

# THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1851.

## ARRIVAL OF THE AFRICA.

The telegraph announces the arrival of the steamer; the most important part of the communication is, that the Penal law has passed the second reading, by a majority of 448 to 95, but that it will not go into Committee until after Easter, that is, supposing that nothing occurs in the interim to increase the Ministerial embarrassments.

We may hope soon to hear that the Catholics are finishing the organisation necessary to prevent the law being enforced in Ireland, even supposing that the bill be carried through its remaining stages, in the Commons, and in the House of Lords.

We have given in another page, a condensed abstract of the proceedings in the House of Commons, upon the second reading of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. On Friday, 14th March, Lord Arundel and Surrey, seconded by Mr. Reynolds, moved "that the bill be read a second time that day six months." Upon this a stormy debate ensued, continued by a adjournment for four nights, without the house coming to a division. The speech of Sir James Graham was certainly the best delivered upon the occasion; opposed as a Protestant, to the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy, the Honorable baronet deprecated all legislative enactment, as all enactments upon the subject, must prove either inoperative or tyrannical. Not only was the speech of Sir James the most forcible, but it was also the most remarkable for its temperate tone, in which he had not many imitators. One fellow, Drummond by name, true to his own vile nature, had the effrontery to designate all nunneries "as prisons or brothels," for such is the way that your evangelical Protestant bespatters those abodes of purity, from whose chaste inmates their revilers would do well to take a lesson. We wonder that some of the Catholic gentlemen present, whose daughters or sisters were thus insulted, did not kick the malignant slanderer out of the House; it could hardly have amounted to a breach of privilege. Should the fellow ever come to Canada, he will find some worthies of his own stamp, ready to receive him with shouts of applause, for chastity is a virtue, of whose existence, evangelicals cannot conceive the possibility. However, the Protestant legislators of Great Britain seem determined to do their utmost to render the convents worthy of Mr. Drummond's epithets. A measure has been introduced, authorising laymen to intrude themselves into the retreats of Catholic piety, where, weary of the world, the virgin spouses of the Lamb, are occupied day and night in singing His praise. By this bill, should it become law, some lewd and filthy official, may compel to appear before him, singly or collectively, as he in his wisdom, or lust may think fit, the timid female, to whom the very breath of the wretch before her must be pollution; and then, after putting to her such questions as his prurient imagination may suggest, he may order her to be removed to the nearest poorhouse, one of those accursed prisons which Protestant charity has erected for the punishment of the poor. Such is the system of legislation in preparation for the Catholics of England and Ireland. Will they tamely submit to it? God forbid. We hope that whilst there is an Irish Catholic, who can handle a pike, or whose finger can pull the trigger, that this, and all the other measures of Protestant tyranny, may be courageously resisted. Three centuries of degradation and oppression, are enough, in all conscience, for men to bear; and we think that we may with safety predict, that whilst they have life to resist, the Catholics of Ireland will never allow those buildings, which they have devoted to the service of God, to be defiled with the presence of the heretical intruder; or permit the beloved inmates of their convents, to be exposed to the lewd gaze and filthy ribaldry of some Whig government official, or half-drunk orangeman, fresh from his beastly orgies.

I have been struck with some curious things in the Report of the Kingston City Mission. Here is an instance:—

Jan. 2.—Visited a poor widow in a state of wretchedness. She had no fuel: the house being out of repair, she was exposed to the cold atmosphere. She cried bitterly, and asked if I would do something for her in the way of procuring her some wood. Found another widow hovering over a few embers: she had no stove, nor any way of procuring one. Read the Scriptures and prayed with her.

The starving widows ask for bread and they get a stone. This is not a very practical kind of religion. Cold and hunger are but poorly antidoted by the reading of a few verses of Scripture. I am tempted to make another extract:—

Efforts having been put forth by the Missionary to reclaim those who have wandered from virtue's path, and whose "steps take hold on hell."—

Dec. 22.—Visited 15 houses, 4 of which were inhabited by poor unfortunate females. I conversed with them. I fully expected to get abuse; as I was hooted at and ridiculed by them the day before, on passing. I, at that time, passed on without seeming to take notice of them. I called to-day at the same house; they all appeared civil and attentive, and some appeared affected with what was said. At another house I conversed with 5 of the same class. I asked what they thought would become of their souls if called into the eternal world, while in their present state? Some of them burst into tears. One with deep sighs, said, "I would soon be away from this, if I only had

a place to go to, but I have no home." Another bewailed her wretched state, and said, "I hope I may soon be better situated, but I have no home to go to." I left them several tracts, for which they seemed thankful.

July 9.—Left tracts and held conversation with several of these poor wretched females. One with whom I was speaking said, "She would gladly leave that place and live differently, if any one would employ her, or if she knew where to go." She is a person who, to all appearance, has received a religious training. Said she was once a Sabbath School Teacher, but it was through giving way to strong drink that first brought her into these circumstances. I felt at a loss to know how to direct her in the way of obtaining a livelihood, for no one likes to employ such persons.

The common sense of the community ought to frown down such wretched cant as this. The City Missionary visits these unfortunate females; they express their desire to escape from their present mode of life, and implore his assistance to accomplish that object; he can do nothing to forward their good resolutions—he states, very coolly, that no one likes to employ them; he leaves them as he found them, without giving them the slightest hope that he can point them to any reputable means by which they could obtain a subsistence; he gives them to understand that their present doom is irreversible—but he leaves them a bundle of tracts! He goes straightway to his employers, to whom he reports that he has made efforts to reclaim these unfortunates. What mockery! what arrant humbug!—*Correspondent of the Courier.*

Such is Protestant charity! we speak not to ridicule, or scorn the inefficiency of the probably well intentioned individual of the Kingston City Mission, who, without the pecuniary means, and still more without the light of our holy Religion, set out with a vague idea of *philanthropy*, and a consciousness of some unfulfilled duty to suffering humanity, to perform his fruitless visits. We give him rather, credit for kindness and goodness of heart, for we know that it is not the wont of Protestants to engage in such works; that old-fashioned Gospel, which taught us that for good works done in the name of our blessed Saviour, we were to receive at the last day a crown and a reward, has become to them a remnant of Popery and superstition, and we find in its place a "holy horror" of good works, which would excite the admiration even of the monk of Witttemberg, could he from "his place" ascend to revisit the earth. So rare have these virtues become, that among Protestants, a Howard, or a Caroline Fry, are looked upon with wonder, as prodigies of goodness and heroism; while Catholicity shows us every day examples of a heroism far surpassing theirs, in the humble, self-denying priest, or in the maiden, who, with wealth, youth, and beauty, and the pleasures of the world before her, renounces them all, and devotes herself for the love of "Him who though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor," to instruct the ignorant, to watch the sick and the dying—in her life of modesty and humiliation to "die daily." She seeks not the praise of men, the public press records not her every act of charity as a "noble instance of philanthropy," and when she dies, no proud monument records her virtues; but the sick, and the orphans, rise up and call her blessed, and breathe the sweet prayers for her departed soul, while redeemed spirits, who have been reclaimed by her ministrations, await to receive her into everlasting habitations.

When we have such pictures daily before our eyes, we cannot scarcely, but turn away with disgust from the Moral Reform Societies, Seamen's Friend's Societies, Bethels, and the thousand other engines which Protestantism is ever devising to accomplish charitable ends. Plans, just like labor-saving machines, which shall dispense entirely with Divine charity. Protestantism can contrive, can speculate, can form very fine societies on paper, for any purpose, from that of evangelising the Papists, or Kalmuck Tartars, to that of providing baby linen for the negroes of the Gold Coast; but when we ask what these have done, we pause in vain for a reply.

If the distributors of tracts, and the agents for un-Catholicising our people, fail in making perversities thousands, it is not from any lack of industry. If the harvest is not plenteous, it is not because the laborers are few. There is hardly a corner in this city which is not more or less infested with them; it is as if the very dust of the earth had been smitten, and had become as lice in all our quarters. We will record some of the exploits of these proselytising gentry, which have lately come to our ears, and for the truth of which we can vouch. There is, in this city, an institution for the reception of the most abandoned women of the town, into which these unfortunate creatures are received, immediately after their discharge from prison, in the hopes that by thus affording them a refuge from actual starvation, and by bringing them within the holy influences of the Church, they may be reclaimed from the error of their ways. Of course the only agent that can be relied upon for the effectual accomplishment of this great work, is Religion; any thing, therefore, which has a tendency to raise doubts upon the truths of religion, has a tendency to prevent the reformation of these unfortunate victims of drunkenness and debauchery. And yet here, regardless of the mischief which they are likely to produce, the colporteurs are especially busy. One brings in a heap of *orthodox* tracts, in which the Trinity is respectfully spoken of; another a bundle of *Unitarian* do., in which the Divinity of our Lord is positively denied; whilst another, not to be behind his brethren in zeal for the holy Protestant cause, earnestly presses upon the attention of the inmates, the evangelical narrative of the "light of the conventicle," the young Maria Monk. This is a positive fact: and we have now before us a pile of these pamphlets, some the product of Trinitarian, others of Unitarian, Protestants. Such

are the means employed, to counteract the zealous exertions of our Catholic clergymen, in the conversion of sinners, and which we think all honest men, of all persuasions, will unite with us in condemning; even the bitterest bigot who ever groaned or snivelled in a conventicle, will admit, that the Papist who lives chastely, is not so injurious to society as, and less offensive to God than, the most evangelical Protestant prostitute that forswears penance, or damns the Pope as she tosses off her quarter of gin. How different is the conduct of Catholics towards Protestants. The latter also have establishments in town, of a nature similar to the one we have described; and if because of the religious differences which exist between us, we cannot assist our separated brethren in their attempts at the moral reformation of the inmates, we will at least abstain from putting any obstacles in their way. We respect their motives too much to interfere with them; and the Catholic who should endeavor to force his way into the Protestant Magdalene Asylum, in order to preach religious controversy, would find no sympathy with his brother Catholics. Besides, before Protestants attempt to make converts, they ought to agree amongst themselves, as to what is *the truth* in which they desire their victims to believe. They should settle their own differences—try and come to some agreement amongst themselves, as to, who is God—the nature of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, before they begin tampering with the faith of others. Protestantism should define its creed, before offering it to our acceptance; at present we can see in it nothing but a mass of discordant opinions, one more ridiculous than another. And what effect must not this discordance have upon the poor ignorant sinner, whose eyes are for the first time opened to the awful consequences of sin, to the necessity of penance, and reconciliation with God? Why, to convince her that all religion is false, and Christianity a great humbug. "Here is the Gospel for you, young woman," cries an orthodox Calvinist, "here is the regular Gospel in all its purity," and proceeds to explain Election, Final Perseverance, and the doctrine of the Trinity, as he understands it. "Be off with you, and don't be bothering the young woman," sings out another, "Christ was no more God than you are. He was a great man—a very great man—a little blinded perhaps by his narrow views; but that was the fault of his time and country. I have a great respect for his memory notwithstanding." "Don't listen to that Unitarian infidel," shouts the first. "Hell fire for all eternity." "Who talks about Hell?" says the Universalist. "That's gammon, young woman, and if you want a nice Gospel, which opens the kingdom of Heaven to all, without regard to character, come to our Gospel shop. It's ours that's the pleasant doctrine." "For God's sake, Protestants," would we say in our turn, "leave the poor creature alone. You admit that she may be saved even as a Catholic; think you to improve her chances by making her an infidel? Keep your 'Dairyman's Daughter,' your 'Maria Monk,' and your 'Miller of the Mountain' to yourselves. Try the effect of them upon the poor and ignorant amongst your own people, and Lord knows you will have no difficulty in finding plenty of subjects; but leave us alone, and even if you do think we are all on the high road to Hell, let us at least have the liberty of going our own way. It will be none the more agreeable for your company." Seriously, we would beg of all honest men, to discountenance, by every means in their power, the dirty system of tract distributing, which is now becoming so common with a certain class, who, it is well known, are actuated by the most mercenary of motives—to augment the number of the frequenters of their conventicle, and thus have larger collections when the plate goes round. Proselytism, by colporteurs, is a public nuisance, which ought to be abated.

There seems to be a singular fatality attending the speakers at French Canadian Missionary Meetings. They cannot open their mouths, but out there flies a string of falsehoods. It seems to be a maxim with them, that all means are lawful against the Church, and more especially against those devoted soldiers of the Cross, the much abused Jesuits. Take, for instance, the following report of a meeting of the "French Canadian Missionary Society," held at Woodstock, and which we copy from the *Woodstock British American*. A certain Mr. Black, who, we believe, claps a reverend to his name, and who is also one of the secretaries, or scavengers in ordinary to the "F. C. M. Society," thus addresses the meeting:—

"Mr. Black noticed the fact of their ('the Jesuits') having obtained a grant, from a former French Monarch, of 1-26th of all grain grown by the Roman Catholic population, and of vast estates in support of their order; and that their character was so aggressive, and their principles so dangerous, as to become objectionable even to the Roman Pontiff, and that for a certain period, their existence was suppressed in Canada, but that in 1843 they re-appeared in Montreal, and that since that period they had been indefatigable in their insidious and secret efforts to obtain absolute control, civil and religious, in Lower Canada; that the 1-26th of the grain was now exacted, and that if means were not found to check their encroachments, he apprehended the most lamentable and degrading consequences." The Italics are our own.

Now, in this extract from Mr. Black's speech, there is, first, the express assertion that 1-26th of all grain grown by the Catholic population of this country, was granted to the Jesuits; secondly, the implication, that since 1843, the Jesuits again exact, that is, claim of right, 1-26th of all grain grown by the same Catholic population. We hardly know how to treat these falsehoods, which are the more detestable as coming from a person who has the impudence to call himself a Minister of the Gospel of Truth. One-twenty-sixth of the grain grown by the Catholics

of Canada, was, as Mr. Black very well knows, never granted to the Jesuits, neither do they exact, nor ever dream of exacting it at the present day. The tithes, which were altered from the tenth sheaf, to one-twenty-sixth of the grain, in order to compensate to the Canadian grower, for the difference between the modes of tithing, in France and in Canada, were guaranteed, not to the Jesuits, but to the *Curés* of the different parishes. One of the former might, by becoming the *Curé* of a parish, which sometimes, though very rarely happened, acquire a right to the tithes, not as a Jesuit, but as the *Curé*. This was, and is the case at the parish of Laprairie de la Madeleine, one of the few parishes in which a Jesuit officiates as *Curé*; but in no other case, could, or can a Jesuit exact any part of the tithes. If, therefore, Mr. Black means that the tithes were granted to the Jesuits, we tell him his statement, on the Woodstock platform, is false; and if he means that, besides the tithes, one-twenty-sixth of all grain grown by Catholics in Canada, was granted to the Jesuits, we tell him that this statement is equally false. We hardly think it worth while to contradict the second part of the story, that since 1843, the Jesuits again exact, one-twenty-sixth of the grain. The payment of the tithes has always been exacted, before, as well as since 1843, not by the Jesuits, but by the *Curés* of the parishes. We do not notice Mr. Black's speech because we think that there is anything derogatory to the character of the Jesuits, even if it were true, that one-twenty-sixth of all grain grown by the Catholics in Canada had been granted to them; our object is, to show, how, from the highest to the lowest, by plain Mister, or sanctified-looking Minister, truth is systematically disregarded, by the members of the "F. C. M. Society." Like the lately convicted evangelical slanderer of the lamented mother of his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, they will shrink from no act of meanness, they will not scruple at any lie, which they think can further their object of calumniating the Clergy. Throw dirt enough, is their maxim, some of it is sure to stick.

The Toronto *Church* gives us the following list of Holy Days recognized by law in Upper Canada—"The only public Holy Days recognized or allowed by law in the public offices here, are the Queen's Birthday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday." What do the Anglicans say to this abrogation of their Rubric by law in Upper Canada? The twenty-seven Holy Days, which, besides all Sundays in the year, it commands to be observed, are cut down to three. First and foremost in this singular category, stands, as one would naturally expect in the Church by Law established,—the Feast of the Nativity of our Most Gracious Sovereign Lady the Queen. Next in order, and inferior in dignity only to the preceding, comes the Feast of the Nativity of our Blessed Redeemer. This is, of course, a high compliment to the Divinity of our Saviour, to whom the law yields an homage almost as reverential as that which it pays to Her Most Gracious Majesty. Last in the list figures Good Friday, or, as we suppose it must be termed in the new Rubric, The Feast of the Crucifixion, suddenly transformed by the magic power of the law, from a day of fasting and deep humiliation, to the dignity of a holy day, or festival. Pleasant, paternal kind of law this, in Upper Canada, which regulates, with such exquisite discrimination, the Festivals of the Church.

The *Transcript*, of Tuesday, again favors us with a few remarks; not with the object of answering the plain question we put to him—What portion of the property held by the Catholic Ecclesiastical Corporations in Montreal, was there given by Edicts of the French Monarchs? This question he tries to shuffle out of, giving in lieu of an answer, a long rigmarole about "Quebec Act of 1772"—Clergy Reserves—Protestants of Lower Canada—George the Third and his Parliament—Tithes and cereal grains—with a little personal abuse,—but not one syllable about the only matter which is of the slightest consequence in the question before us. It would have been just as much to the purpose, if he had given us a long description of the chrysalis palace, or the breaking up of the ice on the St. Lawrence; his object being clearly to bury the only point at issue between us, under a heavy load of words, and thus to avoid answering our question. The *Transcript* says, that, "What we spoke of as the most valuable endowments, was tithes included, not excluded." If such was his meaning, it is a pity he did not express it more clearly. We will quote his very words, "In point of fact, the whole of the tithes, and the most valuable property the Roman Catholic Church possesses, were given by Edicts of the French Monarchs." The impression that this passage is calculated to convey, is, that besides the tithes, the most valuable property the Church possesses, was given by Edicts of French Monarchs. Under such an impression, we called upon the editor of the *Transcript*, to specify what property was so given, or else to avow his "mistake." Instead of doing either the one or the other, we have now a kind of admission, that there was a "mistake in logical position," and that we mistook his meaning. Why could he not have said so at first? If he only meant to say, "that the tithes, which are the most valuable part of the property, were given," &c., he might have, at once, put an end to the whole discussion, by simply explaining his meaning. At all events, the inability of the *Transcript*, to point out any portion of the property held by the Catholic Ecclesiastical Corporations, as given by the French, or British governments, is the most complete admission of the truth of what we asserted, that all such property was acquired either by purchase, or in some few cases, by donations from private individuals; and is, therefore, as sacred in the eyes of every honest man, as the property of any private individual in Montreal.