

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Rownton, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,  
St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

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. . . . \$2½ do.  
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Owing to some unaccountable delay, the English mail had not arrived in town up to the time of going to press. The news by telegraph contains the following items:—

On Thursday an important debate took place in the House of Lords on the subject of war with Ava. Earl Ellenborough moved for the production of a letter, written in 1829 by the East India Company to the Governor General, giving instructions as to the line of operation to be made in any future war with Ava, especially with reference to the proclamation for the annexation of Pegu. Earls Aberdeen and Derby both defended the policy that was pursued; and the latter read a memorandum, written by the late Duke of Wellington, going to prove that war could not have been avoided, and in justice, both to the Peguise and England, government was bound not to stop short of the annexation of that Province. In the Commons, on Friday, the subject of Jewish disabilities was discussed, the object being to extend to Jewish dissenters the same privileges as to Protestants and Catholics. A motion by Lord J. Russell, that the House go into Committee, to consider the subject, was carried by a vote of 234 to 205. The ship "Hemisphere" at Liverpool, from New Orleans, having the crew, 16 in number, of the Barque "Charles" of London, from Cardiff for San Francisco, abandoned at sea. The chief mate of the Steamer "Victoria," lost off Dublin, has been indicted for man-slaughter. C. P. Rooney, Secretary of the Dublin Industrial Exhibition, has been appointed general Superintendent of the Quebec and Richmond Railroad. Apprehensions are entertained of an outbreak in Hungary. Mazzini is supposed to be in Milan; we trust we may soon hear that he is in prison.

CHURCH AUTHORITY.

When we accepted the challenge of the *Montreal Witness*, to state the Catholic argument for the existence of an infallible Church, we did so on the understanding that he would fulfil his promise of meeting us with "a contrary and positive thesis;" that he would do something more than attempt to prove our thesis *bad*, but that he would bring forward a thesis of his own, which he would prove to be *good*. We were anxious to see a "positive," and at the same time a protesting, "thesis, and, in the hopes of having our curiosity gratified we willingly stated our own in the plainest language—We argued—1st, that the means appointed by Christ Himself for perpetuating, and promulgating the knowledge of His doctrines, amongst "all nations" and "until the consummation of all things," must needs be the very best means possible, and therefore infallible—2nd, that the *only* means, appointed by Christ Himself, was the teaching of a chosen "body" of men, by Him expressly commissioned to teach; we therefore concluded that such teaching was the very best means possible for perpetuating and promulgating the knowledge of His doctrines, and therefore an infallible means; and finally, we called upon our opponent, if he demurred to our argument, either to prove that Christ Himself had appointed some *other* means for perpetuating and promulgating the knowledge of His doctrines—or else to admit that He had appointed *no* means. Clearly our opponent was bound to do either the one or the other.

And of course, like a true Protestant controversialist, he has done neither. He murmurs forth some unintelligible objections against the use of the term "body" as applied to the recipients of the commission to teach:—

"The Apostles were no Church, or College, or corporation for the purpose of declaring in a corporate capacity, what men were to believe. They did not meet to consult before they wrote their Gospels or Epistles, and then give them forth as the standard of a Church. Each was clearly, from the nature of the case, inspired separately and individually, for his own particular share of the great work of recording or revealing God's truth to man."

Which means that, according to the *Montreal Witness*, the Apostles went to work, every man on his own hook, without reference to the teaching, and without any connection with the proceedings, of another; our opponent also challenges us to prove "that the Apostles were a body."

By the word "body," in the sense in which we use it, we intend to denote any number of men, bound together by a *communio in re*—laboring for the same ends, employing the same means, and acting under a common warrant, or commission. Thus we call a regiment of soldiers a "body" of men, in virtue of the common bond of discipline wherewith they are knit together for the attainment of one common object—we call even an undisciplined mob a "body" of men, if acting in concert, for the attainment of one object; and for the same reason, and in the same sense, we apply the term "body" to the men appointed by Christ Himself to teach, because of the tie by which they were united, and at the same time, distinguished from all other men—viz., their commission to teach—because of their common object, and of the means which they used in common for the attainment of that object—that common object being the

conversion of "all nations" to Christianity, and the common means being the miraculous endowments which were imparted to them *in common* on the day of Pentecost.

It will thus be seen that the question raised by the *Montreal Witness* resolves itself into this—Was the commission, given by Christ to the Apostles, given to them as individuals, or as a "body,"—that is, as acting in a corporate capacity? We answer—it was given to them as a "body," or corporation, because only, as given to them in that capacity, could the commission have been fulfilled. The commission was universal and perpetual—"Go ye and teach all nations;" and the promise of His assisting presence was—"until the consummation of all things." Now, the Apostles, in their individual capacity, *did* not, because they *could* not,—go unto, and teach all nations;" the commission therefore, if given to them as individuals, was an unfulfilled, because an impracticable, commission. But Christ, if from God, as He represented Himself to be, could not have given an impracticable commission—a commission which was not, because it *could* not be, executed; therefore, we must conclude that the commission given to the Apostles, to "Go and teach all nations" was *not* given to them merely as individuals.

And again, unless we can suppose that Christ was deluding His hearers with false hopes, never, because impossible, to be realised, when He promised "to be with them"—the commissioned teachers—"until the consummation of all things," we cannot suppose that the commission was given to them as individuals.—The only conceivable object of the promise was to encourage the body of teachers in their arduous office of teaching, and to give to all, who in future generations might believe in His name, through their teaching, a sufficient guarantee for their credibility. Looking upon the teachers as a "body," and therefore destined to continue "until the consummation of all things," we can understand, and appreciate the value of, our Blessed Lord's promise; but, if we look upon it merely as a promise made to a few perishable individuals, what silly trifling, what an impudent piece of humbug, must it not appear?

From the consideration of these circumstances, we cannot, without looking upon Christ as an impostor, avoid coming to the conclusion that the commission was *not* given to the Apostles, as individuals, but as to a "body," acting in a corporate capacity, capable of "going unto all nations," and of continuing until the term assigned in the promise—"even until the consummation of all things;" for, only in that capacity could the commission have been fulfilled. To these reasons our opponent opposes the following considerations:—

"If the Apostles, in a corporate capacity, taught the nations, there would be some account of their councils and decisions; and the writings which they gave for the instruction of mankind would have had the sanction and authority of the sacred college, or *Ecclesia Docens*."

This argument is based upon the assumptions, that we have a complete, and written, account of the proceedings of the Apostles; and that they communicated their instructions to mankind in writing. Both of these assumptions are perfectly unfounded.

In the short treatise attributed to St. Luke, we find, indeed, an account of the Acts of the Apostles until the day of Pentecost,—“they remained in an upper room, persevering with one mind in prayer;” after which we have only a few, brief notices of their proceedings. The narrative, after the 12th chapter, is chiefly taken up with the journeyings, and missionary labors of St. Paul, breaking off very abruptly, and without any apparent reason, upon his arrival at Rome, just as it becomes most interesting. But it throws very little light upon the actions of the personal companions of our Lord—the hearers of His doctrine, the eye-witnesses of His miracles, sufferings, death, and resurrection; indeed, of many of them, it makes scarcely any mention whatever after the thirteenth verse of the first chapter; for all we can gather from it, the greater number of the Apostles may have remained in Judea all their lives, catching fish, and mending their nets upon the shores of the sea of Galilee. From such scanty, and very imperfect, records, it is impossible to conclude anything positive as to the *manner* in which the Apostles "taught the nations." Tradition tells us that, ere separating, the Apostles drew up a short summary of Christian doctrine; but of their subsequent adventures, lives, and deaths—what countries they visited—what peoples they converted—what doctrines they preached—what miracles they performed—we can derive no information whatever from any records contained in the book called the Bible. In fact, if we reject the tradition of the Church, we know far more about the actions of Abu-bekr, Omar, Othman, Ali, and the first propagators of Islamism, than we do of those of St. Thomas, St. Andrew, St. John, and the Apostles of Christianity; from which premises, as a Protestant, we should feel inclined to come to the conclusion, that Mahomet was far better adapted for the work of founding a new religion, and took far greater precautions for its perpetuation and promulgation, than was, or did, our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Still more unfounded is the assumption that the Apostles, or teachers commissioned by Christ Himself, committed their instructions to writing. Without affirming that they did not do so, this we do say, that if they did, some most unaccountable fatality has attended their writings. In the Bible there is scarcely a book which can, by Protestants, be shown to be the work of an Apostle. The most eminent for their erudition amongst the Protestants of Germany reject the book called the Gospel of St. John, as a Gnostic forgery of the end of the second century; all that Protestants can affirm positively of that of St. Matthew, is that it was *not* written by the Apostle whose name it bears, but is merely a translation made, nobody knows

when, no body knows by whom; this is the opinion of Neander, a great Protestant authority, who, rejecting the "inspiration theory," comes to the conclusion that the Gospel of St. Matthew was "founded" only, on an account written by the Apostle.

As to the Epistles attributed to the Apostles, the majority of them were not admitted into the canon of Scripture until the end of the IV century, and many of them have been indignantly rejected by the fathers of modern Protestantism, as "epistles of straw."—"Non nostrum tantus componere lites."

But of the writings of the great majority of the Apostolic body, even supposing that they did commit their instructions to writing, there is not a line remaining. If it was the intention of Christ that the Apostles should teach by scripture, and convey, to future generations, His doctrines in writing, never had a master such a negligent, such a disobedient, set of disciples; even St. John—the "beloved"—did not set about the task of writing his Gospel until sixty years had elapsed. But what shall we say for the other Apostles? for Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, James, Simon Zelotes, and Mathias—who, after the ascension "was numbered with the eleven Apostles?"—Acts 1. What were all these about? how did they fulfil their Master's intentions? And yet, if it was Christ's intention that His doctrines should be committed to writing, as the *sole* means of perpetuating the knowledge of His religion, it was the duty of these men to write instantly, and not to leave the work, to be done by others, or perhaps not done at all. There is but one way of accounting for this singular omission, and that is by supposing that Christ did not intend, and that His Apostles did not understand Him to intend, that the *sole* means for perpetuating and promulgating His doctrines should be by written documents. In this opinion we are fortified by reflecting that, in its origin, Christianity was not a *scriptural*, but an *oral* religion; that the true Church, that is the Church founded by Christ Himself—if He did found a Church—could not have been founded on scripture, because that Church must be of far more ancient date than the oldest of the Christian scriptures, and even Protestants must admit that the superstructure can never precede the foundation.

We must, before concluding, correct one or two false statements of our cotemporary. The Church of Rome does not "set aside the inspiration of the Bible." On the contrary, she has constantly asserted the inspiration of the Bible; and it is only because she has, and does, assert, that we believe, it. Our reason for believing in that inspiration may be a *bad* reason, but—would we ask of our cotemporary—can he adduce a *better*? Can he assign any reason at all why we should believe in the inspiration of any of the biographical notices and memoirs published by her Britannic Majesty's authority? If he can, let him produce it; let him show, for instance, that the short notice of the life of Jesus Christ, commonly called the Gospel of St. Mark, is an inspired writing. Either he can do this, or he cannot: if he can and refuses to do it, he is inexcusable for hiding his light under a bushel; if he cannot, we will take the liberty of reminding him that, to believe without reason is not faith, but credulity.

Neither is it strictly true that we rely upon the saying—"Lo I am with you always," &c.—as the *sole* evidence for the infallibility of the Church. Had that promise never been explicitly given—had it never been recorded—our reasons for believing in the infallibility of the Church would have been the same then, as they are now; because infallibility is indispensably requisite for the fulfilment of a commission to teach, and because—having ample reason, from the miracles recorded of Christ, for believing that His mission was divine—we have ample reason for believing that any commission, given by Him, was likewise a divine commission, and therefore for believing that every thing indispensably requisite for the fulfilment of that divine commission was, with it, given.

Still our cotemporary studiously avoids coming to the real question at issue betwixt us—"What means did Christ Himself appoint for the promulgation and perpetuation of His doctrines, amongst all nations," and "until the consummation of all things?" It is not sufficient for him to deny, or attempt to disprove, the solution we adduce to this important problem; he must give one of his own. It is not enough for him to show that our position is *bad*; he must show that his is *better*: he must show, as we said before, *from the Bible*, either that Christ Himself appointed some *other* means for the preservation of Christianity, or admit that Christ appointed *no* means: which would be tantamount to admitting that Christ was an impudent impostor, Christianity a humbug, and the Apostles a coteremporary for his long promised, but still deferred "positive and contrary thesis."

THE JESUITS AND THE GLOBE.

It seems that the Catholics of Kingston have thought fit to exercise their right of devoting the money, which, by law, they are compelled to contribute to the School fund, to the support of a Catholic School presided over by the *Frères Chrétiens*, or Christian Brothers. This contumacious act is too much for the temper of the *Globe*:—

"The Board of Trustees in Kingston have actually adopted a Seminary established by the Christian Brothers, or Jesuits, as one of the Common Schools."

By this paragraph, the writer evidently intends to convey, to the uneducated mass of his readers, the impression that the Christian Brothers, and the Jesuits, are members, not only of the same Catholic Church, but of the same order, and that by way of exciting a prejudice against the former. That there are blockheads, ignorant enough to imagine that the Christian Brothers, and the Jesuits, compose, one and the same order, we can readily believe, for we can

easily credit any amount of Protestant ignorance; yet no one but a very ignorant blockhead, or a very impudent liar, would ever venture to assert publicly the identity of these two entirely different orders: an assertion as palpably ridiculous as it would be to mistake the editor of the *Globe* for a well informed, or honorable man. The two orders are, as every person but moderately acquainted with history well knows, entirely distinct; the Jesuits having been established in the XVI century, by St. Ignatius Loyola; the Christian Brothers in the XVII, by J. B. de La Salle. But this specimen of ignorance, or dishonesty, on the part of the editor of the *Globe*—we cannot undertake to say which—is but a trifle compared with what follows:—He asks the Protestants of Kingston if they would give their children to be taught by the disciples of Loyola—men whom he represents as teaching in their public Schools that—"lying, under certain circumstances, is a virtue"—and "that any amount of evil may be done, if the object in view is good."

It is painful to be obliged to make use of harsh language; we never employ it with gentlemen, but with men like the editor of the *Globe*, there is no way of avoiding it. When he talks about schools, in which it is taught—that "lying is, under certain circumstances, a virtue—and that any amount of evil may be done, if the object in view is good"—he must excuse us for telling him, that such schools may be, and very probably are to be, found in Protestantism—that it was at some such school doubtless that he, the editor of the *Globe*, received his early education—and that he proves himself, in his mature age, to be a faithful practitioner of the lessons he learnt in his youth. And he must also excuse us for saying that the man, who ventures to assert, or insinuate, that the Jesuits teach that—"lying is, under certain circumstances, a virtue—and that any amount of evil may be done, if the object in view is good"—must be either a fool or a liar, and, very probably, both. We hope the editor of the *Globe* will understand our meaning, for we have endeavored to express it plainly, if not pleasantly. Should he find the language disagreeably harsh, the remedy is patent; he has but to adduce, from the recognised writings of the disciples of Loyola, proofs that they, the Jesuits, do teach the meritoriousness of lying, and the lawfulness of doing evil. When he shall have done this, we will publish his proofs, and willingly make him the *amende honorable*.

PROTESTANT RIOTS AT CHARLES-TOWN.

No-Popery rascaldom has been busy again at its old trade of lying, and rioting; happily for once, the Mayor and authorities of a Protestant city did their duty like men, and the disturbances were quelled without bloodshed. We glean the following particulars from the American journals:—

Mary Corcoran, a young Irish girl, the Catholic child of Catholic parents, was incautiously placed by her mother in service, in the family of a rich Protestant Free-Will Baptist, and a Deacon to boot. In a short time the mother had reason to believe, that the Deacon was trying to corrupt her poor child's faith; and, as in duty bound, she, the mother, the natural guardian of the child, exercising over it a parent's legitimate authority, removed the young Mary Corcoran from the house of the rev. seducer, and placed her in service in another, and a more respectable family, where her faith, and morals would not be exposed to the arts of a Protestant Deacon, and where "of her own free will" the child remained until the occurrence of the riots. But, in a Protestant Republic, parents it seems are not allowed to have the control over their own children; the "friends" and "fathers" indignant at the impertinent "independence" of the mother, started, and diligently circulated, a lie, to the effect that, the child had been forcibly abducted—carried off to Canada—and confined in a Convent. As usual, amongst a Protestant community, the lie found plenty of gaping fools to believe it, and a still greater number of canting knaves who pretended to believe it, in order to have an excuse for attacking and plundering the Catholic establishments in the neighborhood. So Protestant rascaldom issued its placards, called meetings, and gathered its unwashed ruffians together in large numbers, with the avowed object of wrecking the Catholic Churches, and charitable asylums, a design which—but for the praiseworthy exertions of the Mayor, Richard Frothingham, Esq., and the steady conduct of the militia—the scoundrels would most likely have carried into execution. However, on the appearance of the troops, the cowardly rascals turned tail, and ran away manfully; a few of the ringleaders were arrested, and held to bail, and the mother, appearing before the Mayor, made affidavit as to her child's place of abode, and promised to produce her in town. We must say that we regret this servile compliance, on the part of the mother, with the clamors of a rascally *canaille*; she should have bid defiance to the rabble rout, and spat upon them—told them that she was not responsible to them for her actions, and that they might go—wherever they liked, but that explanation they should have none from her: this would have been the proper way to treat the impertinence of a Protestant mob. However, in America the people are so rapidly becoming degraded by the vile democracy under which they live, that they have nearly lost all sense of personal independence, or dignity: instead of keeping her child in the service where she had placed her, as she had the right to do, and as she would have done in a free country, the mother yielded to the clamors of the mob, and put her daughter back in service with the hoary headed old Deacon, who had previously tried to corrupt her faith. A pretty commentary this on Yankee liberty. Thank God—we are not yet members of a Democratic community, nor obliged to submit to mob-rule.