



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. I.

MONTRÉAL, FRIDAY, MAY 30, 1851.

NO. 42.

STATE OF FRENCH PARTIES—MORE HOT WATER FOR LOUIS NAPOLEON.

(From the *Weekly News*.)

The present aspect of French politics is one of singular interest. Three great parties, becoming from day to day more clearly defined, divide the field of political conflict, and struggle for the prize of political supremacy. These parties are the Republican, the Bonapartist, and the Monarchical. Let us briefly examine the present state and prospects of each. The Republicans are weak in numbers, but strong in unity; their attitude is one of opposition, and they are in possession of all that an opposition can require to render it formidable and respected with the important exception of a single leader of paramount and transcendent ability. The strength of their position consists in this, that they have the letter of the Constitution on their side, and assume the attitude of men zealous for maintaining the last expression of the nation's will as fixed by the institutional laws which formalised the Revolution of 1848. Their weakness, apart from the want of genius in their leaders, lies in the apathy or distaste of the national mind for any such system as that of organised Republicanism. Let us understand clearly an important distinction. The men of the faubourgs and the barricades, who raised the Republicans of the National—the Girondists of 1848,—to the power which they maintained from the fall of Louis Philippe in February down to the Socialist insurrection of June, and the election of Louis Bonaparte in December, are *Revolutionary*, not *Republican*. A destruction of the present order of society in order to the construction of a new, not the predominance of one theory of government over another—Socialism, in a word, not Radicalism, is that which alone can rouse the masses of the French proletaires into a second battle against a society for their suppression. When Lamartine, in February, talked down the Red Republic—still more when, in June, it died hard under the canons of Cavaignac—all effective union between the party of the Republic and the men of the Revolution, was at an end. It is more than doubtful whether the present members of the Mountain could ever appeal again, with success, to the democracy of the streets.

The events of the last few weeks have made a material change in the views even of the most sanguine amongst the politicians, who looked for a restoration of the Empire in the person of Louis Napoleon. Elected by the almost unanimous voice of France, he accepted the mission in the sense in which, doubtless, it was intended, as a call to substitute for the preceding anarchy a centre of constituted authority, and a government of constitutional order. The position thus assumed soon manifested itself as one of opposition to the Republican party, and so long as the dread of half-vanquished Socialism and the terror of another democratic earthquake prevailed over every other feeling among the leaders of the party of order, their support was given undividedly to Louis Napoleon, with whom the cause of order was, for the season, identified. Under the impulse of these motives, the conservative laws, limiting the right of universal suffrage and the liberty of the press, were passed by triumphant majorities, and Louis Napoleon was deluded into thinking himself the leader of those who meant but to employ him as their tool.

Then came in their natural course the Imperialist aspirations—the solemn progresses—the reviews of the troops, and all the long train of little incidents that betrayed the wish, without the ability, to climb from the chair of the President to the throne of the Emperor.

From that time the party of order and the party of Louis Napoleon have been gradually, but surely, loosening the connection which nothing but a common danger could have cemented, and which the overthrow of a common enemy disjoined. The Prince President served well enough as their titular chief, in days when the temper of the nation would have chafed at the very name of a Bourbon. But when the revolutionary storm was finally overblown,—when a desire for stability and ancient prestige became paramount,—when people began to desiderate the firmness of an hereditary throne, and the splendor of a regal court, the state of the question was changed, and the monarchical party arose with Changarnier as its warrior, and a mixed medley of Orleanist and Legitimist Statesmen for its counsellors. Then came the struggle between the President and his former supporters,—a struggle which issued in a drawn battle—the fall of Changarnier on the one side—the annihilation of the Baroche Ministry on the other.

After that trial of strength ensued a momentary pause, and then a fresh scene came over the shifting scene! The party by whom the Parliament triumph had been won, became disunited,—old jealousies showed themselves between Legitimists and Orleanists,—nay, the rivalries of the days of Louis Philippe

were renewed, and M. Thiers refused to act with the politicians amongst whom M. Guizot was fast regaining his former ascendancy.

Latterly all shades of monarchical opinion, and, with the exception of Mons. Thiers, the whole party of order who are not Bonapartists have amalgamated, or, as the French phrase is, "fused" themselves into a political union, of which the journal called *L'Assemblée Nationale*, under the direction of MM. Guizot, Mole, Berryer, &c., is the organ, and of which the main article of faith is—Restoration of the French Monarchy in the person of Henry V. As this last scion of the direct Bourbon line (best known to readers of the present day as the Count de Chambord) is childless and without hope of issue, his re-establishment on the Throne of France, would only postpone, not extinguish, the rights of the Comte de Paris, the infant-heir of the House of Orleans.

Such is the programme of the party who, in the name of order and the French Monarchy, are now prepared to resist the prolongation of the President's powers, the granting of which, it was some months back supposed that the whole Anti-Republican party would eagerly advocate. According to the latest reliable accounts of the temper of the French provinces, a restored Monarchy would be a more popular measure than a prolonged Presidency. *Nous verrons.*

TOLERATION IN SWEDEN.

(From the *Tablet*.)

Under this "Edict of Toleration," in the first place, the "Romanists" are described as "foreign religionists"—"professors of a foreign religion." Lord Lyndhurst, it seems, borrowed that good old household persecuting phrase of his, "aliens in religion," from the Swedish Edict of Toleration. Mr. Gordon and his Whig masters now improve upon Lord Lyndhurst, and approve the Swedish precedent. Henceforth we are to be "foreign religionists."

Well, but what becomes of these foreign religionists in Sweden? How are they treated? What is the similarity between the position of these "professors of foreign religion" and the "aliens" that should make the Swedish precedent so applicable?

First—They "may, under no condition, be appointed to any office or employ in the State, high or low." From the way in which this is set forth, we gather that Mr. Gordon and his employers consider this to be a piece of antiquated botching. The new Whig plan is far simpler, more effectual, and works with less friction. It is to give the aliens "office and employ, high and low;" not too much, indeed, but quite enough to bribe a faction of them to sell the Church—Wyses, Hugheses, Redingtons, Bellevs, and the rest.

Secondly—"That nowhere throughout the Kingdom may they," the aliens aforesaid, "establish any public schoolhouse or other seminary for the spread of their Faith." This, too, is an obsolete contrivance, though the spirit of it is ever new." The modern Whig substitute is to get hold of the alien schools, and use them as instruments to sap and destroy the Faith.

Thirdly—"That for this purpose they may neither send nor receive any Missionaries within or without the country." This is the modern style. This is the very thing at which the "Papal Aggression" outcry is sedulously directed.

The Fourth is not less decidedly Whiggish—"That no monastery shall be established, nor any Monk allowed or permitted of any sect or religion whatsoever."

The Fifth proscribes the Jews, and is so abhorrent to the Whig Cabinet that in the brief statement of the substance of the "Edict of Toleration" it is omitted altogether.

The Sixth is of undoubted Whig parentage—"Public processions and ceremonies of foreign religions"—(i.e., Cardinals' hats and other "mummuries")—must be forbidden "for the avoidance of seductive provocations to perversions and scandal among the more simple."

Then comes the penal portion of the edict which are specially selected and put forward as deserving of particular notice.

"(1.) Should any one speak disparagingly of Our belief, Our Divine service, Our Ecclesiastical relations, ceremonies, or teaching, he must be fined ten to fifty dollars silver, &c."

"(2.) He who teaches to any one his (foreign) religious doctrine, or spreads his legends, must be fined for the first offence 100 dollars silver, and for the second double."

"(3.) Any person tempting another to attend any foreign religious exercise shall also be fined 200 dollars silver. Should he still persist in so doing he shall lose his privilege of residing in the kingdom."

"The prohibition against their receiving or sending Missionaries, within or without the kingdom, must be executed with the utmost severity."

And executed it is with the utmost severity to the present day. No further back than the 5th of August, 1848, Mr. Wackerbath published in the *Tablet* the names and particulars of a case in which a poor woman was dragged through the streets by four policemen to answer for the crime of becoming a Catholic, with every prospect of having to undergo a fine of £330, and "banished to one of the many islands of granite, uninhabited and uninhabitable, where cold and hunger will soon consummate her martyrdom."

(From the *Freeman's Journal*.)

The noble enthusiasm displayed in the following letter, from the pen of Lady Arundel, in defence of the wronged and outraged nuns of England, is equalled only by the trenchant power which is manifest in every sentence. Lady Arundel has been forced from the privacy of her domestic circle into the rude strife of public political polemics by the dastardly conduct of the *gentlemen* of England; but while we can appreciate the cost at which this noble lady has entered the lists in defence of "heroic virtue," we cannot but rejoice that such a defender has been found—to put to shame the pitiful cowards who insult women, and the more *pitiful poltroons* who, being themselves *Catholic men*, the brothers and relatives of nuns, bear the insult with slavish patience, and lap the crumbs that fall from the hands of the minister who stimulates to the outrage. We know not whether more to admire the beautiful simplicity of Lady Arundel's defence of the nuns—the scathing scorn which she heaps on their calumniators—her eloquent appeal for that justice to the most pure of created beings which the law dares not deny even to the most abandoned—or the irresistible force of argument which pervades the whole letter:

LADY ARUNDEL'S DEFENCE OF THE NUNS AGAINST THE GENTLEMEN OF ENGLAND.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"SIR.—Unbecoming as it would have been, on my part, to have made the slightest attempt to stem the torrent of abuse which has been so unjustly showered on all that is dearest and most sacred to us—Catholics, I cannot allow the day to arrive on which Mr. Lacy's bill against our religious houses, will be brought before parliament, without making, at least, one effort, for the sake of the dear inmates of those abodes of peace and charity, by calling on the more generous members of the House of Commons, for protection and justice.

"To Catholic ladies, who, like myself, have sisters and relatives in convents, it is, indeed, humiliating and most painful, that in England, hitherto considered the land of liberty, we should be forced to exert our influence to save those loved ones from the grossest insults, the most unmanly attempts being now made to deprive them of a security which even the meanest woman shares have insured to them. Can it be possible, that to the members of the House of Commons heroic virtue is so hateful, that no insult is too great to offer those who dedicate themselves to its constant practice? Is divine charity so distasteful to English Protestants, that ladies, by devoting their lives to its various duties, should become objects so contemptible, that they are to be deprived, by law, of the liberty granted to the meanest of their sex, even to the most abandoned? Oh, that such a reproach on Englishmen should go forth to the world! Hatred of Catholicity is a poor plea for so cowardly, so wanton, an insult to ladies.

"Our countrymen must remember that those much abused convents are places in which nearly all the Catholic ladies have received their education, and though some few may have no relatives among the religious, yet the affection these bear their angelic teachers, is the tenderness that persons will ever feel towards those whom, from their earliest childhood they have respected and loved, for their many virtues, their enduring kindness. Little do Protestants know the feelings of joy and happiness with which a lady returns to visit a convent where she has been educated; these are ever the brightest spots in her life, even be her lot among the happiest of this world.

"To Catholics, who know by faith, the day will come when these, our spotless sisters will be fearfully avenged, and that those who now so cruelly insult and calumniate them will have to exclaim, in the language of Scripture—'We fools esteemed their life madness, and their end without honor. Behold how they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints?'—that knowledge urges us the more to raise our warning voices, and call on those who know them not to beware how they insult them.

"But if that consideration has no weight, oh let me implore those members who have sisters and daughters, to ask themselves, ere they treat with insult our sisters and daughters, what would they feel were we to do the like to them? Would they consider any language too strong for their just indignation, and are our feelings one iota less keen, because we look on those dear ones as the loved of God?

"But not to dwell at greater length, on this too painful subject, allow me, who have been entirely educated in a convent, and, through life, in habits of intimacy with numerous members of religious communities, to ask those who credit their calumniators, how is it, if any one of the many charges has the slightest foundation, that those who, like me, have the most experience, should ever be the first to place their children in these very convents? What could any one desire more, than that their daughters should be instructed by ladies of birth, and the highest education, who are actuated not by worldly gain, but by the love of God and their neighbor? And here let me incidentally remark, that if Protestants would only reflect on these motives, the prejudice regarding the apparent insignificance of the pension would at once be removed.

"The tenderness I feel for my children is, I hope, quite as strong as the warmest-hearted mother can know, yet the sacrifice of parting with a daughter for a time, I cheerfully make, rather than deprive her of that which I know will cause her to bless the parents, who deny themselves a present pleasure to insure her the lasting advantage of a convent education.

"Should these few remarks lead some of our more generous antagonists to hesitate, ere they inflict cruel injuries on those who have never given them a moment's pain, I shall be more than rewarded for what it has cost me to address them in so public a manner.

"With many apologies for trespassing so long on your courtesy, I am your obedient servant,

"TERESA ARUNDEL.

"Wardour Castle, May 3."

PENAL LEGISLATION—"WHAT WILL THE CATHOLICS DO?"

To the Editor of the *Tablet*.

Dear Sir—The account contained in the last number of the *Tablet* of the aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Dublin, shows that in Ireland there is a spirit abroad, which bears evidence to the strong and lively Faith that will not suffer its religion to be trampled upon without using every effort to maintain its rights and defeat the machinations of its enemies. If zeal for the Church of God warms into actions the Faith of Ireland, the Catholics of England should not be backward in uniting their exertions with those of the sister island to secure the independence and freedom of their religion.

Bigotry is alive, persecution threatens, and there is a sullen silence on Catholic affairs, which warns us of an approaching storm. Does it become us, then, to remain mute and motionless, as the monumental effigies of our forefathers, whilst that which is most sacred and dear to us is assailed by every species of calumny and insult?

These evil forebodings have not been unnoticed by your able and talented correspondents, Messrs. Weld and Waterton, and, as an humble individual, I beg to thank them for their firm and independent letters to the *Tablet*, wherein they express sentiments which ought to find an echo in every Catholic breast. I trust they will favor us with further development of their opinions, qualified as they are by their talents and principles, to lead us into some active and substantial mode of meeting the present emergency. Mr. Weld, in the postscript of his letter, adds—

"What will the Catholics do?" If we look to the precedents of later years, we shall find little to guide us; but if hitherto we have done nothing, either from an idea that Catholics are recreants to suffer all things in silence, or from some other motive equally wise, though known only to ourselves, it is now no longer possible to entertain such considerations. The late insulting division in the House of Parliament—the foul-mouthed slander and shocking blasphemies of Henry Drummond, backed by the Speaker of the House of Commons—the impending bill against our defenceless Nuns—forbid it. The hand of persecution is lifted against us, and until the injustice of our legislators has compelled us to recognise in them the scourge of Heaven, the honor and dignity of the Church demand that we should raise our voices, and appeal in one firm and united opposition against those acts of tyranny and injustice.

In the meantime, "What will the Catholics do?" I think we may, in the first place, congratulate ourselves that our enemies have proposed measures so mean in principle, so oppressive in detail, so disgusting in their execution, that of themselves they will enforce an unanimous opposition in the mind of every Catholic