

REMITTANCES.

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Union Bank of London, London. The Bank of Ireland, Dublin. The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street, Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum.  
To Country, do. \$21 do.  
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 28, 1855.

By the arrival of the *America* at Halifax on 26th, we learn that Sebastopol was taken on 9th inst.—French loss, 15,000; English, 2,000.

The *Commercial Advertiser* of the 24th instant, notices an article of the *TRUE WITNESS* of Friday last, and asks us:—

"On what principle of justice, a newspaper professing to be the exponent of the views of the Roman Church, charges upon the Protestant people and press of Canada, advocating toleration, a concealed policy inimical to his Church?"

To this question our reply shall be brief, and we hope satisfactory.

Because—the great majority of the Protestant press in Canada, either directly applaud, or, when alluding to it, refrain from condemning, the iniquitous and "inimical policy" pursued by the Governments of Spain and Piedmont towards the Catholic Church in their respective countries. Thereby showing that they do not condemn that policy when applied to the Catholic Church in Europe; and leaving us at liberty to draw the logical inference that they would as little condemn it if applied to the Catholic Church in Canada.

It is a true saying that "the receiver is as bad as the thief;" and it is equally true that he who approves of criminal acts in others, or who, when commenting upon them in his character of a public journalist, does not condemn them, is, to all intents and purposes, an accomplice in the crime. Now, we put it to the *Commercial Advertiser*, has not this been almost universally the case amongst the Protestant press in Canada? Have they not all given their readers an account of the unjust and tyrannical policy "pursued" by the infamous Courts of Spain and Piedmont towards the Catholic Church?—and has not we also asked—any one of them condemned these arbitrary proceedings, or even hinted its disapprobation of the cruel persecution to which, in those countries, Bishops, Priests, Nuns and Religious have been exposed? Nay—so far from condemning it, have not the majority approved of that "inimical policy?"—and does not the *Montreal Transcript* openly profess to find therein grounds for "gratulation and hope?" What then must we conclude from these premises? or how can we suppose that our Protestant cotemporaries, would condemn, if attempted in Canada, that "inimical policy" which they approve of when enforced in Spain and Sardinia?

The laws of truth and justice are immutable.—They vary not with degrees of latitude and longitude; they are the same in Quebec as at Turin; the same for a Bishop of Montreal, as for an Archbishop of Cagliari—for a Convent of Grey Nuns, as for one of the "Sacred Heart." There is not one standard of right for Europe, and another for America; and that which is wrong on one side of the Atlantic, cannot be otherwise than wrong on the other. Is it not written—"what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander?"—*Proverbs*—and how—in the opinion of Protestants, it be just, liberal, and a cause for "gratulation and hope," to drag Priests and Bishops to jail for refusing to administer the Sacraments of the Church at the bidding of the civil power—can we suppose that our separated brethren would look upon it as otherwise than a just and liberal policy, to treat Priests and Bishops in a similar manner in Canada? The property of the Catholic Church here is not a whit more sacred than the property of the Church in Spain; surely then we may be pardoned for supposing, when we hear our Protestant cotemporaries applauding the confiscation of the latter by the Spanish Government, that they would equally applaud the conduct of a Canadian Government which should seize upon the St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum, and turn our Sisters of Charity out into the streets.

If however, in so judging, we have wronged or misrepresented our Protestant cotemporaries, we shall ever be ready, aye, most happy, to do them justice, so soon as they themselves shall put it in our power so to do. We promise the *Commercial Advertiser*, for instance, to publish in our columns, and to give him full credit for, the very first article in which he condemns the cruel and "inimical policy" of the Spanish and Sardinian Governments towards the Catholic Church. And we assure him that—when we find our Protestant cotemporaries, generally, asserting the sacredness of treaties, whether entered into with the Sovereign of the Papal States, or with any other Power—when we see them denouncing as a breach of honor and good faith, any attempt on the part of one of the contracting parties to set aside the provisions of the said treaties without the consent of the other contracting party—then, but not till then,

will we believe that they would keep faith with us in Canada, if it was in their power, and if it was for their interest, to violate it. In like manner, when in their comments upon the affairs of Spain and Sardinia, we shall find them openly denouncing the breach of faith of which the Governments of those countries have been guilty—when we shall hear them deprecating the monstrous interference of the Civil Power in matters purely spiritual—and as loud in their denunciations of the tyranny which consigned a Catholic Archbishop to jail, for withholding Sacramental Absolution from, and for refusing to give the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist to, one whom he deemed unworthy of such a privilege, as they are in condemning the imprisonment of the "Martyred Madiais"—then, but not till then, will we believe that they are sincere in their advocacy of religious toleration, and civil and religious liberty. Finally, when we shall see our Canadian Protestant cotemporaries exerting their influence as public journalists, to secure for Church property the same respect and protection that they demand for all secular property—then, but not till then, will we believe that they are in earnest in their expressions of good will towards us and our institutions. But we repeat it, so long as we find them, either narrating without a word of reproof, or openly applauding as grounds for "gratulation and hope"—as something "wherefore which we should copy in, Canada—the dishonorable and tyrannical conduct of the Spanish and Sardinian Governments towards the Catholic Church—so long as they never allude to the protests of the Sovereign Pontiff against this conduct on the part of the said Powers, but in language of scorn and mockery—so long must we believe that our Protestant cotemporaries do entertain "a concealed policy inimical to the Catholic Church"—that they do hold that faith should not be kept with Papists—that they are not prepared to concede to our Bishops and Clergy, the same independence in the exercise of their sacred functions, that they demand for their own ministers—and that they would, if they could, seize upon, and confiscate to secular purposes, our charitable, religious, and educational establishments. If in this we err, it is easy for the *Commercial Advertiser* to set us right.

The *Church of Toronto* accuses us—the *TRUE WITNESS*—of trying "to defend Sabbath breakers and blasphemers," in our reply to the *Transcript's* strictures upon "ball-playing on Sundays." Our Toronto cotemporary must pardon us for telling him that he lies—under a mistake of course.

This must have arisen from his not having done us the honor to read what we did say upon the subject. For, had he paid attention to our words, he would have seen that, so far from attempting to defend blasphemers or blasphemy, we heartily joined with our Montreal cotemporary in invoking the aid of the Police to repress the crime, and punish the criminals.

To the charge of "defending Sabbath-breaking" we reply in a similar manner. We never have, and trust that we never may, defend such a crime. What we have done is this; we have denied that ball-playing on Sunday involves the crime of "Sabbath-breaking;" and to this opinion we still adhere, and shall continue to do so until we see good reasons for abandoning it.

It is not—we must remind our Protestant cotemporary of Toronto—it is not by vituperation, and old womanish abuse, that he, or his non-Catholic brethren will convince us Catholics of our error, in indulging in innocent and healthy amusements on a Sunday. If in error, we must be set right by argument and not by clamor; and it must be proved as well as asserted that the innocent amusements in which we indulge, and for whose lawfulness on Sundays we contend, are forbidden by the law of God.

We have challenged our opponents to this proof, and they have prudently held their peace. We reiterate our challenge; and we defy the *Church* and the whole Protestant press of Canada, to prove from the Bible—the "sole rule of faith" amongst Protestants—1.—that the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath have been, by the command of God, transferred to the Sunday, either in whole or in part, or in other words, that the observance of the Sunday, as a Holy Day, and as a day of abstinence from servile work, is enjoined in the Bible—2.—That, if the observance of the Sunday as the Sabbath is a Divine precept revealed in the Bible, all innocent Sunday amusements, which have no tendency to divert the heart from God, and which do not encroach upon the hours of divine worship, are thereby forbidden. Will the *Church* accept our challenge? or will he be so kind as to name chapter and verse of the Bible which transfers the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath to the Sunday; and which also forbids us to indulge in innocent amusements on that day, and within the limits above defined.

Our cotemporary, as an Anglican, is treading on dangerous ground. The "Romish paper" whose impiety he condemns, can quote in support of its views the practice of the early Anglican divines, and the positive teachings of the "Reformed Church of England" of the XVII century; in which, as in other non-Catholic sects—the spawn of the great apostasy of the XVI century—the Sabbatarian theory is of very recent origin. Hear what the Protestant historian "Hallam" says on this subject:—

"The founders of the English Reformation, after abolishing most of the festivals kept before that time, had made little or no change as to the mode of observance of those they retained. Sundays and holy-days stood much on the same footing as days on which no work except for good cause was to be performed, the service of the Church was to be attended, and any lawful amusement might be indulged in. It was not till about 1595 that they began to place it—Sunday—very nearly on the footing of the Jewish Sabbath, interdicting not only the slightest action of worldly

business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation; a system which, once promulgated, soon gained ground, as sitting their arrabillious humor, and affording a new theme of censure on the vices of the great." *Const. Hist.* vii.

The historian adds in a note—that "the first of these Sabbatarian laws was a Dr. Bound, whose sermon, was suppressed by Whitgift's order"—the said Whitgift being the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, at the time of the accession of James to the throne of England. From the same source we also learn that "one of *Martin-Mar-prelate's* charges" against the Anglican hierarchy was, that, one of their number—Aylmer, Bishop of London—was in the habit "of playing at bowls on Sunday." From these facts then we may judge how great is the discrepancy betwixt the *Church of Toronto* in the nineteenth century, and the "Reformed Church" of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth. It is well for our Puritanical cotemporaries in Canada that they lived not in the palmy days of Anglicanism; or they would very probably have had their noses slit, their ears docked, and been themselves stuck in the pillory, after a good flogging at the cart's tail, for holding and promulgating their heretical and disloyal principles. Laud would have made as short work with them, as was made with two judges of the western circuit, who about the year 1634, deemed it their duty to speak disparagingly of the "Book of Sports," published in the preceding reign, and regularly read on all Sundays and other Holy Days from the Anglican pulpits. For this offence the said judges were severely reprimanded; and were compelled, at their next appearance on the circuit, to make a humble and public recantation of their heresies; whilst it was farther ordered, that, for the future, every Bishop should see that the said "Book" was duly published from the pulpits of all the churches subject to their jurisdiction. These things be it remembered took place in the reign, and by the express orders, of him whom the "Church of England" as by Law Established" honors as its solitary martyr; and for whose memory it still retains a special service in its liturgy, to be used yearly on the 30th of January, being the day of the martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles the First.

How then can the Anglican *Church* condemn us for defending that which King Charles the Martyr not only defended, but strongly recommended to his loyal subjects? Here are the words of the Royal Proclamation, put forth by James I., and enforced by his son, the Martyr. It enjoined that, after divine service on Sundays persons should not:—

"Be disturbed, loitered, or discouraged, from any lawful recreations, such as dancing either of men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations—nor having of May games, Whitsun-ales, or morris dances, or of setting up of May poles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same may be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of divine service."

Here then is a nut for the *Church* to crack.—Either God has altered His laws respecting Sunday observances since the days of Charles the Martyr; or, the "Blessed Martyr" himself—as the Liturgy calls him—and the pastors of the pure branch of the Catholic Church of which he was head, were habitual transgressors of the Divine commands; not content with sinning themselves, but exhorting others to sin. But, if neither of these, then innocent and healthy amusements on Sunday are not contrary to God's Laws, and should not therefore be suppressed by the Police.

This is the sum of the matter. We, Catholics, leave our Protestant fellow-citizens at full liberty to keep their Sundays as they will; we demand the same liberty from them. In our "private judgment" which is as good as that of any Protestant minister that ever preached in an Anglican pulpit, or ranted from a Methodist tub, ball-playing is perfectly lawful on Sunday. We have the Bible as well as Protestants; we have read it as carefully as they have; and are as thoroughly masters of its meaning as they—or as any of them—are or ever will be. We need no Protestant to tell us our duty towards God; for we are sure that no Protestant that ever lived could, in this matter, teach us anything; and finally, as in religion we seek not to dictate to them what they shall do, or shall not do, or to impose upon them our opinions, so neither will we permit our Protestant fellow-citizens to dictate to us how we shall keep our Sundays. For this we are responsible to God, and not to them.

The arrogance, the impertinence, of these Sabbatarian fanatics would but excite our laughter, and contempt for their anile superstitions, were it not that our liberties as Catholics are thereby menaced. Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens have the modesty to demand that their larical Sabbatarian theories shall be made law and enforced upon us—that we shall be compelled to submit to their cant, and disgusting Puritanism. It is for this reason that we return to the subject so often; and because, before it is too late, Catholic should plainly let their Protestant fellow-citizens know that they will not submit to any interference with their religion or religious practices—that they are responsible to God and His Church alone for the manner in which they keep their Sundays; and that so long as they leave Protestants at full liberty to observe the day as they like, Catholics are determined that Protestants shall not interfere with them in their observance of it, or prevent them from doing on it what they like. How to keep Sunday is a question which we must settle with our God; to man we owe no account how we spend it—and we will give none.

This is a point upon which we should not yield one inch; for if we are weak enough to give way once, we shall be expected to yield more and more, until we have nothing left to surrender. We object to all Sunday legislation to meet the peculiar views of Protestants, because such legislation would establish

a most dangerous precedent. For, if the legislature has the right to prohibit ball-playing, not because it creates an obstruction in the public thoroughfares, or leads to a breach of the peace—[for here there would be legitimate grounds for legislative interference]—but upon religious grounds only, because, in its opinion, ball-playing is an offence against God—then, would the legislature have an equal right, to prohibit any other act which, in the opinion of the majority, might seem to, be contrary to the Laws of God. Thus Protestants declare that the Mass is idolatrous; there can be no doubt that idolatry is a violation of God's laws, the most heinous of which creatures can be guilty; by the same logic then as that by which one legislature would be bound to prohibit ball-playing, and to enforce Sabbatarian observances, would another legislature be bound to prohibit Mass-saying, and to enforce attendance upon the ministry of the Reverend Ezekiel Howlandstick, the gifted pastor of some Little Bethel or other. Thus our Protestant cotemporaries see clearly enough. They see that the enforcement by law of Protestant views respecting the Sunday, would afford a precedent for the establishment in Canada of the whole fabric of Protestant Ascendency. This is why they cry out for Sabbatarian enactments; and this is why we, as Catholics, and knowing by sad experience what Protestant Ascendency means, altogether oppose such legislation; not that we care a pin about Sunday ball-playing, but because we will not yield one jot of our rights as citizens, to Protestant clamor.

And to conclude—we deprecate all legal interference with, all attempts to suppress innocent and healthy amusements on Sunday—because, in spite of the Police, in spite of all the Laws and Statutes that ever were framed, men will have amusements of some kind or another; if not "innocent and healthy," then criminal and unhealthy; if not in the field, in the brothels and grog-shops; if not in a game at ball, in a career of low debauchery, like the brutalised masses of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and other large cities of the United Kingdom, in which Sabbatarianism is enforced by law. In these opinions we are not singular. Many Protestants heartily agree with us; and though they dare not speak out for fear of being put down by the fashionable cant of the day, yet are there hundreds who would join with us in resisting any attempt to interfere with the innocent and healthy amusements of the working classes on Sunday. Whilst on this subject, we would call the attention of the *Church of Toronto*, and our Sabbatarian friends generally, to the following extract from an article upon "Amusements," which we copy from the *New York Christian Inquirer*, one of the leading Protestant papers of North America:—

"The moral influence of amusements, their necessity, their safeguard, have evidently begun to attract the attention of moralists and religionists more than has been the case heretofore. Puritanism, even in the opinion of its warmest admirers, has not sufficiently recognised this fact. The boy reared in a home where asceticism is the rule, is peculiarly prone to fall into coarse sensuality. The same is true of whole peoples. The moral condition of England under Charles II, was in a large part the result of the reaction of the popular mind against the unnatural restraint imposed by Cromwell and his associates. Want of innocent recreation is one of the most common causes of intemperance. Drunkenness is the vice of a people who are listless, heavy, and phlegmatic, and who betake themselves for excitement to the bottle, in the lack of other modes of relaxation. The nations that cultivate music, dancing, and other like amusements, even though the character of the people is somewhat like that of the English and Americans, are comparatively sober. It was remarked during the Prussian wars against Napoleon, that the German soldiers, who had a number of amusements, were rarely drunk even off of duty, while the English soldiers were so continually." Still more marked is the contrast between the English and ourselves, and the southern nations of Europe.

"It would be easy to add other considerations having the same bearing. We are getting fast to be a nation of invalids, and the American race is not only the thinnest, but the saddest extant. Were some blaze lover of pleasure, imitating his ancient prototype, to offer a large prize "for a new pleasure," Brother Jonathan's inventive powers in this direction would hardly go beyond the furnishing of some new drink, perhaps some new combination with other liquids, of mint or sherry; or else the giving of some new name to some pleasant compound already not unknown in American bar-rooms. But be this as it may, unlike the Frenchman, of whom the very opposite is true, the American has no talent for amusing himself.

"A high authority has said, 'Every friend of the Maine Law should be a total abstinence man.' Equally true is it, that he should be pledged to favor all instrumentalities which may increase the facilities for innocent amusements. No legislation can make a joyless people temperate. If they cannot have innocent amusement, they will crave coarse excitement; and if they cannot get alcohol they will make opium and kindred stimulants take its place."

A RIVAL OF THE MONTREAL "WITNESS."—Mister George Brown, the honorable Member for Lambton—pretty stuff they make honorables and M.P.'s out of in Canada!—lately published in his organ—the *Globe*—the deliberate lie that on his last visit to Montreal and Quebec, the notorious "Nick Kirwan" did not dare to lecture for fear of violence from blood-thirsty Papists. The best of the joke is that, whilst thus libelling the citizens of Montreal and Quebec, this fellow Brown was well aware that "Kirwan's lectures" delivered in Montreal and Quebec, were being published in all the Protestant papers of the Province, and, if we may believe the *Commercial Advertiser*, by Mister Brown himself in the *Globe*. The *Montreal Herald* walks into him in fine style.

FALSHOOD AND FANATICISM.—Of all the dishonest devices, by which, in a free state, the unscrupulous, self-seeking, professional politician endeavors to attain his objects—power and place,—there is surely