

FOR SALE,

DRAFTS AT THREE DAYS' SIGHT, on Messrs. OVEREND, GURNEY & Co., LONDON, from ONE POUND UPWARDS, Negotiable at any Town in Great Britain or Ireland. HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., Montreal, Oct. 1852.

INFORMATION WANTED,

OF JULIA HAGARTY, daughter to Jeremiah Hagarty, of the Parish of Carnavan, within five miles of the City of Cork, Ireland. She was left at Lachine sheds in 1847, her father being driven from her by the authorities of the emigrant sheds at Lachine. Address, Jeremiah Hagarty, Picton, Canada West.

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. . . . \$2 1/2 do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 1, 1852. NEWS OF THE WEEK.

This is really a sad dull time for the journalist, for there is literally nothing in the shape of intelligence to communicate. Men ask solemnly of one another, "What news?" and the answer is still the same, "There is no news." At home, the Queen and family remain in strict seclusion at Balmoral. On the Continent every thing is as dull and stupid as a "protracted meeting"; there is not even a Revolution in France, or an outbreak of the gamins of Paris.

In the absence of all other entertaining and pleasing topics—the Irish Priests and Irish Papists having been blackguarded to the utmost extent that even Priests and Papists can be blackguarded with pleasure to the reader—the English press is "taking stock," as the Spectator has it, and giving a report of the political, moral, and religious progress of the English nation during the last six eventful months.

In proof of the immense extent to which the crime of infanticide is practised in England it may suffice to enumerate the following list of cases reported at the last assizes. The dates refer to our own journal, in which they are respectively recorded. A great number—probably as many as the subjoined—have not appeared in our columns, because they presented no features distinguishing them from the horrid monotony of this description of crime.

- July 10th—Northampton—One case of concealing birth. July 13th—Lincoln—One child murder, one concealment of birth. July 14th—Home Circuit—Anne Welsh, tried for murder of her female illegitimate child; acquitted. July 15th—Nottingham—One concealment of birth. July 17th—Norfolk Circuit—Anne Raven, tried for destroying her illegitimate infant; acquitted—insanity. July 17th—Nottingham—Emma Lewis, indicted for wilful murder of her infant child; acquitted—insanity. July 20th—Winchester, July 19th—Richard Roe, and Frances Roe, indicted for conspiring to kill Alfred Roe, son of male prisoner—acquitted. July 20th—Cardiff—One prisoner charged with murder of her infant. July 20th—Ellen Venns, convicted of concealment of birth (bad case). July 21st—Derby—Selina Ride, charged with murder of her infant child; acquitted. July 21st—Mary Maloney, charged with murder of her infant child; acquitted. July 22nd—Mary Glarvey, charged with murder of her infant child; acquitted. July 23rd—Worcester—Mary Robins, tried for the murder of her illegitimate child; condemned to death, but sentence not to be carried into effect.

- July 24th—Dorchester—Louisa Walborn, for wilful murder of her male infant, by administering vitriol; acquitted. July 24th—Anne Appin, for the murder of her child; acquitted. At the close of the proceedings Mr. Baron Martin, who tried the case, observed that the crime of infanticide was most dreadfully common in this county (Dorset). There had been six cases last year, and out of six prisoners on the calendar for the circuit, two were charged with this crime. They had both been acquitted, and in the case just tried most properly so; but those subjected to this temptation had better take warning, or perhaps another case would be better proved, and the unfortunate woman would have to expiate her crime by an ignominious death. July 25th—Maidstone—Catherine Brooke, tried for the wilful murder of her male illegitimate child; acquitted. July 29th—Elizabeth Campney, for attempting to murder her son, by throwing him into a pit; acquitted. July 30th—Durham—Jane Harland, for the wilful murder of her new-born male child; acquitted. Aug. 2nd—Inswich—Maria Stewart, for wilful murder of her female child; acquitted. Aug. 3rd—Bodmin—Mr. Baron Platt, in charging the Grand Jury, observed that there was one case where a young woman was charged with the heinous offence of destroying her own offspring; and if they (the grand jury) should be of opinion that a bill ought to be found, and if the petty jury should find a verdict of guilty against her, it would be necessary, for the putting down of this dreadful crime, to make an example. Aug. 4th—Maria Chitty, tried for the wilful murder of her child, aged seven, by beating out his brains; acquitted—insanity. Aug. 6th—Carlisle—Eleanor Pattison, for the wilful murder of her child; acquitted. Aug. 9th—Wells—Mary Amory, for the wilful murder of her illegitimate child; acquitted—insanity. Aug. 12th—Ellen Roberts (Chester), for the murder of her illegitimate child; seven years' transportation. Aug. 19th—Liverpool—Alice Shaw, for having killed and murdered her new-born female child; not guilty. (Same day)—Selina Mooney found guilty of concealing birth, after being charged with murder; sentence to six months' imprisonment.

This list shows the frequency of the crime, and the difficulty of obtaining a conviction—a difficulty so great that, in sheer despair of a remedy, some have suggested the expediency of altering the law of infanticide. In the same article, the Chronicle remarks:—"English ruffianism has not taken to the knife; but it has advanced in the devilish accomplishment of biting off noses and scooping out eyes. Kicking a man to death when he is down, or treating a wife in the same way—stamping on an enemy or a paragon with hob-nailed boots—smashing a woman's head with a hand-iron—these atrocities, which are of almost daily occurrence in our large towns, are not so much imported crimes as they are the extravagant exaggeration of the coarse, sullen temper of an Englishman, brutalised by ignorance, and stupefied by drink."

Connected with this subject the Times has a long article from S. G. O., showing how the tendencies of the fashionable world are to encourage licentiousness, and that disregard of chastity which, unhappily, is so prevalent amongst certain classes of the Protestant English—

One, two, or three illegitimate children are no disqualification for the reception into a wealthy family of the mother as a wet nurse; the nice tidy Mary has fallen, it is true; but the M. D. thinks himself most fortunate in having found one so healthy and clean, whose own infant is just the right age. Paid high, petted, and sent away at last with presents, it is as though the word given was, "Go sin again." She may have not only fallen as a woman, but failed to her own child's death, as a mother, she was an excellent wet-nurse.

Take the subscription-lists to the various Magdalens, penitentiaries, and Lock hospitals—how many of those who subscribe ever employ wet nurses? Alas, such an inquiry, rigidly carried out, would tell an old tale; it would prove that much of the glitter of philanthropic gold is that of mere tinsel.

However, upon the whole, John Bull is quite satisfied with himself. John is quite a moral man; he goes to meeting on Sundays, and strives to look as gloomy and sulky as possible all day. He don't amuse himself—he is not to be seen laughing, and gadding about, on the Sabbath day like immoral Papists on the Continent; if he does get drunk, he makes a beast of himself in private, and that no way affects the grandeur of his moral position; and besides, he tries to atone for these little self-indulgencies by making himself particularly unpleasant to his neighbors, under the pretence of being "serious," or of having had a "fall." So upon the whole, John is quite content with himself, and is most generously laying himself out for the reformation of the manners of the benighted savages of Ireland; John is very sorry for Ireland, he is—and very anxious to deliver poor Paddy from the clutches of the Priest.

Under pretence of liberating him therefore, John most kindly proposes to deprive the people of Ireland of any voice in the election of members for the Legislature, as quite unfit for the enjoyment of the franchise—"The nation is absolutely unfit for civil liberty," calmly says the Morning Herald; "the more we extend public liberty in a country under Ultramontane direction, the more do we destroy it." So, as unfit for civil liberty, the Herald recommends the disfranchisement of the Irish Catholics—a novel, but certainly a very Protestant way of extending the blessings of public liberty. Two things are to be done in furtherance of the Ministerial policy towards Ireland. The present representatives are to be unseated, and legislative enactments are to be enforced, securing to the Orange gentry, and Orange yeomanry, the sole right of nominating the representatives of the people of Ireland. Some such scheme with regard to Ireland will, it is thought, be introduced by Ministers in the new Parliament; fresh Penal Laws are also darkly hinted at, as in store for the refractory Catholics.

A private letter, per Africa, said to be written by an American gentleman at Paris, announces an attempt to assassinate the Prince President of the French Republic, on his way from St. Cloud—"An individual fired a musket shot at him, from a trench on the route, and the ball grazed his left shoulder. Seeing that he had failed in his attempt, the assassin immediately blew out his own brains. The journals have been prohibited from speaking on the matter." Such is the report, which however wants confirmation.

The steamer Canada brings tidings of the death of the Duke of Wellington, full of years and full of honors. Before the tomb of the departed hero, all political animosities must cease, and men of all parties will join to do honor to the memory, of England's noblest and ablest statesman, of the oldest soldier and first Captain of Europe—of whom impartial history will tell how he measured swords with the best of Napoleon's Marshals, with the mighty Emperor himself, and thrashed them all, and whose loss will long be regretted as the loss of the first of England's "worthies." Honor to the memory of the brave old soldier.

CLERGY RESERVES.

"I am not aware" wrote Mr. Hincks to Sir John Pakington in May last, "that any public fund has ever been devoted to the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church of Canada; whatever property may be in possession of Roman Catholics has been attained principally by private donations, or bequests, although in some cases there were additional grants from the French Crown, which were secured to the possessors at the conquest. These grants were made to communities consisting of Ecclesiastics, or Religious Ladies, either for charitable, or educational purposes, or for the conversion of the Indians. If I am correct in this statement, as I believe that I am, I must respectfully submit that such grants as those to which I have referred, bear no analogy to the "Clergy Reserves," and can scarcely be considered as a public fund devoted to the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church."

Mr. Hincks' "Resolutions" having been adopted by large majorities, we may fairly conclude that the Legislature of Canada has asserted its right to deal with all revenues accruing from the sale of public lands as it thinks best for the interests of the Province: whether the assertion of this right will lead to its recognition by the Imperial Legislature, is more than doubtful; that it will lead to the secularisation of the revenues derived from the sale of lands known as the "Clergy Reserves," seems to be taken for granted by many—though we must confess that we are not amongst those who desire to see the Protestants of Upper Canada despoiled of an endowment in which they have been led to believe that they have a vested right. But whether recognised by the Imperial Legislature or not, whether destined to lead to the secularisation of the "Clergy Reserves," or not, the assertion by the Provincial Legislature of its right to legislate as it thinks fit upon the "Clergy Reserves," has had a very singular effect upon the temper, and logical faculties of several of our Protestant cotemporaries. They cannot deny the existence of the abstract right of the Legislature to revoke a grant of public revenues which the Legislature has made—for which no consideration, either in money or in money's worth, has been given by, and to which no additional value has been imparted by the labor or capital of, the grantee; they cannot do this without denying the right of the Imperial Legislature to revoke the Maynooth Grant—a case completely in point, but to which, as involving a very disagreeable precedent, the advocates of the inviolability of the "Clergy Reserves" are most careful not to allude. So in default of argument they turn round upon the Catholic members of the Legislature, with a—"If you strike me I'll kick your sister; darn'd if I don't—now!" Such at least, being interpreted, is the meaning of the threats held out by certain "organs of public opinion," against the Catholic Church in Canada. "If the revenues derived from the sale of the 'Clergy Reserve' lands be diverted from Protestant ecclesiastical purposes, the property of the Catholic Church in Canada shall also be confiscated." The logic by which these menaces are supported is worthy of the cause. "If the Legislature has the right to revoke a grant which it has made, so also it must have the right to confiscate property which it has not given." Some of our friends are keen-sighted enough to perceive that their conclusion does not follow from their premise, and therefore call in the aid of falsehood to make out their case: a lie will do for them, what logic will not—and so, by way of a middle term, or nequeus, between their major premise and conclusion, they insert the following deliberate falsehood:—"But the property of the Catholic Church in Canada is held by virtue of an unconditional grant from the Legislature." We tell them, as Mr. Hincks has already told Sir John Pakington, and as they very well know already, that the property of the Catholic Church in Canada is not so held, and that therefore we despise their threats, as we laugh at their logic, and execrate their bad faith.

Property which the Legislature has granted to the Catholic Church in Canada—for which no consideration, either in money, or money's worth, has been given by, to which no additional value has been imparted by the labor or capital of, the grantee—and whose integrity has not been guaranteed by international treaties—the Legislature has, we fully admit, the abstract right to revoke, though, as in the case of the "Clergy Reserves," we might question the prudence or expediency of the exercise of that abstract right: but there is no Catholic Church-property in Canada so circumstanced. The integrity of that Church-property was solemnly guaranteed by the treaty in which France ceded Canada to Great Britain—a treaty, be it remembered, in virtue of which alone British laws are of any force in Canada, and the allegiance of French Canadians is due to the British Crown. Any violation of the terms of that treaty would therefore release the French Canadians from all duty of obedience to British laws, from all allegiance to the British Crown, and would justify them in armed resistance to British dominion in Canada. The French Canadians are a pretty numerous body of men, and in a just cause, fighting for their desecrated altars, would make pretty formidable antagonists; it would be imprudent to give them such a cause. For if—as we have been reminded by a Protestant cotemporary—there be very pretty plunder to be got out of a Catholic Church, or Convent, there is quite as pretty plunder to be got out of the stores and warehouses of British Protestant merchants; if the Protestants of Canada get up a little Jacquerie against the property of the Catholic Church, in the name of religion, it might so happen that the French Canadians would get up a little private Jacquerie against the property of British Protestant merchants, on their own account; and certainly if the arguments made use of by our Protestant adversaries be sound, (which thank God they are not) the French Canadians would be perfectly justified in so doing.

Not only is the integrity of the property of the Catholic Church in Canada guaranteed by treaty, its integrity is guaranteed by every principle which society has recognised and laid down for the protection

of the rights of property. It was, as stated by Mr. Hincks, acquired in the same manner as the property of any individual in the community has been acquired—by purchase, by private donations, and by bequests; a great part of it has been so acquired since the cession of Canada to Great Britain. We will cite a few instances, shewing the way in which Catholic Church-property has been obtained.

The Seignory of the island of Montreal was purchased in 1670 by the St. Sulpicians, from the "Company of the Hundred Associates." The Seignory of the Lake of the Two Mountains was acquired by the St. Sulpicians, as a compensation for certain very onerous and expensive services rendered by them to the French Crown; they, at their own charge, undertook to remove a tribe of Indians who were very troublesome to the early settlers, to another district, and to build a substantial fortress for the protection of the colony. For these services they stipulated to receive the very inadequate compensation of a grant of the Seignory of the Lake of the Two Mountains, to which also, by their labor, and capital expended thereon, they have imparted the money value which it now possesses.

The property of the Bishop of Montreal has been acquired since the cession, and is composed in every instance, of purchases made by, and donations from private individuals to, the present Bishop and his predecessors.

The property of the Grey Nunnery was partly the gift of a widow lady—Madame Youville—proprietress of the Seignory of Chateauguay—partly the product of the labors of their own hands. The property of the "Congregation Nunnery" was acquired by purchase; of the Providence Convent in like manner, and so with the other Conventual establishments in Montreal. Let us trace the origin of this conventual property, which Protestants grately inform us the Legislature has the right to confiscate.

A few pious, and charitably disposed ladies meet together, and agree to live in community, devoting themselves and their property to the service of God, and the relief of their suffering fellow-creatures.—In order more effectually to carry out these intentions, they agree that each member of the community shall upon her admittance pay a certain entrance fee, or dower; with the sums so obtained the community purchase a house and garden, build a chapel, an infirmary for the sick, and fit up an asylum for the poor, the aged, and infirm, who are therein gratuitously fed, clothed, and lodged. In process of time new members join the community, bringing in more dowers; by their manual labor, and the sale of the proceeds of their industry—by the gifts and bequests of private individuals—the funds of the community are still more increased; the establishment is enlarged; a farm perhaps, or a seignory, is purchased, from the proceeds of which the expenses of the infirmary and asylum are in great measure defrayed; an Act of Incorporation is procured, and the establishment thus commenced, continued, and brought to perfection, is called a Convent. Now, will any man pretend to say that there is any analogy betwixt property so acquired, and the grant by the Legislature of a certain part of the revenues of the country to a particular religious denomination?—or that because the Legislature has the right to revoke the latter, it has the right to confiscate the former? And yet this is just what Protestants do assert when they threaten that if the revenues accruing from the sale of the "Clergy Reserves" lands be secularised, the property of the Catholic Church in Canada shall be confiscated.

We have said before that, to the best of our belief, there is no general desire amongst Catholics to deprive their Protestant fellow-citizens of the endowment derived from the sale of public lands in Canada; they have none of that "dog-in-the-mangerism" which so eminently characterises the declaimers against Catholic, and indeed against all, Church-property. But there is one way by which we fear Protestants will do themselves much harm, and that is, by holding out threats to the independent Catholic members of the Legislature if they vote according to their consciences. Men don't like to be threatened, and naturally enough conclude, that it is in default of argument that resource is had to threats, and menaces. We would recommend, therefore, to our opponents, to try and defend the "Clergy Reserves" by argument instead of bluster, and to endeavor to explain—Why, if the Legislature has the right to revoke the Maynooth Grant, it has not the right to revoke the grant of revenues accruing from the sale of public lands in Canada, called the "Clergy Reserves."

"By the way, this puts me in mind that I have a nut for the TRUE WITNESS to crack. The united municipality of the three Counties which includes Glengarry, have declared in favor of the Common School system as against the Sectarian system—the Roman Catholics of Glengarry being, to a man, opposed to separate schools, believing them calculated to do nothing but excite religious hatred and quarrels among people who ought to live like good neighbors among one another; what will our friend say to this?"—Commercial Advertiser.

The first thing that the TRUE WITNESS has to say to this is—that the conduct of the Catholics of Glengarry can constitute no precedent for the Catholics of the rest of Canada to follow; the second is—that we do not believe the statement, but regard it as a foul libel upon the Catholics of Glengarry. We do not mean by this anything personally offensive to the writer in the Commercial Advertiser, who is, no doubt, firmly convinced of the truth of his assertion, and speaks in good faith, according to his lights; but we are quite certain that he is mistaken—we will tell him why.

He says the Roman Catholics of Glengarry are, "to a man," opposed to separate schools, and that they are unanimously in favor of the "Common School" system; now this is simply impossible.

There may be, though we doubt it, men in Glengarry calling themselves Roman Catholics—men