

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

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The arrival of the *Canada* brings us European intelligence to the 21st ult. The relative positions of the contending parties have not materially altered, but strong doubts are entertained as to the good faith of Austria, in her late adhesion to the Western Alliance; it would appear that she is backing out, and that, in spite of protocols, her sympathies are decidedly Russian. Sir C. Napier has withdrawn his fleet from before Cronstadt, partly, it is said, on account of the Cholera, which was raging on board several of the ships; the expedition against Sebastopol has been postponed *sine die*. In the meantime, the season for active operations is wearing fast away; with the autumn, negotiations will be again commenced, and Russian diplomacy will reconquer in the Cabinet more than it has lost in the field.

The only other important European news is from Spain, where the insurrection is becoming general, and seems to indicate a Revolution. The insurgents were masters of Madrid.

MR. HINCKS AND THE BISHOPS OF CANADA.

On the hustings, during the election for South Oxford, Mr. Hincks is reported to have addressed the electors, on the subject of the "Clergy Reserves," as follows:—

"We are told that the Roman Catholic Bishops of Lower Canada are hostile to the secularisation of the Reserves. I will give them the benefit of that statement. . . . There has been a document issued, which was signed by seven of the Bishops."

And then, after having insinuated that the opposition amongst Catholics in Lower Canada to secularisation owed its origin to the intrigues of Mr. George Brown, Mr. Hincks had the politeness to add:—

"IT IS WITH THE ILLITERATE, WITH THE MOST OPPOSED TO PROGRESS, AND MOST UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THEIR CLERGY THAT MR. BROWN CADALS."

Mr. Hincks of course must know best, whether a document such as that to which he refers, has been issued by the Bishops of Canada: and we have no right to demand from him, that he should, from any motives of delicacy, avoid mentioning the circumstance, if it really has occurred—if it be not in fact the product of his fertile imagination. Of this we have no right to complain; for—as we have often said—the Prelates of the Church are the best judges of what the interests of the Church require; and we may be sure that they will never obtrude their opinions upon the Government, unless circumstances imperatively call for their interference. Even our opponents must admit—that our Bishops and Clergy are not justly obnoxious to the reproach of meddling with politics—that they have ever distinguished themselves by their dignified reserve, and the prudent manner in which they have kept aloof from the political squabbles of the day. Their influence, if exercised at all, has always been exercised in the cause of law and order. The sum and substance of their political preaching has been—"Fear God, Honor the King, and be obedient to all in authority, for conscience sake." And we believe that it may be truly said, that, throughout her dominions, Her Majesty has no more loyal and devoted subjects, none who more fervently pray for her happiness, than the Bishops of Canada, and those very "illiterate" Catholics who "are most under the influence of their clergy."

At the same time, it is hardly to be expected that, when in their opinions, the interests of the Church are concerned, the Bishops of the Catholic Church, alone of all the members of the different ecclesiastical organisations in Canada, should refrain from temperately, and constitutionally giving expression to those opinions. Anglican clergymen, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist ministers have spoken publicly and warmly on the question of the "Reserves;" and upon no principle of right or reason can that, which is freely tolerated in the latter, be objected to in the former. As citizens, our Catholic Clergy have as much right to form and express their opinions on any political question, as have the members of any other denomination: as specially entrusted with the superintendence of Christ's Church in Canada, and bound to watch over the spiritual interests of the whole community, it is their duty, if they see those interests menaced, to adopt such measures, as they in their wisdom deem best to ward off the threatened danger. We suppose that even Mr. Hincks will hardly have the impudence to deny this, or to assert that, whilst the ministers of every Non-Catholic sect are at liberty to interfere in politics, the Pastors of the Catholic Church alone are to be debarred from making known their opinions upon a question in which they are deeply interested.

No; Mr. Hincks does not do this. But, because he suspects—with, or without; reason it is not for us to say—that those opinions are hostile to the policy which he advocates, he thinks to neutralize the effects of that opposition, by a sneer at those who hold them; and by falsely representing them, and those Catholics who are most under the influence of the Church—

(that is, who most faithfully fulfil their religious duties—as caballing and intriguing with their bitterest enemies, against the high and mighty, most excellent, and immaculate Mr. Hincks! Mr. Hincks may be a wealthy, and a very smart man; in his own estimation, as holding a government situation, he is, we dare say, a most important personage; but we beg leave to assure him—that neither his wealth, nor his office, entitle him to be impertinent—and that, when he accuses our Catholic Clergy, of caballing, or of encouraging others in caballing, with Mr. G. Brown—and sneers at Catholics, "most under the influence of their Clergy" as "illiterate"—he shows himself as regardless of truth, as he is deficient in common courtesy, and all gentlemanly feeling.

And yet we should feel grateful to Mr. Hincks for having at last thrown off the mask, beneath which he has for some time contrived to conceal his real features; we should be thankful to him for having so declared himself as to render it impossible for any honest Catholic to trust him again. His sneers hurt us not: his mendacious assertions fall perfectly harmless from his lips. He knows, and every one knows, that the Catholic Clergy, and the laity who are most under their influence, are the very best men in Canada to intrigue with Mr. Brown. Not that there would be, after all, anything so very atrocious in such intrigues. Mr. Brown is, to say the least, as good a man, as honest a man, as liberal a man, and as favorably disposed towards Catholics, as is Mr. Hincks. The difference betwixt them indeed is all in the former's favor—for certainly no one can accuse Mr. Brown of being a hypocrite; and we must confess that we prefer an out-spoken unscrupulous foe, to a treacherous friend. Indeed, of the two, Mr. Brown, with all his faults, would be a less disreputable colleague for Catholics, than Mr. Hincks.

Nor need our Bishops, our Clergy, nor the laity "most under the influence of the clergy" take it to heart that they find no favor in the eyes of Mr. Hincks. It is no new thing that Catholics who are faithful to their Church, and docile hearers of their Pastors, should be specially obnoxious to men like Mr. Hincks. Honest Catholics need never expect to find favor with "Jack-in-Office." Jack reserves his smiles for your Liberal Orange Catholics—fellows with whom, as hypocrites, and false to their spiritual mother, he has naturally a community of feeling. So it ever has been, and ever will be. No doubt, if Judas Iscariot, after the little transaction with the High Priests—the "Sanhedrim Job"—had not been so rash as to hang himself, he would in time have become a wealthy and distinguished citizen of Jerusalem: might, perhaps, have been advanced to some confidential and lucrative situation—nay, who knows—in time have been promoted to the dignity of private secretary to Pontius Pilate.

But what a confession for Mr. Hincks to make! After having so long endeavored, through his organs of the press, to make it appear that his policy on the "Reserves" question was viewed—if not with approbation—at least with total indifference by the Catholic body, now he publicly tells his constituents, that that policy has been strongly opposed—by Bishops—by Catholics—and just by those Catholics who "are most under the influence of their clergy." We leave our readers to draw their own conclusions.

We trust too, that when again, with sleek face, Mr. Hincks attempts his former professions of liberality towards Catholics, and of respect towards their Clergy, his language on the hustings may not be forgotten: and that it will be remembered that he has denounced those Catholics, "who are most under the influence of their clergy," as "illiterate" and as "most opposed to progress." There is but one logical inference that can be drawn from these premises, viz.—that, according to Mr. Hincks, the Catholic Prelates and Clergy, whose influence develops such effects in those who are most subject to it, must be themselves "illiterate," and "enemies of progress." Holding such opinions—as it is clear he does—it is certain that Mr. Hincks will never seriously endeavor to promote a Catholic system of education in Upper Canada; as the result of such a policy would be to bring the Catholic youth still more "under the influence of their clergy," and thus, according to his theory, to perpetuate that ignorance, opposition to progress, and hostility to the Hinckian policy, which he now deprecates, attributing it to Catholic ecclesiastical authority.

CATHOLIC PRESS IN UPPER CANADA.

The opinions of our Upper Canadian Catholic cotemporaries at the present juncture, are more than ordinarily interesting; because it is in their section of the Province that the results of the Ministerial policy will be most immediately apparent. Speaking of the composition of the future Parliament, the *Catholic Citizen* of Toronto says:—

"To Catholics in particular, attaching as they do, so much importance to the establishment of a proper system of School Education, the certainty of a speedy and equitable settlement of this important question cannot fail to be satisfactory."

We must confess that we are at a loss to imagine upon what grounds our cotemporary bases his expectations, of an "equitable settlement" of the School question, during the next Session of Parliament.—We may be mistaken; but we cannot help thinking, that that consummation is further off than ever: and that, however little disposed the late Legislature was to do justice to our claims, the next will be found still more actively hostile. Amongst men of all denominations, in religion as in politics, there are to be found some, truly liberal, in the proper sense of the term: and far be it from us to deny that even amongst the Liberals, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, we may find one or two whose votes will

be given on the side of Freedom of Education.—But it is of no use concealing facts, or indulging in hopes which never can be realized. As a general rule, the Liberal or Democratic party are opposed to separate schools. The great object of their policy, is, to assimilate the institutions of Canada, religiously, politically and socially, to those of the United States; and we know how utterly vain, hitherto, have been all the efforts of Catholic clergy, and Catholic laity in the United States, to obtain free, or separate, schools for the education of the young Catholic generation in that country.

The manifest tendency of the democratic spirit of the age, in so far as it is not opposed by Catholicity, is towards Socialism, or that condition of society in which personal liberty is unknown, and the rights of the individual are crushed by the despotism of the State. This despotism expressing itself, sometimes, as in Russia, in the monarchical form; sometimes, as in the United States, in the polyarchical form. But wherever, or under whatsoever form, it manifests itself, its effects are the same—the degradation of the individual, and the annihilation of all personal liberty.

Canada has not escaped the inroads of this Socialistic spirit. It is the same spirit which speaks by the mouths of the "Maine Liquor Law" men; and finds utterance in the cry for "State education"—for no "Secularism in education—no separate schools for Catholics." The same error underlies all the theories, both of the "Maine-acs" and of the "State-Schoolists"—viz., that society can be reformed by political enactments; and that all the evils of the day, whether in the political or social order, proceed from defective legislation. This is the fundamental dogma of Demagoguism and Socialism; and whenever we see a democrat, there we may be certain that we behold the friend of Socialism and the enemy of personal liberty. "Just as if a man had any personal rights!" exclaimed the democratic Mayor of Portland when lecturing in this city on the "Maine Liquor Law." "Just as if a man had any personal rights!"—is still the reply of the advocates of State-schoolism to the Catholic parent, insisting upon his rights over the education of his—not the State's—children.

We confess then, that, from the Liberal, or democratic, complexion of the next Parliament, we have but little hopes of obtaining justice; and small as these hopes are, they are still further diminished by the great probabilities there are of Mr. Hincks' Reserves Bill being carried by the assistance of nominal Catholics. We have already shown—and we need not go over the old ground again—that the handing over of the funds accruing from the secularisation of the "Reserves," to the County Municipalities must be fatal to the separate school system; and, from the want of zeal on the part of Catholic electors in some quarters, and from their want of independence in others, it is much to be feared that this ruinous measure will ere long, be carried into execution. When that fatal day arrives, when the Catholics of Upper Canada shall find themselves deprived of all their political influence, and, in the matter of education, as helpless as their brethren in the neighboring republic, they may perhaps, bewail their folly in preferring the interests of a faction, to those of their Church. But it will be too late, then, for them to repent, as it will be out of our power in Lower Canada to help them. The hope, however, of the *Catholic Citizen* seems to consist in this, that Mr. Hincks' Bill will be defeated. Should this, indeed, be the case, we should have no doubt as to the "certainty of a speedy and equitable settlement" of the School question. Should the Ministry however be successful, the Catholic Separate Schools in Upper Canada may be closed at once. The question of Freedom of Education for Catholics will then have been speedily and irrevocably, if not very satisfactorily, settled.

We give the remainder of the article from our esteemed Toronto cotemporary:—

"The necessity of an extension of the Franchise, having been acknowledged, any delay in bringing the bill, already passed, into immediate operation, could not fail to be attended with the most disastrous consequences.

"Again, we entertain great hopes that the jobbing which now prevails in the Crown Lands Department will be speedily checked by such efficient legislation as will ensure to every man, desirous of settling in the country, the utmost facility for so doing—in short, that the immense unproductive domain of the country will be, at least for several years, devoted, by means of free grants of land, to actual settlers, to the great object, viz., that of encouraging the much-neglected, though vitally important, element of our social progress—emigration.

"With respect to the Clergy Reserves, the Protestant body, whose interest are most involved, having proposed a settlement which appears equitable, there can be but little doubt but that the ultra measures of secularizers will receive little countenance in the new House."

The ignorance of Canadian politics that prevails in England, is really astonishing; considering that the English press devotes so much of its time to the discussion of our affairs. The *London Times*, which ought to be well acquainted with the subjects of which it treats, has, in a late article, given a splendid specimen of this ignorance—gravely informing its readers, that, in dissolving Parliament, Mr. Hincks' object was "to submit the great questions at issue to a Parliament which shall be a fuller and more undoubted representation of the Canadian people!"

Whence the *Times* obtained this astounding piece of information, it is not for us to say; but it must certainly excite no little amusement in Canada, and amongst people who know that—by means of the sudden and unexpected dissolution of the late Parliament, without allowing it to carry through the measures necessary for bringing into force the provisions of the new Franchise Law—Mr. Hincks has adroitly

contrived to avoid submitting the great question at issue—the 'Clergy Reserves Question'—to a Parliament which shall be a fuller and more undoubted representation of the Canadian people" than was the last, which he so unceremoniously dismissed, and which—according to the same Mr. Hincks—was incompetent to legislate on the said question, as not fairly and fully representing the wishes of the Canadian people.

The plain fact of the matter seems to be, that Mr. Hincks was afraid to submit his policy on the "Reserves" to a Parliament fully and fairly representing the people; and that he entertained a not unreasonable dread of meeting a Legislature elected under the "New Franchise Law." Hence his hurry to dissolve; and his determination, now fully expressed, to force the "Clergy Reserves" question on a Parliament, as incompetent as was the last to legislate thereon; because elected by the very same limited constituencies, and therefore as little a "full and undoubted representation of the Canadian people," as was the Parliament before which he declined laying his plans for settling this all-important question. And yet the *Times*, speaking, no doubt, on information received from Canada, has the marvellous audacity to tell us that Mr. Hincks's object "was to submit the great questions at issue to a full and undoubted representation of the Canadian people!" this being the very thing which he wished to avoid; and which, by his dissolution of the late Parliament, he has avoided. The voice of the people—of the people whom the late Parliament debarred rightfully entitled to the exercise of the Franchise, from which they have hitherto been declared—will not be heard in the next Parliament; and the settlement of the most important of questions will thus be left to a Parliament not fully, or fairly representing the Canadian people; and therefore, by Mr. Hincks' admissions, morally incompetent to legislate thereon.

The *Quebec Colonist* calls our notices on Mr. Hincks's plan for secularising the Reserves, "crude." Will our cotemporary have the kindness to point out wherein we are in error; and to give a plain straightforward answer to the following questions:—

Does not Mr. Hincks's "Reserves" Bill give to the different County Municipalities of Upper Canada power to appropriate the funds accruing from the secularised Reserves, to common, or Non-Catholic school purposes?

Is not the same Bill so drawn up as to prohibit the said Municipalities from appropriating one farthing of the above-mentioned funds to Catholic school purposes?

Is not such a measure, unjust towards Catholics, and injurious towards that system of Catholic separate schools which the Bishops of Canada have called upon their flocks to do their utmost to establish?

Is it prudent, honorable, or dutiful conduct on the part of Catholics, to lend their support to a measure, which is unjust towards themselves, injurious towards their schools, and which must inevitably lead to the destruction of that system of Education in Upper Canada, which the Prelates of Christ's Church have exerted themselves, and earnestly exhorted their flocks, to establish?

We should feel obliged to our cotemporary to answer these questions with a plain "Yes," or "No." We shall then be better able to judge how far our notions are "crude."

We take the liberty of informing the *Canadian* that, when he says—that the *True Witness* has declared secularisation "to be opposed to the doctrine of the Church, and that the *True Witness* has subsequently retracted that assertion"—he says that which is false; as he did when he accused the Bishop of Toronto of having from the pulpit exhorted his hearers to vote for the present Ministry.

We have said, and we do not retract it, that it is contrary to the doctrine, or teaching of the Church, to deny the duty of the State to afford material assistance to the Church—or to assert that the support of religion should be left entirely to the Voluntary system.

We have said, and say again, that it is impossible, logically or consistently, to advocate the absolute secularisation of the Reserves, without concerning the principle of State assistance in aid of religion, or without asserting the Voluntary principle.

But, as our opponents are neither remarkable for their logic nor their consistency, we do not accuse them of violating the doctrines of the Church in voting for secularisation; but merely of setting at defiance every principle of common sense, and common prudence. We admit, and always have admitted, that they may save their orthodoxy—but only at the expense of their logic.

Nor need we wonder at this, or expect consistency from men who, a few weeks ago, told us that a Parliament elected by such a limited constituency, as is now in existence, was incompetent to legislate on the question of the Clergy Reserves, because it did not fairly and fully represent the wishes of the people; and to-day tells us that a Parliament elected by the very same fraction of the community is competent to do that, which yesterday it was not competent to do. From such men, and their supporters, we look not for truth, honor, or logic.

We are informed that—seeing how far the *Montreal Freeman* has deviated from the principles laid down in its prospectus,—several influential Irish gentlemen have it in contemplation to establish a really independent political and secular Journal, and which they are determined shall not, like its predecessors at Quebec and Montreal, be sold to any Ministry. We understand the first number will make its appearance as soon as possible, under the name of the *True Freeman*. One independent and unpurchasable secular journal, as an organ of Irish opinion, is still a great desideratum in Lower Canada.—Communicated.