

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND.  
 SHORT SIGHT BILLS from One Pound upwards, negotiable in any part of the United Kingdom, are drawn on the  
 Union Bank of London, London.  
 Bank of Ireland, Dublin.  
 National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.  
 By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,  
 St. Sacramento Street.  
 Montreal, February 9, 1854.

## THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 17, 1854.

### NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Sebastopol still holds out; though its speedy fall is confidently predicted by the French and British press. As it was evident on a close examination that the place was not to be taken by a *coup de main*, regular approaches have been made, and an overwhelming force of artillery brought to bear upon the defences. The fire opened on the 16th or 17th Oct., and one breach is already reported as having been effected; but the assault will not be delivered until another opening has been made, and the defences still further destroyed.

The *Asia* from Liverpool the 4th inst., brings the following particulars:—

"Up to Oct. 25th the siege and bombardment of Sebastopol was going on with success. The loss of life in town of Sebastopol was said to be so great that the air was tainted with the numbers of unburied dead, and Admiral Mezhmoff had been killed by a shell. The loss of the Allies was comparatively small. Lord Raglan is understood to favor a long bombardment in preference to an armed assault; water was beginning to fail in the town.

"The Russians attacked the forces in the vicinity of Balaklava on the 25th. Their number was about 30,000. The attack was unexpected.

"The Cossacks preceded the Infantry; to resist them at first there were Ottoman troops and Scots. The Turks gave way, and even left their guns, which, seized by the Russians, were turned against them. The Scottish Regiments held their ground, and other forces arrived, when the Russians were forced to yield, remaining, nevertheless, masters of two forts, from which they fired on the Allies.

"Three Regiments of the English line, Cavalry, exposed to the cross fire of the Russian batteries, suffered severely.

"The French took part in the conflict with admirable bravery.

"Next day the position was attacked by a body of 8,000 Russians, as well from the side of the town as from Balaklava. They repulsed the enemy with great slaughter. The loss of the Russians must have been very great. It is affirmed that the fire of the town had much slackened.

"According to the reports of the wounded officers, the belief continued that Sebastopol would soon be in the hands of the allies. Among the names of the killed and wounded there are none of the General Officers.

"There are contradictory rumors as to negotiations. Austria will certainly not, unless compelled, come to an open rupture with Russia until she is confident of Prussia and the German Governments."

Loud complaints are being made against the inactivity—to use the mildest term—of Admiral Dundas, whose conduct has provoked, not only the censures of his own countrymen, but the sneers of our French Allies. Admiral Hamelin, the Commander of the French naval force in the Black Sea, proposed an attack upon some of the sea defences of Sebastopol; but the more prudent counsels of the British Admiral—who seems to have a strong dislike to the smell of powder—prevailed; and, in consequence, the Fleet is still doomed to the inglorious task of witnessing triumphs, in which it is not permitted to share. The disgust amongst both officers and crews, is extreme; and unless the old woman who, for the last twelve months, has been permitted to bring dishonor on the British flag, be speedily superseded by a more competent officer, some very unpleasant consequences may ensue. Apprehensions of a mutiny are not altogether unfounded.

From the Baltic, the British Lion is slowly wending his way home, with his tail between his legs. The rhodomontade of the Reform Club, and Sir C. Napier's pithy exhortation to his sailors—"to sharpen their cutlasses, and the day was their own"—are painfully contrasted with the meagre results of the campaign. That Sir C. Napier brings his fleet home safe, is, no doubt, very satisfactory; but greater things were anticipated from the man, and the force under his command; and the disappointment of the nation at the negative results of the campaign will find vent. We are promised great things, however, for next spring, and preparations are being made for an attack upon Cronstadt as soon after the melting of the ice as possible.

The articles of the *Times*, calling attention to the deficient Hospital arrangements for our troops, have produced a good effect. Additional Surgeons and nurses are on their way to the seat of war; and large sums have been raised by private contributions in furtherance of the same object in all parts of the United Kingdom.

Trouble seems to be brewing betwixt the French Empire, and the United States, on account of the refusal on the part of the Emperor to allow M. Soule, the American Minister to the Court of Spain to pass through France on his route to Madrid. M. Soule is well known in France for his ultra-democratic principles, which he found means to indulge to his heart's content during the late *emueutes* at Madrid, where his intrigues, and overbearing conduct, have made him very obnoxious to the Spaniards. It is not easy to understand by what motives the authorities at Washington were actuated, in sending such a person as their representative to Madrid; but having made such an extraordinary selection, they

have hardly the right to complain if the Governments of Europe, for their own protection, recognise in him, the unprincipled *sylibuster*, rather than the accredited agent of a civilised Government. It is hinted however that the treatment M. Soule has met with from the Emperor will lead to the interruption of diplomatic relations between France and the United States.

### PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

The Clergy Reserves Bill has passed through Committee, with all the most obnoxious clauses unchanged. It remains to be seen whether the Legislative Council will sanction this infamous measure. The Seigneurial Tenure Bill has also been advanced a stage. The debates on the Seat of Government have led to a postponement of the question for a fortnight, when the discussion will be resumed. By way of exposing the absurdity of the present system, M. Dorion has given notice of an amendment, to the effect, that, if the ambulatory system be continued, Parliament shall sit by turns in every village in the Province, from Gaspé to London, in order to enable the members to acquire the necessary amount of local and topographical knowledge. The 24th instant is now confidently spoken of as the period fixed for the adjournment.

### CHURCH AND STATE.

We trust that in deprecating the principle, now unfortunately sanctioned by our Canadian Legislature—that it is desirable to abolish even to the semblance of connection between Church and State—we may not be suspected of advocating "State-Churchism." Such a union, or rather fusion, of the two Orders—the Spiritual and the Temporal—as is implied by the justly odious term "State-Churchism," we abhor, as ruinous to the interests of religion, and as destructive of the substantive existence, either of the Church or of the State.

That the Spiritual and Temporal Orders—one represented by the Church, the other by the State—are two distinct Orders, we are bound as Catholics to admit: but as religion also teaches us that both have been instituted by God, and derive all their authority from Him, and from Him only, we cannot subscribe to the Protestant doctrine that, because distinct, there should be no connection between them. If it is important to assert the distinction of the two Orders it is as necessary to maintain their connection; and if it be true that they both hold from one source, it is monstrous to suppose that they should be entirely separated.

Now the very term connection implies that distinction; and not until all connection betwixt Church and State has been abolished, can the two Orders become so confounded as to render that distinction impossible. As one thing cannot be said to be connected with itself—as one State cannot be said to be connected with the self-same State—so, as long as there is connection betwixt Church and State, there is no fear for the distinct, substantive existence of either; no danger that State will be confounded with Church, or Church merged in State: in a word, no possibility of "State-Churchism." But if we destroy that connection, one of two things must ensue; either the Church must be merged in the State—by the latter assuming to itself the functions which belong exclusively to the former; or the State, in all its acts, in all its legislation, must utterly ignore religion, and cease to acknowledge its dependence upon, and relations towards, Him from Whom it derives all its authority. In the first case we should have "State-Churchism;" in the other political atheism. Both are to be abhorred; yet one or the other must ensue from the assertion of the principle—"that it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection betwixt Church and State."

Connection then between Church and State, by recognising the distinct existence of both—without which there could be no connection—secures society against the dangers of "State-Churchism" on the one hand, and political atheism, on the other. It effectually guards against "State-Churchism," which is not a connection of two distinct Orders, but the fusion of one in the other; and in practice means the usurpation by the State of the peculiar functions of the Church. When the State asserts its autonomy in the Spiritual Order—when, without any connection with the Church, it aspires to legislate with a reference to God, and arrogates to itself any distinctive religious character—we have "State-Churchism," as we see it developed in England and Russia. In neither country can it be properly said that there is connection betwixt Church and State: for in both, Church is merged in the State, and the former is but a branch or department of the other, as little distinct from the State, as the "Customs" or "Ordnance" departments. In England and in Russia, a Bishop or Archbishop is but a State official, appointed by the Government to carry out the instructions of his superiors, and to preserve order in the particular branch of the service to which he belongs. This is State-Churchism, or the assumption by the State of the functions of the Church. It is a fusion, or confusion, not a connection, of the two Orders—the Spiritual and the Temporal; and wherever a State, not connected with the Church, presumes to legislate with any reference to spiritual objects, or in a religious spirit, there to a greater or less extent is the spirit of "State-Churchism" rife, and there are its evil results manifested.

On the other hand, where the State utterly ignores God, and man's relation to God—in which relationship of man to his maker consists religion—we have an atheistical State, or political atheism; a form of Government which indeed obtained for a few months during the first French Revolution; but was soon abandoned even by its promoters, as incompatible with the existence of modern society, which is the product of Christianity—that is—of the influence of

the Spiritual upon the Temporal. All our modern political and social systems are based upon Christianity; and are indebted for all of good that they still retain to the, as yet, unexhausted influences of Church upon State; or in other words, to that connection which, in Canada, we repudiate. To declare that "it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State," means then—either that it is desirable that the State should assume to itself an independent jurisdiction in the Spiritual Order—that is—in matters pertaining unto man's spiritual interests—which is "State-Churchism;" or that it is desirable that the State should entirely divest itself of all religious character, and renounce its allegiance to Him from Whom it holds, and by Whom it was instituted—which is political atheism.

Now the connection for which we contend, by recognising the substantive existence of, and distinguishing between, the two Orders, affords the only possible solution of the problem—"how to have a Christian State, and at the same time a State which shall not be Church." For the interests of Christian society it is necessary that the State should arrogate to itself no religious functions, and pretend to no independent jurisdiction in the Spiritual Order. It is necessary however that the Temporal Order, or State, should work in harmony with the Spiritual Order, or Church; and this harmonious co-operation necessarily implies a connection between the two Orders—a connection beneficial to both, and which leaves both perfectly supreme and independent, each in its own Order—the State in matters Temporal, the Church, in matters Spiritual.

Hitherto this connection has obtained in Canada. Our State or civil government has not thought it necessary to renounce all distinctive religious character, neither have our legislators deemed it their duty to leave their Christianity in the lobby of the House. The evidences of this connection are legible in our Statute-book, and in all our social institutions; and certainly the effects of that connection have not been so very prejudicial to society as to render it "desirable to remove all semblance" thereof. Through the temporary ascendancy of demagoguism it may be unavoidable, but we cannot bring ourselves to believe with M. Morin and his friends in the Ministry, that it is "desirable." For instance, it is solely owing to the connection between Church and State, that marriage has hitherto been recognised by the State as something besides a civil contract, and that neither divorce nor polygamy are amongst our social institutions. As to how members of the Legislature who have declared that it is desirable to abolish all semblance of this connection, intend to act towards the next Bills that may be laid before them, having reference to the intercourse of the sexes, we are of course in the dark. But—as it is only because marriage, or the indissoluble union of one man with one woman, is a Christian institution, and therefore something more than a civil contract—and as this "something more" can only be ascertained, and enforced by the State in virtue of its connection with the Church—all semblance even of which connection it is desirable to abolish—it does seem a logical and inevitable conclusion from the premises laid down by the framers of the Clergy Reserves Bill, that marriage, as a Christian institution, i. e. as "something more" than a civil contract, must be abolished likewise, in so far as the State is concerned; and that our marriage laws must be assimilated to those of the neighboring Republic, where divorce is legalised, and where, to the scandal of the civilisation of the XIX. century, polygamy is a social institution.

### PROTESTANT RELICS.

It is too bad that Methodists should make us poor Papists the objects of their indignant vituperation on account of the respect and veneration which we entertain for the relics of Martyrs, and holy men of old, who have sealed their testimony with their blood—when our evangelical friends are just as bad in that respect as we are, and their relic-worship differs from ours only in the particular objects to which it is directed. A piece of the Cross whereon the price of man's Redemption was paid, the place where the Body of our Lord was buried, command the veneration of the Papist: the Methodist looks with reverence on the tub whence some inspired Juniper was wont hebdomadally to preach his hearers into fits, and gazes with holy rapture upon Jabez Baster's old pair of breeches. The principle is the same in both cases.

The growth of relic-worship in the Methodist world, is forcibly displayed in a communication which appeared in a late number of the *Christian Guardian*, over the signature of Dr. Green—who, having accomplished a pilgrimage to Europe; visits, not the "Holy Sepulchre," but the "Tomb of Fletcher"—the said Fletcher having been a somewhat notorious Methodist preacher of the last century. Madeley, the village where he was interred, is, it seems, full of memorials of the holy man.

The first relic which our pilgrim falls in with, is in the garden of a superannuated minister, and is described as "an antique looking stone, about two feet high, somewhat in the form of a vase, swelling out about 18 or 20 inches." This was Mr. Fletcher's "Baptismal Font."

"The reader may judge my surprise at this announcement," says the pilgrim. "There stood the venerable relic used as a holy vessel in God's temple, actually turned into!! a flower vase in a country garden. I suggested the propriety of sending it to the Centenary Hall in London."

The pilgrim then gives us an animated description of his visit to the tomb of Fletcher, by the side of which, "hallowed by so many recollections," he long lingered; "and even then"—he adds—"I tore myself away in violence to my feelings, deeply regretting that my time was so limited that I could not linger for hours in a place so suggestive of admonitory thoughts, and so replete with interest to a re-

flecting mind." The sight of Fletcher's pulpit aroused still more rapturous sensations in the pilgrim's bosom; and "kneeling in that holy place"—the pulpit—he got regularly happy, or, in the emphatic language of Mrs. Gamp, "his feelings became too many for him." In the same place are "carefully preserved the cushion, lamps, prayer book, and communion table, used by that holy man." In some cases, the relics of this great Methodist Saint have been lost or destroyed; but the memorials thereof are preserved by means which we should have thought would have roused to fury the iconoclastic zeal of the Protestant world. Thus the pilgrim tells us:—

"The Old Barn which was once used as a depository for the *Tithes*, and subsequently for a chapel for Mr. Fletcher"—be sure when you read of a Protestant Saint, that there is Saintness in petticoats not far off—"has long since been removed; a drawing of it, however, is retained, AND THE AGED SAINTS LOOK UPON IT WITH MUCH VENERATION."

Just as Papists, blinded idolaters that they are, do upon drawings, pictures, or images of the Blessed Virgin, the Saints departed, or the Crucifix; the originals of which objects were perhaps as much worthy of the "veneration of the aged Saints," as was the "Old Barn," in which Mrs. Fletcher did her devotions. Now, if "a drawing of the latter" is "looked upon with much veneration" by elderly Methodists, why should not Catholics look with at least equal veneration upon the symbol of Christ's passion?—Will the *Christian Guardian* please explain.

"WHAT DOES IT MEAN?"—We read in the Upper Canada press, that the editor of a Protestant, or Non-Catholic paper, published in German, has been tried and condemned to imprisonment for the offence of blasphemy and impiety. M. Rudolph, the editor in question, intends to appeal against the decision of the Court, as a violation of the Protestant principles of "private judgment" and "right of speech."

That blasphemy is a crime, and a crime of so heinous a complexion that it should not be allowed to go unpunished, we certainly will not attempt to deny. But by what right does a Protestant Court of justice, does a purely secular tribunal, and in a country which proclaims the desirableness of severing all semblance of connection between Church and State, pretend to adjudicate on such a crime, or to decide what is, and what is not, blasphemy? And why should M. Rudolph be made a victim of, whilst so many hundreds of others, equally guilty of blasphemy against God, His Saints, and His Blessed Mother, are allowed to go unpunished?

M. Rudolph has, according to our informant, protested against the Divinity of Christ—the dogma of the Redemption, and declared his disbelief in the doctrines of Christianity; he has also, through the medium of the press, done his best to make converts to his peculiar form of Protestantism or Denial. Now all this he has certainly as much right to do, as the agents of the French Canadian Missionary Society have to attempt to bring over the *habitués* of Lower Canada to their particular form of Denialism; and yet M. Rudolph is in jail, whilst his fellow-blasphemers, and propagators of impious libels against the truth, are not only allowed to go at large in Lower Canada, but are treated as if they were most estimable members of society. What strange mockery of justice is this! A jail for M. Rudolph—and an oration for Gavazzi!

Have we then an "Inquisition" in Upper Canada?—and who are these persons who take upon themselves to adjudicate in matters purely Spiritual?—Whence do they derive their authority?—and by what tests do they ascertain what is, and what is not, impious, blasphemous, and heretical? Not from the State, nor from the Statute book. For in matters Spiritual, or appertaining to religion, the State, or civil power, has no lawful jurisdiction whatsoever, no, not the slightest, save in so far as it has been authorised by the Church to deal with such matters; but such an authorisation is impossible, if there be no connection between Church and State.

Frankly—even in an age of humbug, in a country where cant and humbug are pre-eminent—this trial and condemnation of M. Rudolph do seem almost incredible. And yet there it is, staring us in the face!—A Protestant tribunal in Upper Canada, where the blasphemous Gavazzi was applauded, arrogating to itself all the functions of the *Romish* Inquisition, and punishing a fellow-Protestant for exercising his rights of "private judgment" and "freedom of speech!" And the Protestant press is silent at this monstrous outrage upon "Civil and Religious Liberty!" Where now is the *Gazette*?—why tarry the thunderbolts of the *Globe*? Why does J. M. Ferres still hold his peace?—and why is Mister George Brown become altogether as a man that is dumb?

M. Rudolph is however going to appeal, and it is most probable that the sentence will be reversed; we may almost say that it is desirable that it should be so. We do not mean that it is desirable that blasphemy and impiety, that crimes against religion, should go unpunished; but we do think that it is better that these crimes should be allowed to go altogether unpunished, than that the State should be allowed to arrogate to itself any independent jurisdiction, however slight, in religious matters. For once tolerate it, and where shall it be stopped? and who shall define its limits? To-day, the State may pronounce the denial of the Divinity of Christ, blasphemy; the next, it may be blasphemy, according to law, to assert it. In connection with the Church, which can alone judge on these matters, the State might pretend, nay, it would be its duty, to punish with temporal punishment the impious and the blasphemous—the Gavazzis, the Rudolfs, and obscene F. C. Missionaries. But as no such connection is to be retained, why we must even let the whole of them off scot-free. Tiny per-