

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, \$2 do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 2, 1855.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Up to the time of going to press—Wednesday noon—the steamer had not been telegraphed at New York. The *Ariel* brings one day's later news from Europe than the *Africa*, but it is of no great importance. It confirms the rumor that Louis Napoleon, in concert with Lord Palmerston, is adopting a very offensive policy towards the Sovereign Pontiff. From the seat of war we have nothing new; but the next arrival may be expected to bring news of the bombardment of Odessa.

PROTESTANTISM AND ABSOLUTISM.

The controversy betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism at the present day is far more political than religious. Most Protestants, if hard pressed, will admit that even Catholics may be saved; and that fasting, chastity, and good works will not exclude Papists from the kingdom of heaven. It is rather upon temporal, than upon spiritual grounds that Protestantism is defended; as more favorable than its opposite—Catholicity—to man's earthly well being; as, at all events, good for the belly and the back, which it professes to fill with victuals, and to cover with superior broadcloth; and above all as the mainstay of our civil liberties and our rights as citizens. Popery on the contrary, is represented as enslaving man in this world, even if it does not deprive him of all hopes for the next; and the Catholic Church is held responsible for the extravagancies of a King *Bomba*, as if she were the friend and protectress of "absolutism" in government.

But even upon this low ground there have never been wanting Catholic controversialists ready to enter the lists with the champions of Protestantism; and who have asserted—aye, and if there be meaning in words, force in logic, or any truth in history, have made good their assertions—that "Absolutism" in civil government is essentially one of the fruits of the "blessed Reformation"; and that whatever of civil or political liberty is still enjoyed by any of those communities that have embraced its principles, is due, not to their Protestantism, or Denial of the authority of the Church, but to the fragments of Catholicity which, in spite of their Protest or Denial, still adhere to them.

The doctrine of the absolute right of kings, and its corollary, the duty of passive obedience, or "absolute submission" to tyrannical and Godless—rulers, is, as every man who has ready history well knows, eminently a Protestant or anti-Catholic doctrine. It was never heard of in Christendom before the sixteenth century; it having until then been always held, in theory at least, that man had no "absolute" rights over his fellow-man; that rights and duties, authority and allegiance were reciprocal; that rulers had duties towards their subjects, as well as rights over them; and that when the former were violated, the latter were forfeited. With the birth of Protestantism however, a new light dawned upon the world, by the aid of which a perfectly novel view of the relative positions of kings and people was obtained; and then, for the first time amongst professedly Christian nations, was the old Pagan doctrine revived, that the latter were subject to the will of the former, and that under any circumstances to resist that will was to oppose God Himself. During a considerable portion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this doctrine was generally professed, if not invariably acted upon; in the Protestant world; for of course, it is not pretended that Protestants were more consistent then, than they are now; or that their practice was at any time in strict conformity with their professions.

"They"—the Anglican clergy—"had studiously inculcated"—says Hallam—"that resistance to the commands of rulers was in every conceivable instance a heinous sin; a tenet so evidently subversive of all civil liberty, that it can be little worth while to argue about right and privileges, whenever it has obtained a real hold on the understanding and conscience of a nation. This had very early been adopted by the Anglican Reformers as a barrier against the disaffection of those who adhered to the ancient religion, and in order to exhibit their own loyalty in a more favorable light."—*Const. Hist. c. VII.* The same doctrine is inculcated in still stronger language in the *Homilies*, which, according to the 35th Article of the Church of England, "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," and are commanded to be read in churches from the pulpits.

To this doctrine of the absolute right of kings, succeeded the no less blasphemous and slavish doctrine of the divine, and absolute right of peoples—

or rather of majorities; including of course the duty of an absolute submission, on the part of minorities, to the will of majorities. This has generally been the fashionable doctrine on this Continent; where polyarchical despotism proclaims itself the inheritor of all the rights and privileges of the monarchial and aristocratic despotisms of the Old World. It is therefore with no little surprise that we find the *Church*, the organ of the Anglican sect of Protestants in Upper Canada, coming boldly forward as the advocate of what we considered—in this part of the world at least—the exploded theory of the absolute right of kings; and asserting as a Christian doctrine, the duty of submission to the will of the civil magistrate, because it is his will.—

"An honest man"—says our Protestant cotemporary—"must shut his eyes, and stop his ears, before he can be convinced that the teaching of Holy Scripture is not that of absolute submission to our superiors. . . . Scriptural and Apostolic teaching require obedience to law, because it is the will of a superior."—*Church*, 12th Oct.

Not so, good *Church*, but because "so is the will of God,—that by doing well you may silence the ignorance of foolish men; as free, and not as making liberty a cloak of malice." These at least are the reasons given by St. Peter why in all things not contrary to the law of God, we should submit ourselves to civil rulers; but nowhere does he, or any other of the sacred writers, assert the duty of "absolute unqualified submission" to their "will," or that their will is law. We are almost inclined to regret that, with his peculiar political opinions, our Protestant cotemporary is not a subject of the Russian Czar, or of the amiable king of Naples; as, in that case he would soon have an opportunity of reducing his principles to practice. We may be permitted to doubt though, if they would stand the test of the knout, or a smart application of the bastinado; remembering as we do, how the very men who, in the seventeenth century were the foremost champions of this same doctrine of "absolute submission" to the "will of their superiors, were amongst the first to set the example of resistance to that will, when in opposition to theirs; and to invite a foreign prince to invade their native land with a band of foreign mercenaries, with the object of dethroning, if not of murdering, their lawful sovereign. We have also some faint idea, that in the Liturgy of the sect to which our cotemporary belongs, there is still to be found a blasphemous rigmorole, entitled "A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving," for the happy issue of that act of rebellion; in which we are told by our friends that "The Lord has put a new song into their mouths;" a "new song" which we strongly suspect our Upper Canadian cotemporary would sing most lustily if subjected to a little of that peculiar discipline which obtains amongst the subjects of the Russian Empire.

We should be unjust to our Protestant cotemporary, however, were to refrain from adding that he qualifies his theory of the rights of rulers, and the duty of subjects. He says:—

"There is another important truth strangely forgotten in these days by most of those who dogmatize upon the principles of government; namely that, the Church of God is a Theocracy more real and personal than that which existed amongst the Israelites previous to the days of Saul. Hence, when the Church is faithful, there is a direct interference on the part of the Most High on behalf of the temporal interests of Her members, which makes perfectly safe that entire submission to rulers which He requires, however unholly and oppressive they may be."—*Church* 12th Oct.

Such a power of restricting the tyranny of the civil magistrate, may indeed be rightly predicated of the One, True Church of God—for that Church is entirely independent of, though not necessarily unconnected with, the State or civil power. Hence the Catholic Church, speaking by the mouth of her Supreme Pontiffs, has often interfered, most effectually, on behalf of her members when oppressed by unjust rulers; vindicating the rights of the former; rebuking, and exhorting the latter, reminding them of their duties, and, in extreme cases, launching against them the thunders of excommunication. But, in order that a church may so act, it is essential that she be independent, and not the mere creature, of the power which she pretends to control; for creature can never limit or control creator. A church, "by law established," cannot offer any effectual resistance to the tyranny of law, which is the will of Cæsar—neither can she—if in Cæsar she acknowledges her supreme head, "unto whom the chief government of all Estates of the Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain"—*Art. 37*—oppose any barrier to the aggressions of Cæsar, either in things spiritual or temporal, in causes civil or ecclesiastical. Such a church is but a branch—not of the Catholic Church, but—of the civil government; whose bishops are but government functionaries, bound to do their master's bidding; and which may be, and often has been, a pliant tool in the hands of the tyrant. But such a church never can be an assertor of freedom, or of the rights of Cæsar's subjects; never can she presume to speak with the bold tongue of a St. Thomas of Canterbury.

Thus the saving clause by means of which the Anglican Church seeks to evade the dangerous consequences of his doctrine of the "absolute rights" of rulers, and the duty on the part of subjects of "absolute submission" to their "will" is—as his own Articles would term it—"a fond thing, vainly invented; grounded upon no warranty of history, but rather repugnant to reason, and all experience."

AN UNLUCKY SPEECH.—It would have been well for His Excellency, the Governor General, had he been born dumb; for so would he have escaped getting himself into an exceedingly unpleasant mess, by a singularly injudicious and ill-timed speech, delivered at Hamilton in Upper Canada, upon the oc-

casional of a public banquet to which he had been invited in that city.

In acknowledging the toast of "The Governor General," His Excellency is reported to have delivered himself to the effect, that, as Upper Canada was the more important section of the Province, so its superiority must in part be ascribed to the natural and inherent superiority of the "Anglo-Saxon" race over the French Canadian race, and all other races of Celtic extraction. This insult to the great majority of the people of Lower Canada, both French and Irish, was received with "loud cheers" by his "Anglo-Saxon" audience—whose modesty and good taste are proverbial; but has since met with a very different kind of acknowledgment from the inferior French Canadians and the other Celts, whom, in his speech, His Excellency took the opportunity to so wantonly insult.

Upon the truth or falsity of the assertions contained in this speech, we shall not at present make any comments; neither need we insist upon the glaring impropriety of which the representative of our Sovereign in Canada was guilty, in thus sowing the seeds of jealousy and ill-will, betwixt the different races of which the population of the Province is made up. We may be permitted to remark, however, that the time chosen for this glorification of Anglo-Saxonism at the expense of the Celtic race, was most unlucky. For it will naturally be asked at the present juncture—How comes it—if the Anglo-Saxon race is so superior to the Franco-Celtic race, and all other races of Celtic extraction—that, at the present moment, the former cut so sorry, not to say contemptible a figure in the Crimea, alongside of their Celtic Allies? How is it that they have not displayed some of their so much vaunted superiority during the present war; and especially during the long protracted struggle before Sebastopol and at the assault on the Redan? During the past winter, whilst the army composed of the inferior race was well able to take care of itself, how came it to pass that the other army, composed in part, and officered almost entirely, by descendants of the superior Anglo-Saxon race, was dying off by thousands daily, of hunger and cold—unable to help itself—the scorn of its enemies—and a burthen to its Celtic Allies, by whom indeed it was fed, protected, and, on more than one occasion, rescued from utter destruction? These questions, easy to ask—questions in fact which are in the mouths of every one, and which have been very significantly asked upon more than one occasion by our Allies of the inferior race—it will not be so easy to answer upon the hypothesis of an inherent superiority in the Anglo-Saxon race, over races of Franco-Celtic extraction. It may perhaps be said that this superiority asserts itself only in times of peace, and in commercial pursuits; that the Anglo-Saxon is a sharper hand at a bargain, has a keener eye for the pence, and is greater amongst broad cloth and dry goods; than is his Celtic neighbor—and this may be true. But if so, His Excellency's laudation of his "Anglo-Saxon" friends should have been somewhat qualified.

We would fain believe, however, that the words, attributed to the Governor slipped out from betwixt his teeth in an unguarded moment; and that he never intended that they should bear the construction put upon them by the "Anglo-Saxon" organs of Upper Canada. These gentlemen, however, have not been slow to improve the occasion afforded them by His Excellency's escapade. Amongst others we may notice the *Toronto Leader*, who charitably and most condescendingly informs the poor inferior Celts of this Province, that their inevitable destiny is to be absorbed—"catawampusly chawed up" as the Yankees have it—by the Anglo-Saxon. The inevitable fate of races," he says:—

"Has settled the point, irrespective of a Governor's speech, or a Ministry's policy. The Celtic race is hastening to dissolution. Its mission, as a part of the human family has all but closed; and whether we speak about it, or hold our peace, the issue is the same. Ireland and Scotland are witnesses of the fact. . . . Canada is hastening to the same end. If the Union lasts, and let us hope it may, the issue cannot be long doubtful."

If this be so, the sooner the Union is dissolved the better; if it cannot be preserved except at such a price—away with it to the dogs; and let the voice of every French Canadian, of every Irishman, of every one in whose veins flows a drop of Celtic blood, be raised against this Union, as an insult to their nationality, and as a badge of degradation to which they will not submit. We know not if the *Leader* speaks as one having authority—or if his commentary upon the Governor's unlucky speech be put forward with Ministerial sanction—but if so, assuredly he has furnished the French Canadians of Lower Canada with the best of arguments for the immediate Repeal of the Union.

But this question involves more than meets the eye—more than a mere question of races. "Anglo-Saxon Ascendancy," which is to be the inevitable result of the Union, according to the *Leader*, means Protestant Ascendancy as well; it means that an Anglo-Saxon religion, as well as an Anglo-Saxon nationality, is to become the all-absorbing religion of this country. It is true that cases of Catholicity may occur, even amongst the Anglo-Saxon race, and of Protestantism amongst the Celtic; but if so, it is only in the sporadic form that they appear. As a general rule, amongst the races of European origin on the American Continent, the Celt is a Catholic, the Anglo-Saxon a Protestant of some denomination or another. Protestantism—if a religion at all—is a Teutonic religion—just as Mormonism is a peculiar form of Protestantism as modified by Yankee Anglo-Saxonism. When therefore the organs of Anglo-Saxon supremacy in Canada tell us that "the Celtic race is hastening to dissolution"—that "its mission has all but closed"—and that its

"inevitable fate" is to be swallowed up by the more powerful Anglo-Saxon race—we must understand them to mean, that the Catholic religion is at its last gasp—that the mission of the Church has all but closed—and that "the inevitable fate of Catholicity" is to be absorbed by Anglo-Saxon Protestantism.—They tell us too, that, "if the Union lasts, this issue cannot be long delayed." If they are right, we say again, that we desire no better argument for the dissolution of this anti-Catholic Union.

Yet may not these boastings, these triumphant anticipations be somewhat premature on the part of our Anglo-Saxon friends? Are the relative positions of the Anglo-Saxon and the Celtic nations in Europe, at the present moment, such as to authorize us to assume that the latter "are hastening to dissolution," and that the former are destined to rule the earth. Great Britain is the representative of the Anglo-Saxon race throughout the world. Is then her position such as to inspire confidence in the permanent superiority of Anglo-Saxonism? Contrast, we say, her position with that of Catholic and Celtic France; and then say if—after all—even the boasted material superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race, be not a gross delusion, which the events of the war now raging have exploded, and which can never more obtain credence amongst the nations. Unable to bring an effective army into the field, unable to clothe, feed, or find shelter for the trifling handful of soldiers whom they have sent to perish miserably in the trenches before Sebastopol—humbly, cap in hand, courting the alliance of that Franco-Celtic race whom they affect to look upon as their inferiors—and their Queen compelled by political misfortunes, to submit to the fraternal embrace of him, who but a few years ago was scorned as a needy adventurer, and upon whom the dogs would have been set, had he dared to approach the royal shades of Windsor—the circumstances of the representatives of "Anglo-Saxonism" in Europe are assuredly not so brilliant as to warrant the language of the Governor-General at Hamilton, or the insulting comments of the *Toronto Leader* and other Anglo-Saxon organs of Upper Canada.—Perhaps, however, His Excellency, during his sojourn amongst the Anglo-Saxons of Upper Canada may find occasion to somewhat modify his opinions. And for this purpose would we strongly recommend him—we do not say to compare, but—to contrast the habits and general characteristics of the two races of whom the population of Canada is composed. This he may do most effectually by referring to the criminal statistics of Upper and Lower Canada, respectively; and from these he will learn that this boasted superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race does not extend into the domain of morals and religion—unless indeed the rapid increase of crime be a sign of the spread of the one, and a test of the influence exercised by the other. It is in the Toronto Penitentiary, if anywhere, that we must look for the real proofs of Anglo-Saxon superiority.

MR. M'GEE'S LECTURES.

We would beg to remind our readers that Mr. T. D. M'Gee will lecture in the Hall of the Mechanics Institute on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday, of next week. His subject will be *Irish History, as a Key to Irish Destiny in the Nineteenth Century*. To all who love Ireland and cherish her memory in a foreign land we would say, this is, perhaps, the best opportunity they may ever have of hearing her history treated of as it deserves. If there be any one man on the American Continent qualified to lecture on Irish History, that man is Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee, who has done more than any man now living in America towards the creation of a modern literature for Ireland. To hear him lecture three times on Irish History will be indeed a privilege; especially for the children of that ancient land, drifted by their changeable fortunes on these distant shores. Like the children of Israel sitting by the waters of Babylon, so do the Irish people every where, look back with enduring love to the land where their fathers lived and died; and they will, we are sure, gladly avail themselves of this opportunity to hear her changeable history treated of by one of her most gifted sons. We are again indebted to the young Men's St. Patrick's Association for the honor of Mr. M'Gee's visit; and we hope to see such an attendance at the lectures as shall warrant them in undertaking future enterprises of a similar nature.

LECTURE POSTPONED.—In consequence of the Hall of the Mechanic's Institute being engaged for Monday night, Mr. D. M'Gee's first lecture has been postponed until Tuesday next; when we expect he will have a crowded audience.

As the Lecture night has thus been changed, we have been requested by the Secretary of the Young Men's St. Patrick's Association to announce that their next monthly meeting has been postponed until Tuesday the 13th inst.

In reply to the TRUE WITNESS of the 19th ult., in which we denied the assertion of the other *Witness*, that the Sisters of Charity who lately left Montreal for Chili had been "made publicly to take a solemn vow of perpetual celibacy;" because—every one of the said Sisters had voluntarily offered herself for the work, and because it is a dishonest perversion of language to say that a person has been "made" to do, that which he or she has voluntarily, and without any external compulsion, undertaken to do—the *Montreal Witness* favors us with the following remarks:—

"We never stated, not even by implication, as our cotemporary affirms we did, that they had been compelled, against their will."

He admits too:—  
That "it is quite possible, if not probable," that the Ladies themselves "wished to do what they have done; quite possible that if at the last moment, they