they will soon find out to their cost.

We read in the *Gazette* of Monday: "They" the English residents in Lower Canada, "have also their religion insulted, and their daily business impeded, by having a Dominant Church set over them, which, according to its superstition, or its zeal, declaring certain days to be holy, compels them to abstain from working upon them, in opposition to the commandment of God." This is an awful complaint, and not the less awful, because, owing to the obscurity of the manner in which it is worded, it is hard to be understood. The purport of it seems to be, that English Protestants in Lower Canada, are compelled, by law, to abstain from work on those days, which the Catholic Church, prompted by the Holy Spirit of God, has set apart from the ordinary grovelling occupations of the world, for meditation upon the kingdom of God, and the things of Heaven. Now, we fully admit, that the State has no right, whatever, to compel any man, be he Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Mahomedan, to abstain from labor on any day of the week, whether it be on the Sunday, the Saturday or Sabbath day, or the Friday. The utmost it has a right to do, is, to abstain from compelling any one to work against the dictates of his conscience, and also, to take care that no man shall have the power to compel his brother to work on any day which his religion commands him to keep holy. If, therefore, it be true that Protestants are compelled, by law, to observe Catholic holidays in Lower Canada, we fully admit that an act of injustice, towards them, has been committed. But is it true? To this we answer, that so far from being true, every man in Canada—the Editor of the *Gazette* amongst the number—knows that it is ridiculously false. Every Protestant is as much at liberty to work upon a Catholic holiday, as he is upon any other day of the week. Are not their stores open on those days? Do not their laboring classes—their artificers—continue their daily avocations upon those days, as well as upon any others? If any one doubt our assertion, let him walk through the streets of the city on the 15th of August, which is the first Catholic holiday, with the exception of Sundays, that will occur; and then, by the use of his eyes, and the evidence of his senses, convince himself of the falsehood of the *Gazette's* assertion, that Protestants are "compelled to abstain from working on them."

The true cause of complaint on the part of our cotemporary is, not that upon these days Protestants are, by law, compelled to abstain from work, for that is an impudent falsehood; but, that Protestants have not the power to compel Catholics to work upon those days, which the Church commands all her children, under the pain of mortal sin, to keep holy; because they cannot, by law, compel servants in the public offices, such persons being Catholics, to bring damnation upon themselves, by disobedience to the express command of God, made known to us through His Church. It is one of, not the least amusing traits of inconsistency, in the character of those persons who cry out loudest against the liberty that is accorded to Catholics, that they are generally foremost in the agitation for what, in their cant, is termed Sabbath observance. The observance of the Sunday, which is not a whit more sacred, or obligatory, than the observance of the feast of Corpus Christi, or of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, is to be made compulsory by law, if these fanatics and hypocrites are to be listened to. Men who have such tender regard for themselves, have none for the rights of a portion of the community, in every point of view as good as themselves. They have no hesitation, no scruples about compelling the Jew to observe the Christian's Sunday, although the Jew, in obedience to the law delivered to his fathers from Mount Sinai, observes the Sabbath day to keep it holy. But thus it ever is with your would-be liberals; liberty with them, means, power of oppressing others.

"Brownson, of Boston, thinks Isaac Newton a humbug, and Lord Bacon another."—*New York Observer*.  
"The above named Brownson is, we believe, the individual who enlightened the Roman Catholic population of Montreal last fall. We doubt not the *True Witness* would endorse his opinion of Newton and Bacon, as it did his assertions about other matters in which he was equally correct."—*Montreal Witness*.

We do not know what Dr. Brownson's opinions respecting either Sir Isaac Newton or Lord Bacon may happen to be, but we shall certainly require some more respectable authority, than that of either the Editor of the *New York Observer* or the *Montreal Witness*, before we give credit to their statement of the learned gentleman's opinions of the above mentioned celebrated men. For Sir Isaac Newton as an astronomer, we suspect that Dr. Brownson may entertain high respect; but for Sir Isaac Newton as a theologian, it is possible that he does not. Nor indeed have most Catholics much esteem for the theological system of Unitarians; still we are certain, that neither Dr. Brownson, nor any other Catholic, would speak of Sir Isaac Newton, or any man, because he happened to be a Unitarian, as a *humbug*. On the contrary, seeing that the denial of the Trinity, is a necessary logical consequence of the denial of Church authority, and the assertion of the right of private judgment, it is most likely that a Catholic would speak of Unitarians, as men, who, carrying into practice what other Protestants sects only profess, have proved themselves to be, if not better Christians, at least better Protestants; and sounder logicians, than those who fondly dub themselves Orthodox, Evangelical, or by some other cant name.

Of Lord Bacon's merits as a philosopher, there exists much difference of opinion among the learned; and far be it from us to hazard any remarks of our own thereupon, or to criticize the system of the author of the *Novum Organum*. But of Bacon, the private individual, the statesman, the judge, it is permitted us to speak; and if we refrain from the use of the word *humbug*, it is because neither it, nor any other epithet in the English language, is strong enough to express our disgust and contempt for the man who, in an age remarkable for its venality and corruption, contrived, by the practice of every art of treachery, meanness and cruelty, to earn for himself a name and reputation for vileness, more infamous than that of any of his fellows. Throughout the course of a long and busy public life, Bacon is almost the only man whom it is impossible to charge with the perpetration of a single noble or honorable action. Raised to distinction whilst young, less through the claims of his father, than the active exertions of Essex, he seized the first opportunity that offered itself, of currying favor with the Queen, by the betrayal of his patron and benefactor: not content with using all the eloquence with which God had gifted him, to procure the death of one from whose hands he had received unnumbered benefits, he must needs traduce his memory, and vilify him after his death; so unwilling was he to leave any depth of infamy unexplored. As attorney-general, Bacon enjoys the disgrace of being one of the last advocates of the use of the torture, a practice which had, in the preceding reign, been pronounced illegal, by the most eminent lawyers of the day. Of Bacon as a judge, it is unnecessary to speak: dishonest in every previous condition of life, it was hardly to be expected that he would improve with age. His character may be summed up in a few words. A false friend in private life, the willing tool of despotism as a minister, and a corrupt judge—he never refused a bribe, and was ever open for sale, until he became too vile to purchase. His great talents, and the fact, of having been an esteemed servant of James and Elizabeth, the champions of Protestantism, and of having been the apologist for the "bowling" of Catholics, may, perhaps, in the eyes of some, cover, as with a mantle, the loathsomeness of his moral character; but it is not likely that Dr. Brownson should think or speak respectfully of him, for he, as a Catholic, will have been taught to judge men by another standard.

We are not aware that we have ever endorsed any of Dr. Brownson's statements, simply because we have not the presumption to imagine that they require it. Still, as the well-informed Editor of the *Montreal Witness* taxes Dr. Brownson with making false assertions, and the *True Witness* with having endorsed them, we pledge ourselves to retract, so soon as our accuser shall be able to point out a single statement made by Dr. Brownson, and by us endorsed, and which is contrary to truth. This offer relates to matters of fact, to historical statements, and not to matters of opinion.

## PROTESTANT ACCOUNT OF THE PROCESSION OF CORPUS CHRISTI.

"But the most gorgeous object in this procession, was, as usual, the *Dais* or Canopy, which cost, according to the *Mineur* £500. Under this marched a priest carrying before his face a great artificial eye, set in a golden disc, to represent the ALL-SEEING eye of the invisible and ETERNAL CREATOR!"—*Montreal Witness*.

Bless us, what well informed men Editors of Protestant papers are to be sure. The great eye set in a golden disc, intended to represent the ALL-SEEING eye of the ETERNAL CREATOR, must have been worth looking at. This puts us in mind of another specimen of Protestant information:—An Evangelical paper in the States, some time ago, gravely informed its readers, that the ashes, which in compliance with an ancient discipline of the Church, are laid upon the heads of the congregation upon Ash Wednesday, are formed by burning the linen cloths, with which, after Communion, the Priest purifies the Chalice. Is there any absurdity too gross for *Evangelical* credulity?

Our nerves had hardly recovered from the shock inflicted upon them, by the gloomy predictions of dire calamities, that were to befall Queen and country, from the gathering of the nations, consequent upon the Industrial Exhibition—sleep, long a stranger to our eyes, banished, by visions of detachments of the *Grande Armée*, crossing the channel, in disguise, with their uniforms and accoutrements in their carpet bags, was once more about to settle on our eye-lids, when we were startled by the following horrid announcement, printed in largest capitals, at the head of the leading article of that staunch Protestant journal—the *Beville Intelligence*:—

## "POPERY AS IT EVER HAS BEEN AND IS.—ANOTHER GUNPOWDER PLOT."

"When a group of Statuary, from ITALY, was unpacked in the Crystal Palace, the hollow interior of the figures were found CHARGED WITH GUNPOWDER! It is added, that the matter has been kept as quiet as possible for fear of exciting alarm.—*North British Mail*." And who, think you, readers, were the wretches who stuffed the statue full of gunpowder? THE JESUITS. "Nothing," continues our sapient friend of the *Intelligence*, "appears too vile, despicable, or devilish, for the hollow-hearted, ferocious, and blood-thirsty, jesuitical Italian wretches. Their object is but too evident. They hoped to throw the nation into confusion by placing a slow match to the 'loaded marble' just as Her Majesty, and her Royal Consort with their Royal offspring should approach them, which was intended to explode." Whether it was the "loaded marble," or Her Majesty; or the Royal Consort, or the Royal offspring; that was expected to explode, is not clear; "when the Royal party came within a distance which make its destruction sure; but the protecting hand of