

REMITTANCES

TO

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on
The Union Bank of London, London.
The Bank of Ireland, Dublin.
The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.

By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,

St. Sacrament Street.

Montreal, December 14, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,

At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

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, JUNE 20, 1856.

ARRIVAL OF THE AMERICA.

HALIFAX, June 18th.

The Steamship America arrived here this morning, en route for Boston.

Her dates, are to Saturday, 7th inst.

The leading papers in England continued to be occupied with the difficulty between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain but nothing more than an official talk had been developed.

The London Journal had published with some show of authority, but of course without positive knowledge of the fact, that Mr. Orampton had been dismissed. The announcement had scarcely any effect on the funds.

The business in American Securities were to a limited extent, and prices had a drooping tendency.

The advices by the Atlantic have extended a depressing influence on the Liverpool Cotton market, prices had reached 18s 6d to 18s 8d per lb. The business of the week amounted to about 5000 bales.

On Breadstuffs a firm tone presented, and for some descriptions of wheat the quotations show a slight advance on the quotations of the previous Friday.

In the provision market there had been some trifling fluctuation. Beef was unsettled and pork rather lower. Lard was quoted one shilling higher.

The Londo Money Market had undergone no change. Consols closed on Friday, 16th at 94½ to 94½.

That cause must necessarily be a bad one, that policy arbitrary, and that legislation unjust, which can be defended only by an appeal to the precedents of the Lower Empire, or the arbitrary edicts of the despots of harlot-ridden France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and assuredly the statesman who in Canada in the present day is obliged to fall back upon such a line of defence, thereby admits that his policy is opposed to the first principles of civil liberty, and of Christian morality. The legislation of many of the Greek Emperors—of the English Plantagenets—and of a Louis the fourteenth or fifteenth—may indeed often be appropriately cited, not as affording precedents to be imitated, but as warning of dangers, which, as freemen and as Christians, we are in duty bound to avoid. Of this self-evident truth, the writer, who in the *Montreal Herald* and *Transcript* of last week, takes up the cudgels for Mr. Drummond, in the matter of the "Religious Corporations" Bill, seems scarcely to be aware.

This gentleman wastes a deal of paper, and makes a great display of historical research to prove what every tyro in history is acquainted with, and what no one has ever dreamt of denying—viz., that—under the Greek Empire—the Plantagenet and Tudor dynasties in England—the French Bourbons—and European Governments generally—measures analogous to, and often more stringent than, those which have passed our Canadian Legislature, were often enacted against the Catholic Church. This fact, which no one dreamt of contesting, our author has fully established—but what then? The question at issue is not—were such things done?—but—were they justly done? That Mr. Drummond can cite precedents for his Bill is true—but this avails him nothing, unless he can show that such precedents should be followed in Canada. He must show—not only that restrictions were placed in former ages upon the Church, by Kings and Emperors, but—that such restrictions were just and necessary then, and are just and necessary now, in Canada. And unless he adopt as his major premise that all the legislation of Greek Emperors and French Bourbons in ecclesiastical matters, was always just and worthy of imitation, he cannot conclude, from the simple fact that they did impose restrictions upon the Church, that similar restrictions should be imposed upon her by the Legislature of Canada. We have been thus particular, because Mr. Drummond seems to forget that from a single premise, no conclusion can be drawn.

In the article alluded to, the writer furnishes us with a long array of questions to show:—

1. What are the real provisions of the Canadian "Religious Corporations" Bill.
2. How far Mr. Drummond's late colleagues, and the members of the present Ministry, are responsible for that measure.
3. That similar laws have been enacted in all times, "without its ever being supposed that they conveyed any expression of contempt for religion, or

any reproach of ministers of religion who kept within their venerable functions."

Our author adds:—

"Our quotations will all be from approved Catholic writers, chiefly from well known books upon French law." We have nothing to say about the manner in which the writer has accomplished the first two of his objects; further than this—that, having fairly stated the provisions of the Bill, he clearly shows that all Mr. Drummond's late colleagues, and the members of the present Ministry, are, equally with Mr. Drummond, responsible for it; he has also shown that analogous measures have been enacted in all ages of the Church. But, the one thing needful to show—that such measures were just, or in any way sanctioned by the Church—he has not shown: though he has clearly established the fact, that they were always, and everywhere, by good Christians, looked upon as conveying the severest reproach upon the ministers of religion, and as tending to bring Christianity into contempt. When to this we add, that the "approved Catholic writers," whom he quotes, are for the most part composed of the unprincipled, servile French lawyers* of the reigns of Louis the fourteenth and fifteenth—men whose conduct in a great measure caused, if it does not fully justify, the horrors of the first French revolution—and of historians like the infidel Gianone, we shall have given a tolerably fair idea of the authorities* by means of whom Mr. Drummond attempts to justify his present hostile attitude towards the Catholic Church in Canada.

The caption with which our author prefaces his long array of extracts contains a fallacy which vitiates his whole argument; and which needs only to be pointed out to destroy the effect of his logic. He heads these extracts thus:—

"WHAT HAS BEEN THE COURSE OF CATHOLIC LEGISLATION IN ALL TIMES."

And by way of illustration he cites numerous instances of Anti-Catholic legislation, or of legislation dictated by a spirit of jealousy against the Church. Now the whole force of Mr. Drummond's argument depends upon the applicability of the predicate "Catholic" to the "Legislation" which he proceeds to cite. But to call such "Legislation" Catholic is a gross violation of truth, for it was a Legislation eminently anti-Catholic; and all that Mr. Drummond therefor has succeeded in showing is this—That in all time, from the first day of the Church's existence to the present, she has had to contend with Kings and Emperors and Parliaments—and that her most dangerous enemies have ever been found amongst her own children; Mr. Drummond need not have left the precincts of our Canadian Legislature to establish such a well known fact. We will however proceed to analyse some of these instances of so called "Catholic Legislation;" and thus endeavor to ascertain what they are worth—how far they tend to bear out our authors third proposition—and how far they afford precedents which it is necessary, or desirable to follow in Canada.

Our author begins with the "Catholic Legislation" of Pagan Rome.† Here no doubt he can find many precedents for his "Religious Corporations" Bill. A Nero and a Dioclesian will furnish him with many a model, and one which Christian Emperors, and "most Christian" Kings* have not disdained to copy:—

"In ancient Pagan Rome" says our author—"corporations were not allowed to take gifts or bequests without special authority;" and of course under the Pagan Emperors the Church could not openly or legally, hold or inherit property. What respect the Church entertained for this "Catholic Legislation" of Pagan Rome—a legislation which our Canadian legislators are desirous of imitating as closely as possible—may be learned from Gibbon and other Protestant historians.

"It had been provided by several laws," says Gibbon when treating of the fortunes of the Church under Pagan rule, "which were enacted with the same design as our statutes of mortmain that no real estates should be given or bequeathed to any corporate body, without either a special privilege or a particular dispensation from the emperor or senate. . . . A transaction is however related under the reign of Alexander Severus, which discovers that the restraint was sometimes eluded or suspended"—c. 15.

From this we learn that the anti-Christian legislation of Pagan Rome, and the "Catholic Legislation" of Mr. Drummond were in spirit one and the same; and that the laws of the heathen Emperors "were enacted with the same design" as were the restrictive clauses of Mr. Drummond's "Religious Corporations" Bill. A new era however was inaugurated with the accession to the Imperial throne and the conversion to Christianity, of Constantine; and a system of legislation, the very opposite of the anti-Christian or "Catholic Legislation" of the Pagan Emperors, was then adopted:—

"It was amongst the first effects of the conversion of Constantine to give not only a security, but a legal sanction, to the territorial acquisitions of the church. The edict of Milan in 313 recognises the actual estate of ecclesiastical corporations. Another published in 321, grants to all the subjects of the empire the power of bequeathing their property to the Church."—Hallam Middle Ages, c. VII.

These edicts, which, as the very opposite of the "Catholic Legislation" of Mr. Drummond we suppose we must qualify as "anti-Catholic," were first partially repealed by an edict of Valentinian 1st—an Emperor to whom we are indebted for the first encroachments upon the "right of testament" in favor of ecclesiastics; and for those restrictions of which we are told that it was never "supposed that

* These men, of undoubted talents, were almost without exception Gallians, or Christians, of the worst description—that is, as nearly Protestants as possible. Their fundamental principle was, that the State was supreme over the Church—a principle which the Church abhors.

† Our quotations—unless the contrary be stated—shall all be from approved Protestant, or Non-Catholic writers.

they conveyed any expression of contempt for religion, or any reproach of ministers of religion." As the author relies much upon this edict of Valentinian, and cites St. Jerome as approving of it, we propose to investigate by the torch of Protestant history, its origin and its provisions—and to show that it was felt as a most severe reproach upon Christianity, and its ministers.

When the "Catholic Legislation" of Pagan Rome was suspended by the edicts of Constantine, and when in consequence, to profess Christianity was not only no longer dangerous, but was almost necessary to advancement in the State—numbers ostensibly embraced that religion, who had no intentions of submitting their lives to its precepts. It is not therefore wonderful that in a generation or two—A. D. 370—a number of worldly minded, sensual men had obtained admittance within the sanctuary; and that they often grossly abused the influence which their position gave them over the minds of the faithful. These individuals—not corporations—often obtained from their dupes large sums of money, either as gifts or bequests, "under the pretence," as Gibbon says, "that they were the instruments of charity and the stewards of the poor." They thus obtained money under false pretences; and thereby inflicted an injury, not only upon society in general, but on the Church in particular, which they defrauded by expending upon their own sensual gratifications, those riches which they had received in trust for the Church, and the relief of the poor. To remedy this crying evil, the Emperor issued his edicts; which restricted, not the gifts or bequests of the faithful to the Church, or to ecclesiastical corporations—but to individuals, and in their private capacity. We quote from the Protestant historian Gibbon:—

"He—Valentinian—admonished the ecclesiastics and monks—not to frequent the houses of widows and virgins; and menaced their children with the animadversion of the Civil Judge. The director was no longer permitted to receive any gift or legacy, or inheritance from the liberality of his spiritual daughter"—c. 25.

It would seem therefore that the object of Valentinian was not to check the increase of Church property, or to restrict the right of individuals to give of their own, as much as they pleased, for religious or charitable purposes; but rather to protect the Church against the frauds perpetrated upon her by her own ministers, who too often squandered upon themselves, the alms which Christian piety had designed for the adornment of the altar, or the support of the poor. And that this was the effect of this edict—that the Church, or ecclesiastical body corporate, gained in wealth by these restrictions upon individuals, or rather upon their power of obtaining money under false pretences—we learn also from Gibbon, who tells us that one consequence of the imperial edict was:—

"That if the ecclesiastics—the individuals—were checked in the pursuit of personal emolument, they would exert a more laudable industry to increase the wealth of the Church."—ib.

Yet even this legislation, though conceived in a totally different spirit from the legislation of subsequent ages, wrong many a bitter sigh from Christians like a St. Jerome, or a St. Ambrose. In view of the monstrous evils to which it was intended to put a stop, and of the advantages which it was intended to confer upon the Church, by preventing dishonest individuals from lavishing upon themselves funds destined for her service—these great and good men might indeed acquiesce in the propriety of these edicts—but they could not refrain from shame and sorrow as they reflected that they were necessary.—Whatever Mr. Drummond may tell us to the contrary, St. Jerome did feel that the Valentinian edicts of 370 did convey a most severe reproach upon the Christian ministry—did give opportunity to the enemies of Christianity to triumph.

"Pudet dicere"—he says—"I am ashamed."—Why should he be ashamed, if he did feel that these edicts conveyed a reproach? "Doleo"—"I mourn." Why should he mourn; did he not feel that thereby the cause of Christianity had received an injury?

It is not our present object to defend the justice of these edicts of Valentinian, which caused such deep shame and sorrow to a St. Jerome, and a St. Ambrose. It is enough for us to show that they were conceived in a spirit very different from that which dictated the restrictive clauses in our Canadian "Religious Corporations" Bill; and that the object proposed was the very contrary of that aimed at by our Canadian legislators. The edicts of Valentinian prohibited gifts or bequests to individuals, or to clerics in their private capacity only; but left every one at liberty to give or bequeath of his own to the Church, or Ecclesiastical body corporate, for religious or charitable purposes. Mr. Drummond's Bill, on the contrary, without even the pretence that abuses exist, restricts gifts or bequests to the ecclesiastical corporation, and for religious and charitable purposes only; but leaves every one at liberty to give or bequeath of his own, as much as he will, to the individual members of that corporation, and in their private capacity. The object of the former was therefore the direct opposite of that of the latter; and yet the writer in the *Herald* adduces these edicts of Valentinian as analogous to, and as a precedent justificatory of the restrictive clauses in Mr. Drummond's "Religious Corporations" Bill! He must certainly have great confidence in his readers' ignorance of history!

Whatever may be the general opinion concerning the *Commercial Advertiser's* wholesale denunciations of our Yankee neighbors, it will, we think, be generally admitted that, unfortunately for the cause of religion, morality, and education in Canada, there is but too much truth in the following remarks, which we clip from our above named cotemporary:—

"American teachers, both in Upper and Lower Canada, have managed to engross a very large share of the educa-

tion of Canadian children; introducing their own school books, filled with false history, and corrupt morality. . . . It is our sacred duty to keep them"—our children—from the pollution of these American school books, and to take care that the place which they would occupy is filled with proper means of instruction."

In the above remarks, we, as Catholics, concur; and take the liberty of congratulating our cotemporary upon the sound views which he entertains upon the "Education" question. "It is our duty, it is the duty of every honest parent, no matter to what denomination of professing Christians he belongs, to take up his parable against the Godless and immoral system of education, that, under the favorable auspices of Mr. Egerton Ryerson, has been imported from Massachusetts into Canada. "Yankeeism" in education—that is, education without religion—is the crying evil of the day; an evil that menaces not only our political institutions, but our whole social fabric, and Christianity itself. Unfortunately however this educational system is the favorite nostrum of all political charlatans; it is the universal panacea of demagogues for all our diseases; one which they will persist in thrusting down our throats, grumble as we may, and no matter how loudly we may protest against the nauseous dose. What mercury is to the ordinary quack-salver, so is the Massachusetts' school system to the Ryersons, and other political "Jack-Puddings" of Canada.

Yes; it is our sacred duty to keep our children from the pollution of an American system of education. But how, we ask the *Commercial Advertiser*, is this our sacred duty to be accomplished?

We see no means by which it can be effected save by securing to our children the advantages of a religious education. But a religious education is, in a mixed community like ours, incompatible with a "Common" education. We therefore fall back upon the conclusion that it is the sacred duty of all parents to oppose a "Common" School system, and to make every exertion in their power to emancipate their children from the vile yoke of State-Schoolism which the Ryersons, and George Browns, of Upper Canada would fain impose upon them. If consistent therefore, and true to the anti-Yankee principles which he professes, we shall have henceforth to reckon the *Commercial Advertiser* amongst the friends of "Freedom of Education."

MR. FERGUSON'S IRISH PIPES.

We had the rare pleasure on Tuesday evening of hearing Mr. Ferguson's admirable performance on the Irish Union Harmonic Pipes; and were glad to observe that every one present seemed to enjoy it as much as we did ourselves. It was a regular musical soirée, reminding one of the old feudal times, when minstrels played in hall and bower. Mr. Ferguson's highest ambition is to fill even in a measure, the place of the harpers and pipers of other days, and hence it is that there is in his playing no affectation of the operatic style, (the *furioso* style it might aptly be called); with him, all is easy, graceful and simple, going straight to the heart, after the manner of the great masters who made the harp of Erin famous in ages long gone by. What Irish heart could bear, without emotion, Mr. Ferguson's "Dear Irish Boy," his "Savourneen Deelish," or his "Harp of Tara;" or could any Scotchman listen unmoved to his "Scots wha hae." To our taste, these noble old strains of earlier times have a meaning and a power that place them beyond the most elaborate compositions of these scientific lays of ours. This may, we know, be disputed, but not, we are convinced by any of those who had the good fortune to hear Mr. Ferguson on Tuesday evening. The Odd Fellows' Hall was crowded to excess, and in the course of the evening, Mr. Ferguson received a welcome reinforcement in our new Sarsfield Band who kindly placed their services at his disposal. Their appearance was hailed with satisfaction.

The great incident of the evening was the entrance of Captain Derlin with his company, and a fine soldierly body of men they are. The Sarsfield Band played the company to the Concert room; and performed, during the evening, several marches and other pieces in good style. After the Concert had concluded, the company marched through several of the principal streets of the City, headed by the Band, playing "Patrick's Day," &c.

The friends and admirers of Mr. Ferguson will be glad to learn that the Mechanics' Hall has been secured for this evening, when we hope to see it filled to overflowing. Next week Mr. Ferguson purposes visiting Quebec. We bespeak for him a favorable reception from our friends there.

We have much pleasure in announcing the approaching visit to Montreal of the *Chanteurs Montagnards Bearnais Pelerins de Rome et de Jerusalem*, where it is their intention to give several of their celebrated musical performances.

This company of artists enjoys a world wide reputation, having had the honor of performing before all the Sovereigns of Europe; and we feel assured that their merits will be appreciated by the lovers of music in Montreal. The following notice is taken from a French criticism upon these distinguished artists.

The *Chanteurs Montagnards* have traversed the whole of Europe; and in the different countries which they have visited, they have not failed to reap that ample crop of laurels which both their splendid talents, and the charitable object to which their talents are devoted, have deserved. They have undertaken, and with a generous perseverance have carried out their design to aid the indigent inhabitants of their native valleys; and in the pursuit of this laudable object, they have had the honor of singing before fifty five sovereign princes in Europe, Asia,