

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

We request our subscribers to remit, without delay, the amount of subscription, addressed—Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE; who will give receipts for the same.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On Monday, the 9th ult., Lord John Russell introduced his long-talked of amendment to the Reform Bill, the principal features of which are, that it proposes considerably to extend the suffrage, by giving the right of voting to £5 householders in the boroughs, and to persons paying an annual rent of £20 in the counties; it proposes also to give the right of voting to all persons who pay taxes to the amount of 40s per annum; boroughs are not to have less than 500 electors, and for that purpose, neighboring towns are to be united in one general representation. The property qualification for members is to be done away with, and the oaths administered, previous to members taking their seats, are to be modified, so as to admit Jews to send their representatives to Parliament. The new Reform Bill is to effect a great change in the mode of conducting the enquiry into cases of alleged corruption, and contested elections; it proposes that, upon an address of the House, based upon any reason, the report of an election, or of a select committee, it shall be lawful for the crown to appoint a commission, which shall resort to the borough, where corruption is stated to have occurred, and to pursue the same system of enquiry as that which had been adopted, with such great success, at St. Albans; by this means it was expected that it would be practicable to procure evidence, sufficient in most cases, to authorise the house to proceed to the disfranchisement of the guilty borough. The Bill makes a provision for diminishing the number of fictitious votes in Scotland, where it is likewise proposed to reduce the franchise qualification from £10 to £5. In Ireland, for which there is a separate Bill, the counties are to be left as they were, but in the boroughs, it is intended that the qualification shall be altered from £8 to £5, which will have the effect of greatly augmenting the number of electors. Members of government are no longer to be compelled to vacate their seats, upon merely changing office. Such are the principal features of the measure which Lord John laid before the house, and which was objected to, as insufficient, by Mr. Hume, because of the omission of all allusion to the vote by ballot, an omission that Mr. Berkeley announced his intention of rectifying, if possible, by an amendment, during the progress of the Bill through the house.

Sir H. Inglis objected to the continual tinkering of the constitution, and objected particularly to the clause which opened the door of the House to Jews. Mr. Roche urged the necessity of a thorough reform in the electoral system of Ireland.

After some remarks from other members, leave was given to bring in the Bill, the second reading of which was fixed for Friday, the 27th ult.

In the House of Lords, on the 10th ult., Lord Roden drew the attention of the house to the state of the disturbed districts in Ireland. As an instance of the insecurity of life in that country, his Lordship mentioned a fact that had come to his knowledge:—Nine gentlemen, out hunting, were seen standing together, by the side of the cover, and seven out of the nine had pistols in their pockets. Another noble Lord asserted that the Tenant League meetings were at the root of the evil, and that it was the duty of government to keep a strict watch over them, and check their proceedings. On the same evening, in the House of Commons, Mr. Sharman Crawford obtained leave to bring in a bill "for the better securing and regulating the custom of tenant right, as practised in the Province of Ulster—to secure compensation to improving tenants, and to limit the power of eviction in certain cases." Sir George Grey, and Lord John Russell plainly intimated their intention to oppose the measure in its subsequent stages, and there is not the slightest possibility of its passing through the House of Commons. Irish tenants must, in the mean time, learn to die in patience. The London correspondent of the *Tablet* has the following notice of the debate:—

"The tone and temper of the house last night, on the introduction of the tenant right question, was extremely disheartening, and left little hope of any practical result from it, except, indeed, exhibiting another evidence of the radical unreadiness or unwillingness of Protestant legislators to legislate for Catholic Ireland. Mr. Crawford, of course, was allowed to speak, and some show of respect was exhibited, as, indeed, could scarcely be otherwise, seeing the sterling honesty of his character. But how little he was listened to by the majority is sufficiently shown by the tone of the discussion, and by the careless observation of Sir G. Grey, that he had not heard a sentence of the speech, which is curious, as the reporters in the gallery, much farther off, contrived to hear a good deal. None are so deaf as those who will not hear; and it is inconvenient to hear what it is not intended to answer. Certainly no one sought to answer the arguments of the mover of the measure; but it was met by all sorts of excuses for "shutting it off," as Mr. Keogh expressed it; a fate which it is pretty plain awaits it. Mr. Crawford's speech was disregarded, and Mr. Keogh's cavilled at; Mr. Sadleir was misconstrued and Mr. Moore misre-

presented. Mr. Bright sneered at, and Mr. Grattan laughed at, even when he told the house the shocking fact, that you might in some parts of Ireland go sixteen miles without seeing, not only man, woman, or child, but horse, cow, or pig. Very laughable, truly. It is true that Mr. Grattan's action is not classical, nor his gesticulation graceful; but he spoke *sad truths*. Such, however, was the fate which all encountered who defended the measure. Mr. Bright's good sense only elicited scoffs, and Mr. Keogh's clever speech was set aside as a party attack, simply because it showed up too strongly the gross insincerity and inconsistency of the Prime Minister's speeches and conduct, an *exposé* under which Lord John *winned*. There was one speech, indeed, so short, so striking, and so sensible, and so strong, that it could neither be laughed at, sneered at, scorned, or set aside; and it made such an impression by a simple, straightforward, earnest way of stating the case, that I who have been some seventeen years in the habit of listening to the debates, heartily desire that Irish members *always* spoke so. This was the speech of Mr. Moore, in which the following passage, summing up the whole history of the question, made a more powerful impression, perhaps, than anything said on the subject:—

"About 200 hundred years ago the English people drove the whole Catholic population of Ireland from every part of the country to the province of Connaught, giving them the alternative of Hell, which they did not, of course, choose to accept. Since that time the population have, by the sweat of their brow, and the labor of their hands, reclaimed a howling wilderness into fertile land, and year after year, the landlords pounced down and grasped the property the tenant had made, and had driven him generation after generation into the wilderness again, to dig and to drain, to sweat and to toil. Is not that a *moral wrong*? And will you, then, leave it a legal wrong?"

Delivered in Mr. Moore's nervous, masculine manner, this passage had an evident effect. But no arguments nor eloquence could influence an audience hostile, or yet worse, *indifferent*. The ministers had actually the impudence to avow that they only allowed the introduction of the bill just to let it be "shuffled out" again, Lord John observing with official insolence that he really did not think "any good" could result from the measure, and indicating that he did not mean to try to produce any other, although previous ministries and his own have, as Mr. Roche reminded him on a former night, admitted the necessity for some such measure by introducing similar ones themselves! That is to say, he will neither do what he admits to be necessary for the good of Ireland himself, nor allow others to do it. And then, with official hypocrisy, he alleged that the bill would not cure all the evils of Ireland, as if any one said it would, or as if that were any reason why it should not cure some, perhaps the principal. The Home Secretary was not content with this, but, with a *truculence* almost worthy of an Orangeman, spoke of the "strong arm of the law." That is, the Whigs excite the expectations of the people by proposing measures for their benefit: encourage them to violence by inflammatory speeches when in *opposition*; and when in *office* withdraw the measures, leave the grievances of the people unredressed, and threaten them with coercion!

"The tone of the government evidently excited considerable indignation among the Irish members, who certainly administered some merited chastisement. But what care the Ministers for that? And what good will it do Ireland?"

"While Sir George Grey was speaking in this coercive spirit in the Commons, the Earl of Roden—an opponent of the people, if not more ferocious, more sincere—was in the Lords appealing for coercive measures; and was so pleased and satisfied with the assurance he received, that he withdrew his measure or motion. So it is come to this; coalition between Whigs and the Orangemen; and the basis *coercion*. And this is the substitute for tenant right; this the answer to outcries for redress; this the remedy for wrongs the *government* admit to exist, and scornfully refuse to remove! The people of Ireland ask bread, and are coldly refused, but are given a stone, or something as bad, cold iron."

In France, the most exciting event has been the installation of M. de Montalembert at the French Academy, in the chair of M. Doz. M. Guizot replied to the address of M. de Montalembert in a brilliant speech.

Several of the Bishops, amongst whom are mentioned the Archbishop of Paris, and the Bishop of Orleans and Rennes, have renounced, on the part of their poor Clergy, all share in the plunder of the Orleans family. With the army also, the decree of confiscation, although assigning to them a large share in the spoils, is exceedingly unpopular.

The attempt on the life of the Queen of Spain, seems to have been attended with more serious consequences than were at first made public, and so little reliance can be placed on the *bulletins* issued by her medical attendants, that it is hard to say if she be at the present moment out of danger. Telegraphic despatch announced the convalescence of the Queen on the 8th ult. The assassin was an ecclesiastic, an ex-friar of the Franciscan order, 63 years of age; no motives can be assigned for his conduct—the wretched man was executed on the 7th ult.

There is no additional intelligence from the seat of war at the Cape. It is rumored that Lord Normanby is to succeed Lord Dalhousie as Governor General of India.

Great excitement prevails in New York, upon the subject of the Maine Liquor Bill, the provisions of which, it is proposed, should be extended to the Empire State; the general opinion seems to be, that the Law will not be allowed to pass, and if passed, that it most certainly will be inoperative. The New York correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette*, has the following remarks, the justice of which the warmest friends of Temperance must admit:—

"I may as well assure you at once, that the Maine Liquor Law cannot pass in this State. The whole city is in a state of excitement about it, and its framers are only a few reformed inebriates, who, as is generally the case, have become fanatical on the subject, and a few women, the wives of drunken brutes of husbands; these last are to be pitied indeed, but the remedy should be in punishing habitual drunkards, by incarcerating them in an insane asylum, and taking all charge of their affairs out of their hands, and not in the enactment of a tyrannical "Sumptry Law," which could not be enforced in the most despotic country on the European Continent, or in Asia."

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

"Is it religious liberty," asks the *Mirror*, "to compel parents to send their children to schools where their religious faith and morals would be tampered with, on pain of sacrificing their just share of the government grant for education, as well as the taxes levied upon them for school purposes?"

The question, as stated above by the *Mirror*, is the sole question at issue betwixt the supporters, and the opponents of the system of compulsory, or State Education. All admit the importance of education, but all cannot admit that it is in accordance with the first principles of justice, or compatible with civil and religious liberty, that parents should be compelled to pay for the support of schools to which they are conscientiously opposed, and should thereby be robbed of the means of sending their children to schools, of whose teaching, they do approve. The question of the *Mirror* seems so simple—the injustice of the State, or the Majority, in trampling upon the religious prejudices—call them so if you will—upon the conscientious convictions of the Minority, is so glaring, that one would think that the bare enunciation of such an iniquity, would call forth the indignant remonstrance of every man in whose bosom the love of justice, liberty, and common honesty, was not stifled by sectarian bigotry. But it is not so. Compulsory State Education is the favorite maxim of modern liberal governments—the great panacea for all the social evils which afflict the world. The ultra-Protestant applauds it, because he sees therein a weapon which may be used against the Catholic Church—the infidel delights in it, and extols its propriety, because he sees clearly how State Education may be used as an engine for destroying all religions, and all creeds; the statesman, or man of the world, especially advocates it, because of the influence it throws into the hands of the civil power, the additional patronage which it begets, the nice snug berths and handsome salaries which spring from its adoption; and above all, because the State, by getting the control of the education of the people, can best accomplish its cherished hope of making itself lord over the Church, and asserting the supremacy of the secular over the spiritual.

That the child belongs to the State, and that to the State belongs the right of educating it, though an innovation on Christianity, is by no means an original idea: there is nothing novel about it, for it is an idea essentially Heathen. Protestantism did not originate, it merely adopted it. Plato, in his visionary republic, advocated; Julian, in his attempts to abolish Catholicity, enforced it: the doctrine of State-schoolism, in so far as it is at variance with original Christianity, with the Christianity that overthrew the altars of Paganism, that made the proud barbarian bow the neck beneath the yoke of Christ, and laid the foundation of all true civilisation—in so far only—does it merit the language applied to it in the School Reports of the Massachusetts Board of Education—"as an innovation upon all pre-existing policy and usages since the commencement of the Christian era;" but whether an innovation upon the ancient policy of Christianity be a thing to be proud of, seeing that it is but a relapse into ancient Paganism, is a matter more than doubtful.

The argument which the friends of the State, or compulsory system of Education, put most prominently forward is,—That, as every member of the State has the right to receive education, therefore it is the duty of the State to take care, that every member of the State shall receive such an education, as will fit him to perform his duties as a citizen. We do not know how the gentlemen who advance this argument, would refute the advocate of compulsory taxation, for religious purposes; religion, he would argue, is more necessary than secular education, to fit a man to perform his duties as a citizen: every man has a right to have a religious education, and therefore, upon this principle, it must be the duty of the State to provide every man with a religion; or it might be argued, that as every one has the right to keep his bowels in order, so therefore it is the duty of the State, to see that rhubarb, and castor oil, in proper quantities, and at convenient seasons, be administered to all its members; or, that as every one has the right to set up in business as a shoemaker, so also it is the duty of the State to provide all its members with a supply of leather, and a sufficient stock in trade. The shortest answer to this favorite argument of the State school men is, that it is not the duty of the State to furnish all its members, with all they have a right to: the duty of the State is, to put no impediment, and to allow no one else to put any impediment, in the way of the exercise of these rights; and our chief objection to the compulsory, or State system, is, that by compelling parents to pay for the support of schools, to which in conscience they cannot send their children, they are prevented—unless they are rich, and can afford to pay for two schools, one of which they make no use of—from exercising their inalienable right as parents, the right of giving such education to their children as they think fit. Put the question of State schools in the following form, and he must be a very liberal Protestant indeed, who would answer it in the affirmative:—"Has the State, or the Majority of citizens in the State, the right to forbid the Minority to educate their children as they think fit?" The answer would most likely be, "No, certainly, they have not;" and yet, in practice, the compulsory, or State system, has this effect upon all who are not wealthy enough to pay for the support of two schools: they must either send their children to the State school, to the imminent risk of their faith, and morals, or be content not to send their children to school at all; and it is this infernal tyranny, that, under the specious pretence of "religious liberty," our liberal Protestants would fain force upon the Catholics of Canada.

We will have none of their "religious liberty;" if our Protestant fellow citizens want schools for the education of their children, they are welcome to

them, but in the name of justice, of common sense, do not let them attempt to force Catholics to pay for them; Catholics, on their part, are perfectly willing, and perfectly able, to educate their own children: they neither expect, nor desire, that Protestants should be compelled to pay for the encouragement of Popery. Give us the Voluntary Principle, that is all we ask; let every man feed, clothe, and educate his own family; or if the State be willing to assist the individual to accomplish his duties, we do not decline the proffered aid, we only demand that, if given at all, it shall be given in such a manner, that Catholics may conscientiously accept their fair share, and no more, of it. By the adoption of this principle, Catholic and Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist, will be enabled to give his children the blessings of a liberal education, without being called upon to do violence to his conscience: the children will be educated, each in the religious belief of their parents, and when they go forth into the world, it will be found that they will not be less fitted for doing their duty as citizens, because they have not been taught that religious indifferntism is the first duty of man.

TRACTS.

In the report of one of the evangelical societies, which take so deep an interest in the welfare of the benighted Papists of Lower Canada, we find the complaint that, the French Canadians are too much addicted to controversy, and are not sufficiently spiritually minded—the meaning of which is, that simple, and uneducated, as Jean Baptiste is said to be, he puts questions to Colporteurs and Scripture readers, which evangelical men find it very hard to answer. They are most unreasonable men, these French Canadians; they have the presumption to ask for proof, that a book, which is extensively distributed by Colporteurs, and actually published by royal authority, is the pure Word of God, as if the word of the Colporteur, who hawk it for sale, were not sufficient evidence of the fact; they are very awkward customers too, these same *hulans*, and all the rhetoric of tract-peddlers seems to be thrown away upon them; if a spirit of enquiry is raised amongst them, it is not, it seems, exactly the kind of spirit that our proselytising brethren wish to evoke—it is not a religious spirit—it is not a spirit which induces men to walk *into* the conventicle—because they walk *out* of the Church, but it is rather a spirit, which prompts those who are animated by it to enquire, "by what authority doest thou these things?" It is evidently necessary, then, either that fresh laborers should be sent into the vineyard, or that the great work of Protestantising the French Canadians be indefinitely postponed.

We have therefore to congratulate our evangelical brethren upon an important accession to their cause, in the person of Dr. A. M. Mauriceau of New York, author of an obscene tract, called "The Married Woman's Private Medical Companion," a work, which professes to teach the most approved method of infanticide, as practised at the present day in New York, and other civilised, and highly Protestantised communities, and which is being extensively circulated amongst the ignorant Papists of this country, besides being strongly recommended to the attention of our religious communities, and of the young ladies who are committed to their care. Dr. A. M. Mauriceau, will prove an invaluable assistant to the tract distributors, in persuading men to abandon the errors of Romanism; the "Dairy Man's Daughter," the "Regenerate Dustman," and, "Spiritual Sweepings, or the Sanctified Scavenger"—are all excellent evangelical provender in their own way; but they do not carry conviction with them, as does the tract issued by the worthy Dr. Mauriceau; he knows how to use a vulgar phrase—to knock the right nail on the head; he knows how to persuade men to protest against the fasts, the asceticism, the self-denial, and chastity, which the soul-debasing superstitions of Popery enjoin: he knows well that, to be successful, the Protestant proselytiser must appeal, not to man's intellect, or to his heart, but to his lower, or animal nature; that men's lusts plead more powerfully against Popery, than all the tracts issued from Paternoster Row, or the most fervent orations delivered at Exeter Hall; he knows that the easiest way of destroying the Papist's faith is, to commence by corrupting the Papist's morals, and that no nation ever was, or ever can be, perfectly Protestantised, until the manners of its people are thoroughly depraved; in fact, Dr. A. M. Mauriceau follows in the footsteps of the great religious reformers of the sixteenth century.

We repeat, that although the subject of our remarks may be proselytising on his own account, and with a view to the profits to be derived from the sale of his tracts, he will prove a most useful and important auxiliary to the societies now occupied in overturning the influence of Popery in Canada. Obscene publications, lascivious paintings, and unchaste discourses, are the surest weapons that can be employed to upset the confessional, and to inspire a truly Protestant horror of penance; to them, more than to any thing else, must be attributed the success of the Reformation. In vain would Luther have preached against good works, or stuck up *theses* on the walls of All-Saints Church at Wittenberg, if the public mind had not been well prepared for the reception of the new doctrines—if the soil on which the seed fell, had not been subjected to a previous course of treading, so as to enable it to bring forth fruit abundantly. Every new religion must have its John the Baptist, and Protestantism had its worthy precursor in the person of the celebrated Ulrich Von Hutten. He it was, who may truly be said to have

* Ulrich Von Hutten, the author of some of the most obscene works of the XVI century, was an ardent admirer of the doctrines of the Reformation; he died in 1523; at the early age of 36 years, rotten with a loathsome disease, and in him the Protestant faith lost one of its brightest ornaments, and religion—pure and undefiled—its most zealous champion.