

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND.

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

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
 PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
 At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
 TERMS:
 To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
 To Country do. . . . \$2 1/2 do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

No fighting as yet. On the Danube, the Russian columns are concentrating, whilst the Allies seem to be amusing themselves with reviews, public dinners, and much talking. The inaction of Admiral Dundas, in the Black Sea, is marvellous; he seems to have discovered the secret of being nowhere, when he is wanted; and of doing nothing with an immense expenditure of labor. Public opinion in England is strong against him, and the only excuse that can be offered is, that the Allied Squadron is required as much to protect the Sultan against his Moslem subjects, disgusted by the recent changes, as to defend Turkey from the encroachments of the Czar. In the meantime, the Greek insurrection is spreading, and is assuming the characteristics of a religious war. On the one side, Russia and the Cross; on the other, Great Britain, France, and the Crescent. It is probable however that the Russians will find means to strike a decisive blow, ere the arrival of the Allies in the field of action. Except as connected with the war in the East, the European news is devoid of interest.

Street preaching in the United States has again led to a serious disturbance. A Protestant minister of the name of Orr, who calls himself the "Angel Gabriel," and "Trumpeter for the King that is to come," was delivering one of his usual Anti-Popery tirades, in East Boston, on Sunday last. As this took place in a public thoroughfare, a crowd collected; the "Trumpeter," and his friends, then went over to Chelsea, where, in the open air, and in the public streets, they again commenced assailing Irishmen and Catholics with every opprobrious epithet. As this took place in a quarter where there are a number of Irish Catholics, it is not wonderful that a row ensued. The Protestants were however vastly superior in numbers and organisation; they drove the Irish from the ground; wrecked their houses, destroyed their property, and then commenced an attack on the Catholic Church. One zealous Protestant particularly distinguished himself by climbing on to the top of the Church, and wrenching the Cross from its fastenings; he cast it to the infuriated Protestant rabble below; the latter with true Protestant hatred of the Cross of Christ soon shivered the symbol of man's redemption to atoms. The military were called out, and at last the rioters were dispersed. The Chelsea civic authorities ordered the "Angel Gabriel" off, at the commencement of the disturbance, when this worthy Protestant minister took his departure, and has not since been heard of.

Parliament is summoned to meet for the despatch of business on the 13th June.

THE MINERVE ON THE "RESERVES" QUESTION.

"All the Catholics of Canada, and the whole Protestant party, that makes common cause with us in politics, are agreed upon the chief points of this question, ('The Clergy Reserves;') they reject all idea of spoliation: they recognise that there is no resemblance between the 'Clergy Reserves,' and the property of the Catholic Corporations of Lower Canada; and that the manner in which the Reserves may be disposed of, will afford no precedent to justify the spoliation of the property of the religious communities in Lower Canada."—*Minerve, 9th inst.*

We know not whether our cotemporary be blind himself, or whether he be merely seeking to blind others—his readers; who, perhaps, never, or rarely, see the accredited organs of the Protestant political party, with whom, in this affair of the "Clergy Reserves" the *Minerve* invites its Catholic readers to act in concert. But certain it is, that the whole, or nearly the whole, of that Protestant political party, so far from "rejecting all idea of spoliation"—as the *Minerve* asserts, openly declare their intention to attempt, at least, the spoliation of all Catholic endowments; and make no secret that it is solely for the sake of effecting this spoliation that they consent to the "secularisation" of the Reserves.—We refer our cotemporary to the columns of his allies—the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Orange Lily*—the *Globe*, the *Montreal Witness* and the other leading Protestant and democratic organs of Upper and Lower Canada. It is true that the first attack will be directed, not against the Ecclesiastical Corporations—but against tithes; these will go first, the others will speedily share the same fate. It will be noticed that the *Minerve* carefully abstains, however, from alluding to tithes, and the effect which the "secularisation" of the Reserves will have upon this important branch of our ecclesiastical revenues.

"It is much to be regretted that some journals, without mature reflection, have treated this question, in view of the interests of the Catholic Church; and

have thus provoked a discussion which, would otherwise have been useless."—*ib.*

There spoke "Jack-in-Office" as plainly as ever poor Jack spoke in his life. It is indeed much to be regretted that his official repose should be disturbed for such a cause, and that all Catholic journalists are not content to view the "Clergy Reserves" question from his (Jack's) office window, and through an atmosphere impregnated with red tape and sealing-wax. It must sound strange in Jack's ears to be told that there are interests, in the eyes of Catholics, higher, dearer, and more sacred, than his; that if the interests of the Church required it, we should have no objection to see him, and his, blown off into infinite space. Besides, according to Jack, there was no occasion for such a discussion—this question of—"secularisation."

"By no means affects the doctrines and teachings of the Catholic Church."—*ib.*

Pardon us, good "Jack-in-Office;" it does, and that most vitally. As we have shewn, "secularisation" is only defensible upon the hypothesis that, State assistance, in aid of religion, is bad, and should be abolished; and therefore as a logical consequence, the State should no longer give its aid to the Popish Priest of Lower Canada to enforce the payment of the tithe. There is more than expediency at stake; we do indeed know that it will be most inexpedient for Catholic interests that the "Reserves" should be "secularised;" but we know also that "secularisation" will never be effected until Catholics recognise as true, a principle which the Church condemns as false—viz.,—That the support of religion should be left entirely to the Voluntary system; and that all State assistance, in aid of religion, is evil.

"Do right," quotes the *Minerve*, "no matter what may happen." We adopt the sentiment, and will act by it. But we deny that it is right to "secularise" the Reserves; we deny—seeing the great want there is in Upper Canada of religious instruction for the people—seeing also the general prevalence of crime and impiety—we deny that it is right to take away the sole fund that exists for applying a remedy to this lamentable moral and spiritual destitution. We defy the *Minerve* to assign one reason why the "Reserves" should be "secularised."—Mind! will of a majority is not reason; for, in God only, but never in man, are will and reason, one.—The *onus probandi*, that it is right to "secularise," rests with the *Minerve*.

Finally, the *Minerve* taxes us with inconsistency, in having treated the question of the "Reserves" differently, two years ago, from what we do now.—For this purpose our cotemporary quotes an article from the *True Witness* of 1852; which so far from convicting us of inconsistency shews clearly how strictly consistent the *True Witness* ever has been on this question.

We asserted then, as we assert now, that as against the Imperial Legislature, the right of the Provincial Legislature to legislate for the "Clergy Reserves" was good.

We admitted then, as we admit now, the legal right of the Legislature to "secularise;" but because we admitted the legal right then, as we do now, we did not then, and do not now, recognise the right, or rather expediency, of exercising it.

We refrained then from discussing the expediency of "secularisation," because that issue had not then been raised; but we, intentionally, and with a view to the objection of the *Minerve*, remarked that though admitting that legal right, many might be disposed to contest the expediency of its exercise. It is not advisable always to exercise every legal right. The Queen has the right of veto; the House of Commons has the right to stop the supplies; but it does not follow that the one is bound to negative every Act passed by Parliament; or the other, to throw the whole affairs of the nation into confusion. The strict exercise of a legal right may oft times involve a great wrong.

Here is our confession of Faith upon this Reserves question, which, if the *Minerve* again thinks fit to attack, we would at least beg of him to state correctly.

We admit, for the sake of argument,—or rather we do not deny—the legal right of the Provincial Legislature to "secularise" the Reserves.

But we do not admit that there exist any reasons why those "Reserves" should be "secularised;" though there are many and cogent reasons, why they should not.

If badly, or partially distributed, to the undue advantage of some denominations, and to the exclusion of others, we admit the propriety of a new and more equitable distribution; which is all that can logically be deduced from the premises. It is only from the premises—that the State should not give any material, or pecuniary assistance, to the cause of religion and morality—that the propriety of "secularisation" can be deduced.

And lastly, we contend that—seeing the great religious destitution that prevails in the Upper Province—it is not wise to throw away the sole means of thereunto applying a remedy.

The *Montreal Freeman* of Saturday last contains an article, professedly written by a Catholic, in which the writer objects to the policy advocated by the *True Witness* as most in accordance with Catholic principles, and most likely to promote Catholic interests in Canada. Far be it from us to contest the *Freeman's* right to criticise and oppose that policy; but we contend that he should do so under his true colors; that he should not assume a Catholic disguise, in order the more easily to assail a Catholic argument. We notice our cotemporary chiefly for the sake of stripping the mask off him; for it was no Catholic that wrote the article to which we allude. For instance, he says:—

"The editor of the *True Witness* does not deny that

the Legislature may lawfully deal with the question"—that of the "Reserves;"—but argues, as he says, from a Catholic point of view. This is, you will perceive, shirking the merits of the question, and amounts to saying, that, because the decision the Protestants desire, and would come to, if left to themselves, might by possibility operate against Catholics in time, we (Catholics) should interfere and prevent such decision. This, I think, is not just." The Italics are our own.

There is much in the above paragraph to show that it was never written by a Catholic; and that the "we (Catholics)" of the *Montreal Freeman*, is but a feeble attempt to conceal the Protestantism of the writer. At best, if a Catholic at all, he is one of those *Orange Kevtholics*, of whom, of old, the Great Dan used to make mince meat, holding them and their principles in abhorrence.

According to the *Freeman*, the *True Witness* "shirks the merits of the question" because he discusses it from a "Catholic point of view;" and is "unjust," because he deprecates a policy, no matter how popular amongst Protestants, which may in time "operate against Catholics." Such assertions never fell from Catholic lips; such sentiments, were never entertained by a Catholic heart.

We "shirk the merits of the question"—and, because we discuss it from a "Catholic point of view!" Why, bless the man, what does he mean? If indeed, he believed the Catholic Church to be the true Church, and her teaching the only sure guide on all questions wherein the interests of religion and morality were concerned, he would know, that the "Catholic," is the only, "point of view" from whence the merits of the question can be discerned; and that it is only by discussing the question, as seen from that "point of view," that its real "merits" can be properly discussed at all. Instead of accusing us of "shirking the merits" of the question, because we discussed it from such a "point of view," he would, if a Catholic, and deemed us in error, have blamed us, for that, enjoying such an excellent stand point, we had nevertheless failed to perceive and appreciate those merits; he would have found the cause of our error, not in our choice of "a point of view," but in our own distorted organs of vision, unable to profit by the advantages of our position. No, no, Mr. *Freeman*; your speech betrays you—"et loquela tua manifestum te facit." Your "*We Catholics*," is but a flimsy disguise, which the first breath of air blows asunder. Beneath your Catholic lion's skin, we plainly see your Protestant ears; and your very questionable attempt at a Popish roar, ends in the melancholy, but most unmistakable bray of the conventicle. It is in vain for you to attempt passing yourself off as a Papist.

And it is "unjust," argues our cotemporary, to oppose "secularisation," because, in time, such a measure may possibly "operate against Catholics." Were the writer a Catholic, he would know that all that operates, or may, by any possibility, operate, against Catholic interests, is evil, and therefore of the devil, and therefore most justly to be opposed. But here we hear the sonorous bray of our unmasked opponent; there it goes, lion's skin and all, and the noble creature stands before us in all his beauty. Translated from a bray of Protestant indignation, into plain English, this is the meaning of the *Freeman's* complaint of injustice against the *True Witness*.

He means—that it is "unjust" for the Catholic to prefer religion to politics, Church to party—and thus to make every thing subservient to the interests of Catholicity—that it is "unjust" thus to prefer the interests of a particular sect, to the general interests of the whole community.

We can understand this language in the mouth of an avowed Protestant; but it is absurd when coming from a pretended Catholic, who professes to believe that the Catholic Church is God's Kingdom upon earth; and that the only true policy consists in extending, consolidating, and perpetuating that Kingdom—whose interests are identical with the true interests of the whole community—and which interests therefore, cannot be promoted without at the same time, and thereby, securing the general well being of all mankind. The Catholic cannot conceive of God's Kingdom upon earth being too powerful, too prosperous, or too widely extended; he cannot for an instant admit the possibility even of their being any interests distinct from those of that Kingdom; or that any claims, no matter how numerous supported, should for one instant be allowed to come in competition with the claims of the Church. The policy of the Catholic is—"The Church."

Either the Catholic Church is what she professes to be; or she is not. If she be, then she is God's Kingdom upon earth; and that policy only is sound, which tends to promote and perpetuate her power, her influence, and her dominion over all men. If she be not altogether what she pretends to be, then is she an impostor; and the sooner all men renounce her, and become even as "*we*," of the *Montreal Freeman*, the better.

Our cotemporary says:—"It were good Catholic policy to act so as to retain the friendship of the old Reform party of Upper Canada."

Yes; most assuredly, if the old Reform party be sincere in its attachment to the Catholic Church;—if its chief policy be to promote the power of God's Kingdom upon earth. But, otherwise—no—decidedly no; for the friendship of the enemies of God's Church is hostility to God; and it is good Catholic policy to act so as to retain the friendship of God; but to retain this friendship, we must, above all things, be faithful and obedient to His Church, and avoid all alliance with His enemies, and rebels against His Kingdom.

In conclusion, we would remark to the *Freeman*:

1. That it is not true that the question of the Reserves "concerns Catholics alone." But if it were, then Catholics should be exhorted to observe a strict

neutrality; and, if they did not throw the weight of their influence against "secularisation," at least to abstain carefully from saying, or doing anything to determine a question in which, according to the *Freeman*, they are in no wise concerned.

2. We would also call the attention of our cotemporary to the fact—admitted by the leading Protestant and "secularising" journals of Upper Canada—that the party in favor of "secularisation" amongst Protestants, is "a miserable handful hardly worth reckoning;" whilst "the great majority of the Protestant population of Upper Canada are opposed to 'secularisation.'"—*Bathurst Courier*.

3. We would conclude, by remarking—that—as Catholics should be entirely neutral in a question in which they are in no wise concerned, and should leave its decision to Protestants alone, who, according to the *Freeman*, are alone interested therein—and, as the "great majority of the Protestant population of Upper Canada is opposed to 'secularisation'"—the advice given to Catholics, by the *Freeman*, and other "Secularisers" of Lower Canada, that they should, by their votes, aid in imposing "secularisation" upon the adverse Protestant majority, is not only manifestly inconsistent with their assertions, that the "Clergy Reserves question concerns Protestants alone"—but is also a monstrous outrage upon the liberal principles of government which they profess—unjust, impolitic, and eminently anti-Catholic.

We copy from the *Toronto Mirror*:—

The regular monthly meeting of the Toronto Catholic Institute took place on the evening of Monday last, and we must express our extreme regret that indisposition prevented our attendance. We are happy to learn that there was a large attendance of Members, and that the utmost unanimity prevailed.

His Lordship the Bishop presided, and several of the Catholic pastors of the city were in attendance.

His Lordship, after thanking the Association for the honor conferred upon him in his unanimous appointment as President, and for his cordial reception on that occasion, called the particular attention of the meeting to the Report recently furnished by the Board of Trustees of the Catholic Separate Schools of this city. This able document was minutely reviewed by his Lordship, and the excellence and superiority of the system of education inculcated, were distinctly pointed out.

The obstacles which bigotry and prejudice continually raise against the beneficial application of the School Laws, were enumerated and traced to the vague and undefined terms employed in the Supplementary Act of last session. Language capable of distortion and misdirection should never be employed in legislation, particularly on subjects of such vital interest, and where adverse parties are on the watch for an opportunity of perverting the law from its direct and legitimate object. The remedy proposed by his Lordship was clear and explicit, and if proper means are applied, we may expect its early adoption by the Legislature. The demand is just and imperative, and must not be withheld.

That part of the Report which shows the deficiency in numbers, in accommodation and school apparatus, received particular attention, and plain and practicable remedies were suggested for adoption.

At the conclusion of his Lordship's comprehensive and instructive address the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

That this Institute cordially concurs in the views expressed by His Lordship the Bishop on the necessity of putting our Catholic Schools in a more efficient state, by affording additional accommodation to both Teachers and Pupils; and to effect this object we pledge ourselves to collect, by means of Subscriptions, a sum sufficient to carry his views into effect, and name the following gentlemen as collectors:—D. K. Feehan, Thomas Hays, Angus Macdonnell, J. P. De la Haye, Jas. Hallinan, S. G. Lynn, P. Doyle, J. McCurry, P. Mullin, and C. Robertson.

The following Resolution was also passed after some discussion, with only two dissentients:

That the Catholic Institute of Toronto pledges itself to oppose by all constitutional means the re-election of the present Ministry and of any of their supporters, if at the next Session of the Provincial Parliament full justice is not done to the Catholics of Western Canada, with regard to the free working of their Separate Schools; and that this Institute invokes the sympathy and assistance of their fellow Catholics in Eastern Canada to promote this object.

Our friends and coreligionists of Upper Canada may be perfectly assured of our earnest sympathy with them, and of our readiness to co-operate with them, in delivering the Catholics of the Western Province from the galling yoke which Protestant intolerance has imposed upon them. The demand, of our friends are very simple, and very just. They demand, that Government assistance shall be afforded to Catholic schools, to the same extent as it is afforded to Non-Catholic schools; this they have the right to ask; and this it is our duty—Catholics of Lower Canada, enjoying as we do Freedom of Religion and Education—to insist upon, for our unjustly treated brethren. At the coming general election will be the proper time to enforce our claims; the question of Education should be made a test question; and no candidate should receive a Catholic vote who will not pledge himself to use every means in his power, as a member of the Legislature, to secure to the Catholics of Upper Canada the enjoyment of their just rights in the matter of education.

But who are the enemies whom the Catholics of Upper Canada have most to dread? What party is it that is most hostile to them, and to their claims?—We hesitate not to answer—The Democratic, or Liberal, party—as its members call themselves in defiance of common sense. The real enemies of Freedom of Catholic Education are your Radical, *so-disant*, "Voluntaries" in Religion, and "Secularisers." Nay with them, one motive which incites to "secularisation" is the certainty that it will be an easy matter to put down Popish "Separate Schools" when once they shall have succeeded in "secularising" the Reserves. The best and surest way for Catholics to maintain and perfect their system of Separate Education, is to oppose with all their power the success of the darling plan of Mister George Brown, and his fellow-workmen of the Holy Protestant Alliance.

The two questions—of the "Clergy Reserves," and