

same for all sects, but there were private or extraneous reasons why some distinction should be made in favor of the Catholics. With reference to persons entering convents, their property was generally made the subject of a previous contract, a portion of it being distributed amongst their relations. In such a matter the person might do as he or she pleased. As to property left to the inmates of convents after they had taken the vows of poverty and obedience, it was at their own disposal, unless assigned away by previous contract. He had known cases where this had occurred, and the property was disposed of by the person to the more immediate relatives. This however was only in England.

The Chairman (Mr. Headlam) asked how it was that in a recent case the lady abbess of a convent had in a lawsuit, entered a specific claim to a certain property left to two ladies after they had taken the vows.

Cardinal Wiseman stated that he believed that the case occurred in Belgium, where the convents were more strictly under the canon law of the Church. The course observed in these matters varied much according to the rules of the houses into which these "religious" entered, and according to the agreement made by them.

The Chairman then proceeded to question Cardinal Wiseman as to the jurisdiction of the propaganda in cases spiritual or temporal referred from this country.

He had been at Rome, and was acquainted with the course of procedure of the propaganda in reference to religious cases, but he did not remember that any temporal case had been referred during his stay. In spiritual cases the complainant preferred a petition, which was afterwards served upon the defendant.

In answer to further questions, Cardinal Wiseman said that he must respectfully decline to answer them. A bill was at present pending before the legislature which materially affected his position, and any admission as to his communication with the see of Rome might, as the act was retrospective, involve him at the instance of any common informer.

The chairman put several questions to the Cardinal as to the jurisdiction of Roman Catholic prelates in cases of disputed marriage, divorce, &c.

Cardinal Wiseman said that on former occasions, when in a different position, he had given every information on this subject, and he should be very willing to do so now were his position not altered; but he was required to answer questions which might involve admissions to be followed by disgraceful consequences. He begged to decline answering any of these questions.

The Chairman asked whether the knowledge of the fact that nothing said before the House of Commons could be used against him, without their permission, would alter the Cardinal's opinion.

Cardinal Wiseman replied in the negative. He had known cases where the protection of the House of Commons was not sufficient to secure persons against the consequences of their own admissions.

The Chairman then proceeded to examine the Cardinal in reference to bequests made to Roman Catholic bishops or clergymen.

The Cardinal replied that a clergyman might do as he pleased with money left to him without any conditions attached to it; but if left for an ecclesiastical purpose, it would be applied as desired, or to purposes analogous, as they would have respect rather to the spirit than to the letter of the bequest. Such an application and its propriety rested with the conscience of the person in whose charge the money was placed. If a thousand pounds were left to him without any particular purpose declared, he should not feel himself bound to apply it to any specific object.

At the conclusion of his examination the Cardinal bowed and withdrew, accompanied by several ecclesiastics.

(From the Weekly News.)

The Parliamentary debates in the House of Commons opened, on Saturday last, with a discussion not very creditable to the Dean and Chapter of Windsor, or, rather, to the ecclesiastical system of which, like the Bishops, they will probably be described as the innocent and unfortunate victims. Sir B. Hall had inquired how much was paid, by the public, for permission to enter the body of the Queen Dowager in the vaults of the Chapel Royal at Windsor, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer proved that it was a mere bagatelle—only £220; a sum really smaller, in proportion to the £1000,000 a-year paid to the deceased, than the fees allowed to the clergy on the burial of a pauper, bear to the annual expense incurred by the parish in supporting one during life.

We mean no disparagement or disrespect to the memory of the illustrious lady. Our objects is rather to protest against the perpetuation of that execrable system which turns the clergy, whether they will or no, into a kind of spiritual excisemen, giving them the power of taxing us on every great occasion, whether festive or mournful, and of taking toll upon the more important transactions of human life, from the cradle to the grave. Neither do we intend any reflection on the clergy, as individuals. Those devout persons who have given themselves up disinterestedly to the service of the Church, can have no other desire than to exemplify generosity of the divine mission; and, therefore, if they appear to the world to be avaricious, rapacious, insatiable, or inexorable in their pecuniary claims, we may be quite sure and take it for granted, that they are not so in reality. This is their greatest misfortune, the misapprehension to which their position subjects them; and it may be regarded as a species of martyrdom that, whilst they are, in heart at least, as poor, and humble, and contented as Lazarus, they are compelled to act as though they were as rich, and arrogant, and greedy as Dives himself.

This is, in fact, the substance of Mr. Gladstone's apology for the Bishops. What they suffer is the last refinement of persecution, to which virtue and piety are subjected in these latter days; for which Pope's celebrated distich need not be quoted. There can be little doubt of the increasing wisdom of the tempter, who goes to work very differently in St. James's-square, when he is permitted to try the faith of a Bishop, from the coarser methods which he adopted in simple and patriarchal times. It is quite certain that Job was never tried by the enemy of mankind with the power of granting building-leases on the Paddington estate, nor St. Peter with the keys of the vaults in the Chapel Royal at Windsor; and, therefore, we ought to give the greater credit to those holy men, in modern times, who have gone through such an ordeal without injury. We ought even to pay them the more veneration, when we know that their conduct is the

very converse of a vulgar hypocrisy;—that it is the submission of virtue to the disguise, and even to the infamy of vice, for the sake of some greater good; and that, when they are pocketing the tens and hundreds of thousands of pounds which seem to belong to religion, they are only doing injury to their own feelings, in performing "a sacred duty to the Church and to their successors."

Such is, in effect, the apology for scandalous practices, that are doing more injury to Christianity than all the hostility of paganism and infidelity. Of course, we do not apply these remarks, in all their literal force, to the case at Windsor. We refer to the system at large. But even that case must have been a very bad one, when we learn that George the Fourth refused to pay the money, on occasion of the funeral of the Princess Charlotte, and compelled the Dean and Chapter to give up to him the keys of the Chapel Royal, that he might bury his daughter without paying them their tribute at the gates of death.

The Times is very severe upon the "lucrative errors" of the Anglican Bishops, which have led to these Right Reverend Fathers in God, appropriating to themselves large sums of money, which ought to have been devoted to the relief of the spiritual destitution of the people of England. The following letter lately appeared in the columns of that journal:—

THE INCOMES OF THE BISHOPS.

Sir,—I recounted, without comment, on Wednesday last, the lucrative errors committed by the Bishop of Durham in 1836-37, in submitting the tabular returns of the average revenues of that see for the guidance of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In consequence of the desponding view which his Lordship then took of the position of the estates belonging to his bishopric, he has ever since (for the last 14 years) received £15,500 instead of £8,000 a-year, and is, it seems, to continue to receive that sum, or a larger one, till death or translation removes him.

I will now further point out what has chanced to some others of his fortunate and right rev. brethren in consequence of the extraordinary faith of the simple Ecclesiastical Commissioners in episcopal disinterestedness on that occasion.

The average net yearly income of the see of Worcester for seven years, ending with 1835, amounting, according to the return made by the then bishop, to £7,301 13s 1d, and the future income of that bishopric having been fixed by act of Parliament at £5,000 a-year, the commissioners settled that at the next avoidance of the see its incumbent should be charged with an annual payment to them of £2,300 a-year. But, as soon as the present bishop was appointed, I find from the blue-book before me, that his Lordship began to bestir himself in a most extraordinary manner to better his financial position.

In May, 1844, he addressed a memorial to the commissioners, setting forth the grounds upon which he had arrived at the melancholy conviction that if he was compelled to pay the before-mentioned deduction of £2,300 a-year, the residue of the revenues of his see would not leave him anything like an average income of £5,000 a-year. He pointed out how the apprehended "defalcation of income" would "utterly prevent him from fulfilling, as he would wish to do, those offices of charity and hospitality which belong to his position in the church." He threatened that nothing "but judgment and a writ of execution" should compel him to submit to the annual deduction of £2,300, which, when he entered upon his duties and emoluments as bishop, he well knew he would be called upon to pay. And, in conclusion, he claimed as an act of justice, that the said annual deduction should be reduced from £2,300 to £1,500, declaring at the same time that he had no desire "to receive a shilling beyond the income assigned to his see by the 6th and 7th of William IV., cap. 77, sec. 41;" but that with less he could not exist.

The commissioners, compliant enough in general, took on this occasion a different view from the bishop, and were inexorable. A long correspondence ensued. In a letter to their secretary, dated Nov. 1, 1845, the bishop urges that he has a right to be indulged as much as certain other lucky occupants of the episcopal bench, whom he imprudently enough names. He says, "It appears by the returns presented to the House of Commons last session that the average receipts of the Bishop of Durham, for the last seven years have been £11,792 instead of £8,000; those of the late Bishop of Ely, £6,772 instead of £5,500; while the Bishop of Salisbury who is not taxed at all, has received yearly £7,450, and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol £5,600, besides his commendations." Granting, therefore, that the revenues of the see of Worcester have improved, is it fair that I should be denied the benefit of such improvement when it has been thus allowed to other bishops?" He then goes on to dilate on the "hardship and injustice" of his case, utterly oblivious that his income, when he episcopated, had been expressly settled by act of Parliament at £5,000 a-year, and that he had subsequently declared, in his memorial, that he did not wish for a shilling more! The luscious examples of Durham and Ely, of Salisbury and Gloucester, had, however, evidently in 1845 debauched his mind, and had shaken the praiseworthy asceticism which, in 1844, had heroically resolved to fight the battle of life with the aid of £5,000 a-year and a good conscience. The result of his Lordship's agitation in 1844 was, after all, but to reduce the annual deduction paid by him from £2,300 to £2,200 a-year.

This year (1851) we are enabled to judge accurately of the hardships to which this ill-used, under-paid, and querulous prelate has actually been exposed in consequence of the harshness of the commissioners—to see clearly why his hospitalities have been, as he proved that they must be, unworthy of his station, and his charities infinitesimally small during the last seven years. A first glance at the tabular view of the revenues of his diocese would seem to show that the Bishop of Worcester has been in pecuniary difficulty throughout the last seven years; for in 1844 he appears to have paid no part whatever of the annual deduction of £2,200 due to the commissioners, although he received that year a revenue of £8,820 18s 2d; and in 1849 he appears to have been in arrear to them no less than £5,282 18s 4d, having the previous year received an income of £11,623 7s 2d, and in 1849 an income of £12,813 6s 0d! The upshot of the whole business is, that the Lord Bishop of Worcester, who, in 1844 did not want a shilling more than £5,000 a-year, has ever since that date pocketed an average net income of £9,407, exactly £4,407 a-year more than the act of Parliament, which fixed the amount

of his income, intended him to receive; and if the commissioners had not turned a deaf ear to his very undignified importunities in 1844, he would have received during the whole of that septennial period £10,107 a-year!

And it must be observed that every shilling of this £7,500 a-year, which the Bishop of Durham has received during the last 14 years over and above his legitimate income of £8,000 a-year, and of this £4,407 a-year which the Bishop of Worcester has received during the last seven years over and above his legitimate income of £5,000 a-year, would, if these sums had been paid over, as they ought to have been, to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, have been applied towards relieving the spiritual destitution of which the Marquis of Blandford so eloquently and justly complains. A curate is considered, in the present day, well paid at £120 a-year. The overplus which these two bishops have diverted from the coffers of the Ecclesiastical Commission to their own private emolument would thus have sufficed to relieve the spiritual destitution of their respective dioceses by the presence of no less than one hundred well-paid curates!

I know it has been urged that if these bishops' income were strictly confined to the sums fixed by the act of Parliament, and if their Lordships were not allowed to benefit personally by the improvement of the estates belonging to their sees, they would not care to improve them at all—they would not even care to manage them well—they would rest satisfied if their own stipends were paid, and would not exert themselves to carry out any measures likely to increase the resources of their dioceses for the benefit of the Ecclesiastical Commission.

But surely the men who argue thus—who place episcopal morality on so very low a grade—are the worst enemies the bishops and the church can have. Those prelates are, or ought to be, the very cream of our Churchmen—pious, zealous, and disinterested; they are set on high, and are lodged in palaces, as a sign and an example to the rest of the laity; and are laymen to believe that these virtuous and good men, heart-wring as they are at the spiritual destitution which surrounds them, and which they are ever imploring us to relieve with open hands, could not, nevertheless, be induced to husband conscientiously and judiciously the resources especially entrusted to their care for its relief, unless they were permitted to pilfer therefrom enormous perquisites for themselves? The irony of their most malignant assailants could invent for them no more damaging defence than this, yet this is positively all that the ingenuity of their best friends can allege on their behalf.

CARDINAL WISEMAN AT CAEN.—The Ordre of Caen gives the following extract of a letter dated London, July 18, addressed by the Cardinal to M. Youf, Superior of the Bon Souvenir, at Caen. [Translation.] "M. le Supérieur..... I wish to express to you my warm acknowledgment of the kind reception which you and your Community gave me, and of the agreeable abode you procured for us at Caen. Our passage was terrible, and the sufferings of those on board (above 150) dreadful. Thank God, neither Mr. Searle nor myself shared in them. On my arrival I found the summons spoken of in the papers; I attended it; and think our adversaries have gained little to boast of. By way of equivalent, I found a new harvest of conversions. On Sunday I shall confirm several persons of the haute noblesse, converted since my departure. Cause, therefore, your zealous Brethren and your good sister, and even your poor children (the deaf mutes) whose heart God knows, to pray for our England. Recall me to the kind remembrance of my friends at Caen, as also Mr. Searle, and accept the sentiments of esteem with which I have the honor to be, M. le Supérieur, your devoted servant in Jesus Christ, † N. Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

The Pope's Army.—The Pope may laugh at Lord John's Bill, and at the Thesiger improvements of the same; for the Pope has an army fighting in the very heart of England—fighting in the cause of Popery to the confusion of the English Church. Scarcely an English Bishop but is enrolled—enrolled at his own banker's—in the Pope's service. Scarcely an English Bishop who does not—it may be unconsciously—bring thousands of mercenaries in aid of what he loves to denounce as the Scurlet Harlot. And nevertheless he does her service, blindly battling for her abominations. Here is one Bishop—let him wear the mitre whom the mitre fits—one Prince of the Protestant Church; a Prince professing the meekness and self-denial of the Christian state, who, in the course of fourteen years, has received no less than £79,639 19s 8d over his salary; such annual salary—for the purchase of camel's hair, locusts, and wild honey—being only eight thousand pounds per annum! With the Pope invading us—invading and proselytising—do not the very Bishops fight for him? Unconsciously, no doubt; nevertheless, every pound so retained by a Bishop is a mercenary on the side of his Holiness.—And this admitted, at this hour Pope Pius the Ninth has an army of hundreds of thousands strong fighting for him—actively battling—although locked up in the coffers of Protestant Bishops. We would advise them with all speed, to disband such unhallowed forces.—Punch.

Henceforth Catholics must take council, not as to how they can oppose the progress of the persecuting bill, but as to how they can best meet the penal enactment. Never did a more solemn and important duty devolve upon the heads of the Catholic body, lay and clerical, than that which the passing of this bill will have imposed upon them. They will have to consider how, notwithstanding this law, they shall retain in full and unimpaired activity their ancient episcopacy—how they will perpetuate the long line of prelates who, since the introduction of Christianity into this island, have guided and governed the Catholic Church in Ireland—how they can best maintain that unbroken connection with the See of Rome which this bill would sever—how they can perpetuate their priesthood and protect the property bequeathed by the charitable and pious for the uses of the Church, and the maintenance of the widowed and the fatherless. These are among the responsible duties which this bill devolves upon the Catholic body, and we have no doubt, no misgivings, but, on the contrary, a full and abiding assurance, that the zeal and determination will correspond with the emergency—that the Church in Ireland shall not be crippled—that its episcopacy shall be maintained in inviolable succession—that the connection with the See of Rome shall not be disturbed—that the priesthood shall continue as of old—and that in all things the Irish Church shall be as perfect, as efficient,

and as untrammelled at the end of the first cycle of persecution as it was at its commencement.—*Dublin Freeman's Journal.*

Two PRETTY PILGRIMS.—The *Milan Gazette* relates the following curious story:—"On or about the 16th instant, at two o'clock at night, two young girls, the elder of whom could not be more than eighteen, presented themselves at one of the gates of Florence. They were both dressed in white, and barefooted, wore broad-brimmed straw hats, and had their heads closely shaved. Their age and appearance naturally called the attention of the gendarmes who were at the gate, and the following dialogue ensued between the officer in command and the two fair pilgrims:—"Ladies, what is there at your service?" "We want to leave this town: pray open the gate." "And where are you going to?" "To Jerusalem." "With what intention?" "We want to visit the Holy Sepulchre." "But have you money for so long a journey?" "We have twenty-five pauls (16s. 4d.), but we shall beg our way." "But have you considered the danger you may encounter?" "Oh, we have a protector on whom we can rely; it is God." The officer, although he had nothing to say against their protector, nevertheless refused to open the gate; but after many entreaties he consented to accompany them to the house of the nearest priest in the neighborhood, who turned out to be a friend of their families, and the officer was not a little astonished to learn from him, that one of the two pretty pilgrims belonged to one of the most noble families of Florence. We need not add, they were both reconducted to their homes."

UNITED STATES NEWS.

The Sandwich Islands are in a miserable condition. The native population is weak, licentious and degraded. The American missionaries have Christianised the country into every species of vice. We do not mean to impute to the missionaries the odium of having demoralised the islanders by their example. But they have so unsettled the pagan simplicity which marked an inoffensive people, that the way was paved for the vices of civilisation, which were more eagerly adopted than its virtues. The lessons of religion have had no effect; the wild promptings of sin have alone been followed and regarded. The experiment of converting the islanders to Christianity has failed miserably, and the result shows the futility of endeavours to enlighten the heathen.—*New York Tribune.*

A SINGULAR AWARD.—The offer of a small premium was lately made, through the Boston Congregationalist, for the best essay in answer to sundry questions in relation to practical religion, and especially pointing out the relation of the soul's salvation to a knowledge of the person of Christ; a point, we would think, involving the most peculiar features of the orthodox views. The committee in the case awarded the prize, without knowing the authors of any of the proposed essays, to Rev. Mr. Briggs, a Unitarian clergyman of Plymouth, Mass. It is certainly a suggestive circumstance, in many ways—and perhaps we may say hopeful—that the best exposition of such a point of theory should have been supplied by a Unitarian, even in the judgment of orthodox critics.—*Ibid.*

HUMAN REMAINS FOUND IN THE STOMACH OF A SHARK.—The *Bridgeton* (N. J.) *Pioneer*, says that last week a party from that place went on an excursion to the Breakwater for the purpose of catching black-fish. While engaged in this sport they caught a female shark, measuring nine feet and four inches in length, and supposed to weigh near four hundred pounds.—Upon arriving at the wharf they dissected this monster of the deep, and found within her stomach a quantity of bones and a man's lace boot. Three of the bones were in a perfect state of preservation, and were pronounced by competent judges to be the ribs of a human being.—*Philadelphia Sun.*

THE BONSECOURS SCHOOL.

THE RE-OPENING of the Bonsecours School will take place on MONDAY, the FIRST of September. August 21, 1851.

WANTED

TO BORROW, £600, for which Security shall be given in Property, consisting of ONE HUNDRED ACRES of CLEARED LAND, on which are built NEW STONE SAW and FLOUR MILLS, with DWELLING HOUSE and OFFICES. Title to the above Property indisputable. For further particulars apply (if by letter, post-paid) to A. B., True Witness Office.

N. B.—The Proprietor would have no objection to take a Partner in the business, with about £1,000 Capital. August 21, 1851.

DRY GOODS.

WE beg to apprise the numerous friends of Mrs. Coffy, and the public at large, that she has opened a Dry Goods and Fancy Store at No. 23, St. Lawrence Main Street. Persons desirous of making purchases in the above line, would do well to give her a call, as she is determined to sell at the lowest possible prices.

In compliance with the wishes of her friends, Mrs. Coffy has engaged the services of a competent milliner and dressmaker; so that those ladies who may favor her with a trial, will find their orders punctually and carefully attended to.

JOSEPH BOESE,

25 College Street, opposite the College, MANUFACTURER of OIL CLOTHS, which comprise PRINTED IMITATION MAHOGANY, BLACK WALNUT, TABLE and PIANO COVERS; also Plain Black for Caps, Trunks, and for use of Coachmakers. Also, all kinds of SILK and WOOLLENS DYED, in the best manner, and with dispatch.

ROBERT M'ANDREW,

IN returning thanks to the public, for the liberal support he has received during his long period in business, in SOREL, intimates that he will REMOVE on the 1st May, to MONTREAL, to 99, St. Paul Street, where he will open an extensive WHOLE-SALE and RETAIL DRY GOODS ESTABLISHMENT. His long experience among Country Merchants, with strict attention to their orders, will, he trusts, gain him a share of their patronage, particularly as he pledges himself to supply them with as good Articles, and at as LOW, if not LOWER RATES than any house in the city. May 14, 1851.

OWEN M'GARVEY,

House and Sign Painter, Glazier, &c. &c. &c. THE Advertiser returns thanks to his friends and the public, for the liberal support he has received since his commencement in business. He is now prepared to undertake Orders in the most extensive manner, and pledges himself that he will use his best abilities to give satisfaction to those who may favor him with their business. Gilding, Marbling, Sign Painting, Glazing, Paper Hanging, White Washing and Coloring, done in the most approved manner, and on reasonable terms. No. 6, St. Antoine St., opposite Mr. A. Walsh's Grocery Store. May 7, 1851.