

**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, APRIL 6, 1855.

**NEWS OF THE WEEK.**

The Committee of investigation into the disasters in the Crimea which have lost to Great Britain her brave army, and the military renown won for her by a Wellington, still continues its sittings; and day after day drags to light some fresh evidences of stupidity and dishonesty, incredible, if not too clearly substantiated by the condition of the miserable remnant of Britain's once noble army. "Where shall we begin?" asks the *Times*—"on what principle shall we select, when every day spreads before us a profusion of follies, blunders, obstinacies and crimes enough to supply a dozen of farces, or as many tragedies? No *Arabian Nights*, no stories of *Wise Men of Gotham*, ever matched the stupidities, the perversities, the downright malignities of office. Were not the results 'horrible and heartrending,' equalling, indeed, in their misery and magnitude the fell swoop of an earthquake, or other visitation of nature, we might almost be amused at the absurdity of the disclosures before the Committee of Enquiry."

One fact however has been clearly established; and that is, that the disasters so appalling and heartrending, must in a great measure be attributed to the rascality of the contractors who, intent only upon their dirty profits, supply the Government with the worst possible materials, at the highest possible prices. One of the chief causes of the sufferings of the troops has been the delay in making a road from Balaklava to the camp. But this work of primary necessity, could not be accomplished because of the want of means, especially of tools. Not that tools in abundance were not furnished. But alas! owing to the knavery of the mercantile houses who had taken the contract to furnish them, the tools were utterly worthless, and broke in the men's hands at the first stroke. A pickaxe without a handle, a bill-hook that would not cut a billet of wood, and a broken shovel, were distributed to the men, who were expected therewith to construct seven miles of road, and to carry on the work in the trenches. No wonder then, that the latter did not advance, that the road was not made, and that the men perished of hunger and fatigue. It would be well, now that these facts have been established in the House of Commons beyond the possibility of cavil, that the public press should learn "to put the saddle on the right horse;" and instead of blaming the aristocratic officers, should insist at least upon hanging one or two of the knavish contractors, to whose rascality the sufferings of the troops have been distinctly traced. It was the same in the Peninsula, at Ciudad Rodrigo, at Badajos, and before Burgos, where the honor of British arms, was jeopardized, and the lives of thousands of brave men wantonly sacrificed, because, as we read in the Duke's dispatches, the tools with which he was furnished were utterly worthless. It has again been shown to the world that a British army has been lost, not because its officers were gentlemen, but because the contractors who furnished its *material* were dishonest knaves. It seems also that the Medical and Commissariat departments, have been much mismanaged throughout. Acres of lint were sent out to the hospitals, and the men's wounds were dressed with hay; whilst provisions of all kinds, fresh meat and vegetables, were allowed to rot, the soldiers meantime were perishing of hunger.

The prospects of peace, resulting from the Vienna Conference, and the death of Nicholas, have had a favorable effect on the funds; but it is said that, though England is willing to submit to the terms of a degrading peace, Napoleon III. will never consent to sacrifice the honor of France, and to bring disgrace upon French arms, by concluding a peace which shall not provide for the destruction of the fortifications of Sebastopol. In spite of the dissensions of the British Government, the Emperor seems determined to place himself at the head of his troops in the Crimea. When remonstrated with on the subject by Lord Clarendon, he is said to have made reply to the effect that, "if the British Government was jealous of him, it was very easy for it to send out Prince Albert to accompany him; and that he, for his part, should have the greatest pleasure in fighting side by side with the Queen's husband against the common enemy."

The news from the Crimea is less gloomy than usual. Sickness is abating in camp, and supplies of all kinds are arriving regularly. The Allies seem about to make a desperate rush upon Sebastopol, which, failing, the siege will most likely have to be raised; for, when the warm weather sets in, the prospect camp—reeking with the stench of thousands of

but half buried corpses, rapidly decomposing under the combined effects of heat and moisture—will become no longer tenable. Plague and cholera would soon sweep away the miserable remnant which famine and the sword have spared.

**CHURCH AND STATE.**

"It is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State."—*Clergy Reserves Bill.*

"Between religion and politics there should be no connection."—*Protestant Press, passim.*

On the motion of Mr. Cameron, our Legislative Assembly—which only last autumn proclaimed the "desirableness" of doing away with all semblance even of connection between Church and State, between things secular and things ecclesiastical—was induced last week to swallow its leek in a very amusing, if not in a very dignified manner, by taking a very decided action in a matter purely ecclesiastical. Mr. Cameron's motion, which was carried by a majority of 70 to 30, was to the effect that:—

A humble address be presented by the Provincial Legislature to Her Majesty—setting forth, that, the members of the "United Church of England and Ireland as by Law established" in this Province, labor under peculiar disadvantages, from which members of other religious denominations are free; inasmuch as the former are not allowed to meet in synod with their bishops and clergy in their several dioceses, and have no voice in the appointment of their office-bearers—and praying, therefore, that Her Majesty will be pleased to cause a measure to be introduced into the Imperial Parliament to remove any obstacles that may exist to prevent the synodal action of the said members of the "United Church of England and Ireland as by Law established;" and to enable them to appoint their own office-bearers, and to frame rules and canons for their own guidance.

It may at first sight appear—and during the debate in the House it was argued—that the sole effect of granting the prayer of the above address would be to place Protestants in Canada, members of the "Church as by Law established," on a footing of perfect equality, with the Protestants of other sects, and with members of all religious denominations; that, in substance, all that was asked for by the petitioners, was, that they should be relieved from certain burdens peculiar to them as citizens professing a particular form of religion. In this light was Mr. Cameron's motion represented; and did it in reality demand nothing more for the petitioners, most certainly every friend to religious equality, as before the law, for citizens of all religions, should give it his hearty support. But this is not what the petitioners aim at, as shall be evident on a moment's reflection.

For what is there, would we ask, in the laws of the land as at present existing, to prevent Dr. Strachan, his friends and colleagues, as citizens professing a particular form of religion, from meeting and consulting together, when, where, and as they like?—from calling themselves and their assemblies by such names or titles as they may please to adopt? or from enacting such rules and canons and appointing such office-bearers, as they may think fit? Nothing, literally, nothing. As Canadian citizens, they are as free to do any, or all, of these things, as are their fellow-citizens, the Bishops and Clergy of the Catholic Church; who ask no permission from the State to meet every three years in Provincial Council—and who, deriving their spiritual authority from a power infinitely above that of the State, hold their Synods when they please; and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost enact laws, and enforce discipline, without knowing, or caring to know, whether the State approves or disapproves of their proceedings. Dr. Strachan and his friends—as citizens professing a particular form of religion, and members of a particular Protestant sect—are, as it is, just as much at liberty, and have the same power and authority, to hold Synods, pass laws, and appoint their own office-bearers, as are, or have, the ministers and members of any other Protestant denomination in the Province. In their capacity of citizens, the clergy and laity of the "Church as by Law Established" are as free as, and enjoy every legal right or privilege enjoyed by, the clergy and laity of any other religious denomination in Canada. As citizens, therefore, they have no right to ask for more; and, upon the principle of perfect equality, as before the law, for citizens of all religions, the Provincial Legislature has no right to countenance them in their exorbitant demands.

For, if it be desirable to remove all semblance even of connection between Church and State—between things secular and things ecclesiastical—it is evident that the State can neither recognise the religious character of any of its citizens, nor take cognizance of any ecclesiastical differences or distinctions betwixt them; and that, before its tribunals, Dr. Strachan, and Ebenezer Grimes of the Conventicle, must appear as simple citizens, and nothing more. If there should be no connection between Church and State, then it follows that the State has nothing whatever to do with Catholics or Protestants, with Anglicans or Methodists, with Churchmen or Dissenters, with clergy or laity, with Christian or Heathen. The State sees, knows, and deals only with citizens, and as such, as all equally entitled to its countenance and assistance. But if Dr. Strachan and his friends, as citizens, do already enjoy all that is enjoyed by any of their fellow-citizens in Canada, whether Catholic or Protestant, what is it that they do demand? and for what object is it that they now invoke the countenance and assistance of the Provincial Legislature? The reply is obvious. Their demand is, that they may be permitted to enjoy the immunity from State control enjoyed by Dissenters, whilst retaining their legal standing as members of a "Church by Law established." Their object is, to obtain from the State a formal recognition of acts by them performed, not in their capacity of citizens, but as members of a particular religious denomination. It is not then

equality with, but a supremacy over, all other religious denominations in Canada that they seek.

Though as citizens—in which capacity alone has the State any right to recognise them—Dr. Strachan and his co-religionists are as free to meet in Synod, frame laws, and appoint their office-bearers, as are the members of any other religious denomination in the Province—yet, as members of the "United Church of England and Ireland, as by Law established," they are subject to certain legal restrictions; submission to which the State exacts from all upon whom it confers the privileges of State-Church membership. These restrictions are in fact the price which the law exacts, and Dr. Strachan and his friends must be content to pay, for the peculiar advantages which they enjoy as members of a "Church as by Law established." If they do not consider the said advantages worth the price demanded, they are not bound either in law or conscience to conclude the bargain; but if they do conclude it, they must be content to adhere strictly to all its terms. If, for instance, Dr. Strachan desires that the State shall recognise in him, because of his ecclesiastical character, something more than it recognises in every other citizen, and shall acknowledge his episcopal rank—if his colleagues desire that the State shall accord to them a peculiar position because of their ecclesiastical standing—he and they must be content to submit to such limitations of their ecclesiastical functions as the State may see fit to impose. If they desire, however, to enjoy the same immunity from all legal interference, and State restriction, as is enjoyed by Catholics, and by Protestant Dissenters from the "Church as by Law established," they must make up their minds to renounce the peculiar advantages which, as members of the "Law established Church" they enjoy; and must be content to become, as before the Law, even as Catholics, as Protestant Episcopalians in the United States, and as other Protestant Dissenters. This they may do; but they have no right to ask for that liberty which is peculiar to members of ecclesiastical organisations not "established by Law" so long as they retain the privileges peculiar to a "Church" that is "by Law established;" or so long as the State recognises any distinction between their acts and their office-bearers, and the acts, and office-bearers of any other religious denomination. When an Anglican Bishop of Toronto and the ministers of the Methodist or Unitarian congregations in that city, shall be upon precisely the same footing as before the State—when the former shall no longer enjoy in virtue of his ecclesiastical position, any official pre-eminence over the others—then, and not till then, will the Bishop and clergy of the "United Church of England and Ireland as by Law established" be entitled to demand the same liberty of Synodal action as is now enjoyed by the Methodists and Unitarians of the Province.

As it is, this is what the Anglican petitioners so modestly demand. That the State shall recognise in them, a particular body, or society, distinct from all other religious denominations; that certain acts to be performed by Dr. Strachan and his colleagues in their peculiar and purely ecclesiastical capacity, shall by the State be received as invested with a particular virtue—that the State shall take cognizance of their ecclesiastical appointments, recognising in the persons so appointed a particular character; and that, under certain conditions, rules and canons to be by them enacted, shall be legally binding upon all the members of the said body. They demand, in fact, that their particular sect shall be recognised by the State as the "Church as by Law established in Canada." It is against this then, that we protest, as unjust towards the members of other religious denominations. If, however, the Anglicans will consent to renounce the peculiar privileges, and dignities of their State connection, as members of a "Church as by Law established;" and if—that connection renounced—the State still shall seek to impose any restrictions upon their synodal action, or the appointment of their bishops, we think that we may venture to promise them the hearty sympathies and active co-operation of the Catholics of Canada for the recovery of their rights. So long, however, as their bishops are content to derive their right of episcopal jurisdiction from the State, so long as the State assumes the right of conferring that jurisdiction, so long must Anglicans submit to wear the fetters which the laws of the land impose upon them. If they would be free they must first renounce the wages of servitude; and if they feel themselves oppressed "by Law," they must remember that it is solely because they are, of their own accord, members of a "Church by Law established."

That we have not misrepresented the views of our Anglican fellow-citizens, is evident from the following extract from a petition intended for the "Honorable Legislative Assembly of Canada," and agreed to by the "Bishops, clergy, and laity of the diocese of Quebec," met together in conference on the 12th of January:—

"That your petitioners are desirous of meeting in Synod to frame rules and canons, &c."

"That they further desire that the rules and canons adopted by such Synods should, as far as the members of their own denomination are concerned, be recognised as having the effect of law."

"Wherefore, your petitioners humbly pray that such addition may be made to the Provincial Act—6 Vic., c. 32—as will give to the rules and canons adopted as aforesaid by a Synod of the Diocese of Quebec, the effect of law, so far as the members of the Church of England in that diocese are concerned."

What would be thought of the Catholic Bishops of Canada, were they to demand that the "rules and canons" framed by them in their Provincial Councils should be recognized by the State "as having the effect of law" upon the Catholic population of the Province? A pretty outcry there would be against priestly assumption.

**THE GRAY MURDER CASE.**—Eleven "intelligent jury men"—all jury men are highly intelligent in virtue of their office—have signed a petition to the Governor General praying that His Excellency be pleased to extend a free pardon to William Gray, whom they, the said "intelligent jurors," found, guilty the other day of the wilful murder of his wife—but which finding they now believe to "have been erroneous." Oh! highly "intelligent British jury men!"

Considering, however, that, since they found a verdict of guilty against Gray, it is impossible that the jurors can have obtained any additional evidence of which as jurors, they can take cognizance—and that they had, on the day of the trial, fully as good means to judge of the truth or falsity of John Reilly's depositions as they have now—their petition is about the most extraordinary confession of official stupidity that we ever had the good fortune to meet with; and is certainly but too well calculated to bring trial by jury into disrepute. What security to the subject can trial by jury afford, if a man's life be at the mercy of a set of numskulls, who one day, after mature deliberation, find him guilty of murder; and the next, tell us themselves, that their verdict was "erroneous;" and that, without any fresh evidence having been laid before them, they are satisfied that they have unjustly condemned an innocent man. Upon Gray's guilt we offer no opinion; but this much is certain—that the jurors, who but yesterday found him guilty of murder, and, who to day, with precisely the same evidence still before the Court, and upon which evidence alone jurors are, by their oaths, bound to frame their verdict—pronounce him not guilty—must be either fools or knaves, and as such a disgrace and a reproach to our Courts of justice.

But these "intelligent jurors" have done more than merely write themselves down "asses." They have explicitly accused John Reilly of perjury; who, we trust, will pursue some, or all of them for defamation of character; and teach jurymen the lesson for the future, that, once out of the box, their functions as jurors cease, and that they are not at liberty to publish documents accusing, without a ghost of a proof, their fellow-citizens of false swearing.

**DECLINE OF POKERY.**—We hear most contradictory accounts of this "master piece of Satan," as Protestants truthfully and elegantly designate the Catholic Church. At one moment we are assured that it is on its "last legs;" and just as the old women are beginning to congratulate one another over the downfall of the "Man of Sin," their rejoicings are untimely nipt in the bud by the announcement that the "sick man" is up and going about, stronger than ever. We read, for instance, in the *Montreal Witness*, an extract from a Protestant paper of Kingston, from which it would appear that that terrible creature—the Pope's bull—has broke lose from his keepers, and is rushing in his fury over the land, so that all the old women are trembling for their lives; whilst poor dear Mrs. Partington, has been heard to declare her conviction that the country is about to be subjected to cannon law, and a Papal regiment.

"Twenty-five years ago"—says our Protestant cotemporary—"a priest in his black gown parading the streets of an Upper Canada city was *rara avis*; now they are thick as blackbirds. The increase of the Roman Church in Upper Canada, in numbers, wealth, and last, though not least, in power, during that period, has been unparalleled in its annals; and there is no wonder that Protestants, who know that the principles of that Church never change"—Romanists should feel thankful for this Protestant admission of the immutability of their Church's principles—for its immutability is a strong presumption of its divine origin—"should begin to feel rather uneasy under the prospect before them. The Romans no longer think it needful to hide their light under a bushel; they now elevate it upon a candlestick, and plant it upon the rock of St. Peter." In another place the same journal complains that Catholicity "is like a great *Upas tree*—did the writer ever see a *Upas tree* we wonder?—gradually overshadowing the land, which, if not trimmed"—whether it is the "Upas tree" or the "land" which requires "trimming," is not quite clear—"by vigilant hands, will soon throw its benumbing exhalations"—horrible thing these "benumbing exhalations"—"over the minds of the people."

The Protestant journalist calls loudly therefore for legislative measures to suppress the growth of the "Upas tree," which he wouldn't have the woodman spare on any account. It must be cut down by Axe of Parliament, and cast into the fire; lest the minds of the people be benumbed. Again, we thank our Protestant cotemporary for his admissions—which signify this—that—in the opinion of Protestants—Protestantism, unaided by legislative enactments and brute force, is impotent to resist the purely moral action and influences of Romanism; that, if left entirely to itself—if not "trimmed" by vigilant hands, the "Upas tree" of Popery must, ere long, overshadow the country; whilst Protestantism, unsupported by the State, must wither and die out like a vile weed. Our cotemporary is quite correct. All we ask for "Romanism" is—"a clear stage and no favor."

**CONSISTENCY.**—The *Montreal Witness* has some very severe remarks upon the conduct of some of the members of *L'Institut Canadien*, who have expressed a desire to exclude certain religious papers from their reading room. "We trust," says our cotemporary—"that this patriotic institution will remain true to its liberal principles, and protect freedom of thought."

We may be mistaken; but it does seem to us as if the *Montreal Witness* in its new-born zeal for "freedom of thought," or "Freethinking," must have forgotten the very active part it took some years ago to put down "freedom of thought," by laboring for the