

REMITTANCES TO

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacrament Street.
Montreal, March 1853.

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, JUNE 3, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On the 9th ult., the Royal assent was given to the Canada "Clergy Reserves" Bill. Fresh exposures have been made, in the House of Commons, of the artifices, and cajolery, employed upon the Irish members, and which, to the regret of every well-wisher to Ireland, have effectually succeeded in breaking up the Irish Parliamentary party, which, with so much trouble, and at so much sacrifice, was formed at the last election. The treachery, to call it by the mildest term, of Keogh, Sandler, and others,—their infamous violation, of the most solemn pledges, oaths even—of oaths voluntarily taken, in the holy name of God, and before the face of the people—have proved more fatal to the cause of Ireland, than all that the utmost malice of Ireland's hereditary enemies could have inflicted. Ireland is now, thanks to the treachery of the men in whom she trusted, and whom she delighted to honor, without weight or influence in the Legislature; without hopes of redress for her thousand wrongs; whilst every paltry Jack-an-apes may, unrebuked, lift up his voice against her. Her representatives, many of them at least, have been bought and sold, body and soul; they are but the tools, the chattels of the government, who claim, and enforce, the right of doing what they will with their own.—Had an enemy done this, there might have been comfort, there might yet have been hope for Ireland; but alas! it is her own sons, her own familiar friends, that have betrayed her, and left her naked to her enemies. Not only has the venality of the Irish members proved fatal to the national interests of Ireland, but it has encouraged the enemies of Catholicity, throughout Great Britain, to renew with more virulence than ever, their unholy warfare against the Church. Of this the debates in both Houses of Parliament, during the past week, afford us melancholy proof. It may be doubtful whether these fresh attacks of the enemies of our holy religion will succeed; but it is certain that, if the general opinion had not been that, as a party, as a power in the Legislature, the Irish Brigade, or Catholic vote, might safely be treated with contempt, these attacks would never have been made. We allude especially to the Bill introduced by a Mr. Chambers, on the 10th ult., for subjecting, to the indecent inspection of government officials, the tranquil abodes of Catholic ladies, whose only offence is that, retiring from the world, they have devoted themselves to chastity and charity, to the worship of God, and the service of their fellow-creatures.

This new outbreak of Protestant brutality, and bigotry, commenced in the House of Lords, where, on the 9th ult., the Earl of Shaftesbury presented a petition praying for the inspection of nunneries. This called up Dr. Whateley, who supported the prayer of the petition, like a good Protestant who, when meditating some act of superlative meanness and rascality, invariably launches out into a little self-glorification, and always prefaces an attack upon the rights of others, by a long panegyric upon freedom. Thus he commenced by professing a tender respect for the "religious and civil liberties" of his fellow-countrymen; but thought that the best way of proving the truth of his professions, in general, was by shewing their falsity, in particular. By way of excusing this singular conduct, he related a series of anecdotes about nuns, and nunneries—carefully abstaining, however, from giving names, dates, or localities—all intended to illustrate the horrors of conventual discipline.

"He would mention a case," said this honorable gentleman, "which came within his own knowledge. A boy, in the service of a certain institution in Dublin"—mark he did not say *what* institution—"was in the habit of visiting his parents; but ceasing to do so, they made enquiries, and finding they could obtain no satisfactory information from the institution, they became alarmed, and applied to the Police, who ascertained that the boy was confined in one of the Roman Catholic establishments mentioned in the petition.—The boy was at length produced, and his appearance was enough to curdle the blood with horror. He had been apparently dreadfully punished—though only a trifling punishment was said to have been inflicted—and incarcerated. The incarceration had been resorted to, as asserted, merely to give time for the wounds to cure."

Upon the strength of this anecdote—between which and the *Montreal Witness'* legend of the runaway Jesuit, there is a striking family resemblance—Dr. Whateley supported, and called upon his hearers to support, the prayer of the petition; and from the complacency with which it was listened to, we have no doubt that it had the desired effect. Still we have no hesitation in pronouncing the legend to be a ma-

licious lie, and the right reverend Protestant prelate who circulated it a malicious liar. The story bears "falsehood" imprinted upon its very front. Were it true, Dr. Whateley would have given, the names, of the boy, and of the Roman Catholic institution, where it occurred. Had such an event occurred, the matter would have been brought before the Police authorities of Dublin—had such an event occurred "with-in his own knowledge," as Dr. Whateley averred, he would himself have given information to the Police; nor would he have allowed the matter to rest so long in silence. This view of the case was taken, as we shall see, by more than one of the speakers in the House of Commons, who pretty plainly taxed the government prelate with falsehood, and with bearing false witness against his neighbor.

On the 10th ult., Mr. Chambers moved, in the House of Commons, for leave to bring in a Bill, for the inspection of nunneries. In his speech, the mover did not so much as attempt to make out any case against these establishments, or to assign any reason why, the sanctity of the domicile should be so extraordinarily violated. "An impression prevailed," he said, "that certain persons in these institutions were subject to coercion"—and upon the strength of "an impression,"—an impression unsupported by a single well authenticated case—the Legislature are asked to set at naught the great constitutional axiom, that an Englishman's house is his castle, and to destroy the surest guarantee for personal liberty. If supported by the State, the State would indeed have the right—it would in certain cases be its duty—to exercise a surveillance over the management of institutions, by it supported. But a convent which receives nothing from the public funds; is as much a private house, and should be, at least, as sacred from intrusion, as the private dwelling house of any gentleman or lady in the land. Mr. Berkeley, the same who won for himself a deal of unenviable notoriety about two years ago, in the Miss Talbot case, seconded the motion.—"Ladies having taken the veil were precluded from seeing their friends, unless in the presence of the Lady Abbess; this had happened to him, and he had been refused an interview with one of his nearest and dearest friends."

This insolent allusion to Miss Talbot, now married to Lord E. Howard, was not allowed to go unchastised by her husband. The young lady, when at the convent, had indeed, with a proper respect for herself, her birth, and situation in society; declined a profligate interview with Mr. Berkeley—a staunch Protestant no doubt—but a person with whom, no lady, especially a young, unmarried and modest lady, would feel inclined to hold any intercourse whatever.

"Lord E. Howard rose and said, that he felt indignant and disgusted that such a person as Mr. Berkeley should presume to speak of Lady Howard in the impertinent familiar manner that he had done. That the lady, now his wife, had ever been detained for one moment, in a convent, against her will, was false—(hear, hear)—and in stating that she had been so detained, Mr. Berkeley had stated what was not true; and certainly he (Lord E. Howard) was by no means a bad authority. So far from having been detained against her will, Lady Howard often expressed herself with gratification at the joy and comfort she had enjoyed whilst in the convent alluded to. It was disgraceful that he should thus be compelled to have the private affairs of his family dragged before the public, in order to refute these false accusations. That the lady whose name has been thus unjustifiably brought forward did, when in the convent, decline to see Mr. Berkeley, is true—and I can assure him"—added sarcastically his Lordship—"that she has not any wish to see him now."

We hope Mr. Berkeley may take the hint, and not again seek to obtrude himself upon the society of ladies, for which, whatever he may be for the society of Exeter Hall, he is, in every respect, eminently unqualified. Mr. Bowyer next analysed Dr. Whateley's pretty little No-Popery legend in the House of Lords, about the "boy," and asked, pertinently enough—"Why, if the story were true, no legal proceedings had been taken? The absence of any such proceedings satisfactorily disposed of the case?"—continued Mr. Bowyer—an opinion in which the House seemed to acquiesce. Lord John Russell also spoke at length against Mr. Chamber's motion, but languidly—as one who was fully convinced of its injustice, and of the falsity of the allegations upon which its supporters relied; but still as the writer of the Durham letter, and the framer of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. He argued:—

"That there ought to be strong grounds for passing such a Bill, in a country which boasts of its personal liberty. When we come to the intelligible evil—the evil of persons being confined in convents against their will—which the hon. mover has suggested to the House—without giving any particulars—without any of those cross-examinations without which cases of this kind are little worth—we have no evidence whatever; and yet I think this House ought to require proofs before they legislate upon the subject. The hon. member for Cheltenham (Mr. Berkeley,) complains that he was not allowed to see a young lady, except in the presence of a third person. This affords no grounds for legislation, for the same thing might have occurred if the young lady in question had been living under the charge of a Protestant aunt, or any other friend; the case was entirely of a private and domestic nature. The restraints upon females in a convent were not physical but moral: they were detained, not by bars and bolts, but by their oaths; the only thing which could prevent this kind of coercion, would be a law prohibiting convents altogether. But, Sir, there is a further reason, and it seems to be unanswerable, why we should not come to the conclusion to which the hon. gentleman asks us to come. The hon. gentleman says: 'That the ladies are confined by force—that their personal liberty is denied them—and that the whole power of the British parliament is required in order to set them free from the bonds by which they are detained.' Now, if it is true that we live in a free country, don't tell me that the Roman Catholic gentry of Great Britain and Ireland are utterly dead to those feelings of political freedom which animate the subjects of this kingdom in general (hear hear). Don't

tell me, above all, that they are so destitute of the common affections of humanity that they would willingly see the laws of freedom set at naught, and the doctrines of slavery acted on, towards their nearest relations, and that they have not the heart to stand up in this house and denounce that tyranny, and ask our assistance to shake off their fetters (hear hear). I cannot believe that, if the evil referred to had existed to any extent, the Roman Catholic gentlemen of this country would not themselves have come to this house and asked us to pass a law in order to establish the freedom of their own near relations (hear, hear.) For these reasons I should be sorry to consent to a bill on this subject; but is that all the objection? Does the objection end with that statement? No; I think the objection goes a great deal further than this. It is not only that the persons of the Roman Catholic persuasion do not come and ask us to interfere on behalf of their female relatives, said to be detained in prison; but it is evident that they would feel it a serious injury, and somewhat of an insult, if we were to attempt the passing of such a law (hear, hear). If we are to have any law on the subject—if any remedy is required, let it be a remedy that will apply to the whole nation (hear, hear). Let the Habeas Corpus Act be made more complete—let there be fitter means for all persons, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, who are confined against their will, obtaining the interposition of a court of justice; but such is not the remedy which this bill proposes. When such a remedy is proposed it will be time enough for the House of Commons to consider its necessity. But it is proposed that application should be made to the executive government of the country—that the authority of the Secretary of State should be interposed, and that he should be asked to send down, to those houses containing nuns, an inspector, armed with the power of investigation, if required. Well, I say that a remedy like this, differing from the ordinary laws of the land, and put in force by a Secretary of State, who may be called upon by the house to interfere in any case which may be got up by a popular gust of passion in the country—such Secretary of State belonging to a party, who may possibly be favorable to Roman Catholics, but who, on the other hand, may possibly be hostile to them,—I say, that such a power could hardly be used without exciting feelings of great indignation on the part of Roman Catholics that their religious institutions were unduly interfered with, and that, not for any purpose of public policy, still far less for any purpose of public necessity (hear, hear). You have heard some symptoms of those feelings in the declaration made by the two hon. members to night, that if such inspection were authorized by parliament, those who belonged to those institutions would immediately quit, both this country and Ireland, and would establish themselves in other countries where they would not be liable to that inspection. I cannot conceive such an event happening—I cannot conceive the sisters and near relations of the Roman Catholic gentry of these two countries leaving this country without exciting the strongest feelings of resentment on the part of the gentry and middle orders, both of this country, and of Ireland (hear, hear). And I cannot conceive that those who have conducted the education—those who have attended the hospitals and institutions for the sick—all at once going out as exiles from this country, without producing in the minds of the lower classes, who have received the benefit of their ministrations, the strongest feeling that they are suffering a grievance from the parliament of this country (hear, hear). Sir, I believe that our interference on this subject is likely to produce bad effects. I can see no sufficient reason for saying that the general law of this country is not ample for the protection of the personal liberty of all the subjects of this country. I see no reason to think so ill of our Catholic fellow-countrymen as to believe that they would behold, without complaint, their near relations immured against their will, or confined in contravention of the law, and to the destruction of their health and comfort (hear, hear). So feeling, Sir, upon this subject, having had before in this house a bill upon this subject, seeing no likelihood that the present bill will be at all more satisfactory to me than the one against which I voted two years ago, I must refuse my assent to the introduction of this bill (cheers from the Irish members).

Mr. Drummond thought that legislation would be utterly inefficacious. He could not go the length that some gentleman did in blaming the Sisters of Charity, for he had seen the good they had done. Besides, they had laws against monasteries and Jesuits, and yet there they were, Jesuits and Monks, increasing every hour, and laughing in their faces. By what means could they insure the efficiency of this new law?"

Sir R. Inglis, Mr. Newdegate, and Sir John Tyrell, supported the motion, which was opposed by Messrs. Lucas, Whiteside, and Fagan. Upon a division, the majority in favor of Mr. Chamber's motion was 23—the numbers being 138 to 115.

From an analysis of the votes, it is evident that the government is not sincere in its opposition to this iniquitous measure. Members of the government, and the leaders of the ministerial party, are free to speak and vote against it, but we may be certain that they will make no very strenuous effort to defeat it, and thereby run the risk of losing the votes of the Exeter Hall party, upon other questions. The whippers in, if judiciously employed, could, on Tuesday night, have ensured a majority against the motion; and that they were not so employed is but a proof of the bad faith of ministers, and of the little regard they entertain for the hostility of the Catholic members for Ireland. If the latter had remained united, and faithful to the policy agreed upon last autumn, Mr. Chamber's motion would never have been allowed to pass; we doubt if it would ever have been introduced.

The member for Westmeath has named Messrs. M. O'Connell, French and Hayter, as the persons who bargained, or pretended to bargain, with the Irish Brigade, that, if they would unite for the ejection of the Derby ministry, the Income Tax should not be imposed upon Ireland. The above named gentlemen have not denied the charge; only Mr. Hayter professes to have spoken unofficially. The scene in the House of Commons to which these disclosures gave rise, is described as having been most violent. The debate upon the items of the Budget still continues, but now that the Income Tax question is settled, excites no very lively interest.

Scandal mongers have been abundantly supplied

with their favorite dish lately. A Rev. Mr. Gordon, a notorious Protestant preacher, having been detected in a most scandalous affair, of which an account appeared in this paper last week, has absconded, after the delivery of a most touching and edifying discourse from his pulpit. A fellow named Wilson has been committed for attempting to extort money from Mr. Gladstone, by means of indecent threats.

The event of the week in Ireland has been the Inauguration of the Great Exhibition. This came off on Thursday, the 12th ult. with great eclat, the ceremony having been performed by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant. It had been rumored that Dr. Whateley, in his character of Government archbishop, was to have officiated, but this project, if ever seriously entertained, was prudently abandoned; there was plenty of music and good singing, but no Protestant preaching or praying. Mr. Benson, the architect, underwent knighthood at the hands of His Excellency; Mr. Dargan refused to submit to a similar infliction.

France continues quiet; but the No-Popery agitation in Holland still rages as hot as ever. From the correspondence betwixt the Dutch, and Papal, Ministers, now published, it is evident that the King had long ago been informed of, and had then offered no opposition to, the projected re-establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy. In one note, the Minister of Foreign Affairs is anxious to assure the Court of Rome "that no opposition will be shown, on their part, to the Catholic Church in the Low Countries, being freely organized by the Holy Sec." The conduct of the King in now turning round upon this same Court of Rome is inexplicable; there have been deceit and bad faith it is true, but upon his part, and practised against Catholics. Yet neither these, nor the more active persecutions which are menaced, will be able to undo what has been done. Every blatant fellow from Dutch Protestantism is but another tribute to the completeness of the victory of Popery; Protestants would not sing out so, if they were not hurt, and badly hurt.

By the *Arabia*, we have news up to the 21st ult. The political intelligence is of little importance. On the motion of Mr. Spooner, the sum of £1,235, for repairs at Maynooth, was refused; and immediately after, £2,750, for the Protestant Theological Professors at Belfast, was accorded. This is how Protestants show their regard for "Religious Equality." His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, as Delegate of the Holy See, had convoked a Synod of the Bishops and Clergy of the Province of Leinster, to be opened on the Feast of Corpus Christi. We regret to have to record the death of the Very Rev. P. Roothan, General of the Society of Jesus, who expired at Rome on the 8th ult. It is again asserted that the Pope is about to visit Paris.

CORPUS CHRISTI.

On Sunday last, the Feast of Corpus Christi, was celebrated with all that pomp and magnificence which the Catholic Church delights to put forth, and which she so well knows how to employ on her solemn festivals. Immediately after High Mass, the Procession in honor of the Blessed Sacrament commenced forming in front of the Parish Church. The Parochial banner was followed by the congregation of St. Patrick's Church, arrayed in the insignia of their Temperance, and other religious, Societies. Then came the members of the different confraternities, the ladies of the religious communities, attended by their pupils—the orphan children, under the charge of the Sisters of Charity;—then the students of the Montreal, and St. Mary's, Colleges. The Clergy came next; and behind them appeared the magnificent Dais, beneath which walked His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, assisted by the Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, bearing in his hands the Blessed Sacrament, before which, arose clouds of incense, whilst groups of little children, clad in white, and crowned with garlands, strewed the way with flowers; and the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying:—"Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest."—*St. Matt. xxi. 9.*

The Procession passed along Notre Dame street, stopping at the Congregational Nunnery, where the good Sisters had prepared a beautiful temporary chapel for the occasion; it then proceeded to the Church of Bonsecours, and from thence returned along St. Paul Street to the Hotel Dieu; and so back to the Parish Church, which it entered amidst the triumphant pealing of the bells, and songs of praise.

The weather was, as it almost invariably is upon these occasions, all that could have been desired.—The late rains had layed the dust, and the rays of the sun were tempered by a moderate breeze. Not the slightest disturbance of any kind occurred.—Though thousands and thousands thronged the streets, not an obstruction was offered—not the slightest disrespect was shown—by any of this immense concourse of people of all religious denominations; a fact which was observed, and, no doubt, appreciated, by the Catholic portion of the community. Let us hope that nothing may occur to interrupt the good feeling which at present exists, and that honest men of all persuasions will unite in frowning down all attempts to interfere, by violence, with the free exercise of religious worship.

We learn from *Le Canadien* that the *Fête Dieu* was solemnised with unusual splendor at Quebec. Rain fell in the early part of the day, but towards noon the weather became propitious. Our cotemporary remarks with pleasure, as a proof of the harmony which prevails amongst the various religious denominations, that the houses of the Protestant residents were tastefully decorated in honor of the occasion.

We have been asked—"What means this pageant? Cannot God be acceptably worshipped without all this parade? Cannot Catholics confine themselves to