

REMITTANCES

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. Sacramento 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. . . . \$2 1/2 do.

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 10, 1855.

TO OUR READERS.

With the present number we conclude the fifth volume of the TRUE WITNESS; and embrace this opportunity, of returning thanks to our numerous paying subscribers for the support and encouragement that we have received from them, and of recommending their punctuality in making payment, to our non-paying subscribers as an example worthy of all imitation.

We had intended, with the sixth volume, to commence a new and enlarged series of the TRUE WITNESS; but owing to the difficulties that we have had to contend with in collecting arrears due to us, we have been compelled to postpone the execution of our original design for some months. We are well aware that it is to the hardness of the times, and the scarcity of money, that we must in a great degree attribute the dilatoriness of some of our subscribers in meeting our demands; and that so soon as they can, they will, faithfully discharge their obligations towards the printer. In this expectation therefore, we intend to defer any alterations in the form of the TRUE WITNESS until the first of January next; when we propose to issue the first number of a new series, considerably enlarged, and we trust, in other respects made more worthy of the support of our Catholic friends.

This will of course demand a considerable outlay on our part; but we rely upon the punctuality of our subscribers to enable us to meet it. We therefore call upon them to pay up as speedily as possible all outstanding arrears, and to take notice that the terms of subscription are—"Six months in advance." Our City collector will call upon our Montreal subscribers in a few days, and we hope will meet with a favorable reception from them.

We cannot close this notice without thanking, very sincerely, our numerous local agents for their generous and indefatigable exertions in our behalf.—We beg of them to accept favorably this acknowledgment of our gratitude for their important services to the TRUE WITNESS.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Baltic arrived at New York on Wednesday morning, with Liverpool dates up to the 28th ult.—The news from the Crimea is of little importance; but, upon the whole, is far from cheering. The siege still lingers on; more apparently because the Allies cannot well abandon it, and the besieged cannot compel them to withdraw from before Sebastopol, than from any present hopes of a successful issue. The French continue to push their approaches towards the Malakoff; but, according to the Times' correspondent, the Russians still maintain the superiority of fire, and on the night of the 12th July destroyed a French battery erected betwixt the Mamelon and the Malakoff. The siege works have consequently again "received a check." The Russian garrison have also made one or two pretty smart sorties, with the result of which Gortschakoff professes himself satisfied; whilst the French make but light of it.—Something is expected shortly from the fleet; and a rumor in Paris asserts that the late preparations are not intended for an assault upon Odessa, but for a dash at Sebastopol by land and sea simultaneously. General Simpson has tendered his resignation, but reports the general health of the army good, and the cholera on the decrease.

In the Baltic, nothing has occurred. There have been consultations betwixt the French and British Admirals, from which it is suspected that something will shortly be done somewhere.

Sir William Molesworth's appointment, as Colonial Secretary, is confirmed. It is expected that Parliament will be prorogued about the 16th inst.—Austria seems more than ever inclined to make common cause with Russia, and her wavering policy is causing general uneasiness.

There have been serious Protestant riots at Louisville; during which the inextinguishable hatred that the Yankee Protestant naturally entertains towards the Catholic Irishman was strikingly displayed. Many Catholics were brutally murdered by their Protestant oppressors. Particulars in our next.

The Church—the Anglican organ of Upper Canada—hitherto published at Toronto, has changed hands, and upon the 3rd inst., made its first appearance from Hamilton; where, for the future, this champion of Church of Englandism will have his abode.—The editor breaks ground in his first number with an article against the "Immaculate Conception" of the

Mother of God; having been greatly "edified by the study of the Abbé Laborde's masterly work on the 'Impossibility of the Immaculate Conception.'" Not having seen the Abbé's work, we are unable to say if our cotemporary of the Church quotes its title correctly; if he does, it seems that the Abbé must have undertaken to defend a very hard thesis—viz., that it is impossible for the Omnipotent to create a pure creature.

The Church also favors us with a specimen of the argument resorted to in Abbé Laborde's "masterly work, with which he has been so highly edified."—"I am required"—says the Abbé, as quoted by the Church—"to believe at the same time these two things—(1.)—that, the Immaculate Conception is a dogma of the Catholic faith, and of ALL AGES—since what is not of all ages cannot be Catholic; and (2.) that the belief in this dogma is, nevertheless, entirely modern." The Abbé's case is undeniably a hard one, and he has good cause to complain of the injustice of Rome towards him in particular; for not so does Rome behave towards any others of her children. By none of them, save this poor, dear persecuted Abbé Laborde, does she require it to be believed that the "Immaculate Conception is a dogma of the Catholic faith, and of all ages—and that the belief in this dogma is, nevertheless, entirely modern." Rome requires no such belief of her children; all that she requires them to believe is, that, though the explicit definition of the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" is entirely modern, the dogma itself is old, and has ever been implicitly held, from the first centuries of the Christian era. The Church will, we trust, be able to perceive the immense difference, betwixt what the Catholic Church requires of all her children in general, and what she requires of the poor Abbé Laborde in particular.

For instance, the dogma of the "consubstantiality of the Son to the Father" was only explicitly defined for the first time in the IV. century; though the dogma itself had been implicitly held from the beginning. So with the Personality of the Holy Ghost—and His Procession from Father and Son. These were always, and in all ages, dogmas of the Catholic Faith; implicitly held by all the faithful, though not explicitly defined, before the IV. and later centuries. The faithful were then required to believe of these dogmas, what the Catholic of the XIX. century is required to believe of the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception;" not that the dogmas themselves, but that the definitions thereof, were modern.

"We will not"—says the Church—"accept any thing as the 'truth that cannot be proved from Scripture, and the Fathers of the three first centuries.—We believe that the doctrines of Jesus Christ, were fully and entirely embodied in the Bible by our Blessed Lord Himself, and by His apostles." It is very well for the Church to say he "will not" believe this—and "he believes this;" but can he give any reason for his refusal to believe in one case, and his easy credulity, not to say an idle superstition, in another? Why stop with the writers "of the three first centuries?" And if admitting them as of any authority in matters of faith, why not extend the same indulgence to the writers of the IV., V., VI., and succeeding centuries? The Fathers of the earliest centuries of the Church's existence, were unless miraculously preserved from error by the presence of the Holy Spirit, just as likely to err, and therefore as unworthy of credit, as the writers of the succeeding centuries; and if the Lord, in fulfillment of His promises, was present with His Church "in the three first centuries," continually assisting her, and leading her into all truth—why—when—and in what manner—was this supernatural presence withdrawn from her A.D. 300? The Church should be prepared to give every man a reason for the faith that is in him; but we defy him to give any reason why he should yield more deference to the Christian writers of the second and third centuries, than to those of the fourth, fifth, and succeeding centuries. The Church, unless miraculously assisted, was just as liable to fall into error in the first century of her existence, as in the XIX.; and if miraculously assisted in the one, what reason have we to believe that He, Who promised to be with her all days, even to the consummation, has deserted her now?

Were it not impertinent, we should also like to ask of our, at one moment sceptical, at another easily credulous, cotemporary, what reason he has for believing that all, or any part, "of the doctrines of Jesus Christ were embodied in the Bible by our Lord Himself?" We pause for a reply.

A few lines lower down, our cotemporary confesses his "pious belief" that the Blessed Virgin "was made pure through the operation of the Spirit by the conception of our Saviour;" though that, by the operation of the same Spirit she should have been "made pure," from the first moment of her existence, seems to him a thing utterly impossible, and a monstrous Popish delusion. We will not enlarge upon the fact, that, to Omnipotence, it is as easy to make a pure creature, as to make an impure creature pure. We will content ourselves with asking him, where in the Bible does he find authority for his "pious belief?" In his version of the Scriptures, we read that, before the "conception of our Saviour," the Angel Gabriel addressed Mary as already—"highly favored—blessed amongst women;"—and as having "found favor with God."—ST. LUKE i., 28, 30. A form of salutation certainly not appropriate towards one in a state of mortal enmity with God—as Mary must have been when the Angel first addressed her, if she was conceived maculate, or subject to the curse of Original Sin—and if it was only "through the operation of the Spirit by the conception of our Saviour," that she was "made pure," or that the stain of Original Sin, wherewith her soul was defaced, was blotted out. St. Paul tells us that all are by nature the children of wrath.—Eph. ii., 3. If then the

Blessed Virgin was only "made pure" from the curse of Sin—"by the conception of our Saviour," it is certain, if St. Paul speaks truth, that when the Angel first addressed Mary—that is, before "the conception of our Saviour"—she was still "a child of wrath," and therefore not "highly favored"—not "blessed"—and not in "favor with God." It is evident therefore that Mary must have been "made pure" before, and therefore not by "the conception of our Saviour."

The Church professes respect for the opinions of the early Fathers of the Church. We recommend him to study their writings; and he will find that; on this point, they are agreed—that greater and more glorious privileges were accorded to Mary than to any other Saints, or favorites of the Lord. Now, in the Bible, our cotemporary will find it written that Jeremias, and St. John the Baptist, were cleansed, or "made pure," in their mothers' wombs.—JER. i., 5; ST. LUKE i., 15; and were therefore born Immaculate; the "Immaculate Nativity" of the latter is also decreed by Act of Parliament, which enjoins the observance as a Feast, of the 25th of June, by the Anglican Church. What reason then can the Church assign, why we should believe with him, that Mary was conceived and born under the curse of sin, and so remained, a "child of wrath," and a servant of Satan, for many years of her life—whilst Jeremias and St. John the Baptist were cleansed from their mothers' wombs, from the first instant of their birth?—or how shall we reconcile this "pious belief" of the Church, with the Christian faith, that Mary was "highly favored" above all the children of Adam?

To have been only equally favored with others, God's Saints, Mary must at least have been sanctified, that is, "made pure," or Immaculate, in her mother's womb, or before her birth. But this is not recorded in Scripture; and therefore the Church cannot, or rather "will not," believe it; for it is the will, rather than the intellect, which is in defect with our Protestant cotemporary. Neither can he believe that Mary was "made pure" at any time betwixt her birth, and the visit of the Angel; for neither is this recorded in Scripture. He must therefore admit, either—that, from the instant of her conception, Mary was "made pure" by the special privilege and Grace of God, and in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ the Saviour of the human race—which is the Popish dogma of the "Immaculate Conception"—or, that when the Angel Gabriel first saluted her with that homage or worship, which Catholics still delight to render unto her, she was still a "child of wrath"—foul with the loathsomeness of Original Sin—therefore the object of abhorrence to Him whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity—and that therefore the message of the Angel, "thou hast found favor with God," was a lying message.—There is no escape from this dilemma for him who denies that Mary was Conceived Immaculate, and who will not believe anything that is not recorded in Scripture; for it is not written in Scripture that, at any time betwixt her conception, and the Angelic Salutation, the Blessed Virgin was "made pure."

Miss Nightingale's mission to the military hospitals in the East has turned out a total failure. That high minded lady, saddened, and sickened at the disgusting scenes of immorality and bestiality which she was doomed to witness, but was unable to remedy, has as our readers are aware, abandoned her attempt to organise a body of Protestant Sisters of Charity. She has returned home; and were it not for the Catholic Sisters who still remain at their posts, our wounded soldiers would be left to the tender mercies of these harpies, known in H. M. Service as "Hawlar Hags," or professional hospital nurses.

The reason assigned for Miss Nightingale's withdrawal from the work which she had so nobly undertaken is, the insubordination and incorrigible drunkenness of her hired assistants. It seems, however, that drunkenness was the least of the failings of these interesting creatures; and that their incontinence and habitual licentiousness, not only caused fearful scandal, and led to many dissensions betwixt Miss Nightingale and the other Protestant ladies, who with her had undertaken the hopeless task of setting on foot a Protestant Sisterhood—but at length compelled the stout hearted leader of the expedition to abandon in despair her generous efforts to ameliorate the moral and physical condition of the sick and wounded British soldiers.

God forbid that we should triumph over, or that we should take any pleasure in, this melancholy and humiliating termination of, we believe, the first Protestant attempt on record to show that Protestantism was not altogether the barren tree that it had been represented; but that it too could bring forth fruit worthy of competing with the choicest products of Catholicity. But though we may not rejoice or triumph over the ridiculous finale of the Nightingale mission, we may point to it as another and very profitable lesson;—as a proof of the insufficiency of philanthropy, or natural benevolence, to do the work of charity, or supernatural grace.

For whilst the Protestant expedition, supported by all the assistance that Government could give it, cheered and encouraged by the loud plaudits of the world, has utterly failed, the Catholic missions to the military hospitals still continue their labors of love and mercy; and the field which Miss Nightingale has reluctantly found herself compelled to abandon, as demanding labor beyond her strength, is still occupied, and successfully tilled, by the humble, unassuming, and by men unknown and unrecompensed Irish Catholic Sisters of Charity. Amongst them are to be found, ladies as highly educated, as delicately nurtured, as unused to scenes of bloodshed, or rioting, as were Miss Nightingale and her brave companions. No Government patronage is extended to the

former; no press publishes their names to an admiring world; no eye but God's is upon them; and no pen, save that of Angels; records their noble deeds, their silent heroism, their daily, hourly martyrdom.—Yet they, the Catholic Sisters, remain firmly, unflinchingly, at their posts, which the others have been at last, after a wearisome and hopeless struggle, compelled to abandon. Surely in this, if the Catholic has no right to triumph, he may at least find abundant cause to thank God, that He has been pleased to glorify His Holy Name, and to acknowledge as His own the Church which He established.

And Protestantism too! should it not take a lesson from these things? Can it not see that God is not with it?—and that its offerings will not be had in respect by Him who accepted the sacrifice of Abel, but rejected that of his brother Cain? Naturally, our Sisters of Charity are but poor, weak, tender women; as unable, as Miss Nightingale, and her companions, to fulfil the rude task assigned to them. Nay, perhaps far inferior—for who shall deny to Miss Nightingale the possession of every natural good quality?—a stout heart and a kind one, disinterested philanthropy, and a marvellous energy, combined with a no less marvellous prudence? In worldly gifts, in natural endowments, Miss Nightingale may have far excelled the humble Irish Sisters of Charity. Yet one thing lacked she. That grace which cometh from on high; that supernatural strength which is to be found only in that supersubstantial bread with which the Church daily nourishes her children from her Altars. In that heavenly manna, in that supernatural food, is to be found the secret of the supernatural strength of the Catholic Sister of Charity.

"Why have we no Sisters of Charity like our French Allies?"—was a question asked in the London Times nearly a year ago, when the neglected sufferings of the British wounded at the battle of the Alma, were contrasted by the English press with the attentions lavished by our brave Catholic allies upon their maimed soldiers. For a brief moment it was thought that Protestantism, too, might have Sisters of Charity; and when Miss Nightingale's expedition to the hospitals started, the Protestant press seemed confident that its brilliant achievements would soon throw the labors of the Popish Nuns into the shade. Little more than six months have elapsed—and the Protestant mission is an acknowledged failure; its organisation broken up; whilst its leaders, dispirited and disgusted, have returned home. "Protestantism"—writes Fauber Gloriot in the *Univers*—"has here to suffer most humiliating checks"—

"You have heard of its efforts to emulate the devotedness of our Sisters, by a counterfeit institution of Protestant Sisters, destined for the service of the hospitals. This attempt has served only to show once more, that, outside of Catholicity, there can be no true devotedness such as is necessary for charitable institutions. These ladies arrived here, with a numerous retinue of servants that they called nurses, and who alone are charged with the care of the sick. As might have been expected, enormous scandal happened.

"The directresses, in their turn, ended by quarrelling, and confusion and anarchy precipitated the dissolution of this association. Alongside of all these disorders, and scandals, the English soldiers see the Irish Sisters of Mercy, who have been sent here, giving the example of union, of self-denial, and of devotedness without measure. Believe it, it proves the most efficacious kind of preaching; and so conversions are numerous, but they are obliged to keep still respecting them, to avoid exciting the jealousy of the Protestant ministers."

In the last number of the *Montreal Witness* our cotemporary referred with much complacency to the fact, that, at a trial of the ploughs of different nations, the ploughs of Protestant England stood first, whilst Popish ploughs were the worst of any. The conclusion, though not expressed, is irresistible—that, as the ploughs, so the religions of the respective countries. Good ploughs, well made harrows, and ingeniously constructed threshing machines, are of course—no Christian will be so bold as to deny it—unmistakable proofs of the Grace of God. Yet would we venture to propose to our evangelical cotemporary another test of the comparative merits of Protestantism and Popery—viz., that afforded by the condition of the sick and wounded soldiers of the Allied Armies in the Crimea. In one army—that of the Catholics—he will see the soldiers in hospital well taken care of; all their wants, spiritual and bodily, supplied by a well organised, and well conducted body of voluntary nurses; serving, not for the sake of fee or reward in this world, but out of love to Him Who, for our sakes, became poor. In the hospitals of the other—the Protestant army—he will see, on the contrary, scenes at which humanity shudders, and which, if not related by a Protestant press, could scarcely be credited of a nation calling itself Christian. He will see our brave soldiers—left to die like dogs—their wounds undressed, their groans unheeded, and their souls neglected.—Yet, not altogether. For there too he will see, though in far inferior numbers, the same gentle Sisters, as those to whose presence the comfort of the French wounded must be attributed—and but for whom the British and Irish soldier, in his sickness and in his sufferings, would be abandoned to the cruel mercies of the disgustingly dirty, gin-drinking, God-blaspheming, hirelings, who have exchanged the profession of prostitutes, for that of nurses in the military hospitals; or rather, not exchanged altogether, but who carry on their old trade under a new name. These indeed Protestantism can furnish us with in any quantity; but it can give us no Sisters of Charity.

DECLINE OF POPERY.—The *Christian Guardian* of Toronto—Methodist—publishes a correspondence from the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, which, as coming from an inveterate foe of Catholicity, and as illustrative of the progress that Popery