

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

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
 TERMS:
 To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
 To Country do. \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1854.

Any of our subscribers who change their residence on or about the 1st of May, will please inform us of their new address.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Arabia*, from Liverpool, on the 18th instant, reports no fighting as yet, either on sea or land. Active negotiations, betwixt Russia and Austria, still continue; but it is as yet impossible to say what part the latter Power intends to play in the Game Royal now commenced. The sympathies of Prussia are, it is said, entirely with the Czar. In the Baltic, the ice was breaking up, and Sir C. Napier was anxiously expecting the Russian fleet to put to sea. The Allied squadrons, in the Black Sea, were off Varna, where it is supposed that the Russians meditate an attack. On the Danube, there has been some skirmishing, unattended however with any decisive results. The first detachment of French troops, 3,000 strong, under General Canrobert, had arrived at Constantinople. From Great Britain, there is nothing of importance to record in the political world, Parliament having adjourned for the Easter Holydays.

THE "DOUBLE MAJORITY."

Amongst the French Canadian advocates of "secularisation," we must, it seems, include the *Courier de Saint Hyacinthe*; so that, together with the *Minerve*, and *Canadien* of Quebec, which are both ministerial organs, the majority of the French Canadian press are on the side of the *Globe*, the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Montreal Witness*, the *Orange Lily*, and the leading radical and anti-Catholic journals of Upper Canada. On the other side, the *Journal de Quebec* comes out strongly, on Catholic principles, as the uncompromising opponent of "secularisation" and Protestant demagogism.

To account for the line of policy adopted by a large portion of the French Canadian press, it must be borne in mind that, with them, the real question at issue is not so much the "secularisation of the Reserves" as the "abolition of the Seigneurial Tenure." To secure the votes of the Protestants of Upper Canada in favor of the latter measure, the assistance of the French Canadian vote is to be given to the "secularisers." It is thus that the *Courier de Saint Hyacinthe* seems to understand the "double majority."

There are others again amongst the French Canadians who believe that the institutions of Lower Canada will be best protected, by their assisting the majority of the Upper Canadians to carry out such measures as to them seem most desirable; and that, by adopting this line of policy, French Canadians will have the right to demand of the Upper Canadians that they refrain from interference with the affairs of Lower and Catholic Canada. These men are, no doubt, actuated by the purest motives; they seek the welfare of their country, and the integrity of their Church. Still, though respecting their motives, we cannot but differ from them as to the policy to be pursued, in order best to attain the objects which they have in view; they seem to us to be credulous to a fault; honest themselves, they assume that the enemies of their laws, their language, and their religion are also honest. It is this error which vitiates their whole policy.

It is true that, by adopting, in the case of the "Clergy Reserves," the policy of the "double majority" advocated by these men, on any future occasion, when the interests of Lower Canada are solely, or principally, concerned, French Canadians would have the right to demand of the Protestants of Upper Canada to follow a similar policy. They would have the right, we say—but what might they have to enforce such a demand? And without power to enforce it, it would be laughed at, trampled upon, and set at naught. To trust to the faith, honor, or truth of the enemies of our Church—of men who would hesitate at no act of meanness, or brutality, to accomplish their daring object—would be indeed to lean upon a reed. In this opinion we are happy to see that the *Catholic Citizen* of Toronto fully agrees with us.

Should, however, Lower Canadians now bind themselves to follow out the system of double majorities, let them not hope that with the same measure of fairness with which they mete, will their adversaries measure back in return. Let them, we say, expect anything at the hands of the ultra sectarian party, rather than justice or fair play.—*Catholic Citizen*.

It is indeed almost incredible that men can be so infatuated as to believe that the radicals of Upper

Canada—flushed by triumph over the "Reserves," and invoked by a pretty numerous body of French Canadian radicals and infidels in the Lower Province—will submit to the restraints of the "double majority;" if men will persist in believing such an absurdity, it is merely a proof that there are no limits to human credulity, and gullibility. "We shall have the right to ask the Protestants of Upper Canada"—says the *Canadien*—"to refrain from meddling with Lower Canadian affairs." Yes, you will have the right; and so had the lamb the right to ask the wolf to let him go. History, as handed down to us by old Esop, does not tell us that the wolf made much of "les réclumtions" of the poor little innocent, simple, and credulous lambkin.

But what about this majority in Upper Canada in favor of "secularisation?" Is there such a thing, after all? What if it should turn out that, in spite of the clamor of the democratic organs, and the assumptions of the *Canadien*, the majority of the Protestants of Upper Canada were opposed to "secularisation?" Would our French Canadian cotemporaries still counsel their fellow-countrymen to force upon the Protestant majority of Upper Canada, a measure of such questionable propriety as the "secularisation" of the funds set apart for the services of religion?

The Conservative press, we know, claims a majority in favor of retaining the "Reserves;" but their evidence may be suspected, as that of an interested party; we will therefore put it on one side. But what do the organs on the other side say? Do the advocates of "secularisation" pretend that the majority of the Protestants of Upper Canada is on the other side? Let us hear them; remembering that though it is a common rise for the politician to issue exaggerated reports of the strength and numbers of his adherents, he will never underestimate them. What does the Upper Canadian "secularisation" press then say about this majority—upon whose assumed existence the *Canadien* and his friends base their arguments?

The *Bathurst Courier* is one of the warmest advocates of "secularisation" in Upper Canada. In its issue of the 24th ult., it has a long article upon the subject, in which the writer gives an analysis of the respective numbers of the two parties in the Upper Province—the "secularisers," and "anti-secularisers." We copy the following:—

"Let no Voluntary however deceive himself with the idea that the contest will be easily gained, because it will not; and this can be best understood by considering who are in favor of secularisation, and who are not. One thing is certain, the Conservatives are opposed to it, and they form a pretty numerous portion of the people of Upper Canada. All the Church of England people are opposed to it; so are a large portion of the Church of Scotland Presbyterians, a portion of the Methodists, and some others. In favor of it we have the Free Kirk Presbyterians, Baptists, a portion of the Church of Scotland Presbyterians, and Methodists, and some other denominations not so numerous. When the numbers, composing these denominations, are taken into account, IT WILL BE FOUND THAT A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE PROTESTANT POPULATION OF UPPER CANADA ARE OPPOSED TO SECULARISATION."—*Bathurst Courier*, 24th March.

"Of the entire population of United Canada, nearly one-half are Roman Catholics. And how will this half of the people vote on the secularisation question?—This is an important consideration, for on whichever side the majority of them may vote, that side will gain the day."—*ib.*

And continuing his calculations, and supposing that a majority of the Catholics should vote with the Protestant majority of Upper Canada against "secularisation"—our cotemporary asks the question—"Where would be the Voluntary party?" He answers:—

"A MISERABLE HANDFUL, SCARCELY WORTH RECORDING."—*ib.*

And it is to give this "miserable handful" of Protestant Voluntaries a triumph over the "large majority of the Protestant population," that Catholics are called upon by the *Canadien* and the *Courier de Saint Hyacinthe*, to proclaim themselves upon principle—and not by way of concession to the wishes of a majority—advocates of Voluntaryism in religion! Is it thus that our cotemporaries interpret the system of the "double majority?"

Three things are note-worthy in the above extracts from the *Bathurst Courier*:—

1. That a large majority of the Protestant population of Upper Canada is opposed to secularisation, and to Voluntaryism.
2. That secularisation can only be carried by means of the Catholic vote; and particularly, by the vote of the Catholics of Lower Canada.
3. That it is as "Voluntaries" upon principle, or as asserters of the superior excellence of Voluntaryism in religion, that Catholics are called upon to give their votes in favor of secularisation.

Such being the relative positions of parties, by the confession of the advocates of "secularisation"—and they cannot object to our assuming the truth of their own statements—the *Canadien* and his friends, call upon the French Canadian Catholics to vote with the Protestant minority—the "miserable handful" of Upper Canada—for "secularisation." Let us, for the sake of argument, admit the propriety, and justice of this advice; but mark the result.

1. A large majority, we will suppose, of the Catholic population of Lower Canada is opposed to the abolition of tithes.
 2. That abolition can only be carried by means of the Protestant vote; and particularly, by the vote of the Protestants of Upper Canada.
- Therefore—upon the same principle as that upon which the Catholics of Lower Canada are now called upon to give their aid to a "miserable handful" of a minority, in order to force "secularisation" upon the "large majority of the Protestant population" of Upper Canada—should the Protestants of

Upper Canada, join with the minority of Lower Canada, in order to force abolition of tithes upon the large Catholic majority. Such would be the logical consequence of the *Canadien's* interpretation of the "double majority" system; we leave our cotemporary to digest it at his leisure.

We copy the following from the *Quebec Mercury*:

"DISORDERLY ASSEMBLAGE.—On Sunday evening, during the hour of divine service, a large assemblage of disorderly persons met in front of the St. Mathew's Chapel, in St. John's Street without, for the purpose, either of interrupting the discourse of the Rev. Mr. Carden, or of offering violence to his person. No disturbance took place. Mr. Carden did not preach, the pulpit being filled on the occasion by the Lord Bishop of the diocese. But some of the mob climbed up to the windows during his lordship's sermon, and groaned in disapprobation, to the hearing of several of the congregation within. The police were witnesses of this; but the patrol consisting of three men could not dare to interfere with the mob.

"Freedom of speech must be maintained; the law of the land should be vindicated against these lawless proceedings. Perfect anarchy will be the result of submission to the spirit which is now abroad. It must be resisted at once."

A similar statement appeared in the *Quebec Gazette*, coupled with a somewhat bombastic appeal to the Protestants of Quebec to right themselves; an appeal surely unnecessary, for, were the facts of the case as stated by the Protestant press, we are certain that every honest Catholic would join heart and hand to bring to justice the unmannerly ruffians who, under any pretence whatsoever, should presume to offer any interruption to the devotions of their fellow-citizens.

But from the *Canadian Colonist*, we are happy to learn that there is no foundation for the assertions of the *Gazette* and *Mercury*. It appears from the *Colonist* that the Chapel in question is a favorite spot for assignations; where ardent youths, on amorous thoughts intent, sigh impatiently during the long sermon hours for the presence of their more devout—sisters. Upon this occasion, the sermon seems to have been longer, or the swains outside, more impatient than usual; and hence a rush, or scramble, towards the door when the congregation was coming out, in order to secure possession of the much-coveted, but long-delayed prize. We copy from the *Canadian Colonist*:—

"We were somewhat astonished on reading the following paragraph in the *Gazette* of yesterday (Friday, the 22nd inst.) not having heard anything of the row or gathering spoken of by our ancient cotemporary, at St. Mathew's Chapel, where, he says, 'the errors of Popery' were discussed. We, however, immediately made enquiries, and we learn from the best authority now extant—Bobby Symes being *non est inventus*—that there was no row at all, and no unusual gathering outside the Chapel on Sunday evening. It appears that the Chapel in question is attended by a large number of young ladies, who have each a beau, and some of them two or three beaux a-piece; that these gents have less regard for the preacher's eloquence, or rather for the 'discussion of the errors of Popery,' than their 'ladies fair,' and during the service enjoy themselves in perambulating the streets with a genteel swagger and smoking a cinnamon cigar. The service being over, each gent receives his lady love at the door to take her home, always provided she is not taken possession of by some more favored suitor. It is not surprising that, where such a state of things is carried on so generally, a little scramble should occasionally take place. Our readers will easily imagine what may occur to cause a commotion, and account for what happened on Sunday evening. No one would have taken any notice of the circumstance—it being nothing unusual—but some wag has doubtless been hoaxing our cotemporary, knowing how easy it is to get him to set up a hillabulo about Popery, by telling him that the dandies with cinnamon cigars were real Papists—perhaps Jesuits in disguise. Let Mr. Ross be sent for to indict for beginning to demolish—Bobby Symes to investigate—Raiton and Geggio to swear, and Mr. Sewell to pack a Jury. But we forget: Protestants, according to the *Gazette's* paragraph, are not to apply to the Courts of Justice any more. The terrible warrior of the *Gazette* threatens a resort to violence; so let the dandified gentry look out. If a rival should happen to walk off with the lady of his affection from the door of St. Mathew's, he must only pocket the affront. No altercations will be allowed in future."

The *Quebec Gazette* has been compelled to retract its falsehood about the meditated attack from an Irish Catholic mob. "It may be," he sneaks out now—"it may be that the intentions of the crowd of persons, who collected on Sunday evening last, during the service at St. Mathew's Chapel, were not such as we anticipated." The following is the Police Report on the subject, out of which a mendacious Protestant press has endeavored to raise a fresh cause of quarrel betwixt Catholics and Protestants:

"To Ed. Gluckemeyer, Chairman of Police Committee.

"At 8 p.m., sub-constable Neilan and two men to patrol Louis and John Suburbs, upon arriving opposite the church in the English burial ground, John Street, (Suburbs) observed a crowd of people standing on the footway near the church door; halted the police near the door; soon after observed a man, who had got over the fence, looking in through one of the windows; called to him to come out of that, he had no business there; he replied he had as good a right to be there as I had; told him if he did not come out of that I should arrest him, and bring him to the police station; a man came from the crowd and took him by the arm, and brought him away; remained until the congregation came out of the church; there was neither noise, nor disturbance, nor any insult offered to any one; all were quiet; the party in the street went down John Street and through the gate; followed them as far as Fullerton's Tavern, and then returned and patrolled the suburbs until midnight; found all quiet.

"A true copy from Police Diary, as reported by sub-constable Neilan.

"R. H. RUSSELL,
 Chief of Police.

"Quebec, 19th April, 1854."

Of the Irish members of the House of Commons, no one is listened to with more respect than Mr. Lucas. The reason of this is, that the hon. member does not mince matters, makes no affecting and incredible protestations of affection to "our glorious Protestant Constitution"—and carefully eschews the whining tone in which some of his colleagues plead their cause, as if half ashamed of it, and altogether afraid of shocking the No-Popery prejudices of their "separated brethren." Mr. Lucas speaks out like a man; telling the House of Commons, and the people of England, what they may expect from their present warfare on the Catholic Church: there is no humbug about Mr. Lucas:—

He objected to this inquiry, because it was proposed in a hostile spirit, with the view of destroying conventional establishments, and of commencing a crusade against the religion of millions of subjects of the British crown. Those who undertook that crusade would, however, most certainly be disappointed; all the power of the law and of the state could not save them from defeat—(cheers)—for the Catholic millions of this country were prepared to maintain their right to religious freedom, whatever the law might say, or whatever the legislature might do—(renewed cheers.) He thought he might refer, on this point, in a voice of warning, to the hostilities upon which this country was just entering, and which required all its strength, for the contest might be protracted even beyond the expectation of those who took the most gloomy view of affairs. If parliament endeavored to make the law more stringent, and to rake up the sleeping statutes of 1829, in order to put them in force against the religious convictions of the millions of their Catholic fellow-subjects, he could only say, on behalf of the Catholics, that they accepted the challenge, and that they would not shrink from the conflict. He would assure the house, however, that they were engaged in a contest from which they could derive no honor, and from which he believed the empire would derive no benefit. They had been told that it was imprudent to resist inquiry, because aversion to inquiry showed there was something to conceal. But he would say in answer that this motion for inquiry was only one part of a concentrated system which must be met somewhere. If the committee were conceded to-day, something else would be demanded to-morrow, and to-morrow we should have to renew the contest on the same grounds, and against the same designs, though nominally against a different proposition. Resistance must be made somewhere, and it was better to begin it at the beginning.

The best speech during the late debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Chamber's motion for insulting the nuns, was by Mr. Osborne: we copy from the Report in the *Times*, as an amusing illustration of the manner in which the No-Popery agitation is "got up" and kept alive by the Rev. gentlemen of Exeter Hall. The member for Oxford had got up a "cock and a bull" story about a Miss Fitzallan, confined in a convent at Banbury against her will; in reference to this silly and malicious falsehood, Mr. Osborne said:—

"He was anxious to know something about this case from Banbury, and accordingly found that the house to which reference was made was not an enclosed house at all, but an establishment belonging to the Sisters of Mercy. I belonged to a Miss Fitzallan, whose real name was, he believed, Magan, who was out of her mind, and had passed herself off as the daughter of the noble lord behind him (great laughter), he being at the time of the presumed fathership 10 years of age. (Laughter.) She had been to France and everywhere else, and was, he believed, one of those impostors with whom this country was occasionally infested; but the house was not an enclosed house at all, and therefore this was one of those cases which he would leave, with that of Miss Fitzallan, to be settled by her reputed father. (Laughter.) These were the kind of disclosures that were made and cordially believed in this country. He could remember on the other side of the house one of the twin members for Warwickshire (a laugh) circulating a story, which frightened the whole country about a building at Edgbaston, which, on inspection, he found to contain numerous cells. (Laughter, and "Hear, hear," from Mr. Spooner.) He would give the hon. gentleman the advantage of those cells. (Laughter.) A great sensation was produced in the house, and he believed it had no small effect upon the division that was taken at the time; but it turned out that these cells were no more than cellars. (Laughter.) What he described as a cell for flagellating monks, turned out to be a ladder for hanging up mutton. (Great laughter.) The hon. gentleman was imposed on, or at least, imposed on himself. Those parts that were supposed to be oratories turned out to be nothing else than closets, and there was a large drain running across the road which the hon. gentleman mistook for a chamber of penance. (Laughter.) Such stories as these had been constantly put in circulation, and by none more than by the hon. member for North Warwickshire. (Hear, hear.) Real sectarian rancour seemed to possess some of the properties of the elephant's trunk. There was nothing too monstrous for it to grasp, and nothing too petty for it to pick up. He was surprised to see that some of these people had selected the county of Sussex for a new device. It appeared that Italians were imported, as they did organ boys, and set to furnish lectures for the instruction of the people. He would quote the bill announcing one of these lectures, which contained rather a novel piece of geography. A lecture was advertised at Hastings, and the placard was addressed to "the Friends of the Reformation." It stated that "the Rev. Joannes Victor de Theodore, D.D., formerly an Infalutus"—he always found that these people knew more about the Romish church and its titles than Roman Catholics themselves (a laugh)—well, this gentleman was "an Infalutus and archdeacon of the Romish church, who, by the Pope's order, was sent to Siberia for reading the Scriptures (great laughter); where for a year and eleven months his sufferings were very great." (Much laughter.) It was also announced that this gentleman was to appear in pontifical robes. (Renewed laughter.) Not contented, however, with this exhibition, the supporters, if not of the hon. and learned member for Hertford, at least of his principles, must need have recourse to a baron (loud laughter)—a real baron known as the Baron de Camin, who went about delivering lectures on the institution of nunneries in the Roman church, &c.