

**REMITTANCES**  
 TO  
**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. Sacrament Street,  
 Montreal, December 14, 1854.

**The True Witness.**  
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 23, 1857.

**NEWS OF THE WEEK.**  
 THE last dates from Liverpool fully confirm the previous reports of the outbreak in China. It would seem that Brother Jonathan has also a "crow to pick" with the Celestials; and that a French squadron is fitting out for the China Sea. The Son of the Moon, and first cousin to all the heavenly bodies generally, will soon have enough on his hands.  
 From Europe, the news is pacific. The Neuchâtel question is in a fair way of being adjusted, and the Paris Conferences are a mere matter of form.

FROM our "frank confession"—as the *Aylmer Times* calls it—that the Roman Catholic Church is not, and that the one true Church—that which has been in existence ever since the day of Pentecost—cannot be, "founded on Scripture," or the writings of the New Testament, seeing that that Church is older than the most ancient portion of the said scriptures, and that it is impossible for a superstructure to be older than its foundation—our cotemporary boasts that he "can readily prove that Romanism is not Christianity." This proud vaunt he attempts to make good, by the following strange logical process:—

He argues—1. That "Christ acknowledged the authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament." This we admit; but as Christ left no "Canon," or list, of the said Old Testament Scriptures, this avails but little. There were apparently amongst the Jewish inspired Scriptures, books which we have lost: as for instance, that wherein was recorded the prophecy of "Enoch the seventh from Adam," quoted by St. Jude in his General Epistle, 14th verse; and of which the knowledge must have been preserved by means of a book: unless indeed, even under the old dispensation, oral tradition, as well as Scripture, was a recognised medium for transmitting divine truth from one generation to another—from the days of Enoch before the Deluge, down to those of the first century of the Christian era.

Secondly—argues our cotemporary—"Christ taught His will to His disciples, in order to prepare them for preaching it to men, and committing it to writing, which they did at His direction, and under His authority."

That Christ taught His will to His disciples—"or"—[to quote our cotemporary]—"apostles as they were afterwards called"—is undoubted; for it is implied in the name "disciples," or learners, which of course implies a teacher; but it no where appears upon the record that He ever directed His disciples, "or apostles as they were afterwards called," to commit His teachings to writing. If our cotemporary holds to the opinion that He did direct them so to do, he should be prepared to prove it; not by vague assumptions, but by well established historical facts; and remembering always that, according to a Protestant maxim, "whatsoever is not read therein"—Holy Scripture—"nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith."—39 Articles—Art. vi.

Not only is there not in the said Scriptures one word to make us suspect that Christ ever directed His disciples, "or apostles as they were afterwards called," to commit His teachings to writing—but, from the subsequent conduct of the said Apostles themselves, we have the strongest reasons for believing that He did not. We have for instance, every reason for believing that they were sincerely attached to, and faithfully obedient to the directions of, their Divine Master; and would therefore, had they been so directed by Him, have been all, not only prompt in fulfilling His directions, but would have taken good care to secure the fruits of their literary labors to future generations, by bequeathing to them a list of the books by them written, and therefore to be received as authoritative by all men in subsequent ages. These things doubtless they would have done, if obedient disciples, if directed by their Master to write, and if possessed of a grain of ordinary prudence.

Now, the undoubted historical fact is, that not only the disciples, "or apostles as they were afterwards called," left behind them no list, or "Canon" of Scripture—no means whatsoever by which the humble, but earnest inquirer of distant ages might learn what writings he was to receive as the authoritative works of the Apostles—but that there is scarce a single writing now extant, which, without calling in the assistance of an infallible authority in religious matters, can be proved to be the work of an apostle, or of an

eye witness of Christ's miracles, and an ear witness of His teachings upon earth.

To begin with the Gospels. Those of St. Mark and of St. Luke do not even profess to have been written by Apostles, or under Our Lord's direction. On the contrary, the latter begins his history by informing us, that "it seemed good" to him to write; a form of words hardly reconcilable with a positive direction from Christ to write. Of the Gospel called of St. Matthew, all that the Protestant can state positively is, that, in its present form, it is not the work of him whose name it bears; whilst the Gospel of St. John, the last in point of age of all the New Testament writings, has been, both by early heretics, and modern Protestants, denied to be the writing of an Apostle at all. Whether any of the other Apostles wrote biographical notices of their Master, with a summary of His teachings, (in compliance with His directions), we need not inquire; it is enough for us that, if they did, not a vestige of their literary labors remains at the present day.

Thus Neander, the Protestant theologian of the evangelical school in Germany, in his "Life of Christ," tells us that:—

"The settled results of my investigations on this subject may be stated as follows. The historical remains, as well as the nature of the case, show that the writing of the Gospel history did not originate in any design to give a connected account of the life and public ministry of Christ as a whole, but rather grew out of a series of traditional accounts of separate scenes in His history. These accounts were partly transmitted by word of mouth, and partly laid down in written memoirs. . . . Our first three Gospels resulted from the compilation of such separate materials, as Luke himself states in his introduction. Matthew's Gospel, in its present form, was not the production of the Apostle, whose name it bears."

Passing next to the *Acts*, and *Epistles* of St. Paul, our Protestant cotemporary will hardly pretend that either were written by a "disciple," to whom Christ had taught His Will upon earth, or one to whom He gave the commission to "teach all nations," and the assumed directions to write. Of the Epistle called of St. James, all that our Protestant friend can assert positively is, that, on the highest Protestant authority—that of St. Luther himself—it has been pronounced an "epistle of straw;" whilst of the other writings of the New Testament, there is scarce one whose genuineness has not been called in question, not one which has any other claims upon our veneration as inspired Scripture, than the authoritative decisions of the Catholic Church. This may appear very shocking to our Aylmer cotemporary; but if he will attempt to establish the authority of any one book of the New Testament, without appealing to those decisions as final, he will soon find the truth of our assertion. And this should suffice also to convince him that Scripture, or Writings, cannot be the foundation of the true Church. For, until by a competent living authority—and only an infallible authority was competent for such a work—the Canon of Scripture had been settled—which was not till late in the IV. century—no one, without pretending to a special revelation, could possibly know what Scriptures, or Writings, he was to receive as the inspired Word of God, or as authoritative in the supernatural order.

Let us ask of our cotemporary to transport himself in imagination to the middle of the second century of our era, before the "Canon of Scripture" had been authoritatively defined; and whilst by many Christian communities, or churches, many writings which are now included in the New Testament Canon, were rejected, or looked upon as apocryphal; and others, now excluded, were accepted as Holy Scripture; how, under such circumstances, would he, as a Christian, have acted?—by what process would he have endeavored to arrive at certainty upon the numerous and important controversies which then raged in the Christian world? By appeal to the Scriptures? But how would he have known to what Scriptures to appeal; when, as yet, no universally recognised "Canon of Scripture" was in existence?—or has he the presumption to suppose—either that God would have given to him a special revelation upon this head—or that by his individual judgment he would have been capable of solving so momentous a question; one upon which there is, even at the present day, so much variety of opinion amongst the most learned Protestants? And yet, until he had with infallible certainty settled his "Canon of Scripture," it would have been impossible for him to appeal to Scripture as the "touchstone that must settle all controverted doctrines;" for till then, Scripture itself would have been to him an "unknown quantity" in the problem presented to him for solution.

The Church therefore could not have held in the second century, or before the "Canon of Scripture" was settled, "that the Scriptures" were the foundation of the Church; but would have asserted of herself then, as St. Paul asserted of her in the first century, that she was "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets"—Eph. ii, 20. Now, though tradition tells us that the said Apostles bequeathed to the Church the valuable legacy of the "Apostles' Creed," yet it is certain that they did not

\* It is worthy of notice that this Creed contains a profession of belief "in the Holy Catholic Church," but not a word about believing "in the Holy Scriptures."

leave her, what would have been of infinitely more value—nay indispensable, upon the hypothesis of the *Aylmer Times*—viz., a "Canon of Scripture," or accurate list of the writings which were to be received by all as of divine authority, and as the foundation of the Christian Church. Of two things therefore, one. Either we must admit that the Apostles were the most stupid blunderers and nincompoops to whom was ever committed an important charge—in that they did not settle the foundations of the Church; or, from the fact that—though careful to ordain Bishops in every country which they visited, and to whom they gave the charge to "keep that which was committed to their trust"—1 Tim. vi, 20—and to commit the things heard from the Apostles to other faithful men, who should "be able to teach others also"—2 Tim. ii, 2—they took no precaution whatever to settle a "Canon of Scripture;" we must conclude that, in the opinion of the Apostles themselves, the Scriptures were not the "foundation of the Church," or "the touchstone that must settle all controverted doctrines." The Church, and the Church alone, is that "touchstone;" and therefore is it that, with St. Augustin, the Romanist of the XIX century still exclaims "I would not believe the Scriptures did not the authority of the Church move me thereunto."

Our cotemporary is perfectly correct in his surmise, that—"if religion is from heaven it must be true, and there must be some mode or method of communicating it to man"; but it does not thence follow that "mode or method" must either be Scripture or writing, or else oral teachers, all alike inspired." For there is another mode conceivable; as for instance, that of a living body or Church; no individual member of which is indeed inspired; but which, as an organic whole, is possessed of a vital principle, even the indwelling Spirit of Christ; by Whom it is effectually preserved from all error, from all possibility of corruption, and is constantly led into all truth. Such a "mode or method of communicating it"—religion—"to man" is conceivable; and therefore we are not compelled to accept either alternative propounded to us by the *Aylmer Times*. It is also evident, that, if there be such a body, Church, or spiritual organism, there would be no fear of her changing, or of "some new thing turning up which would overthrow her whole past teaching and experience." The possibility of change and error can not be predicated of a body, animated by the Spirit of Him Who is truth—the same yesterday, to day, and forever; and thus the objection urged by the *Aylmer Times* against a Church, as the "mode or method of communicating religion to man," is valid only upon the hypothesis that she is a mere human institution. But if of Divine origin, the body of Christ Himself, in vital union with Him as her Head—a divine organism in fact, not a mere congeries of individuals—his objection of course is worthless; and such a "mode or method of communicating religion to man" may still be, for all he has shown to the contrary, the one "mode or method" appointed by Christ Himself.

To the pressing, but reasonable invitation in our last number to the *Montreal Witness*, to name his authority for, or to withdraw, his positive assertion that "88 per cent." of the juvenile criminals committed to the Montreal jail during the past year "were pupils of the nuns and friars," our cotemporary returns no answer. He refuses either to give his authority for his calumny, or to withdraw it.

Amongst non-evangelical persons, there can be but one opinion of such conduct; and though it may find favor in the eyes of that numerous class amongst whom our cotemporary lives, moves, and has his being—amongst the saints of the conventicle, who having, during six days of the week, duly adulterated their goods, cheated their customers, watered the rum, and sanded the sugar, on the seventh go up to our Zion to give thanks to the Lord that they are not as other men are—amongst the worldly minded, amongst those who make no peculiar profession of sanctity, it will be treated no doubt as it deserves.

Having thus effectually disposed of Lic No. 1.—that, of the juvenile criminals, committed during the last year "88 per cent were pupils of the nuns and friars"—we will proceed to demolish Lic No. 2.

In his issue of the 14th the *Montreal Witness* asserts—referring to the "books of the Montreal jail" as his authority—"that, out of 300 commitments of juvenile offenders during the year—264—or precisely 88 per cent—were Catholics." To this we reply by the following statistics kindly furnished to us by one who has authorized us to use his name as a guarantee of their truth, if they are contradicted. We may add that they have been carefully compiled from the "books of the prison."

During the year 1856 there were committed, of persons under 18 years of age—and persons above 18 can hardly be ranked amongst "juvenile offenders"—214, and not 300 as the *Montreal Witness* asserts.

But of these 214 commitments, 45 have been commitments of the same individuals; thus leav-

ing the actual number of "juvenile offenders" committed during the past year, 169.

Of these 169 juvenile criminals, the religious denominations are given as under:—

Catholics.....	142
Protestants.....	27
	169

Thus showing that 19, and not 12 per cent of the whole juveniles committed were Protestants.

Again, of the 142 Catholic juveniles committed, only 31 were of French Canadian origin; the remainder being for the most part unfortunate Irish immigrants, committed to jail generally, as an act of charity, and not because of any offence against the laws of God or man. We will explain the process.

Of the Irish emigrants of whom numbers are shipped out to Canada, often from the poor-houses of the mother country, a great many are of course landed upon our shores in a state of extreme destitution. A widowed mother, for instance, with perhaps a couple of little children from 4 to 5 years old hanging to the skirts of her petticoats, another in her arms, and another at the breast—is arrested by the Police as a vagrant. As a vagrant she is, as an act of charity, committed to jail; and—not to separate her from her children—the latter are committed to jail along with her. This is an event of constant occurrence amongst the poor Irish Catholic immigrants; and thus it is, that, of our "juvenile offenders," many are babies at their mothers' breasts; sucking criminals as it were, certainly not very dangerous to society, nor offensive in the eyes of Him Who once took little children in His arms and blessed them.

But—and this is the best and most convincing test of the moral results of the training given by our Catholic educational institution—of our French Canadian population which as fixed and permanent is of course most subject to the influences of our "nuns and friars," only 31 have been inmates of our jail; and this though our population is composed by an overwhelming majority of French Canadian Catholics. Indeed, when we take into consideration what an inconsiderable fraction (numerically) of the population of the district is composed of Protestants, it is clear that in furnishing 19 per cent. of the "juvenile offenders," they furnish fully their quota of crime."

Our object is not however to impute criminality to our separated brethren; but to convict the *Montreal Witness* of wilful and deliberate falsehood in his jail statistics. This we have fully accomplished. We have contradicted, and defied him to prove, or to give his authority for his statement, that "88 per cent." of the juvenile offenders for the past year were "pupils of the nuns and friars;" and he dare not answer us, he dare not meet our challenge, thus avowing himself a convicted liar. We have shown by statistics, which are unimpeachable, that there have been only 169 juveniles committed during the past year, instead of 300, as asserted by the *Montreal Witness*; and that of these 169 juveniles, 19 per cent., and not 12 only, were Protestants. We have shown, lastly, that of that portion of our population which is most subject to the influences of the "nuns and friars," only 31 have been committed to jail; and having done this, we can well afford to treat the future calumnies of our evangelical cotemporary with the contempt that they deserve.

THE "BOSTON PILOT" AND THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—The delusion under which we, in company with many others, have for some years labored, that the *Boston Pilot* was a Catholic paper, has been effectually dissipated by the perusal of a scurrilous and bigoted communication from a *soi disant* Irish correspondent, writing over the signature of O'Keefe, with which the *Pilot* of the 3rd inst., pollutes its columns. This infamous article is directed against—not only such men as Dr. Newman and other distinguished converts to the Catholic faith—men not more distinguished by their learning and rare abilities, than by the heroic sacrifices which, in obedience to the dictates of Divine Grace, they have made for the cause of truth—but against the Sovereign Pontiff and the Catholic University of Ireland. Of the former, the "converts" who with the approbation of the latter have been named Professors in the Catholic University, this Mr. O'Keefe has the amusing impertinence to speak as "illiterate, stupid, ill-bred Englishmen;" and according to the same authority, the author of *Calistia*, and one of the ripest scholars of his age, is set down as one of a batch of "imported dunces" and "scoundrels."

Indeed for a Protestant to join the Church, and to abandon home, station, position in society, and all that on earth men most dearly cherish, for the sake of Christ and His Gospel, is, in the eyes of the *Pilot's* correspondent, an unpardonable sin. "It is they," he says, speaking of the pretended failure of the Catholic University—"it is they who are guilty. They come in the garb of converts, and pour their pestiferous breath into the ears of our venerable bishops"—(silly dupes these Bishops must be to let themselves be deceived by such a set of "illiterate, stupid, ill-bred Englishmen")—"and poison the holy hearts of those pure and

amiable prelates with their crafty whisperm-polluted as the aristocracy are with every vice—foul with every variety of corruption. It is these scoundrels, who are to blame and these alone." And then a little further on he speaks of these "scoundrel converts" as "wretches" who "will adopt any creed" in order to warp a simple Irish Catholic Bishop to their purpose; for it would seem that the said Prelates, and the Sovereign Pontiff to boot, are but a set of easily gulled simpletons, whose intelligence can be of no higher order than are the morals of the "scoundrels"—the illiterate, stupid, ill-bred converts" who make tools of them. For, one naturally asks, if the said "converts" of English origin—the Newmans, the Wilberforces, the Mannings—are the "illiterate stupid ill-bred scoundrels" that the *Boston Pilot* represents them, how is it that they have been able to "win their way into the confidence" of the Catholic Bishops of Ireland?

To reply seriously to such charges would be beneath the dignity of the gentleman, or the Catholic journalist. We notice them solely for the purpose of warning our Catholic readers against the *Boston Pilot*, as a publication more dangerous to the true interests of the Church, and our holy religion, than the most rabid Ultra Protestant sheet issued on this Continent; because, under pretence of advocating the cause of Irishmen, it wantonly and malignantly assails the characters of some of the best and noblest of the Church's children; and because, whilst hypocritically professing itself a friend of Catholics, it gives insertion to ribald abuse of Catholic clergymen, in which even an Achilli or a Gavazzi would hardly dare to indulge; and plainly insinuates that the Irish Hierarchy, with the Pope at their head, are but a set of simpletons, the dupes of "illiterate, stupid and ill-bred scoundrels;" and therefore of course, more illiterate, more stupid, and more ignorant of good manners, than the scoundrels who impose upon them.

We have been requested to publish the following details, in the hope that some clue may be obtained to the "whereabouts" of the chief actor therein.

A young Irish girl, Mary Anne O'Connor, engaged 2 years and 6 months in the colony, was about a few weeks ago as house servant by a Mr. William Henry Jones of *Sault au Recllet*, who used formerly to practice in the United States as a Baptist preacher; but who, whilst in Canada, devoted his energies to the business of block making. The girl O'Connor, who had been living with Mrs. Flynn, who keeps a servants' Registry Office in Alexander street, entered her service with her late master upon Christmas Eve. On the 5th inst., he told her that he and his family were about to make a round of visits to their friends, and would in consequence be absent from home for several days. He recommended her therefore to return to Mrs. Flynn's during the interval; promising to call for her, about noon on Saturday the 10th inst., at Mr. Mountain's, St. Lawrence Main Street. The girl O'Connor did as she was advised; leaving however behind her, her chest containing all she had in the world, in the expectation that her absence would be but short.

On the Saturday following she waited as appointed, at Mr. Mountain's, but in vain. No Mr. William Henry Jones made his appearance. Anxious for her box, the poor girl started for the *Sault*; and on her arrival there, found to her dismay that her master had decamped—having, in the hurry of his departure, not only forgotten to discharge certain debts by him contracted, but taking with him the entire worldly possessions of Mary O'Connor. It is supposed that this worthy has "made tracks" for the States, to resume, very probably, his old trade of evangelizing as a Baptist minister of the Gospel. Should this meet the eye of any one acquainted with the present residence of the aforesaid William Henry Jones, he will confer a great kindness on a poor friendless girl, by putting himself in communication with her at Mr. Flynn's Registry Office, Bleury Street, Montreal.

Information wanted by his daughter, now in Montreal, of Michael O'Connor from the county of Limerick Ireland; who came to America about four years ago, and is supposed to be still in Detroit, where he resided—Leonard Street—when last heard of. Address to Mary O'Connor, care of Mr. Flynn, Bleury Street, Montreal. American papers will confer an act of kindness on a poor girl by giving insertion to the above.

A subscriber wishes to know why we have not noticed a scandalous affair, in which a clergyman of the Church of England is seriously implicated. We reply that we have not done so—because the details are unfit for a Catholic periodical, which finds its way into the hands of young persons of both sexes; and because to attempt to base an argument, or to create prejudice, against a particular denomination on account of the misconduct of one of its members—unless such misconduct is the direct and necessary result of fidelity to its teachings—is conduct as repugnant to all the rules of logic, as it is unbecoming a gentleman and a Catholic; and should therefore