

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

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.

- The Agents for this Journal, who are authorized to receive subscriptions, and to give receipts, are, for—
 Alexandria.—Mr. D. McGillis.
 Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. Jas. Doyle.
 Brantford, C. W.—Mr. John Comerford.
 Bytown.—Mr. Edw. Burke.
 Carleton.—A. E. Montmarquet, Esq.
 Carleton, Ristigouche, &c.—Rev. F. X. Tessier.
 Chambly.—Mr. John Hackett.
 Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. Stuart McDonald.
 Counties of Kamouraska and L'Islet.—Rev. L. A. Bourret.
 Dundas County.—Mr. Alex. McDonald, (Ich).
 Eastern Townships.—Mr. Patrick Hackett.
 Lochiel.—Mr. Owen Quigley, P. M.
 L'Orignal, Ottawa.—Rev. Mr. Tabaret.
 Mosa, C. W.—Mr. Thomas Fitzpatrick.
 Norwood.—Rev. Bernard J. Higgins.
 Norton Creek.—Mr. Hugh McGill.
 Oshawa.—Rev. J. B. Proulx.
 Pembroke, C. W.—Mr. Thomas Lee.
 Percé, Gaspé.—Rev. Mr. Gingras.
 Perth, C. W.—Mr. John Doran.
 Petit Rocher, N. B.—Rev. E. J. Dumphy.
 Picton, C. W.—Rev. Mr. Lalor.
 Prescott, C. W.—B. White, Esq.
 Quebec.—Mr. Mathew Enright, 24, Mountain St.
 St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. Patrick Flynn.
 Sherbrooke.—Mr. Thomas Griffith.
 St. Thomas, C. W.—Mr. Patrick Bobier.
 Shipton, Danville, and Melbourne.—Mr. A. Donnelly.
 Terrebonne.—M. Prevost, Esq., N. P.
 Three-Rivers.—Mr. John Keenan.
 Tiguish, P. E. I.—Rev. Mr. McIntyre.
 Toronto.—Mr. Thomas Hayes.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 3, 1851.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

By the following, which we copy from the *Tablet* of the 13th ult., it appears that the government does not intend to prosecute the Catholic Bishops of Ireland. His Grace the Archbishop of Armagh, is rather too dangerous a person to meddle with. The *Tablet* says:—

"We are informed, on what should be very good authority, that a letter has been received at the Castle, from Lord John Russell, intimating that it is not the intention of the Government to institute any prosecution against the offending Bishops; that in the opinion of the Whiggish cabinet, and of the writer, the whole business has been already carried too far; and that it is desirable to endeavor to allay the excitement, rather than increase and aggravate it. In other words, the Government is cowardly, as well as wicked. They have done their best to excite a commotion, and to trample down the Church; but they find it too strong for their purpose; and they are, therefore, fain to proclaim an amnesty to their intended victims, in the hope that their intended victims will extend an amnesty to them. Happily, this base calculation will turn out as false as that which preceded it. No Catholic, in his senses, will trust the Whigs henceforward."

From this it appears that the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill is to be allowed to remain a dead letter, in so far as Ireland is concerned.

Mr. George Petrie has presented a design for the O'Connell national monument, of which the *Dublin Freeman's Journal* gives the following description:

"The design contemplates a triple group of monuments, each the type of an order, and the three, representing the chief ecclesiastical structures, which are connected with the introduction and establishment of primitive Christianity in Ireland. These are the Round Tower—the Church—and the Sculptured Cross. 'I have endeavored,' (says Mr. Petrie) 'to design a triune group, which, as combined with the greatest character of durability, would present all the features of the earliest works of the kind yet remaining in Ireland, and at the same time exhibit as much beauty of form, harmony of composition, and elegance of execution, as the simple character of the objects, and a strict adherence to authorities, would permit and justify.'"

The estimate of the cost for the above design, is little more than £4,000.

The Canadian Ministry has been entirely broken up, by the resignation of Messrs. Baldwin and Lafontaine. Mr. Hincks is spoken of as the new Premier, and he is to have for colleagues in office, Messrs. Drummond, and MacDonald. On Wednesday evening the friends and admirers of the late Premier, entertained him at a public dinner, in testimony of their approbation of his political conduct.

The Catholics of Toronto have completed the organization of their Institute. They have put forth an admirable address to the Catholics of Canada West, (part of which we copy into our columns) recommending the immediate formation of Branch Institutes, for the purpose of co-operating with the Parent Institute in the city of Toronto, for the social and civil amelioration of the entire Catholic body. The *Mirror* enumerates the following, as amongst the advantages which may be expected to accrue to the Catholics of Canada, from the firm and combined action of all the children of the Church:—

"Besides the material advantages which the Catho-

lic population would derive from a well digested system of secular improvement, it is quite evident, that the contemplated organization will be useful in looking after their religious interests. From the tone lately assumed, by a portion of the press, especially the clear-gut and ultra-democratic organs, there is every reason to anticipate attacks against the free and complete exercise of the Catholic religion in Canada. In such an emergency, would it not be well to have a united, and well-trained body, ready at the shortest notice to defend their rights, and repel aggression, come from what quarter it may."

In our next number, we hope that we shall be able to announce the organization of the Catholic Institute of Montreal, the formation of which will be a pledge to our brethren of Upper Canada, of the desire of the Catholics of this part of the Province, to co-operate with them, in every undertaking, which has for its object, the "social and civil amelioration of the entire body."

ADDRESS OF THE CATHOLICS OF TORONTO, TO THEIR CO-RELIGIONISTS OF CANADA WEST.

Fellow-Catholics.—At a general meeting of the Catholic citizens of Toronto, held here on the 22nd of last month, the necessity of adopting some line of action, by which the united opinion of the entire Catholic body of Canada West could be had, and exercised, upon subjects of immediate interest to them, was clearly demonstrated, and unanimously recognized. This plan embraced, as an essential ingredient, the idea of combination for purposes of intellectual improvement; and, according to the resolutions then adopted, it was to be developed for the consideration of our co-religionists at a distance by means of a public Address.

There are many reasons why the present moment should be chosen as the fittest for the commencement of a lasting and firmly based organization, and it is with the strongest conviction of the truth of those reasons, and the necessity of taking advantage of them, that we have formed ourselves into a *Catholic Institute*, believing that from our position as citizens of the metropolis of Canada West, we shall be the better enabled to watch over the immediate interest of the Catholic body, and as the centre of unity, be ever ready to sound the alarm, should a time for united and concentrated action arrive.

Amongst the most important objects of the *Catholic Institute*, we desire to originate and foster that system of secular education, by means of public lectures, libraries, reading-rooms, useful and truthful publications, &c., which must of necessity be the basis of our structure, and without which, no combination could be of any avail towards a high and beneficial end. We address you, not in a spirit of dictation, but simply as members of the same body, children of the same Holy Church, inheritors of the same Sacred Faith, entreating you with all deference and esteem, to unite with us for a common object, which closely affects the interests of all.

Though the great hope of Catholicity in Canada West is centred in the proper religious education of its youth, yet much may be done for the adult population. By a strong, determined effort on the part of those who, by their position and education, can exercise an influence amongst their neighbors—by adopting the plan of the Parent Institute, and collecting as many Catholics of every Village, Town, or Township, as may be residents, and desirous of co-operating with the entire Catholic Body, a Branch Institute could at any time be formed, elect its President, Vice-President and Secretary, enrol as many members as may be willing to aid the good cause, and then report to the Parent Institute in this City, with which a connection will be at once established. A Branch Institute thus organized, with its officers and members, will be immediately registered in the Books of the Parent Institute, and its formation announced through the press. During the winter months, the Parent Institute purposes sending to the Branches, lecturers of ability, who will lecture on subjects of general interest, free from all interference with any man's political opinions, thus confining themselves to such topics as *all Catholics* will find useful and instructive.

Not only is it in this capacity that the *Catholic Institute* may be made available for good, but also in the exercise of those privileges which our free political institutions confer, a wholesome vigilance may be kept over the various movements of the day—the more so, as it must be evident to the least observant amongst us, that a desire for innovation is spreading rapidly through the land, which, though to a certain extent salutary and patriotic, cannot be too closely watched, lest it transgress those limits that confine the real welfare of the country and the best limits of true liberty. It is not considered either expedient or advisable, that Catholics, as a body, should pronounce a decided opinion on the subjects at present agitating the country; individuals should consult their own judgment and be guided by its decision on all party political questions; it is only when the interests of our religion are more immediately at stake, that the *Catholic Institutions* throughout the Province are expected to join in concert, whether it may be for the purpose of warding off attacks made against it, or to obtain for its members a footing of perfect equality with all other denominations.

Besides the advantages already mentioned, as likely to result from the organization of Branch Institutes throughout the whole Province, not the least in importance would be the friendly feelings which mutual intercourse among Catholics may produce. These friendly feelings would scatter petty jealousies to the winds—expand the heart and prepare it for large and generous views—expel mere national and individual antipathies, and make us what our religion teaches us to be—a band of brothers, encouraging and sustaining the weak, glorying in the prosperity of the industrious, assisting and comforting the destitute amongst us; and thus, by a concentrated will, adding to the welfare of the whole, by the truly Catholic conduct of the various parts. There is one idea that we must keep ever prominently before us—our common religion makes us one in all the essential relations of life.

Fellow-Catholics.—We have only a parting word to add; whatever partial differences of opinion may exist among us, it is quite clear that the necessity of such an Institute as this in contemplation, is keenly felt through the country. In Canada, thank God, we are not directly called upon to resist penal laws or bigoted aggression, but we cannot be too safely provided against all possibility of the introduction of any such degrading measures. While we tender our earnest and heartfelt sympathy to our co-religionists at home, laboring at present under the infliction of un-

called-for legislation against their religious freedom, we cannot be too careful that the insulting trammels are not introduced on the free soil of America. Let, then, this invitation which, in the spirit of our common Catholicity, we address to our fellow-Catholics throughout Canada West, be unanimously responded to, and before twelve months have rolled by, we shall, with God's blessing, be in a better position, socially and politically, than we have hitherto occupied.

(Signed)

CHAS. ROBERTSON, President.
M. S. McCOY, Secretary.

Toronto, September 24, 1851.

We have received a communication from "A friend to the Bible and religious liberty," in which numerous queries are propounded to us, and to which an answer is requested through the columns of the *TRUE WITNESS*. We have no objection to comply with the request of our correspondent, upon this condition, that he accept our answers for nothing more than what they are really worth, viz., the answers of a Catholic layman, who is by no means to be considered an infallible exponent of Catholic doctrine.

The first question put to us is—"To keep the Sabbath holy, is a divine command plainly pointed out, both in the Catholic and Protestant Bibles; what then shall be thought of those who employ a great part of that time in vain amusements?"

In this question there is a little vagueness of expression, as there usually is, in all Protestant documents. But we suppose that by *Sabbath*, is meant the Sunday, or Lord's day, and by *vain amusements*, amusements which, if not positively sinful, are, at least, unfavorable to the growth of piety. What shall be thought of men who spend the greater part of the Sunday in such amusements? The answer is very simple, when the offenders are professedly Catholics.

The Catholic Church, whose teaching is, or ought to be, to all her children, the supreme, and sole rule of faith, and practice—is very explicit upon the manner in which Sundays, and the other festivals, which, under the direction of her Divine spouse, she has enjoined to be kept holy—are to be sanctified. She enjoins a total abstinence from all servile work; a diligent, and fervent attendance upon the public offices of the Church; a strict, an unusually strict watch to be kept over every thought, word and deed; and especially exhorts to the practice of spiritual exercises, and all works of heavenly charity. All occupations, or amusements, calculated to provoke to sin, to divert the thoughts and affections of the creature, from the Creator; to increase the love of earth, or to diminish the love of heaven, are positively forbidden. The Church does not prohibit *all innocent* relaxation on the Sunday; but she teaches, that no relaxation is innocent, which produces in the heart of man, a distaste for communion with God, or which trenches upon the periods allotted to the public Divine service, and other religious exercises. Any Catholic who does not, to the best of his ability, comply with all the precepts of the Catholic Church, is undoubtedly guilty of grievous, of mortal sin. Mem.—To be gay or cheerful on the Sunday, is *not* looked upon, by Catholics, as sinful—nor is a smiling countenance deemed a proof of a bad heart.

"What are we to think of the Protestant who spends the greater part of Sunday in vain amusements?" This is a very different, and a far more intricate question. We know what to think about the Catholic in similar circumstances, because we know his rule of faith, and practice, and understand exactly what it commands, and what it forbids. With the Protestant, all that we know, is, that nominally, his rule of faith is, certain unauthenticated translations, of unauthenticated copies, of some ancient writings, generally attributed to a few of the Apostles and their cotemporaries, bound together in a book called the Bible, and which writings, every Protestant claims the right of interpreting, according to his private judgment. Thus it is hard to know what the Protestant rule of faith is; he says it is the Bible; the truth is, it is what he thinks he finds in the Bible; a very different affair indeed. The Protestant rule of practice, or conduct, is still more difficult to find out. So far as we can discover, it seems, that every Protestant is to obey the dictates, of what he calls his conscience, but what is, very often, only another name for, his prejudices. "Work yourself out, Follow your convictions," are the anxious of Protestantism. Unless, therefore, we can obtain an insight into the Protestant's prejudices, or become intimately cognizant of his convictions, we cannot say whether he be following implicitly the dictates of his "rule of practice;" and as it is impossible for us to know what a Protestant thinks he finds in his version of the Bible, (indeed, a man who sets to work in good earnest, can find anything he likes in it) we cannot say, whether he be walking in accordance with his "rule of faith." Our correspondent, "A friend to the Bible and religious liberty," would, very likely, find fault with, and reprove a man, for vain amusements on the Sunday; he would, very likely, pronounce cricket an abomination, and skittles decidedly unscriptural, according to his way of thinking. The other might, perhaps, make answer and say, "My way of thinking is different; who made you a judge over me? I have read the Bible as well as you, and as I understand it, the Sabbath was commanded merely as a Jewish ceremonial, and is of no moral obligation at all. There is not a word in the New Testament commanding it to be kept by Christians; and our Saviour, by His conduct and language, seems to have plainly taught that its observance was no longer necessary. Allowing, that the commandment, to keep one day in seven, as a day of rest, is of perpetual obligation, I have as much right as you, or any other man, to choose what day in the seven I shall keep. Besides, does not St. Paul expressly tell the Colossians, not to allow any man to judge them, in respect of new moons, holidays, or *Sabbath*

days: Your conduct in presuming to judge me, is more unscriptural than my skittles." If called upon to adjudicate between the two, we certainly should decide, that though our correspondent might, perhaps, be the better Christian, his opponent was, certainly, the better Protestant; that is, acted more in accordance with the great principles of the Reformation—rejection of authority—and the assertion of the right of private judgment.

Next, we are asked—"If it be the duty and privilege of all, to worship God according to what is pointed out by Christ and the Apostles, what shall be the reward of those who prevent them from enjoying that privilege?" To this we answer, that their reward shall be that promised to the Scribes, who shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither entering in themselves, nor permitting others that were on the point of entering, to go in. It is an awful sentence—woe—weeping, and gnashing of teeth. We hope our correspondent will not accuse us of uncharitableness, for thus pointing out the fate, which, if the Bible be true, awaits those who have thrown impediments in the way of Catholics worshipping God in the manner pointed out by Christ and his Apostles, and revealed, through the teaching of the Catholic Church. When we reflect, how often that worship has been forbidden, under heavy penalties, by the Protestant legislators of the British Islands, we wonder how a Protestant can take any pleasure in alluding to the subject. Pagans, and Protestants share betwixt them the foul disgrace of having attempted to deprive Catholics of the privilege of worshipping God in the way of His appointment. Our correspondent may object to our testimony, as that of a Catholic; we will give him a Protestant witness—Hallam:—"Persecution is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches—that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." The subject must be a painful one to "A friend of religious liberty"—we will drop it.

Surely, our correspondent cannot have any difficulty in finding appropriate answers to the other questions; at least, we believe, that quarrelling and drunkenness are as much condemned by Protestants, as they are by Catholics. But if a friend to the Bible, really has any doubts, we earnestly recommend to his perusal, the little Catechism, in use in the schools of the Christian Brothers. It is so simple, that even a Protestant, if he will but read it attentively, will be able to understand it.

THE COURIER AND THE BOOK OF SPORTS.

In our reply to a correspondent, we have already noticed the gross inconsistency (to call it by no harsher name) of Protestants, when they presume to censure Catholics, for the manner in which they spend the Sunday. Although as Catholics, and as before the Church, we renounce all right of private judgment in matters of revelation, yet when arguing with Protestants, we will contend for that right, in the most unlimited extent. To Protestants in general, canting about Sabbath observance, it is sufficient for the Catholic to oppose his private judgment, and to answer, that according to his way of thinking, amusements, innocent in themselves, are not prohibited by the Bible on Sundays. A Catholic has just as much right to act according to his way of thinking, as a Protestant has.

But the inconsistency of the puritanical Protestant, is as nothing, in comparison with the inconsistency of the Protestant of the Church of England, when the latter pretends to condemn Sunday amusements as sinful, and as desecrations of the Sabbath; and, above all, it is laughable, when, for the sake of winning a little applause, from the frequenters of the conventicle, we find a paper, which pretends to be an organ of the Church of England, crying out, day after day, against the enormity of fireworks at Longueuil on Sunday evening. We give no opinion in the matter; we are not defending fireworks; neither do we presume to condemn them. Sky rockets may be, for all we will advance to the contrary, the unpardonable sin—and Roman candles, the mystery of iniquity; but we do not see why it was worse, to ignite them on a Sunday evening, than it was to fire a salute in honor of Lord Elgin, on a Sunday forenoon, and during what, to the majority of the citizens of Montreal, was the hour of Divine service. But let that pass. We want to point out the absurdity of a member of the Church of England, contending for the sinfulness of amusements on the Sunday. It was a Protestant king, a most high and mighty prince, a dread sovereign, a nursing father to the church, upon which he arose as the sun in his glory, who, in virtue of his spiritual supremacy over the church of England, commanded to be read in churches, not only a permission, but an exhortation, to all loyal subjects, and good churchmen, to indulge, on Sundays, after service, in all kinds of public sports, and athletic amusements—Dancing, Archery, May-Games, Morris-Dances, &c.; bear baiting being prohibited, as unlawful sport. It was another head of England's church, and not only the head of the church, when living, but its Martyr, *par excellence*, who, by and with the advice of England's Primate, and the consent of the majority of the Bishops of the Anglican establishment, enforced the reading of this proclamation in all the pulpits of England; and now a member of that same church tells us, that amusements, like fireworks, are sinful on a Sunday evening, and should be put down by the civil magistrate. Oh! shades of the martyred Charles, of the saintly Laud, what think ye of these, your degenerate children? Come now, *Courier*, let us reason together. When your Reformed church of England permitted, nay, exhorted, from the pulpit, the people to amuse themselves, with dancing, archery, May-games, &c., on the Sunday, it was permitting, and exhorting, to crime, or it was not. If it was publicly exhorting to, crime,