

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. \$2 1/2 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. MATTHEW ENRIGHT, 24, Mountain St.  
Three Rivers.—Mr. JOHN KEENAN.  
Terrebonne.—M. PREVOST, Esq., N. P.  
St. Hyacinthe.—Mr. PATRICK FLYNN.  
Alexandria.—D. M'GILLIS.  
Oshawa.—Rev. Mr. J. B. PROULX.  
Picton, C. W.—Rev. Mr. LALOR.  
Toronto.—Mr. S. LYNN, King Street.  
Norwood.—Rev. Mr. BERNARD J. HIGGINS.  
Cornwall, C. W.—Mr. A. STUART McDONALD.  
Perth, C. W.—Mr. JOHN DORAN.  
Bytown.—Mr. EWD. BURKE.  
Carillon.—A. E. MONTMARQUET, Esq.  
Aylmer, C. E.—Mr. JAS. DOYLE.

## THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 4, 1850.

The editor of the *Montreal Witness* says, that "the absence of replies to our attacks upon the F. C. M. Society, may result from the difficulty of ascertaining what are intended for attacks, and what for *badinage*." Surely the editor of the *Montreal Witness* must have a queer idea of a joke. However, he promises that "if we will gravely state our charges against the French Canadian Missionary Society, or its Missionaries, he will do his best, not officially, but from some acquaintance with the Society's operations, to answer them." Well, that's a blessing. We only hope he will keep his word. At the same time, we do not know how to put our charges or attacks, call them what you will, in plainer language than we have done already. We have spoken out openly—no hinting that we know of—unless hinting in the way that the Irishman did, when he gently insinuated his desire to be rid of an importunate visitor, by kicking him out of the house.

If the editor of the *Montreal Witness* will give himself the trouble to look at our number for the 20th of September, he will see the charges which we have brought forward against the Society, and the mode of refuting them pointed out. With the subordinate agents, the pedlars, we have nothing to do. They, poor men, say and write in their journals what they think will please their employers. The Society publishes these falsehoods, and thus becomes responsible for them; because it was its duty to have ascertained their truth, before giving them to the world.

Had we found amongst the Committee-men and Officers of the Society, merely the names of a few obscure and ignorant fanatics, such as usually appear upon the *Records* of Evangelical Societies, we would have treated its *Records*, and itself, with the contempt it deserves. We would have taken no notice of it. But when we find the names of several of the well-known and influential citizens of Montreal—of Clergymen of the church of England, who, we suppose, are members of the Society with the full consent of their Bishop, and who, therefore, may be presumed to represent the Anglican Church party in Canada—of gentlemen, real live officers, who have had the honor to bear her Majesty's commission and to wear her uniform—heading the list of office-bearers of the Society—its statements, its *Records*, go forth to the world possessed of authority. All these gentlemen—these clergymen—these officers of the army, colonels and what not—all become personally responsible for the truth of every word contained in the *Records*. For this reason it is that we have honored them with so much attention.

We do not intend going over the old ground. We have pointed out to the editor of the *Montreal Witness* where he may find our charges against the Society; and which may be reduced to the following heads. We accuse the Society, first—of the slandering of Clergymen, whose places of residence are hinted at pretty plainly, but whose names the Society dares not give at full length, because it knows that its lies would be instantly refuted. Second—of deliberate falsehood against the "priest of S. R.," accused of falsely quoting Scripture to a woman "lately delivered

ed," and of "administering the Sacrament to all in the house who would receive it." Third—of perversion of Scripture, in teaching little girls that the New Testament itself says, "that nothing is to be added to it (*the New Testament*), and nothing taken away." Fourth—of damnable heresy, in teaching, that the Blessed Virgin is not the Mother of God (*theotokos*), but only the Mother of Christ, *Christotokos*; thus making a distinction of persons (not natures, remember) in Christ;—being aided and abetted in all this by gentlemen who call themselves *priests* of the church of England; and who ought to know better.

Many other charges might we make, but we content ourselves, for the present, with these, and we are willing, as we said before, to test them all by the simple circumstance of the priest at S. R. administering "the Sacrament to all in the house who would receive it." Tell us—we would say to the *Montreal Witness*—tell us S. R.—Sorel? Who was the priest, and what Sacrament did he administer? If it cannot answer these questions, if it cannot prove the administration of the Sacrament, as related in the Society's *Records*, for July 1850, we are justified in treating all its *Records*, journals, &c., as impudent falsehoods.

The F. C. M. Society may answer or not, as it thinks fit. It may put up tawdry with the expressions—with the charges of falsehood, calumny, perversion of Scripture, and heresy,—which we have brought against it, only if it does so, it will have no right to complain of any language that hereafter we may think fit to employ.

We observe in the *Montreal Witness*, of Monday last, a complaint made by a gentleman named James Byrne, that a Bible, presented by the Committee of the Montreal Bible Society, to the owners of the *Canada* steamboat, had been disfigured by some person writing his remarks therein. We fully agree with Mr. Byrne, that this was a most unjustifiable, ungentlemanly act. No man has a right to destroy or disfigure property which does not belong to him. And though we deny that it is a *duty incumbent upon all Christians*, to circulate the Protestant version of the Scriptures, we admit that no one has a right to write his remarks in another person's book.

But the writer asks—"In what sense is the Bible issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society a mutilated book?" And also—"Have we not herein the whole testimony of God?" To the first question we reply, that the Bible issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society is mutilated by the omission of the Books of Maccabees, of Tobias, of Wisdom, and others, whose canonicity rests upon as good, that is, upon precisely the same authority as the canonicity of the Book of Esther in the Old Testament, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, 2nd St. Peter, 2nd and 3rd St. John, and of the Apocalyptic Vision, or Book of Revelations, in the New Testament, or, indeed, of any other Book of Scripture. That authority, in all cases, being the infallible decision of the Church, and nothing else.

The canonicity of all the above-named books has been called in question at some period or another of the Church's existence. The Synod of Laodicea, for instance, A. D. 361, refused to admit as canonical the Book of Revelations, as well as the Books of Tobias, Maccabees, Wisdom, &c. The Council of Carthage, a few years later, restored them to the place they now occupy. The Bible no where declares what books are canonical and what are not. To obtain a knowledge of the Canon of Scripture then, we must either have recourse to some human testimony, or else to a revelation direct from God. Catholics make no pretensions to be the subjects of the latter, and therefore receive the authority of the Church as decisive upon the question—what composes the Canon of Scripture? That authority has pronounced these books, which Protestants, but not Catholics, term the *Apocrypha*, (for the Catholic has no doubts,) to be divinely inspired, and, therefore, does the Catholic receive them as such. The Catholic has no authority for believing in the inspiration of any book contained in the Bible, except the authority of the Church, inspiration being a fact in the supernatural order, and, therefore, requiring a witness in the same order to certify its existence.

But, "Have we not herein the whole testimony of God?" the writer asks. The Catholic says no, and calls upon the Protestant for proof, that in the Bible issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society, is contained "the whole testimony of God." It is a very important question; and one upon which we certainly will not take the word of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as decisive.

We quote the following specimen of Religious Tolerance in that supereminently Protestant country, Scotland, from the *Weekly News*, of Sept. 14th.

Liberty of Conscience, Religious Freedom, are words ever on the lips of our Puritanical friends. How they carry their professions into effect, the following is an admirable exemplification:—

"RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.—If we want a proof that many of the avowed friends of Protestantism are, in reality, her most effective enemies, Scotland will always supply us in plenty. It was moved in the Greenock Parochial Board, last week, 'That permission be given for the Catholic children, and others of the same persuasion in the poor's-house, to assemble in a room set apart, on Sundays, or on any other day thought most convenient, for the purpose of receiving religious instruction—orphans and deserted children included—and that the religion professed by the parents of orphans and deserted children be registered agreeably to the 23rd rule of the house regulations.' This motion was met by an amendment in these terms: 'That all the children in the poor's-house be brought up in accordance with the religious persuasion of the majority of the heritors and ratepayers of this community.' The amendment was carried by a large majority! This is not merely bigotry—if we mistake not, it is a gross infraction of the law, and the decision might be reversed by the Poor-law Commissioners. It is seldom that intolerance expresses itself in such bold and shameless terms."

It is to be hoped that this resolution will soon be repealed as opposed to the 51st Rule of the Board of Supervision, which enacts that, "Any Regular Minister, of the religious persuasion of any inmate of the poor-house, shall, at any time in the day, be allowed by the House Governor, to enter the poor-house, for the purpose of affording religious assistance to such inmate, or for the purpose of instructing his child or children, in the principles of his religion."

Protestant liberality, like the tender mercies of the wicked, is a cruel thing.

### THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE GAS COMPANY.

—On Monday last, the Report of the Light Committee was received, from which it appears that the Gas Company had refused to take less than what they had formerly demanded for furnishing the city with gas during the ensuing winter. The Report of the Finance Committee gave the amount which could be spared for lighting the city as £500. After a long debate, Dr. Hall's motion, to the effect that the Light Committee should be instructed to offer the Gas Company £4 10s. per lamp, was carried by a majority of 11 to 8.

Mr. Holmes gave notice of a bye-law, to levy a tax of 3d. in the pound, upon real property.

Sunday next, after Vespers, will take place the ceremony of blessing the corner stone of the college of Jesuits. His Lordship, the Bishop of Montreal, will officiate. Friends to the progress of education and the propagation of the Truth, are invited to attend.

His Grace, the Archbishop of Quebec, departed this life on Thursday, 3rd instant, at 11 A. M. May his soul repose in peace. The interment is expected to take place on Monday next, in which case his Lordship of Montreal will not assist at the ceremony on Sunday afternoon.

"An Enquirer" asks us if there is a Catholic Temperance Association in Montreal, and if so, why it has not as yet presented its address to Mr. Gough, the eloquent temperance advocate and lecturer. We reply, that there are two Catholic Temperance Societies in Montreal: one composed of the French Canadian population, the other of the Irish. The Presidents and Officers of these two societies, can alone explain why they have as yet presented no address to Mr. Gough. Of this, without any personal acquaintance with the proceedings of the societies, we are certain—that it has not proceeded from any disrespect to Mr. Gough, to whose unremitting exertions in the noble cause of temperance, every man, whether Catholic or Protestant, will readily bear witness, and to whom they most heartily wish all health and happiness, with continued success in the cause to which he has so honorably devoted himself.

We have received from Mr. McCoy, Great St. James Street, a very interesting little pamphlet purporting to be a letter from Major Robert Carmichael Smyth, to the Author of 'the Clockmaker,' pointing out how the people and capital of Great Britain may be advantageously employed in her own colonies.

The object of the author is, to show the practicability of forming, and the advantages to be derived from, a direct railroad communication between Halifax and the mouth of Fraser's River, crossing the continent, within the limits of British America, and thus ensuring a speedy intercourse with India, China, and our Australasian settlements.

The writer calculates the length of railroad at 4,000 miles, which, at £24,000 a mile, would cost the sum of £96,000,000; but, as the cost of the railroad from Halifax to Quebec, is estimated at

£5,000,000, for 600 miles, or a little more than £8,000 per mile, he supposes that a much smaller sum than £96,000,000 would be found sufficient.

Now, when the Atlantic is regularly crossed in from ten to eleven days, when a submarine telegraph betwixt France and England, is a *fait accompli*, it is impossible to say where the possible ends. Very likely the Rocky Mountains offer no obstacles which engineering skill could not overcome. But there is still the difficulty of finding on this continent a sufficient amount of labor to carry on such a gigantic undertaking. This difficulty the writer proposes to surmount by employing the convict labor of Great Britain, for the construction of the above-mentioned railroad. To this part of the scheme there are serious objections. First: Convict labor is, of all kinds of labor, the most expensive and the most unprofitable. Work performed by convicts costs dear, and is always badly executed. In New South Wales this is so well known, that to designate a slovenly piece of work, done at a great cost, and of little use when completed, the expression "A Government day's work" is in common use. Secondly: Convicts could not be kept in a state of compulsory labor in this country. If in New South Wales the convicts do not desert from the roadgangs, it is not because of the two or three sentries standing over them, but because the convicts well know that escape is impossible. If they take the *bush*, as it is called, they must either die of starvation, or, possessing themselves of arms and horses from the settlers, run what they call a short course, but a merry one, generally terminating in a few weeks with an order for ropes and coffins from the Sydney dock-yard. To prevent their escape, convicts must be kept heavily ironed, in which case they cannot work, and if their limbs are free of irons, all the sentries in the world would be insufficient to prevent their making their escape, and crossing the lines to the neighboring Republic, or to the diggings of California.

The moral evils inevitably growing out of the employment of convict labor, have been too well exemplified in New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, and Norfolk Island, to render it likely that the people of this continent will submit to have it introduced amongst them.

We thankfully acknowledge the receipt of the following amounts:—Rev. Mich. Brennan, Belleville, £1; Rev. Mr. Dollard, Kingston, £1 5s.; Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald, St. John's, C. E., £3 15s.; Mr. Jas. Doyle, (our agent for Aylmer, C. E.), £3 10s.; Rev. Mr. James Chisholm, Lindsay, £1 5s.

We respectfully inform our correspondents that we have no back numbers on hand.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the True Witness and Catholic Chronicle.

DEAR SIR,—Happening to take up the *Montreal Witness* of Monday last, I found it to contain so many rare tit-bits, that I thought I would make of them a sort of literary *ragout* for the entertainment of that numerous class of your readers who never see that excellent journal. In the first place we have the editor (or somebody for him) slyly chuckling over the fancied success of Britannicus, your late adversary, and boasting of his having forced you to make certain admissions. Now, "tell it not in Gath"—but it is as clear as noonday to any impartial reader—that it is he who was driven back from one point to another, he letting each in turn fall as though he feared it too hot for his fingers—not a single point have you admitted, only that which you never had occasion to deny, the temporary error of the Maronite people, and the censure passed on the pope in question, for what was altogether but a sin of omission. It would be well if others had the grace to admit themselves wrong, when they really are so, but that would not be *evangelical* conduct. Then, side by side with that assertion of theirs, we find another which is equally good for my *hash*. "Catholics," (oh! I beg pardon, did he say Catholics?) "Catholics," says he, "never quote the Bible, but they are great at Church history, and the writings of the Fathers!"—Bless my stars, Mr. Editor, why did you not take up some passage in the Bible, relative to the affair of Honorius, together with the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople?—Surely, you could have found something "to quote,"—The matter in debate happened, it is true, in the seventh century, but then, you know, a few centuries later or earlier makes no great difference; if it is not in the Bible it *ought* to be, so I would advise you to look the sacred volume over again. Being a Catholic (pardon, good neighbors, I mean Romanist!) you are, of course, but very little acquainted with its contents, so do pray examine whether the records of the latter half of the seventh century are not to be found somewhere in the inspired writings. *The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible!* such is the war-cry of the thousand and one sects that have sprung from its *mis-use*. And yet no two sections of them agree about the translation of that same volume, and they rail most vociferously against mistakes and falsifications in each other's versions. Nor can they tell whether the Bible, as it now stands, contains *all* the