

Jewish Sabbath, although it was in fact, neither Jewish nor Christian, but simply Puritanic. And such, with some unimportant changes, is the Sunday of evangelicals at the present day. The Blue Laws of the Puritans, which forbade a man to walk in his garden, to kiss his wife, or play any instrument of music but trumpets, shawms, sackbuts, and Jews-harps, and is even said to have put an injunction upon the "working" of small beer, upon the Sunday, have become obsolete, it is true; but their spirit lives yet, and rankles under the stiff folds of our white-cravated friends, as they groan over the profane sounds of innocent enjoyment, which break in upon the Sunday evening's stillness.

Such is the miserable cant which they would fain impose upon us. With such bad logic, and worse religion, would they enforce upon a Catholic community their Puritan Sabbath. But for us, while we must ever recognise Sunday as a day consecrated by our Holy Church, sacred from the toils of the week, and devoted to the joys of religion and of the social circle, we know neither Jew nor Puritan, and must not be accused of irreverence, if we laugh at the impotent resolutions of the new society, which is added to the list of evangelical engines, "The Sabbath Observance Association."

#### ECCLIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

By letters received from Rome, we are informed that the Rev. Mr. Baillargeon, named Coadjutor of the Archbishop of Quebec, has been consecrated Bishop, under the title of *Tloa*, by his Eminence, the venerable Cardinal Franzoni, Prefect of the Propaganda, on the 23rd February last. The assistant Bishops were the Most Rev. Dr. Hughes, of New York, and Monseigneur Mazenod, of Marseilles. Monseigneur Baillargeon was expected to leave Liverpool about the middle of May, and will probably be in Canada about the beginning of June.

During eighteen years that he has been Curé of Quebec, the Right Rev. Gentleman has endeared himself to all the members of his flock, by his piety, his untiring zeal, his constant efforts to promote the welfare of his parishioners. It was especially during the years 1832, 1834, and 1847, when Quebec was devastated by cholera, and by fever, that the respected Curé exhibited all the qualities of a good Pastor, ever ready to lay down his life for the weal of his flock. The establishment of the "Brothers of the Christian Doctrine," in the City of Quebec, is due to the efforts, and to the pecuniary sacrifices of Mgr. Baillargeon; it will remain an enduring monument of his affection for the juvenile portion of his parishioners, and of his solicitude for the diffusion of sound principles amongst them.

We learn from the *Mélanges Religieux*, that the Rev. P. Alex. Taché, of the Society of Oblats, for several years a missionary among the North-West Indians, has been elevated to the episcopal dignity by his Holiness Pius IX. A private letter from Quebec, states that the Bulls necessarily issued on such occasions, have been received by his Grace the Archbishop. He has been appointed Bishop *in partibus*, under the title of *Episcopus Aratusensis*, and, we presume, Coadjutor, with future succession, of Mgr. Provencher, Bishop of St. Boniface.

To the Editor of the True Witness and Catholic Chronicle.

#### INFORMATION FOR THE READERS OF THE MONTREAL WITNESS.

"There shall be a time, when they will not endure sound doctrine; but according to their own desires will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth, but will be turned unto fables."—St. Paul's 2nd epistle to Tim., ch. 4.

That the times in which we live, are such as the apostle predicted in the passage cited above, no one can deny. Travel where you will, you are sure to meet those who will not endure sound doctrine; you will meet those who desire not to be instructed, but to be pleased, and who therefore heap to themselves teachers according to their own desires. They hold not what is true, but what pleases them. Men have naturally an aversion for pain, they have a repugnance for every thing that contravenes their desires, they love ease, and are impatient of restraint. On this account, many reject a doctrine, which teaches them not to seek their own satisfaction, but God's good pleasure. They dislike those who teach such a doctrine, and, according to their own desires, they choose teachers that will speak to them the things that please. In this they follow the example of the foolish, infatuated people, of whom we read in the prophecy of Isaiah: "Who said to the seers, see not; and to them that behold, behold not for us these things that are right; speak unto us pleasant things, see errors for us." But the Gospel teaches all men not to please themselves, but God; not to do their own will, but His; and that none shall be saved, but those who obey the Divine will. "He that doth the will of my Father, who is in Heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven;" and again, "If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me." This doctrine, so destructive of self-love, meets violent opposition from every one who is, as St. Paul says, "a lover of pleasures more than of God." Without the spirit of self-denial and patient suffering, without the destruction of self-will, no one can be called an obedient disciple of Christ. To what length we are to carry our obedience, He himself showed when He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. If we hoped to be saved, we must bear a resemblance to Him in our lives and manners. For the elect, "Deus prodestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui." A spirit of proud rebellion took possession of the human mind, in consequence of Adam's disobedience, a desperate remedy was needed, to cure that desperate disease;

this remedy we have in the obedience of the Son of God. To a mind well regulated and instructed, it is painful to see how this sacred principle is derided. In direct antagonism with this virtuous principle, we find circulated daily, in the publications of this age, (publications which foment licentiousness, under the specious names of liberty and independence,) impious principles, destructive of the virtues of obedience and peace, principles, subversive of all due respect for authority, principles, containing the seeds of sedition, of insubordination, of socialism, of rebellion. Amongst the flimsy rags that advocate these accursed principles, the *Montreal Witness* is conspicuous; it has gained a notoriety, that renders it detestable to the lovers of peace and order. It is fearful to contemplate, how pernicious to society, the teaching of that journal must be. He will say, perhaps, that he directs his attacks only against the authority of the Catholic Church. This is a vain subterfuge: for if the spirit of false liberty be once infused into the human breast, the respect due to authority of every kind is extinguished, and the germ of socialism replaces it. Men should therefore think well, before they would encourage the diffusion of principles so wicked and so pernicious. But suppose the lying *Montreal Witness* doctrine, aimed only at the authority of the Catholic Church, I would ask him, since he professes to know and revere the Bible better than his neighbors, does he think it no sin to contradict St. Paul, who said, "Obey your prelates and be subject to them. For they watch over you as being to render an account for your souls; that they may do this with joy, and not with grief. For this is not expedient for you."—Heb., ch. 13, v. 17; and in v. 7, "Remember your prelates who have spoken the word of God to you; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation;" and in v. 9, "Be not led away with various and strange doctrines?" In order to ascertain whom are the prelates we are commanded to obey, we have only to enquire for those who, like St. Paul, admonish the people to be all of one mind, to think the same thing and to speak the same thing; those prelates, who teach the faithful to mark those who make dissensions and offences contrary to the doctrine which they have learnt, and to avoid them; those who maintain unity and eliminate error, for such is the object of their authority, according to the words of the Apostle, "And he gave some apostles and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other pastors, and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: until we all meet in the unity of faith,.... that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of man, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive." It is plain, that the prelates and pastors of the Catholic Church, only inculcate the principles laid down in the above texts. They insist on the necessity of holding the one true faith, and they guard this sacred deposit unadulterated, from the filthy dregs of error, by driving out of the one fold, every presumptuous and daring innovator. These prelates, then, alone tread in the footsteps of the apostles. They are the legitimate inheritors, and the rightful owners, of the privileges granted by Christ to His apostles. To them, it is said, "He that hears you, hears Me, and He that despiseth you, despiseth Me." This is a fearful crime, certainly, to despise Jesus Christ, and of this crime they are guilty, who despise the pastors of His Church! Does the editor of the *Montreal Witness* reflect on this, when he abuses the Catholic prelates and pastors, when he endeavors to excite odium against them, by calling them tyrannical and despotic, and avaricious, and ambitious? What ambition can they have, except that of being nailed to the cross like Him who loved us, and delivered Himself up for us? It is not for any crimes they are reviled; it is on account of their fidelity in keeping that which was committed to them. It is, because they require, as St. Paul did, that all the faithful be of one mind, and that there be no divisions among them, but that they be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment. It was indeed rather funny, to hear how that prodigy of light, at the head of the *Montreal Witness*, boasted of unity among Protestants, during the noisy days of the "feasts of trumpets," in the conventicle. There is, no doubt, a union amongst them; but it is the union of different brigand companies, who, no matter how divided among themselves, unite for mutual defence. Theirs is a union, forced on them by their weakness, against the Catholic Church, powerful by the force of truth. Satan knows that his kingdom could not stand, if divided against itself, he is therefore too cunning to foment dissensions among the hodgepodge of which it is composed. Since all error is in antagonism with truth, it would be surprising, if all the societies who advocate error throughout the world, did not league, as they do in the conventicle, against the only society on earth that contends for the truth, pure and unadulterated truth. In this the Catholic Church stands alone against the world, and inherits that portion which Christ foretold to His apostles, when he said, "Know that if the world hated Me, it will hate you also." And why did the world hate Christ? "Me it hateth," says he, "because I give testimony of it, that the works thereof are evil."—St. John, ch. 7, v. 7.

#### PHILALETIES.

Montreal, April 9, 1851.

(To the Editor of the Transcript.)

Sta.—Are not your views—your editorial views—upon the Ecclesiastical-property question, at present under discussion between you and the editor of the *True Witness*, at variance with your excellent knowledge of this subject? You have given great attention to the Tenure of land in Lower Canada, and you are in fact, as by profession, well skilled in Law. Will you then, like an honest Englishman, explain in a clear and succinct form, your authority for asserting

that the Seigniorial rights of the Seminary owe their "present title to the Quebec Act of 1772;" also, if you please, the distinction between these Ecclesiastical rights and those Seigniorial ones of laymen, so that we may see whether all the fine writing of late, relative to this matter, be dictated or not by the spirit of Protestantism? There is no need here for the discretion you recommend; either the rights of the Seminary are unquestionable, or they are bad. If bad, Protestants are not the Christians to leave them undisturbed; but if good, then you have no right to assail them. Mind you, the question is clearly this, and not the *Tithes*. But, talking of tithes, wherefore give it as "your opinion, that the Protestants of Lower Canada would very willingly part with their three-fourths of the Reserves, if the Catholics would part with the other fourth, and the tithes!" Why tithes? What have Protestants to do with them? In fact, I fear it is yourself who are "ignorant" of this matter, which you so modestly charge the editor of the *True Witness* with not knowing. One must infer from your allusion to tithes, that Protestants are compelled to pay them; whereas, by the thirty-fifth clause of the Imperial Act of 1791, and indeed by the Quebec Act also, they have ever been exempted in Canada from this "Irish enormity." Thus, "That no incumbent of the Church of Rome, appointed to any Parish in the said Province, should be entitled to receive any tithes for lands or possessions occupied by a Protestant, but that such tithes should be received by such persons as the said Guy Carleton, Esq., his Majesty's Captain General and Governor-in-Chief in and over his Majesty's said Province of Quebec, should appoint." Is it not enough, then, that the Curé is deprived of the one-twenty-sixth of the cereal produce of every farm within his Parish, of which a Protestant becomes possessed, without wishing to deprive the Minister of God of the means of life!—such means too as do not equal the cereal offering which the Irish annually make their beloved Pastors in addition to their deminimal allowance.

You do not mean to talk of "the most valuable endowments, tithes excluded," but you do speak of them, "tithes included." Tithes then make these endowments invaluable. Wherefore valuable on account of tithes? You were treating of the Seigniorial endowments of the Seminary. These are not tithes. Seigniorial rights are *corporeal* rights; tithes are *incorporeal*: both which are as susceptible of distinction in argument as in law. Yet you would confound them, evidently to consign them to the same fate. You say that Lord Sydenham's Ordinance was "limitary as well as confirmatory" and your express doubts (not your own, of course) as to these limitations being complied with. What then? If, as you say, the Seigniorial rights of the Seminary derive their "present title" from the Quebec Act, how can this affect the question? Know you not that this confirmatory ordinance was merely intended as a *quid pro quo*, to put a stop to certain Protestant representations to Downing Street, and Downing Street Despatches in reply, upon the expediency of robbing the Seminary of its property? but, as to the "limitations," go try them in court, or where you please, and be satisfied. The fact is, that neither to this ordinance, nor to the Quebec Act, does the Seminary trace its Seigniorial titles.

In 1627, "The Company of One Hundred Associates" was formed under the auspices of Cardinal Richelieu, with something of the same sovereign powers as those of "The East India Company" of the present day. Their Charter made over to them all the territory of this Province, that is, of "New France." And from this Company, a Company of Catholics at Paris purchased the Island of Montreal, but becoming involved in pecuniary difficulties, about 1640, transferred it to the St. Sulpicians, who became responsible for all the outstanding debts, which were found far to exceed in value the property thus acquired. In 1644, the Royal confirmation was added. This property, so acquired, 211 years ago, was, at the cession of this colony to England, in 1759, secured to its present corporate owners, by the following Article of Capitulation: "All the Communities, and all the Priests, shall preserve their moveables, the property and revenues of the Seignories, and other estates, which they possess in the Colony, of what nature soever they be; and the same estates shall be preserved in their privileges, rights, honors, and exemptions."—Granted? Four years after, in 1763, the Articles of Capitulation were confirmed by the *Treaty of Paris*, so that any violation of them now, would constitute a *casus belli* between France and England, unless, indeed, it may be argued, that one International Treaty annuls another, even of a different nature, if preceding it, and thus, without foreseeing where this doctrine leads, a subsequent treaty be cited against this one. The Quebec Act was a constitutional Act, "one of conciliation to the Canadians"—America being then troublesome—just as were the concessions made to the Irish a little after, with this same object, "by which the English Civil Law, which had been introduced amongst them, was changed for the *Coutume de Paris*, the ancient system, to which they had been so long accustomed."

You put the question, whether George III. had not as good authority for making grants as the French king. This, of course, is not intended as serious, since it would be absurd to dispute it. But what the English sovereign does, the English sovereign can undo—especially if done badly, and most imperfectly, as in the matter of the Clergy Reserves—with the advice and consent of his Parliament. What he cannot do with or without the consent of his parliament, is, to violate treaties. The Clergy Reserves were never *vested*, but only *reserved*; the seigniorial endowments of the Seminary were vested from the first. Endowments, if made from the Clergy Reserves, would be good only from their date—not good

because of the Imperial act of '91, which made no endowments, but only set these Reserves apart for future endowment; but good on account of the authority vested in the sovereign, under this act, while unreppealed, to make such endowments. If the "Clergy Reserves" is a vexed question to-day, it is due to Protestantism being so prolific of creeds, that no power under Heaven can legislate for it, and this appropriation only follows the fate of all the rest.

Well, you object to the language of the editor of the *True Witness*, but you forget your own canons in your criticism. His language comes of an intense regard for truth, which makes a man intolerant of a writer's equivocation, in the teeth of indisputable proof, rather than surrender a political prejudice to conviction, or a point in argument to an adversary. But whence comes yours, except it be from that Anglo-Saxon plethora, which has nothing but superciliousness to offer, when pushed beyond the pace of a Yorkshire drayman? As for your "looking with contempt," &c., why, it is only a matter of taste after all, possibly of a bilious taste too, which the observance of the *lent* would, in all probability, correct. The word which roused your wrath, and gave you so fine an opportunity for escape, is often used as a *wedge* in argument, but never morally.

Yours, &c.,

CATHOLICUS.

Montreal, April 12, 1851.

#### IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

##### HOUSE OF COMMONS—MARCH 24.

##### THE ECCLESIASTICAL TITHES BILL—ADJOURNED DEBATE.

The sixth night's debate upon this Bill was resumed by Mr. Fagan, who contended that the measure was unnecessary, because it was the received opinion, both with lay and clerical Catholics in this country, that the authority of the Pope was strictly limited to matters spiritual. The hon. gentleman justified the conduct of the Archbishop of Turin, saying that "it was sacrilege to offer the sacramental rites to an impenitent sinner."

Mr. Smythe characterised the measure as a Bill of sham pains and penalties to repel a sham aggression.

Mr. M. Milnes could not concur with the opponents who repudiated the present Bill without suggesting a better.

Mr. Sadleir enlarged upon the loyalty of Catholics, and maintained that the proposed hierarchy was necessary for their protection against ultramontanism.—Mr. H. Berkeley and Mr. G. Berkeley supported, and Sir J. Young, Mr. H. Grattan, Lord Castlereagh, and Mr. A. Hope, opposed, the Bill.

The House then became impatient for a division, and a motion for adjournment produced an appeal from Lord J. Russell that the discussion should be allowed to close, since six nights had been spent in debate and forty-eight Members had spoken on one side or the other.

Many vehement remonstrances were urged on behalf of the Irish, the Scotch, and the Catholic Members, against what was called an untimely termination of the debate.

The House adjourned at two o'clock.

##### HOUSE OF COMMONS—MARCH 25.

##### CONCLUDING DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING.

Mr. Hobhouse, resumed the debate on this Bill. He was opposed to any legislation upon the subject. "They could no more consider the word 'bishop' in the character of a designation or title than the words physician, barrister, &c." If he knew anything of the signs of the times, the Church of England was much more threatened on the side of irreligion and infidelity than on the side of Romanism.

Mr. Portal in a maiden speech expressed the opinion that the Bill was "a mere mockery and delusion, alike unworthy the wisdom of that deliberative assembly and this great country."—Mr. John O'Connell assailed the Bill with much acerbity, and declared that the threats of the Premier "passed by" Catholics, like the idle wind which they regard not."—Mr. Lawless followed up the attack. The noble lord had failed "in pleasing the Protestant-ascendancy boys," while on the other hand he had deserted "the real religious-liberty men."—Mr. Scully condemned the Bill altogether—principle and details.—Mr. Hume looked upon this debate as one of the most unfortunate occurrences that had taken place during his long parliamentary experience.—Sir F. Thesiger had been anxious, all through the debate, to hear how the Bill could repress the present aggression, or prevent a future one. Cardinal Wiseman might drive a carriage and four, not through, but over the noble lord's Bill, without feeling the slightest shock. Every Catholic would invariably give the hierarchy their titles.

Mr. Gladstone, as a representative of an English University, had the misfortune to be opposed to all his colleagues.—The letter of the noble lord to the Bishop of Durham was a letter which I am certain he never should have demeaned himself to have written—(loud cries of "oh, oh.")—Perhaps I am wrong—perhaps I am in fault—(loud cries of "hear,")—but allow me to explain. I did not mean to say (though I have my own opinion as to the letter) that the noble lord had done himself, dishonour in writing it. I only meant to say that he would have demeaned himself, and disgraced himself by writing it, if, when he wrote it, he thought there had been a breach of the law of nations—(hear.) Nothing surely could be more disgraceful to an English Minister, than that, when a breach of the law of nations had been committed, and an insult against the Sovereign of England by a foreign power, he should have complained of that breach of the law of nations and repelled that insult, not through any communication to the power which had committed that breach and that insult, but by a letter published in a newspaper.—(hear.)

The speeches of Mr. D'Israeli and Sir G. Grey concluded the debate.

The House then divided; the numbers were—For the second reading, 438; against it, 95; majority, 343.

The House adjourned at a quarter past three o'clock, until Thursday.

Of your charity pray for the repose of the soul of Marie-Louise Curotte, Veuve St. George Dupré, who departed this life on Sunday, the 13th inst., aged 79 years.—R. I. P.