

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.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
 TERMS:
 To Town Subscribers. \$3 per annum.
 To Country do. \$2 1/2 do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 3, 1854.

OPENING OF THE JUBILEE.

The Jubilee announced in the Encyclical Letter of the Holy Father, opened for the Diocese of Montreal on Wednesday last, the Feast of "All Saints," and will terminate on the 31st January, 1855. A Pastoral Letter from the Bishop of Montreal, which was read in all the pulpits on Sunday last, prescribes the conditions requisite for gaining the Indulgences, which, in this holy season, the Church proffers to her penitent children. We copy from His Lordship's Letter:—

"This Jubilee being especially a Jubilee of prayers, the following regulations shall be complied with, during the three months that it lasts:—

"In so far as it is practicable, there shall be said in every church daily one Low Mass; this Mass to be of the Jubilee. The celebrant, kneeling at the foot of the Altar, shall immediately recite the Litanies of the Blessed Virgin. The Faithful are invited to assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass throughout this holy season.

"On Sundays, and Festivals of Obligation, after High Mass, the Priest shall repeat five *Pater* and five *Ave*.

"After solemn Vespers, there shall be on every Sunday, and feast celebrated—the Feast of All Saints excepted—a solemn procession, during which shall be sung the Litanies of the Blessed Virgin, in honor of her 'Immaculate Conception'; to be followed by the *Salut* and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The '*Parce Domine*' shall be sung thrice at the opening of the Tabernacle, together with the verse, '*Ostende Nobis*,' &c., and the prayer, '*Deus cui proprium est*,' &c., immediately following. Then shall be sung some anthem, hymn, or psalm, in praise of the 'Immaculate Conception' of the Blessed Virgin; the verse and prayers following shall always be from the new office of the 'Immaculate Conception,' established by our Holy Father the Pope; and the service shall finish with the '*Tantum Ergo*,' with the verse and prayer of the Blessed Sacrament."

The conditions for obtaining the benefits of the Indulgence are then given:—

"There shall be, according to the terms of the Encyclical Letter, a Plenary Indulgence, applicable to the souls departed, for all, who—having humbly, and with a hearty detestation, confessed their sins, and being purified with sacramental absolution—shall receive in a becoming manner the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist; and in a devout spirit shall visit thrice the Parish church, praying in the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff, for the exaltation and prosperity of our holy Mother the Church and the Apostolic See, for the extirpation of heresies, for peace and concord amongst all Christian princes, and finally for peace and unity amongst all Christian nations.

"To gain the said Indulgence, it is moreover required that, within the three months of the Jubilee, each one should fast once, and give an alms to the poor.

"We appoint as churches to be visited for the City of Montreal, the Parish church, and those of St. Patrick, and St. Peter. To gain the Indulgence, it is therefore requisite to visit once each of these three churches, or one of them, three times.

"As to prisoners, invalids, and others, legitimately hindered from performing any of the above-mentioned conditions, their confessors may commute these conditions for other good works, or postpone them to some period, as soon after the Jubilee as possible.

"Young children, not having made their first Communion are exempted from the obligation of receiving the Eucharist.

"Confessors will enjoy, during the three months of the Jubilee, the apostolic functions accorded by the Holy Father in his Encyclical Letter of 21st November, 1851, and published in our '*Mandement*' of 29th June, 1852; as also those privileges granted in our Letters of the 1st of August last.

"We grant, moreover, to confessors during the same period, power to give absolution in cases reserved for the Bishop of this Diocese. These great powers are given in the design of affording to all poor sinners, as much as possible, the means of effecting their reconciliation with God, and in the reasonable hope that, once delivered from the burden of their sins, they will continue to walk in the paths of justice."

The faithful are also invited to continue their subscriptions for the restoration of the Cathedral, and Episcopal establishments of the Diocese.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Pacific* left Liverpool on the 18th ult., up to which date no tidings of the fall of Sebastopol had reached England. It was expected that the place was to be assaulted on the 8th. Prince Menschikoff with some 30,000 men holds his ground to the North East of the City, expecting the reinforcements which were to arrive about the middle of October, and would raise his force to 60,000. The garrison of Sebastopol is estimated at 30,000, so that the whole Russian force in the Crimea would then amount to 90,000 men of all arms. The Allies have at least an equal number, and are receiving additional reinforcements daily.

In the Baltic the campaign is at an end. The French ships are on their way home; and it is expected that Sir C. Napier will soon follow, with the squadron under his command. It is rumored that the restoration of the Kingdom of Poland will speedily occupy the attention of the Allies. Russia is concentrating troops on the Austrian frontier, as if in anticipation of hostilities. Betwixt Prussia, however, and the Czar, it is hinted that the best understanding prevails.

From Great Britain, the news is of little interest. Heavy failures in Ireland had followed those in Liverpool; and the mercantile horizon looks decidedly threatening. A commercial crisis has long been foretold, and already the first mutterings of the coming storm have made themselves heard on both sides of the Atlantic.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

Several important measures have been advanced a stage. Mr. Felton's Bill to prohibit the liquor traffic was allowed to pass its second reading, on the understanding that it would have to be very considerably modified in the Special Committee to which it was referred. Mr. Ferres introduced a Bill to abolish Holydays, which after an animated discussion was withdrawn, upon a promise from government that steps would be taken to relieve Protestants from the inconvenience of which they complained. The Seigniorial Tenure Bill has been read a second time; and the Clergy Reserves' Bill has been taken up in Committee. Several amendments proposed by M.M. Brown, Dorion and Foley, were negatived by large majorities.

SUNDAYS AND HOLYDAYS.

By referring to the proceedings in Parliament, it will be seen that Mr. Ferres' Bill for doing away with many of the "Holydays" at present recognised by law, has been withdrawn, on the understanding that the Inspector-General will take immediate steps to remedy the grievances complained of by a portion of our Protestant mercantile community. By the existing law, Sundays, and other Festivals of the Church, are recognised as Holydays, as are also Good Friday, and the Feast of the Nativity of Queen Victoria. On these days, the public offices are closed; but except on Sundays, there is no compulsion to abstain from the usual routine of business. No man is required by law to observe any Holyday, except Sunday.

Now, there can be no doubt that, if it be desirable to do away with all semblance of connection betwixt Church and State, Mr. Ferres is right in so far as he goes; only, like the majority of his Protestant brethren, he does not go far enough to be consistent. The reason for the observance of the Feast of All Saints, is precisely the same as that for the observance of Sunday. In the Bible, not one word can be found enjoining the observance of either; and both are declared Holy on the same authority—viz—the authority of the Catholic Church—between which and the State, "it is desirable" to sever all connection. An honest man, therefore, in introducing a Bill for the abolition of Holydays, would have included all, as the observance of all Holydays is a matter pertaining to the Church, with which the State has no right to interfere. Mr. Ferres did indeed make a vain attempt to draw a distinction between Sunday and other Holydays—quoting for this purpose a passage from the Pentateuch, which was not well received by the House—it being generally felt that it would have been more in harmony with his antecedents had he contented himself with an extract from Dr. Mauriceau, or from some other obscure and immoral author. However, it is a pleasant verification of an old proverb, to see that even J. M. Ferres can "quote Scripture for his purpose."

And yet it was not much to his purpose either;—for, like other great logicians, in trying to prove his position, he proved too much, and therefore, nothing at all. "Six days shalt thou labor" was the passage on which Mr. J. M. Ferres relied, as a scriptural condemnation of the practice of observing Holydays oftener than once a week. But he did not seem to see that this text, if it condemned "Romish" Holydays, by making six consecutive days' labor compulsory, was equally strong against all seasons of relaxation, other than Sundays; as strong against the observance of the "Nativity of the Queen," as against the observance of the "Feast of the Nativity of Our Lord." Now, though in Protestant eyes the latter Feast may be of little consequence, and is, by most Protestants not observed at all—and by true blue Puritans, is, along with mince-pies and plum puddings, absolutely condemned as damnable—yet the neglect of the former, or the "Feast of the Nativity of the Sovereign," is looked upon as little better than sacrilege; as blasphemy against the great "Head of the Church." And yet, if the text quoted by Mr. Ferres absolutely enjoins "six days' labor," and thus prohibits all Holydays except Sundays, the birth day of the Sovereign of England must henceforth be as little regarded as if he or she, were a mere insignificant personage, like the Blessed Virgin and Apostles, or the Saints and Martyrs of the Catholic Church. Mr. Ferres' application of scripture was felt not to be felicitous or generally applicable.

Irritated at the opposition which Mr. Ferres' Bill met with in the Legislature—an opposition which we must confess was very inconsistent, and, as based upon religious grounds, came with a very bad grace from gentlemen who voted for Mr. McDonald's secularisation Bill—the *Commercial Advertiser* indignantly asks—"Have we a dominant Church in Canada?" and adds:—"If not, then the Romanist must not compel his Protestant brother to observe days and seasons his creed does not recognise, nor put him to trouble and inconvenience because he himself does so." To this we would reply—1. That, as Catholics,

we desire no dominant Church, in the sense in which our cotemporary employs the word "dominant;" and 2. That no Protestant is by law compelled to observe any Catholic Holyday with the exception of Sunday. The utmost of which Protestants can complain, is, that the employees of Government are not compelled to do violence to their religious scruples by working on days enjoined by the Church to be kept Holy.—For ourselves, and for all others, we desire the fullest religious freedom, and repudiate all idea of religious ascendancy. We demand for ourselves freedom to observe Holy, those days which the Church has commanded to be kept Holy; and that we be not put to trouble or inconvenience because we so observe them. Upon the same principle, and with as much right, as Protestants demand for themselves legal protection on Sundays, do we demand legal protection of the same nature, and to the same extent, on other Holydays of the Church.

We contend for religious freedom and perfect religious equality, as before the law, for all men: for Catholics and Protestants—for Jew and Christian. And yet, strange to say, if any inconsistency were strange on the part of Protestants, our Non-Catholic friends who tax us with aiming at the establishment of a "dominant church," and who complain of the intolerance of the Government, in that it allows its servants, being Catholics, to keep Holy Catholic Holydays, have the intolerable impudence to demand of the same Government that it shall give its aid to establish a Puritan ascendancy in the matter of Sunday observances! The same man, who complains of being persecuted, because he cannot compel a Catholic clerk in a public office to work on a Catholic Holyday, sees no hardship—no intolerance—no assertion of religious ascendancy—in obliging the Jew—who, with the Bible alone for his guide, "observes the seventh day to keep it Holy"—to close his place of business, and to conform to Christian observances on the first day of the week! He would prevent the Jew from transacting business on Sunday, because Sunday observance is his *doxy*; and he would compel the Catholic to toil on another Catholic Holyday, because the observance of "Romanist Holydays" is not his *doxy*! Marvellous are the freaks of Protestant religious liberty!

How would the *Commercial Advertiser* meet the arguments of one of the sons of Israel after the flesh, remonstrating against a law compelling a Jew to conform to the outward observances of a Christian Holyday?—or what reason can our cotemporary assign why a Jew has not as much right to keep his place of business open, without legal interference, on the Sunday, as the Protestant has to open his store, and to transact business, on the Feast of the "Immaculate Conception?" Is it because Protestants are many, and Jews few? because the former are strong, and the latter weak? But this is the argument of the coward and the bully; the plea of the tyrant, and religious persecutor; it is the substitution of might for right, and would justify every act of oppression that the strong and many have ever perpetrated upon the weak and few. Is it because Christianity is true, and Judaism false? But what right has the Protestant to impose his ideas of religious truth upon another? Or how would he meet the claims of the Catholic to compel Protestants to observe Catholic Holydays, founded upon the assumption, that Catholicity is true, and Protestantism a pernicious heresy? And yet the Catholic has as valid reasons for asserting the truth of Popery, as the Protestant has for assuming the truth of Christianity.

We should much like to see a Jew engage in controversy upon the subject of compulsory Holyday observances with a Protestant of the *Commercial Advertiser's* stamp. The former might argue—almost in the words of his opponent, when addressing Catholics—"We have no dominant church here in Canada—between Church and State there should not be even the semblance of connection; then the Protestant must not compel his Jewish fellow-citizen to observe days and seasons his creed does not recognise, and which are not commanded in the Bible; neither must he put him to inconvenience and trouble, because he himself does so."—*Vide Commercial Advertiser* of Tuesday. The Protestant, if an honest man, gifted with ordinary intelligence, would at once perceive that the argument was as good in the mouth of a Jew as in the mouth of a Protestant; and would immediately agitate for the repeal of all laws rendering the observance of Christian Holydays obligatory upon the Jewish mercantile community—who are subjected to great inconvenience in consequence of being obliged, first to observe their own Sabbath, and then the Christian Sunday. It is thus that J. M. Ferres, and the editor of the *Commercial Advertiser*, would act if they were anything better than arrant hypocrites.

By the bye it is rumored that a kind of connection exists between the two parties last named; and thus two phenomena, which of late have attracted our attention, may be accounted for. 1.—The quantity of space which our cotemporary devotes to chronicling the sayings, doings, and opinions of J. M. Ferres.—2.—The appearance in the columns of our *once* respectable cotemporary, of beastly and immoral advertisements, of the same nature as those through which the *Montreal Gazette* acquired its unenviable notoriety. Husbands, and fathers of families, should look to this, and not allow the impure sheet, which gives admittance to such abominations, to meet the eyes of wives or sisters, sons or daughters. Even the staunch Protestantism of the *Commercial Advertiser* should not be allowed to palliate its obscenity.

The *British Colonist* of the 24th ult. contains an able letter on the subject of the Clergy Reserves from Dr. Strachan, who, over his usual *nom de plume* "John Toronto," addresses the Hon. M. Morin; and, speaking in the name of the body to which he belongs, puts in a strong light the dangers

to which the confiscation of Protestant endowments must inevitably expose the titles, and other endowments of the Catholic Church in Canada. Such a remonstrance comes indeed rather late in the day, when secularisation may be looked upon as *un fait accompli*, and will, we fear, effect no useful purpose. Still as expressing the sentiments of a gentleman holding a prominent government appointment in the Anglican establishment, and who therefore may be accepted as the exponent of the views of the largest and most influential body of Protestants in the Province, Dr. Strachan's letter is entitled to respectful consideration. In no captious spirit would we criticise its contents; and it is with no intention of giving offence that we would point out one or two errors into which the writer has been betrayed.

Dr. Strachan no less truthfully than forcibly points out the consequences to Catholic Church property, of the proposed spoliation of Protestant endowments; and insists upon the inconsistency of the attempt to save the former at the expense of the latter. That some Catholics have given their votes in favor of secularisation, is true, and to be regretted; but Dr. Strachan errs in attributing that vote to jealousy, or fear of Anglican influence:—

"I am not much surprised," he says, "that Socialists, as they are called, the Clear Grits of Upper Canada, and the Republicans of Lower Canada, should band together against every kind of Ecclesiastical endowment. And I can even conceive, though not without some difficulty, that they may be joined by those who believe, contrary to holy Scripture and the universal experience of many centuries, that religion ought to have no support except on the voluntary principle. But I am quite unable to discover the cause which urges you to protect the Roman Catholic endowments, while you obstinately advocate the confiscation of those of the Church of England, unless from your hatred of that Church; and because you consider her as the great obstacle to the spread of Popery through the whole Province."

Dr. Strachan overrates the influence of the body to which he belongs; and a little pardonable vanity in this respect, has betrayed him into an almost unpardonable act of injustice toward M. Morin and his Catholic colleagues who have voted for the secularisation of the Clergy Reserves, in imputing to them hatred of the Anglican church. We know not whether Dr. Strachan will accept it as a compliment, or as the reverse; but the fact is, that there is no Protestant sect whose influence is so little dreaded by Catholics as that of the Anglican establishment.—Of those who abandon the Catholic Church, very few, for instance, take up with Anglicanism; neither are Anglicans, generally speaking, desirous of receiving into their ranks deserters from Popery.—The weeds which the Pope throws over his garden wall are greedily picked up by Methodists, Jumpers, and others; but, as a general rule, Anglicans will have none of them; knowing well that the *Achillis*—the *Gavazzis*—the *Leaheys*—*et hoc genus omne*—are not fitting associates for gentlemen, and can but bring discredit upon any society with which they ally themselves.

And when a Catholic, yielding to his lusts, does leave the Church, he generally likes to get as far from her as possible. Now of all the Non-Catholic sects, the Anglican has rejected least, and retained most, of old Catholic doctrine and discipline. It asserts too, many true Catholic principles, though with a false application; principles irreconcilable with any form of Protestantism, or Denial; which repel, instead of attracting, the wanderer from the Catholic fold; and which therefore render the sect which illogically retains them the least attractive of all Protestant sects, and the least capable of opposing an effectual barrier to the spread of Popery.—If a man is willing to accept the doctrines of Apostolic Succession—and of the Sacramental and Sacerdotal systems—he will find them in their integrity, and as parts of a consistent whole, in the Catholic Church. As put forward by Anglicanism, they are irreconcilably antagonistic to another set of principles, which, as a form of Protestantism, Anglicanism is compelled to assert: and as a witty friend of ours once somewhat irreverently remarked—"if he were inclined to take a dose of Popery at all, he would take it pure; but he didn't fancy a second-hand claw of tobacco."

We do not pretend to assign the motives whereby M. Morin and his colleagues have been actuated, in voting for secularisation, and the total severance of Church and State: but certainly we may assert that hatred or fear of Anglicanism, as an antagonist to Popery, was not amongst them. We rather suspect that M. Morin believes—that the people of Upper Canada have so decidedly declared themselves in favor of secularisation that it would be imprudent and unjust on the part of the Catholics of Lower Canada to oppose the measure—and that the effect of such opposition would be but to direct the hostility of Protestant demagogues against the Catholic institutions to which he is sincerely attached. We differ from M. Morin, both as to the premises, and the conclusions. We do not believe that the voice of Upper Canada has pronounced in favor of secularisation, because that voice has not been heard, and cannot be heard, until the New Franchise Law comes into operation. As little do we believe that the ingratitude of democracy can be averted from Lower Canada, if we yield to them in the Upper Province; nor do we believe that the appetite for destruction will be satiated with the Clergy Reserves, or appeased whilst there is any thing left to destroy. Rather would we attribute M. Morin's vote to weakness, and to a mistaken policy, than to hatred of Anglicanism, or any dishonorable motives.

We would also desire to set Dr. Strachan right upon another point—as touching the action of the Catholic Institute of Toronto on the Reserves question. It is an error to conceive this body as "called to promote secularisation;" unjust to represent it as "petitioning the Legislature for a share of the spoils."