

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

WILL BE PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON.  
 At the Office, No. 3, McGill Street.  
 TERMS:  
 To Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum.  
 To Country do. \$21 do.

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.  
 All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid. Subscribers not receiving their papers regularly, are requested to make their complaints known to the Editor of the Journal.

The Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—  
 Quebec.—Mr. Mathew Enright, 24, Mountain St.  
 Sorél.—Mr. Robert McAndrew.  
 Three-Rivers.—Mr. John Keenan.  
 Terrebonne.—M. Prevost, Esq., N. P.  
 St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. Patrick Flynn.  
 Alexandria.—D. McGillis.  
 Oshawa.—Rev. Mr. J. B. Proulx.  
 Picton, C. W.—Rev. Mr. Lalor.  
 Toronto.—Mr. Thomas Hayes.  
 Norwood.—Rev. Mr. Bernard J. Higgins.  
 Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. Stuart McDonald.  
 Perth, C. W.—Mr. John Doran.  
 Bytown.—Mr. Ewd. Burke.  
 Carleton.—A. E. Montmarquet, Esq.  
 Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. Jas. Doyle.  
 Jundus County.—Mr. Alex. McDonald, (Ich).  
 Irford, C. W.—Mr. John Comerford.  
 Eastern Townships.—Mr. Patrick Hackett.  
 Chambly.—Mr. John Hackett.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 15, 1850.

That the editor of the *Montreal Herald* should be indignant at the outrage perpetrated by some scoundrels, Sunday last, against the Rev. Digby Campbell's Church, is very natural, and very just. All gentlemen, no matter what may be their belief in matters of religion, must execrate all acts of brutal violence, and ought to call upon the proper authorities, to prevent their repetition. But it is curious, to say the least of it, that the editor of the *Montreal Herald* should assume that the perpetrators of the violence were Catholics, or that some remarks of ours could have been the exciting cause of the events of Sunday last. We say again, as we said before, that we do not believe that the rioters in this case, or in that of Mr. Osgood, were Catholics. The *onus probandi* rests with him who says they were. Not every one who calls himself a Catholic, is to be considered a Catholic; as not every one "who saith Lord, Lord," is to be considered a member of the Kingdom of Heaven. He only who doeth the will of the Father, or who keepeth the commandments of the Church, is, indeed, a member of Christ's Kingdom, or of the Church. Let us apply this rule, the truth of which no one of common sense will deny, and we will be able to judge how far we were in error when we wrote, "that in our opinion they (the rioters) were of no religion at all, or, what is much the same thing, that they were good, staunch, ultra-Protestants, loathing the Sacraments, and inspired with a truly evangelical hatred of Penance and the Confessional; protesters against the Church, and not her children." These were the words we made use of, and we are prepared to maintain their truth against the editor of the *Montreal Herald*, or any one else. Protestant means one who protests. To protest means (referring to the dictionary) "to make a solemn declaration expressive of opposition," and that declaration can be made as well by deed as by word. In religion, a Protestant means one "who makes a solemn declaration expressive of opposition" to Catholic doctrine; and, an ultra-Protestant means one who pushes that opposition to its extreme point. But many men seem to forget the meaning of words, and reason as if Protestantism was an affirmation, instead of being, as it is, a pure negation. A belief in the Trinity, in the Atonement, or even in a God, can never be a predicate of Protestantism; for a negation can never produce an affirmation. When, therefore, we wrote the word Protestant, we intended to denote, not a person who believes anything, but merely a person who denies something; and, by the word ultra-Protestant, not one who believes a little, but one who denies a good deal. Such is the sum and substance of our etymological faith, and, in support of our opinion, we throw ourselves upon the dictionary, and upon the grammar of our country, as the one supreme authority to which all men must bow. But, by acts of violence against their inoffending brethren, the rioters of Sunday protested against the commands of the Church, and *ipso facto* are to be considered Protestants, no matter what they profess themselves to be, or how much or how little they protest against or deny.

Acts of violence have been committed. Perhaps amongst the perpetrators were some scoundrels calling themselves Catholics. We deny their right to so call themselves; and we regret the outrage, the more so, as we said before, because it "gives knaves and fools occasion to insinuate that Catholics are favorable to such proceedings."  
 But the editor of the *Montreal Herald's* liberality

is like the handle of a jug—all one side. He is moved, almost to tears, by the breaking of a window, but remains indifferent, when gentlemen, clergymen, are insulted and maligned by lying publications, such as the *Montreal Witness* or the French Canadian Missionary Society's *Records*. A Protestant lecturer may talk of *vagabond Priests*, as long as he likes, and is sure of applause; but if the Catholic lecturer presumes to point out the absurdities of Protestantism, as a system, and its injurious effects upon mankind, he must be denounced as an illiberal bigot—he must, forsooth, be taunted with his misfortune of having been born and educated as a Protestant, as if that was not a continual cause of mourning and shame to him, who, through the Grace of God, has been led to renounce the error of his ways, and to become a member of the Church of Christ.

A PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE DISTURBANCE AT ST. HYACINTHE.

The Rev. Mons. Chiniquy's last discourse upon Temperance, was delivered upon Sunday morning. The sermon in the afternoon was upon the advantages to be derived from the "St. Hyacinthe Working Man's Association." But the outrage upon the distillery did not occur until the night between, the Monday and Tuesday following.

Three thousand eight hundred persons, had enrolled themselves beneath the banners of temperance, and on leaving the Church, a distiller, by public notice, called upon the inhabitants of the parish, to bring him their grain, for the purpose of distillation. The entire population naturally looked upon this notice, at such a time, as an intentional insult, and the crier was obliged to decamp to escape actual violence. To the circumstance of this notice, more than to any other, is owing the popular excesses which followed. For upwards of a year, a great number of the grog-sellers at St. Hyacinthe, have trampled under foot, every law, human and divine, and have kept all honest persons in a state of continual alarm, by their threats and sometimes by overt acts of violence. Many respectable persons, who had been desirous of having recourse to the strong arm of the law, to put a stop to these disorders, have had their houses attacked and their cattle mutilated. One, a witness against a grog-seller, had been seized in the open streets, last March, cruelly beaten, and carried in a sleigh a distance of 12 miles, where he was tied up in a stable. These facts, and a thousand others besides, had exasperated the respectable part of the population against the grog-sellers, who themselves had shewn the example of violating the law.

The Rev. Mons. Chiniquy, whilst pointing out the evils caused by grog-shops and distilleries, terminated his discourse by an earnest exhortation to his auditory to respect the law. "Be guilty," said he, "of no acts of violence to person or property. Protect yourselves against the grog-sellers, by firmly uniting in purpose, never to set foot in their houses, or to spend a copper in their shops. But be ready to assist your magistrates in their efforts to maintain the public peace. Force can never be legal to you, unless when you shall be obliged to repel the attacks of the grog-sellers. Then, but then only, you may remember, when protecting yourselves, that you number about 4000, and that against you there is but a score of vagabonds."

The Rev. Mons. Chiniquy was not aware of the existence of a distillery at St. Hyacinthe, or else he would have made some allusions to it. Those who paid the most attention to his sermons, agree that in none of them, was there any allusion made to the distillery. The amount of injury is stated at £36.—*Communicated.*

On Wednesday and Thursday of last week, Mr. Lord and Dr. Brownson delivered lectures upon the respective merits of Protestantism and Catholicity, as agents in the work of civilisation. The lecture of Dr. Brownson was but a continuation and development of the subject, and principles, which he had previously discussed, and laid down; and we purpose contrasting it with the lecture upon the same subject delivered by Mr. Lord, throwing in the remarks of Dr. Brownson, in opposition to, those made by the former gentleman.

It was evident that in treating the subject of civilisation, Mr. Lord had one great difficulty to contend with, and much difference of opinion will exist as to the manner in which he encountered it. Dr. Brownson had, in his previously delivered lectures, laid down a clear and concise definition of the meaning of the word civilisation, which, according to him, "is a fact not in the material, but in the moral order," and is employed to denote that process by which man is restored to and maintained in the normal state, which he lost by sin. "That normal state being the highest development of civilisation."—Now, Mr. Lord felt that he could not deny the correctness of that definition, nor could he *totidem verbis* admit it. Mr. Lord's avowed object was, not to bless, but to curse Catholicity; but, if he had adopted, at his outset, Dr. Brownson's definition of civilisation, he would have found himself compelled to adopt that learned gentleman's conclusions, thus placing himself in the awkward position of the unfortunate Balaam, who, when called upon to curse the enemies of Moab, through the overruling Providence of God, found himself compelled to bless them, yea, three times.

Mr. Lord commenced, therefore, by defining, rather, what civilisation was not, than what it was. It was not the cultivation of the fine arts,

of music, painting, or sculpture. It did not consist in a great elegance of manners, or in a high state of literary culture. In all these things, Pagan Rome may have excelled Christian Rome, as much as she, in her turn, has surpassed all the other nations of the earth. To this remark we give our unqualified assent. Civilisation is the creature, according to Mr. Lord, of certain great Christian ideas,—ideas which he admitted were never entirely lost sight of, even by the corrupt Catholic Church, but which are held in a higher degree, and in a purer state, by Protestantism, which has, therefore, accomplished greater things than Catholicity. Such seemed to us, at least, to be the thesis which Mr. Lord undertook to maintain.

The Catholic Church, (and by the word Catholic, Mr. Lord, rather unnecessarily, explained that he meant Roman Catholic,) in spite of all her corruption, was effectual to the conversion, and, therefore, to the civilisation of those barbarous tribes, which, in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, rushed from the North and East, and founded the modern European nations, upon the ruins of the old Roman Empire. During the middle ages, the Catholic Church approved herself the friend of the poor and oppressed. She almost entirely abolished, and where she did not abolish, she mitigated all the horrors of slavery,—alleviated misery and misfortune,—proclaimed the great truth of the equality of all men in the eyes of God, and not only proclaimed, but gave to it a practical development. In her ranks, the son of the serf might rise to be the peer of nobles, and of the sons of princes: and it was the Catholic Church which first raised woman to the social position which she now holds, making her the equal and companion of man, instead of being his slave, and the sport of his lust. Corrupt as she was, she yet reared within her bosom those saints, those holy men of whom Christendom, at this day, may well be proud. Though, how an impure, a corrupt Church, can produce Saints, we do not understand. A Saint is one sanctified. Sanctification is the work of the Grace of God. The Church, the channel—the sole channel through which those Graces can flow,—the instruments by which they are given the Sacraments,—can then, we would ask, can the Grace of God, can His holy gift flow through a corrupt and polluted channel? This question may be left to the discussion of Theologians. However, we see what, even by Protestant admission, the Church did. Let us see what Protestantism has done, according to Mr. Lord. It has laid plans. It has devised schemes. It has formed projects of *philanthropy*, of universal regeneration, and improvement. It has generated all kinds of societies—missionary and anti-slavery,—and prison discipline, and anti-war, and general peace societies. But what has it done with all these fine tools? Why, even Mr. Lord could not mention *one single nation, one single tribe*, upon the earth's surface, which owes its civilisation to Protestantism. He was obliged to content himself by showing what Catholicity has done, and what Protestantism has projected—what Catholicity has accomplished, and what Protestantism has talked about accomplishing. But, abandoning his first view of civilisation, as a fact *solely* in the moral order, Mr. Lord endeavored to show what great things Protestantism had effected in the material order—in secular education, as fitting man for this world; in promoting habits of commercial industry and thrift; in active philanthropy: for devotion, and for liberty. We cannot take notice of all the examples brought forward by Mr. Lord, to prove his assertion of the superiority of Protestant over Catholic secular education. We can notice only a few of the most prominent.

First, Mr. Lord contrasted the amount of Protestant secular education, with the amount of Catholic secular education, in Canada. Now, although we do not admit that a mere secular education is any test of civilisation, we are perfectly ready to meet our opponents upon this ground, and we contend that, man for man, in their respective stations of life—Clergyman for Minister, Lawyer for Lawyer, Merchant for Merchant—the Catholic Canadian is, in point of education, not only the equal, but often the superior, of his Protestant Anglo-Saxon fellow-citizen. The latter may, perhaps, be the more enterprising speculator, more learned in the price of wheat or flour, able to discourse more eloquently upon Ashes, Pearl and Pot; but, in literary acquirements, in a knowledge of the classics, and in fact in all that tends to the cultivation of the mind, the French, or Catholic, Canadian, who has received his education in the Catholic Schools and Colleges of Canada, is as well, and often more accomplished. Would that we could add that he always made a good use of his intellectual advantages, and that he always remembered with gratitude, the Spiritual Mother who bore him, and to whose fostering care he owes the possession of those arms, which he too often turns against her bosom.—Mr. Lord next compared the state of Great Britain with that of Ireland, where, according to him, only about one-twentieth of the population can read and write. This is false, and if Mr. Lord, will give himself the trouble to enquire, he will find that the Irish are, as a nation, far better educated than the English. But were the Irish the physically-degraded wretches which Mr. Lord represents them, were they indeed squalid beggars, bearing burdens, hewers of wood and drawers of water, herding with swine—what, we would ask, has made them so? We do not say England—for your Englishman is not cruel—is not a tyrant, but we do say, that that foul thing called Protestantism has been the cause, and the sole cause, of the miseries, social, moral and physical, under which Ireland does, and has so long labored; Protestantism made it penal for the Catholic father to educate his son; and now, with an impudence which Satan himself might envy, but could hardly hope to imitate, the Protestant taunts the Irishman with ignorance. In England, where, the State has

richly endowed a Church, for the purpose of educating the people, one half of the population can neither read nor write, thousands have never heard the name of Christ, and know God, only as something to swear by—as something to give greater emphasis to an imprecation. In Ireland it would be impossible to find, amongst the Catholic population, a single individual ignorant of the great truths of Salvation, taught, not by a wealthy hierarchy, but by the insulted, the impoverished priest, upon whose head; but a few years ago, a price was set as upon a wolf's. But what means, said Dr. Brownson, this boast about the superiority of Protestant secular education? Why, by the testimony of a Scotch Presbyterian traveller in France, the Catholic children are better instructed in History, Geography, and Music, than are the children in Protestant Scotland, whose parochial system of education is so much vaunted. Compare Rome, with her population of 160,000, and about 300 schools, mostly gratuitous, for the education of the poorer classes, with Berlin with its population of 500,000, and 250 schools. But if the Protestant is rash in boasting of the superior quantity of education in Protestant countries, he is still more so when he has the impudence to boast of its quality—to talk about Protestant morality, or to insult Catholic Ireland, by mentioning her in the same breath as the New England States. The Irish may be poor, for Protestant England has made them so; they may be sometimes ignorant, because, for a long time, it was a grave offence for a Catholic parent to educate his child; but the most impudent Protestant slanderer, who ever took up his parable against Ireland and the Irish, dare not breathe one syllable against Irish morality and purity. It would be as hopeless a task as it would be to convince any person of the morality of the New England States, with which Mr. Lord had the extreme folly to contrast Ireland. Morality of New England, indeed! of that country where a Made. Restell publishes her foul advertisements, with impunity, and where, in open day, establishments for the express purpose of enabling mothers to destroy their offspring, rear their infamous fronts to heaven. Why, with the exception of Scotland, where, according to a writer in Blackwood, crime has, in the last few years, increased seventeen hundred fold, and Sweden, it would be difficult to find so impure, so immoral, a country as the Northern States of the American Union. Dr. Brownson, who knows it well, could but allude darkly to the foul crimes which prevail in that Protestant country—crimes which here can scarce be mentioned, but which there scarce take the pains to seek concealment,—crimes which, of old, have drawn down Heaven's wrath, on guilty man, and which St. Paul stigmatises as amongst the most crying of the sins of Imperial Rome. Alas! too, for the effects of education in England. We can but allude, *en passant*, to the enquiry which took place in August last, in one of its great government educational establishments, and to the simultaneous expulsion of thirty-three of the pupils. "What," says the *Spectator*, commenting upon this disgraceful exposure, "what if these unhappy youths are merely the victims of detection!"

But the great evil of the Catholic system of education, in the opinion of the Protestant, is this, that it does not place the Bible in the hands of young lads, in order for them to pick a religion out of it, as best they may. We do not deny it. In Catholic countries, the indiscriminate reading of the Bible, by children at school, is not recommended, and we would ask any sensible person if this is not a wise restriction? We would ask any Protestant, any person into whose hands the Bible was placed when a boy, what use he made of it? and if it be not true that the indiscriminate perusal of the Bible, by young persons, may be, and very often is, dangerous both to morals and to faith. It is not necessary to multiply instances, but we appeal to every one who has received his education in a Protestant school, and into whose hands the Bible has been put before his faith was fully formed, and ask him what use he made of the Bible when a boy at school?—There now, my dear and Rev. "Mr. Grimes Washpot," you need not look so horrified. You know it is quite true. You know what use you made of the Bible, yourself. You need not blush so deeply, either. Your case is not a singular one. Your father did it before you, and so will your son, and your son's sons after you. Look around you next Sabbath, at meeting, and be comforted. Of all those countenances, so solemn, so sanctified, upturned towards you, there is not one whose possessor has not been as guilty as you, yourself, have been, though, pretty dears, they did not tell their mammas anything about it when they came home for their holidays. It is not you, but the system, that we condemn.

But, if dangerous to morality, we contend that the indiscriminate perusal of the Bible, without the authoritative explanation of an infallible guide, is no less dangerous to faith. With the Catholic, Faith precedes the reading of the Bible, because the Bible is not the Catholic's sole rule of Faith. Faith, which is the supernatural gift of God, communicated through the teaching of the Church, is, with the Catholic, supposed to precede the reading of the Bible. But with the Protestant, to whom the Bible is the sole Rule of Faith, Faith is to be the effect produced by reading the Bible; and as the effect can never precede the cause, the Protestant must approach the Bible, for the first time, as an infidel. For, if he be not an infidel, he must have Faith; and if Faith precede the reading of the Bible, the Bible cannot be the cause of the pre-existing Faith. Now, to the infidel, or to one whose Faith is not firmly established, there is no book so dangerous as the Bible, and none so well calculated to give an erroneous idea of the attributes of God. More men have been confirmed in infidelity, by the story of Jacob and Esau; and by presuming to judge of God's conduct, as to the mode in which the former obtained his father's blessing, by their paltry *human* reason, than by all the trash of