

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The news from the Old World is devoid of all interest. No trial of strength has as yet taken place in the new Parliament, and it seems to be the general opinion that Lord Palmerston will contrive to get over the remainder of the Session peaceably.

In our Provincial Parliament the Session of '57 is rapidly drawing to a close. Members have made everything comfortable for themselves and their friends; have done all the jobs they were expected to do; and having done this, will speedily be dismissed to the enjoyment of their ill-gotten gains. The Governor General will start for England about the beginning of next month.

CRIME AND EDUCATION.—Under this caption, a late number of the London Times contains a communication from the Rev. Joseph Kingsmill, a Protestant minister of the Anglican establishment, who holds the situation of Chaplain of the Pentonville Prison; and who has therefore abundant means at his disposal for forming a correct opinion upon the long mooted question—“Does Secular Education tend to diminish crime?” The result of the reverend gentleman's experiences we give below.

That, of late years, secular education has been widely diffused amongst all classes of the community, and that in consequence “the people as a whole have advanced a stage or two in refinement and the enjoyments of intellectual life,” are facts which the Rev. Mr. Kingsmill recognises. “But,” he adds, “on the other hand it cannot be denied that there has been contemporaneously with this general improvement, and plainly from the increased power which such knowledge imparts, a growth of some most serious evils; for instance, a vast circulation of infidel and licentious publications, and an increase of such crimes as forgery, embezzlement, complicated fraud, ingenious imposture, and of tricks in trade amounting to crime, although not always punishable by law, often not a whit less heinous; in some cases, indeed, more so, as in the adulteration of food and medicine.”

The writer then proceeds to give some statistics, showing clearly—1.—that the sole effect of secular education has been to change the character of the crimes committed, but not at all to reduce the number of criminals; and 2.—that of serious crimes, the far greater portion are perpetrated by men who have enjoyed the benefits of a good secular training. “Ignorance,” he says, “marks the lowest order of crime far more than it does the highest. I have studied this aspect of the question for many years—painfully from real life—and I have no hesitation in affirming that the worst class of criminals (I do not mean the most brutal and savage, but the most injurious to society) have been men of above the average condition of mental powers, and educational advantages.” And this experience, he continues, is borne out by facts which he adduces from the criminal statistics of the empire.

The lowest class of criminals—such as petty pilferers, shop-lifters, pick-pockets, and transgressors of police regulations—are generally characterised by their ignorance; and as they invariably belong to the very poorest class of society, this is not to be wondered at—They are criminals, they resort to dishonest modes of obtaining their daily bread, not because they are ignorant, but because they are poor and starving. The offences of these poor and ignorant members of society, are, for the most part, committed, under the pressure of actual want, and of acute physical suffering; their crimes are also rarely marked with that atrocity, and deep premeditation, which are characteristic of the villainies of the educated scoundrels, who enjoy almost a monopoly of the “highest order of crime.” as the Chaplain of the Pentonville prison remarks. This is fully borne out by the following statistics:—

The average number of prisoners under summary convictions—and whose offences therefore belong to the “lowest order of crime”—with “little or no education,” is, according to the last Report of the Inspectors of Prisons, about 95 in the 100. But as we ascend in the scale of crime, as we progress from those trifling offences which are dealt with summarily—many of which from a moral point of view do not appear crimes at all, though they may imply some infraction of a police regulation—to crimes of a “higher order,” we find the proportions between the educated and the uneducated criminals greatly altered. The Rev. Mr. Kingsmill has classed the prisoners in Pentonville Jail, and he has found that:—

“The proportion of men doomed to perpetual exile, or perpetual penal servitude (in any of which had at the first received sentence of death) having little or no education, is only 4 in the 100; and of the men on the ‘double penal list,’ consisting of convicts sent back to separate confinement for further probation and punishment in consequence of outrageous conduct, and crimes of the grossest kind, the proportion falls to 26 in the 100.”

In other words, whilst the proportion of uneducated to educated criminals is, in the “lowest

order of crime,” as about 95 to 100, in the “higher orders” it is about equal—thus clearly showing that mere secular education has no crime-repressing influence; and in the “highest order” of all, or amongst the doubly-died, irreclaimable, and most hopeless villains, the educated criminals are to the uneducated nearly as 3 to 1—thus seeming to indicate that mere secular education not only does not tend to diminish crime, but that its effect is to increase and aggravate it. The conclusion which the Chaplain of Pentonville Prison draws from these facts, is:—

“That education only changes the character of crime; that it improves the intellect, but does not reform the heart.”

From out of which, as a Great Teacher of old said—“proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies.” We have therefore no hesitation in admitting with the Rev. Mr. Kingsmill, that mere secular instruction is an injury to the State, as—

“Conferring the increase of power, which should be for good, but is only for evil.”

But if we admit this, and, at the same time, admit the incompetency of the State to combine moral or religious training, with its secular education, we cannot avoid coming to the conclusion that “State-Schoolism” is not only an infraction of the rights of the individual parent, but is a serious injury to society; inasmuch as it puts arms, and arms of the most dangerous kind, into the hands of its subjects, without, at the same time, showing them how those arms should be used. In other words, the vicious educated man is a more dangerous enemy to society than is the vicious but uneducated man; because, if knowledge is power, the former has far more power, and not less inclination, to do evil, than has the other.

Will the advocates of “State-Schoolism” leave off theorising for one moment, and deal with facts! We have presented them with some most important facts; the criminal statistics of the United States will furnish them with others. If a widely extended system of secular education does in aught tend to encourage the growth of religion and morality, the people of the United States must be the most moral and religious people on the face of the earth; the most God-fearing, and the most upright in their dealings with one another, and the least addicted to superstition—to “Spirit-Rapping,” “Free-Loveism,” and Mammon-worship. Do then the facts, as revealed to us by the actual state of American society sustain the theory of the “State-Schoolists,” that secular education diminishes crime? For if they do not, then is that theory false; and the plea based thereupon in favor of “State-Schoolism” must be disallowed.

BENEDICTION OF THE CORNER STONE OF THE CHURCH OF ST. LAMBERT.—On Monday last, pursuant to notice, this pleasing ceremony took place in the presence of an immense concourse of spectators, including the Hon. M. Chauveau, M. J. Viger, a large body of our Montreal Clergy, and the most distinguished of our citizens. His Lordship Mgr. Tache, officiated, the Bishop of Montreal having been detained in town by urgent business; and it was estimated that at least 1,200 visitors were present, thanks to the excellent arrangements of the Committee of Management, who had engaged the services of the steamer *Iron Duke* for the occasion. Volunteer Company No. 4, commanded by Captain Devlin, was in attendance; as were also Companies No. 5 and 8, commanded by Captains Bartley and Belle.

At 3 P.M., the procession of the Bishop and Clergy, preceded by Capt. Devlin's Company—whose martial bearing excited general admiration—and accompanied by LeCompte's excellent band, moved forward towards the site of the new church. The religious ceremony then commenced; an eloquent discourse was pronounced by Mgr. Tache; after which the solemn Benediction was given, and the corner stone lowered into its place, while Capt. Devlin's Company fired a salute in honor of the auspicious event.

The meeting was then addressed by M. M. Chauveau, J. Viger, Esq., and Capt. Devlin; and a handsome collection, in aid of the funds of the new church was taken up on the spot; every one being zealous to contribute his mite for that purpose. An excellent collation, in the residence of M. Joseph Rousseau, one of the members of the Committee, was then done justice to; whilst at Morris's and Irving's hotels a substantial luncheon was provided for those whom there was not room at M. Rousseau; and at about half-past six the company returned to town, delighted with the glorious ceremony at which they had had the happiness of assisting, and full of admiration at the excellent arrangements of the Committee of Management, to which must be attributed the success of this beautiful festival, which will long be held in grateful recollection by the people of St. Lambert and its vicinity.

And we all—as well as our friends at St. Lambert—have reason to be thankful to Almighty God for the great and visible progress which our holy religion is making in Canada; as attested by the rapid growth of churches, and Catholic institutions, in every part of the Pro-

vince. Every where the sweet sound of the “Angelus” bell meets our ears; everywhere the eye rests with pleasure on some handsome temple wherein a pure and holy sacrifice is daily offered up; and for these blessings we should give thanks to Him, who daily and marvellously protects us from the fury of our enemies.

On Sunday last, Mgr. Tache delivered an eloquent discourse in the Parish Church, in favor of foreign missions; a handsome collection was the result. In the evening His Lordship again preached at the *Bonsecours* church, and with equal success. On the Feast of the Holy Trinity he will preach at the Cathedral; and we believe that our Irish friends will shortly have the pleasure of listening to this illustrious orator in St. Patrick's church.

On Tuesday last His Lordship, the Bishop of London, C. W., arrived in town, and took up his residence at the Episcopal Palace. His Lordship proposes making a visit to Quebec. We are happy to have it in our power to inform our readers that the health of Mgr. LaRocque, about which his friends have lately been so uneasy, is improving. His Lordship is still at St. Hyacinthe.

THE QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY.—Monday last was generally observed throughout the Province in honor of our Queen, as a gala day, and day of rejoicing. The weather—but for the dust which was awful—was beautiful and everything went off admirably. There was a general turn out, and review of the troops, and militia companies; the churches, public buildings, and shipping in the port, were gaily decorated with flags of many colors, conspicuous amongst which were the British Ensign and the Tri-color of France; and the general enthusiasm with which the day was observed must have convinced the most superficial observer that, no where in her extensive dominions, has Queen Victoria more loyal subjects than in Canada.

DOINGS AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.—Our esteemed Toronto correspondent, writing to us under this caption, will we hope, appreciate the motives which have induced us, for the present, to suppress one or two paragraphs of his interesting communication. He writes as follows:—

“Mr. Editor—I have nothing peculiarly glorious, or very exciting to relate. The Session, thus far, has been frittered away in the jobs, and self-interested schemes of Railway-men; who, to the exclusion of the spirit of religion, and every other spirit except the imp of corruption, absorb the whole time, and attention of the House. To expect from this Parliament, as do some of our verdant friends, anything but bribery and corruption, is to read the signs of the times with a most obtuse pair of spectacles. This Session, however, like the scorpion carries a sting in its tail; and in the midst of the painful feelings consequent upon its sting, even that most humble and obedient of all civic animals, an Upper Canada Catholic, may well be excused uttering a note or two of protest against present and passing measures.”

Our correspondent then enters into an examination of the causes which have hitherto rendered abortive the incessant and heroic efforts of our Bishops and Clergy to procure from the Government, a full recognition of the right of Catholics to “Freedom of Education.” Of the fact that these efforts have hitherto been barren of results, no one can doubt; of the causes of that failure, we have often expressed our opinion—assigning as the chief, the want of unity and disinterestedness on the part of the Catholic laity, and the treachery of our Ministers and Parliamentary Representatives. In our own venality, our tame subservience to “Jack-in-Office,” in our greedy “place-hunting,” and in the facility with which we allow ourselves to be bought up like a lot of old goods, must we look for the causes of our repeated failures; which would be deserving of pity had they not been too well merited by our misconduct, and backwardness in following the noble example set us by our proper leaders, our Bishops, and Clergy. Had we done our duty, as they have done theirs, we should long ago have brought the struggle to a triumphant issue. And even now, if—as a body—we were prepared to pursue a disinterested course, to rise superior to all personal considerations, and to consult only the good of religion, and the interests of morality, we might still hope for success. But we must be prepared to make sacrifices, when the cause in which we are engaged demands them; we must remember that it is impossible to serve God and Mammon; and that unless we are determined to change our entire policy, and to discard from our ranks the timid, the time-server, the “place-hunter,” and the “Government-lack,” all our efforts must end at last in a ludicrous and contemptible failure.

Our correspondent notices, and with just indignation comments upon, the “convenient” absence from the House, of many of our nominally Catholic members, when questions, deeply affecting the interests of religion, are at stake—as in the case of the discussion on the Bill for incorporating the “Sisters of Loretto.” On these occasions, which imperatively require the presence of every Catholic member in his place in the House, our correspondent truly remarks:—

“Not only are they conveniently absent, but they are, as a recent instance has demonstrated, quite capable of allowing a bad ‘Marriage Bill’ to pass to a third reading without a division.”

The Catholic Church than all the ‘Secret Societies’ in the country. By it, certain rights hitherto enjoyed by the Catholic Clergy are curtailed; and because the ‘fog-end’ of the conventicle has not the power to marry without a license, it is proposed to level down the Catholic priesthood to the same plane. . . . We care not what powers the Legislature may please to confer upon Baptists, Jumpers, Methodists, and Swaddlers of every hue; but we do object to any, the slightest, encroachments upon the rights and freedom of our own clergy. And therefore, with respect to that clause of the Bill which enjoins the latter to make certain yearly returns, and to pay ‘five shillings’ for each to the Registrar; and which inflicts a fine of ‘one pound’ per day upon any priest neglecting to comply with this arbitrary requirement, we hesitate not to pronounce it infamous. As if to enhance the insult, the same clause provides that the penalties may be inflicted by any Police Magistrate. The whole measure is, in fact, dictated by the same spirit, as that which presided over the Marriage laws of the first French Revolution; and which spirit was, thank God, successfully resisted by the Bishops of the French Church, with the Sovereign Pontiff at their head.

Yours sincerely, “CATHOLICUS.”

Agreeing in the main with our correspondent in his opinions as to the defects of Mr. Foley's Bill, we would, at the same time, acquit its author and supporters of any hostile designs against our rights as Catholics. They have a most difficult problem to solve—a problem indeed which cannot be fully solved upon Protestant principles, without an accompanying dissolution of the entire social fabric. The “family” is the basis of modern society, as the sanctity of Christian marriage is the basis of the “family.” The difference betwixt modern Christian, and ancient heathen, society, is the result of the difference betwixt marriage as a sacred and religious contract ordained of God Himself, and of which all the conditions are by Him prescribed—and marriage, as a mere “civil contract,” the terms of which are prescribed by the State. Now it is, we think, evident that the object of Mr. Foley's Bill is to recognise in marriage something more than a mere “civil contract;” to admit, in fact, the divine, or religious element in the sexual unions of our heterogeneous community; and is therefore so far laudable. It is defective—as we endeavored to show in our last—in that it does not clearly define who is, and what constitutes, a Minister of a Religious Denomination recognised by the State. But this defect is inseparable from all Protestant legislation upon marriage, and is the necessary consequence of the rejection of the authority of the One Catholic Church. It is also a defect which it is more easy to note than to remedy; and therefore, though fully alive to the defects of Mr. Foley's Bill, we are prepared to give it a fair trial, accepting it as an attempt at a compromise betwixt two irreconcilable principles; for, with all its faults, it is better than a Bill for reducing marriage to a mere “civil contract.”

During the debate in the Legislative Assembly upon the “Sisters of Loretto” Incorporation Bill it was urged as a reason for restricting their right to hold real estate, that, a Religious Community of Ursulines at Three Rivers were owners of about one fourth of the land in the centre of the town, to the great detriment of the place, as in consequence, necessary public improvements could not be carried out. The *Bre Nouvelle*, a French Canadian paper, satisfactorily disposes of this impudent and groundless assertion. We translate from our cotemporary:—

“What establishes the falsity of this allegation is, that hardly a year ago, some citizens having formed the project of constructing a new street from the St. Maurice to the prison, to run across the land of the Ursulines, had but to ask the consent of those Ladies. Having cheerfully yielded to the wishes of their fellow-citizens who had this project at heart, they agreed to grant gratuitously the land required for the new street, and a sum of £40 in addition for fencing, so as to have the advantage of conceding and leasing the lots on both sides of the street. Besides they were willing to open themselves one or other of the streets, a little in rear of, and parallel to the first, in case the former had succeeded. The project failed, because the City Council did not deem fit to burden itself with the purchase of a house which it was necessary to remove in order to carry out the projected improvement.”

“We beg all journalists who are friendly to truth to correct the error. It is with this object that we do so especially for the sake of justice, so as to repair the injury caused by the somewhat too free tongue of a member of Parliament to a Religious Community, towards which the City of Three Rivers is under great obligations.”

The *New York Freeman* notices in his last, the iniquitous treatment which Catholics in Canada receive from the hands of the Legislature; but we would warn our respected Catholic cotemporary against the error into which too many of his fellow-countrymen are apt to fall, of supposing that the injustice to which we are occasionally exposed is the result of our British connection, or would be remedied by any further assimilation of our institutions to those of the United States. So far from this being the case, our grievances, as Catholics, proceed from this, that Canada is too much Yankeeified already; and would be aggravated immensely by any closer connection of this country with the neighbouring Republic.

For, if the *N. Y. Freeman* will take the trouble of looking into our Catholic grievances and their causes, he will see at once that they do not proceed from the presence, or any preponderance, of the monarchical element in our political institutions; but on the contrary, are the direct result of the almost unlimited power of the democratic or anti-monarchical element. Our cotemporary will therefore perhaps under-

stand why it is that the True Witness, whilst fully admitting and admiring, the many excellencies of the United States political system—which after all is, to a considerable extent a transcript of the old English constitution of Catholic times—and its skilful adaptation to the wants and social necessities of his fellow-countrymen, has no desire to see it adopted in Canada; because the consequence of that adoption would be but to put additional power into the hands of the Protestant democracy—our worst enemies. Whatever it may have been at other times and in other lands, here in Canada, the Crown or monarchical element in our constitution, is, humanly speaking, the sole barrier against the inroads of democratic despotism; and therefore is it, that every true hearted Catholic in Canada can, with a good conscience, join cordially in the cry “God Save the Queen,” *Domine salvam fac Reginam.*

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.—The sentence pronounced by the Council of State, declaring His Lordship the Bishop of Moulins guilty of “abus,” is creating much stir in France, amongst all classes of society; and is not calculated to augment the popularity, or to contribute towards the stability of the present government, which manifests a disposition to walk in the foot steps of its tyrannical and infidel predecessors.

The Bishop of Moulins, it must be remembered, exposed himself to the wrath of the civil power, by requiring from every priest whom he appointed to a parish, a promise not to appeal to the State against his Bishop, should the latter deem it advisable to remove him. This act was no doubt an infringement of the old despotic laws, beneath which the Church groaned in the evil days of the Bourbon and Orleans dynasties; but at the same time it was but an assertion of the inherent and indefeasible rights of the Catholic Church and her Prelates; and one therefore which, upon the principle that it is better to obey God, than man, the Bishop of Moulins was fully justified in making. In numerous synods, held since 1848, the ignominious shackles which the civil power had long attempted to impose upon the Church had been indignantly spurned, and resolutions were come to, to put a stop to appeals to the civil tribunals against the acts of the spiritual authorities. In consequence of these resolutions, the Bishops now require of every Priest, when appointing him to any ecclesiastical function, an engagement binding himself not to avail himself of the civil law authorising such appeals; and it is this which provoked the late attack against the illustrious Bishop of Moulins.

The decision of the Council of State has however but confirmed the determination of the Prelates of the Church in France to stand by their rights, and to resist the encroachments of the civil power upon the domain of the spiritual. No less than twenty Bishops, as we learn from the correspondent of the *Weekly Register*, have sent in their protests against the condemnation of the Bishop of Moulins, and manifested their intention to persevere in the course condemned by the Council of State. “Some indeed” adds our informant, “have held very strong language upon the subject; and the Emperor is said to regret already the conduct of his government upon this occasion. It is evident, should the latter presume to take any bolder measures to enslave the Church, it will find in the Clergy of all ranks no tools to serve a despotic line of policy. Indeed, one may consider this late affair as a providential event, intended to put the French Church upon her guard; and she seems already disposed to take advantage of the opportunity.”—Amen—must be the response of every lover of religious liberty.

HIGH CHURCHISM.—The High Churchmen, encouraged by the late legal decisions, seem inclined to try how far they will be permitted to play at Popery within the Parliament Church. They have introduced the use of the chasuble in their celebration of, what they call, the “Holy Sacrifice;” and the *Union* newspaper, their organ, complains of the number of communicants upon a late occasion; as, from the lateness of the hour it was more than probable that most of them had “broken their fast.” We wonder what poor Dr. Sumner, and his master, Lord Palmerston will say to this.

The Parliament Church seems to be getting into very bad odor amongst all classes at home; and even the *London Times* denounces it, as, as corrupt as any of the swindling Banks whose astounding financial tricks have lately been revealed to a deluded public. “Our Banks are bad enough” says the *Times*—“but there is still more rottenness in the State of Denmark. Our clergy cheat one another, and cheat the law of the land, and Bishops are standing by, and coniving at these gross frauds.” The *Times* then calls on Convocation to interfere; and if possible, to “put its stigma on clerical rapacity, and stamp this wretched exhibition of Rector cheating Curate, with ignominy.” It is amusing to witness how these Protestants—not “love,” but—blackguard one another.