

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, Gilman & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,  
St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Parliamentary campaign has commenced in good earnest, and there have been already several interesting discussions in both Houses. On the 11th, the Earl of Cardigan called the attention of the House to the Sixmile-bridge massacre, and requested an explanation from Lord Aberdeen with respect to the intentions of H. M. Ministry. Lord Aberdeen, in reply, stated that he had only that day received intimation from the Lord Lieutenant that the matter was under the consideration of the Irish Government, and that no steps whatever had been decided upon as to the conduct to be pursued either, towards the soldiers, or the priests accused of inciting the people to violence. In the House of Commons, Lord John Russell repudiated the statement of Mr. Saddleir at the late Carlow election, to the effect that he, Lord John Russell, had expressed any repentance for his share in the passing of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill: "As he had been accused of having changed his opinion on this important measure, he would take the opportunity of stating that he still thought the same upon the subject as he did two years ago." This explicit avowal of Lord J. Russell settles the question of the propriety of any member of the Irish Brigade accepting office under a Russell-Aberdeen ministry, and places Mr. Saddleir in a very awkward position before his countrymen and co-religionists.

On Monday, 14th, Lord Aberdeen in the House of Lords, and Lord John Russell in the Commons, were obliged to apologise for the very indiscreet, and *after-dinner* speech of their colleague Sir Charles Wood, delivered at Halifax, and reflecting, in no measured terms, upon the conduct of the French Government. Lord John read a letter from Sir C. Wood, who from *indisposition* was unable to attend, in which the hon. gentleman "professed his sorrow that any expressions used by him in addressing his constituents should have been understood as offensive to the French Emperor; he could not say whether he actually made use of the precise expressions attributed to him, but it was very possible that, speaking without premeditation, some incautious expressions had escaped him." The matter was then allowed to drop.—On Tuesday, Mr. F. Peel moved for leave to bring in a bill to enable the Legislature of Canada to make provision concerning the Clergy Reserves. He entered into a history of these reserves, and of the jealousies and heartburnings to which they have given rise; the object of the present Bill was to repeal an Act which had long proved an obstacle to the peace of the country, and to leave to the Colonial Legislature, the only tribunal legitimately qualified to decide upon matters purely local, the ultimate disposition of these Clergy Reserves. Sir John Pakington, without opposing the introduction of the measure, feared that it might be liable to the reproach of involving a breach of national faith. Sir Robert Inglis was loud in his condemnation of the measure, as striking at the roots of all corporate, and indeed of all, property. The hon. gentleman is, we may remark, a warm opponent of the Maynooth Grant, an endowment held by the Catholics of Ireland, upon precisely the same tenure as the Clergy Reserves are held by the Protestant ministers of Canada, viz., an Act of the Imperial Legislature; an argument therefore which is good for the repeal of the one, is equally good for the repeal of the other; but it is not much that men, like Sir R. Inglis, are troubled with a respect for consistency.—Lord John Russell denied that the grants, of the revenues accruing from the sale of public lands in Canada, to any particular religious denomination, were irrevocable. The settlement of 1840 was an interference with the previous settlement of 1791, and now they were called upon to make another irrevocable settlement. The question was not, whether an endowment once made by Parliament ought to last for ever, but whether Parliament should adopt a rule, that, with regard to a question of local concern in the settlement of this property upon one portion of the clergy or another, it was fit to allow the local assembly to legislate. Upon that question the government had no doubt whatever. After a few remarks, from Mr. Hume, leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Dr. Philpotts, the government bishop of Exeter, moved in the Lords, for copies of the correspondence between the Colonial Office, and the Legislature, and Governor General of Canada, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves: he looked upon the Bill for enabling the Colonial Legislature to dispose of them, as a grievous injustice to the colony. The Earl of Desart thought it would be a heavy blow to Protestantism.

On Thursday, the Madiai case came under the consideration of the House of Commons. Mr. Kinnaird moved "that an address be presented to the Queen, praying that her Majesty would be graciously pleased to take such steps as she may deem most fitting, for bringing under the notice of his Imperial Highness the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the strong feelings prevailing among a large number of her Majesty's subjects, in consequence of the persecutions in Tuscany." Lord D. Stuart seconded the

motion, as one in which the Protestant feelings of the people were deeply interested. Mr. Lucas replied in a telling speech, in which he contrasted the sympathy of the liberty loving Protestants of England for the Madiais, with their indifference to the brutal ill-treatment inflicted upon Catholic Priests in Russia, in Switzerland, in Sweden, and at Tahiti, with the approbation, and in several instances, at the instigation, of the British government. "What had been the conduct?" asked Mr. Lucas, "in cases in which Catholics had been concerned?" The suffering of the Nuns of Minsk had been greater than those of the Madiais, and yet there had been no interference on behalf of the victims of Russian intolerance: this might be attributed to the *prudence* of her Majesty's Ministers, unwilling to involve themselves in a dispute with a great power like Russia, though ever ready to bully and insult a weak one like Tuscany. Then again, with respect to the expulsion of the Jesuits from Switzerland, the noble Lord, now Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the eloquent advocate of toleration, raised no voice in their behalf: on the contrary, he was earnest in insisting upon their spoliation and banishment; and, because the lay Catholics of the canton of Lucerne, resisted this tyrannical proceeding, his Lordship recommended that they should be shot down, and that a war of extermination should be waged against them. At Tahiti, the government had sustained Mr Pritchard, a dissenting minister, in his infamous treatment of the French Catholic Missionaries, and to the present day the same gentleman had never received a word of reproach from his government, for doing what the Grand Duke of Tuscany was accused of doing. In Sweden also, the laws against the professors of the Catholic religion were most oppressive, and executed with the greatest severity, and yet the Protestant sympathies of England were never aroused for the unhappy victims of Swedish intolerance. Mr. Lucas meant at an early period to submit to the House a motion with reference to other circumstances, other facts, other countries, and other acts of persecution, which equally deserved the attention of the House with that which the honorable gentleman had brought before them: when he brought forward his motion he hoped to be seconded by the hon. proposer of the present motion. Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston defended their conduct with respect to the Jesuits. The Jesuits were Papists, and therefore ought to be robbed and persecuted; Catholic Missionaries had no business in the South Seas, and Mr. Pritchard was a very nice gentleman. After some further discussion, Mr. Kinnaird's motion was withdrawn.

The Convention of the government bishops and clergy came off on the 15th; after going through some ceremonies, the farce was put an end to by Dr. Sumner, who prorogued them until the 18th August next, under protest from some of the members.

Rumors have been for some time in circulation in Paris to the effect that an alliance by treaty between France and England, with a view to counterbalance the influence of the Northern powers, is in contemplation. Lord John Russell has made over the seals of the Foreign Office to Lord Clarendon. It is the intention of the government to prosecute the soldiers, and the priests, implicated in the Sixmilebridge massacre.

The *Baltic* steamer brings intelligence of the attempt to assassinate the Emperor of Austria at Vienna. The culprit, who is a Hungarian, was arrested; the Emperor was but slightly injured. The insurrection in Lombardy is suppressed for the present. Radetzky has issued stringent proclamations, and is inflicting well merited punishment upon the insurgents. Unfortunately, Mazzini, the prime mover of all the disturbances, has as yet escaped arrest. He is a cunning scoundrel, with a great deal too much regard for his personal safety to expose himself to danger. Had he, or Kossuth, the pluck of men about them—had they placed themselves at the head of the insurgents—or would they now partake of the perils and sufferings to which their deluded followers are exposed—we might condemn their politics, but, at the same time, we might believe them to be honest, even if wrong-headed, men. But when we see the cowardly fellows, skulking far away from the conflict, or from where there is any chance of a musket ball coming whistling about their ears, and yet exhorting others to rush upon dangers which they are afraid to face, it is impossible to avoid feeling the most profound contempt for the poltroons. Alexander Smith disclaims the proclamation issued in his name; he did not give it an earlier denial, because its disavowal might have exerted an unfavorable influence on the struggle—that is, if the insurrection had been successful he would have taken credit for his share in the transaction—having failed, he is too glad to find a loop-hole through which to sneak.

Hungary seems to be on the brink of another rebellion: it is said that guerilla bands are forming all over the country, and that Austria is preparing for an approaching struggle.

The Boston papers speak of an attempted attack on Wednesday the 2nd inst., upon the Catholic, buildings and institutions at Charleston—in consequence of a rumor that a young girl lately converted from Catholicity had been forcibly abducted. But for the firmness of the authorities there would have been another Ursuline Convent burning business: however the mob was dispersed without bloodshed, and order restored. We copy the following additional particulars from the *Traveller* of the 5th inst., from which it will appear that the rumored forcible abduction of the girl was nothing but one of the ordinary Protestant lies, got up, in all probability, by some evangelical reverends of the same stamp as the gentry, who excited the Protestant mob to the burning of the Charleston convent a few years ago:—"Yesterday Mrs. Ellen Corcoran, the mother of the girl, ap-

peared before Mayor Frothingham of Charlestown, and made sworn affidavit to the following facts:—

"I took my child Mary Joseph Corcoran, sometimes called 'Hannah,' and sometimes called 'Honora,' under my own custody, of my own free will and without the interference of any one. I placed her in a boarding house kept by John Welch, in Purchase-street, Boston, and she remained there, unrestrained of her liberty, until I procured a place for her in a private family out of the city, where I took her at my own expense, and where she now remains of her own free will and subject to no control."

"Mayor Frothingham under his own signature, says:—The undersigned have received positive assurances from the above named Ellen Corcoran, that her child, the above named Mary Joseph Corcoran shall return to Boston, and come before us as soon as Mrs. Corcoran, or a messenger whom she shall designate, can have time to go to the place of her residence and bring her back; and that the girl Mary Joseph shall be in Boston on, or before, Monday, the 7th inst."

The notorious Gavazzi has arrived in America, and there will be fun shortly with a pack of grinning fools rushing to hear the apostate monk blackguarding the Pope, in a language of which they do not understand a word.

FREEDOM OF EDUCATION.

We publish below, a petition in favor of "Freedom of Education" which is now being circulated, for signature, amongst the Catholic citizens, of both origins, of Montreal. We are not of a sanguine temperament; we have no faith in Protestant consistency, or Protestant promises generally; above all we distrust Liberal Protestant legislators, and have an instinctive horror of the man who "professes liberal principles." Yet we may be pardoned, if we venture "to indulge a hope" that Mr. George Brown will cordially support the prayer of the petition when presented. Mr. George Brown is a friend of the "Voluntary Principle"—at least he says he is—and as such, must surely cordially approve of the following sentiment:—

"That the members of one Religious denomination should not, by Law, be compelled to support the Religious, or Educational establishments, of another denomination, or, to which they are conscientiously opposed; and that they should be at liberty to support such Religious and Educational establishments *alone*, as they conscientiously approve of."

And then, Mr. George Brown, who feels so keenly for the wrongs inflicted upon the Catholics of Three Rivers in that, by Law, they are compelled to pay for the erection of a Catholic Cathedral, of which they can, and will, conscientiously make use—must be moved at the bare mention of the injustice of compelling Catholics to pay for the building of Non-Catholic School-houses of which they can make no use. If the former be an infringement of the "Voluntary Principle," how much more must the latter be an infringement of the same glorious "Principle?"

Besides, we would put it to Mr. George Brown—how much more inexcusable is it to violate the "Voluntary Principle" in the latter case, than in the former? Surely Religion is of more importance than Secular Education, just as heaven is of more importance than earth, and eternity of more importance than time. Now, if Religion, a thing of so great importance, can safely be left to the workings of the "Voluntary Principle," it follows, that Secular Education will run no danger if provided for in the same manner; how then can he hesitate to leave the care and support of Secular Education to the efforts of Voluntaryism, after having abandoned to its care, the far nobler, and the far more important, interests of Religion—Clearly, as a friend of the "Voluntary Principle" Mr. George Brown, will give a cordial support to the prayer and allegations of the following petition in favor of "Freedom of Education."

TO THE HONORABLE THE KNIGHTS, CITIZENS, AND BURGESSES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF CANADA, IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The Petition of the undersigned Roman Catholic Citizens of the City of Montreal,

HUMBLY SHEWETH—

That your petitioners beg leave, respectfully, to approach your Honorable House as the advocates of Freedom of Religion, and Freedom of Education.

That in a mixed community like ours, composed of members of all religious denominations, and all, by Law, entitled to equal civil rights, Freedom of Religion, and Freedom of Education, consist essentially in this: that the members of one denomination shall not, by Law, be compelled to support the religious, or educational, establishments, of another denomination, or to which they are conscientiously opposed; and that they shall be at liberty to support such religious and educational establishments *alone*, as they conscientiously approve of.

That Freedom of Education is as much the right of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada, as is Freedom of Religion.

That it is as unjust, and as repugnant to the principle of Freedom of Education, to compel Roman Catholics to pay for the support of Schools to which they are conscientiously opposed, as it would be unjust, and destructive of all Freedom of Religion, to compel Protestants to pay for building, and the support of, Roman Catholic Churches.

That it is grossly unjust to tax the members of any particular denomination for the support, either of Churches or of Schools, of which they can make no use, and which they cannot allow their children to attend, without doing violence to their sincere and conscientious (even if mistaken,) religious convictions.

That these principles, as essential to the maintenance of Freedom of Religion, and Freedom of Education, are fully recognized and acted upon, in Lower Canada, in which section of the Province the Protestant minority are exempt from the obligation of paying for the support, either of the Roman Catholic Church, or of Roman Catholic Schools; and in which they (the said Protestant minority) are, by Law, entitled to their separate Schools, supported by a fair share of the public School Fund, and the teachers of which are selected by a separate Board of Protestant Examiners.

That these principles are constantly violated in Upper Canada, in which section of the Province the Roman Catholic minority are compelled by the School Law, as at present interpreted, and enforced, to pay for the support of Schools entirely under Protestant control; in which children of Roman Catholic parents have been forced to join in Protestant religious exer-

cises, and to read Protestant books of devotion; in which moral training is often almost entirely neglected, (School Report, page 101); of which the teachers are, in too many instances, men of immoral habits, and imperfect education, whose opinions and conduct it would not be for the advantage of the young to imitate or imitate (School Report, page 66); and which Roman Catholic parents, therefore, cannot allow their children to attend, as by so doing, they would be doing violence to their sincere and conscientious (even if mistaken) religious convictions.

That your petitioners, though residing in a different section of the Province, cannot but feel acutely the grievous injustice to which their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens of Upper Canada are, and have long been, subjected.

That your petitioners place great reliance on the justice and wisdom of your Honorable House.

Wherefore, your petitioners humbly pray—in the name of their Roman Catholic brethren of Upper Canada—in the names of Freedom of Religion, and Freedom of Education—that a remedy may be applied to the gross injustice of which your petitioners complain; that to the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada may be granted the same rights as are already enjoyed by the Protestant minority in Lower Canada; and that, as Freedom of Religion, and Freedom of Education, are, by Law, fully secured to the latter, the same justice may be accorded to the former.

And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

STATE-SCHOOLISM IN THE UNITED STATES

It is always one source of consolation to the true Christian to reflect, that, no matter what his grievances may be, there are sure to be plenty of others good deal worse off than he is himself. For instance, the Catholics of Upper Canada, think it a great hardship to be compelled, by law, to support Non-Catholic Schools; they feel it a grievance to be taxed, in order to make up the salaries of a Methodist Superintendent, and his understrappers; and we think that they have very good grounds for complaint. But, if they will but cast their eyes across the lines, they will see abundant reasons to be thankful that they are not the citizens of a democratic republic; they will be the more reconciled to their position, when they compare it with that of their brethren, and co-religionists, in the happy land of mob-freedom; and they will thank God for the greater amount of liberty which they enjoy, owing to the far less democratic nature of their institutions and government. In Canada, Catholic parents are taxed, it is true, for the support of Non-Catholic Schools; but they need not, *as yet*, send their children to them, unless they like; in the United States they have gone a step further in the course of State-Schoolism, and now seriously propose to make, not only the payment for, but the attendance on these State-Schools, compulsory.—"My children"—says the State, that is, the sovereign majority—"shall go to my schools;" and if its subjects are "its children," most assuredly the State is right.

But it seems that there are in the United States, as elsewhere, a troublesome, discontented, class of persons called parents—foolish fathers and mothers—who fancy that they have, somehow or another, claims over the State's "children;"—that having given birth to the child, and fed it, clothed it, tended it, in infancy and sickness, they have some right to be consulted as to its education; nay, they go so far as to assert that the child is "their" child, and not the State's child, and that the State shall not have it.—To make matters worse, these refractory parents are, for the most part, Papists; whereupon Yankee Protestantism at once detects a clear case of foreign conspiracy to overthrow its republican institutions; in the beautiful language of the Kentucky Demosthenes—"It smells a rat—it sees him brewing in the storm—and it will crush him in the bud."

Nowise troubled with this charge of anti-republicanism, or with these terrible threats, the Catholic press throughout the United States, animated, and guided by the exhortations, and by the instructions, of the Prelates of the Church, is unanimous in demanding Freedom of Education for all classes of the community. The School question is the question of the day with our brethren in the States, as it is with ourselves in Canada; but far greater are the difficulties with which the former have to contend, owing to the smallness of their numbers, their poverty, and above all, to the democratic despotism of their institutions, which enables a brute majority to trample upon, and ill use, the minority, as it pleases; were we as far plunged in the filthy slough of democracy, our condition would soon be as bad as that of our republican neighbors, despite our greater numbers, and our more prosperous condition.

For of all tyrannies, the most cruelly oppressive and unrelenting, as it is the most odious and degrading, is the tyranny of a democracy, or despot majority. Under all other tyrannies, the condition of the oppressed is never so low as to leave no room for hope; if his body be shackled, still his mind may be free. But for the wretched victim of democratic despotism, there is not even hope; he is not only oppressed, but degraded, morally and intellectually—degraded far below the level of the beasts of the field, and rendered, not only incapable, but unworthy of freedom—fit only for the yoke and the lash; the most pitiful, the most abject, creature that crawls over the face of God's bright earth.

Not that we mean that the institutions of the United States are, or in their origin were, democratic; though it is true—a truth acknowledged and lamented by America's best and most learned statesmen—that these institutions have to a great extent become, and are daily becoming more and more, so; and that the encroachment of democracy threatens, at no distant date, to destroy the Constitutional, or rather Traditional, Freedom for which the fathers of the Confederation so bravely fought. There is in America, as in Europe, but one power capable of resisting the onward-march of this tyrant foe; and, well,