

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Union Bank of London, London. The Bank of Ireland, Dublin. The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street. Montreal, December 14, 1854.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 27, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE Imperial Parliament was opened on Tuesday, the 3rd inst., with the usual formalities; the Royal Speech being read by the Lord Chancellor. This document is as stupid as most Royal speeches generally are; giving, of course, the least possible amount of information in the greatest possible quantity of words.

Her Majesty—who at one moment is in ecstatic raptures of joy, and the next plunged in deepest sorrow—expresses her pleasure at the result of the Paris Conference; rejoices in the prospect of an amicable settlement of the Neuchâtel difficulty; regrets the obstinacy of the King of the Two Sicilies in rejecting the interference of Foreign Powers, with the internal affairs of his kingdom; “indulges a hope” that pending negotiations with the Government of the United States, on the Central American question, will prove successful; announces the conclusion of a treaty with the King of Siam; mourns over the infatuation of the Schah of Persia, and the continued contumacy of the Chinese authorities; is delighted with the gallantry and spirit of her troops; expresses her gratification at the general well being of her people; and commits the great interests of the country to the wisdom of Parliament, upon whose deliberations she invokes the Divine blessing. The Hudson Bay question has been mooted in the House of Commons; and a Special Committee has been appointed to enquire into the affairs of the Company. By some speakers it was proposed that the existing monopoly should be broken up, and the land thrown open to British colonisation—the whole territory to be annexed to Canada. Of course, Mr. Spooner has given his annual notice of a motion against Maynooth; there have also been some animated debates in both Houses on the justice and policy of the hostilities now being carried on in the East. The conduct of the Government has been, by some of the speakers, strongly condemned, and papers loudly called for.

From the Continent, there is little of importance to report. The condition of Naples excites much attention, as there is apparently a storm brewing in that quarter. The Emperor of Austria has, it is now said, decided upon granting a general and unconditional amnesty to all political offenders in his dominions; and it is also reported that the Czar has the same intentions towards his exiled Polish subjects. The progress of hostilities in Persia is watched narrowly by the Russian Government, and it would appear that movements are taking place among the troops on the shores of the Caspian. From Persia and China, we have nothing new; but it is confidently asserted that the Schah has, as yet, no intentions of submitting to the demands of the British Government. On the contrary, a “Holy War” has been proclaimed, and the people are loudly called upon to take up arms.

The American press is still filled with revolting details of the Burdell murder. From an affidavit made by a Dr. Spicer, formerly a partner of the deceased, it would seem as if Mrs. Cunningham, who was certainly at one time, Dr. Burdell’s “prosechyte”—as the *Morning Chronicle* would call it—had a few weeks before the murder been really married to him; but it would also seem certain that, for some time, she had been living with Mr. Eckell, likewise as his “prosechyte”; thus the mystery of the murder is yet far from being cleared up. A new Protestant sect has been inaugurated amongst our neighbors. The founder is a German woman, a Mrs. Maister, who calls herself Sister of the Holy Trinity, and professes to save souls; and no doubt with as much truth as do other Protestant missionaries. Mrs. Maister has however had the misfortune so to carry on her operations as to bring herself within the clutches of the law; and she has been committed to stand her trial on a charge of fraudulently obtaining money from her converts. In Canada, our evangelical gentry manage things more cleverly.

Without wishing to give offence to our friend of the *Ottawa Tribune*, he must permit us to express our surprise and regret at the altered tone, with respect to the all-important “School Question,” which, in his last week’s issue he has, for motives to us unknown, been pleased to adopt. But a short time ago, and we flattered ourselves that the *Ottawa Tribune* was a bold and uncompromising advocate of “Freedom of Education;” and we read with pleasure, and hearty concurrence, his manly exhortations to his Catholic supporters to stir themselves in the good cause—and to force their wrongs upon the notice of an unwill-

ling Legislature, and a corrupt and time-serving Ministry—as the only means of extorting justice from our opponents; and of rescuing the souls of our little ones from the grasp of the proselytisers.

“It is the duty of our people”—said the *Tribune* but a fortnight ago—“throughout the length and breadth of the Province to petition the Legislature at an early day for the passing of a law similar to that proposed by Mr. Boves at the last Session. We are sure that our efficient and active School Board in this City will take this matter up. If we expect our friends in the House to take this matter in hand, it is our duty to strengthen their position by every means in our power. One way of doing this is to flood the floor of the House, with petition upon petition. It is the only alternative now left us, and it must be carried through energetically. We would recommend that the Toronto Board or the Board of this City, undertake to prepare the necessary headings for such petitions, and copies be sent to each parish in the Province; requesting the gentlemen to whose care they may be entrusted to have them filled up by a certain day, and forwarded to Toronto, there to be placed in the hands of some independent member for presentation. If this be done it will prove, beyond a shadow of doubt, to the Legislature that we are united to a man on this question, and no Ministry will dare refuse us our just and unalienable rights—the right of every parent to educate his child as his conscience dictates. Let the ball be put in motion, and victory will crown our efforts.”

Thus spoke the honest independent Catholic, but a few days ago; when, not having the fear of “Jack-in-Office” before his eyes, or the interests of the Cauchon clique of corruptionists at heart, he gave free expression to the dictates of his conscience. Judge then of our surprise at the change of tone and manner indicated by the following extract from an article upon the same subject in the last number of the *Ottawa Tribune*:

“An article appeared in our columns last week, during the absence of the Editor, suggesting the propriety of petitioning the House at its next session for the amendments required to the Separate School Bill. This movement, in our opinion, would be certainly calculated to strengthen the hands of Mr. George Brown and his Clear Grits allies, while there is no certainty of his being successful in securing any improvement on the law as it now stands. There is yet a strong spirit of fanaticism abroad, a spirit engendered by the *Globe* and its allies, which prevents even intelligent and well meaning Protestants from viewing the question in a rational light; they entertain a dread that the Catholic body, in seeking freedom of education, aim at the subversion of the Common School system. The Clear Grit party labor steadily to instil this idea into the minds of the Protestants of Western Canada, and this has been the chief element of Brown’s success up to the present time. Now, we should like to see Mr. Brown deprived for a season of his trump card, which would in our opinion effectually finish his career. We should like to strengthen the hands of our liberal Protestant friends against Mr. Brown and the clear grits are politically arrayed. We believe the surest means to effect this would be to abstain from agitation of this question for a season. To bear patiently with the deficiency of the present bill, until the Protestant dupes of the agitator see how little cause for alarm exists in granting to Catholics a fair and equitable School Bill; it is for this reason that we think a Session might safely be allowed to pass without pressing for the slight Amendments which this Act calls for. We have no fear of obtaining these Amendments if this course is taken, and we could safely hope to see the animosity and bitterness engendered by Mr. Brown, completely allayed within a short time if a prudent course is thus pursued. While Brown has pursued his anti-Catholic policy, his inveterate opposition to the material advancement of this section of Canada has been equally apparent, his scheme for basing representation on population, tho’ advocated on the grounds of depriving Catholic Lower Canada of its Legislative influence, it is intended to give to the western peninsula a complete control over the public expenditure so as to monopolize for his favorite section the lion’s share of the loaves and fishes. This Ottawa country would remain a wilderness under the regime of the clear grits and rouges. No public improvements, no fair play could be expected from them. We have two motives for desiring the discomfiture of this firebrand and his allies. And we hope that Catholics at least will make some little sacrifice to ensure such a result. As yet no attempt has been made in Western Canada to induce renewed agitation on the School question, and until we can see that there is a general belief in the propriety or expediency of committing ourselves to a course of agitation, the coming Session, we must refrain from advising the people to make any move in the matter.

Whence this change?—one is naturally led to ask.—To what thaumaturgic influences has the editor of the *Tribune* been exposed, that he should thus suddenly belie all his honorable antecedents? We can understand easily why the Ministry should desire to avoid during the coming session, all agitation upon the School Question. We can readily conceive that, to them, it is highly desirable that Catholics should allow the matter to drop; for it is the interest, as it is the intention, of our rulers, to shirk, if possible, the School Question—as a question, the discussion of which is fraught with peril to the Ministerial barque. For this reason, but for this reason only, can we admit the good policy of allowing the Session to pass without making an effort to ameliorate our condition, and to throw off the degrading shackles of “State-Schoolism” which press heavily upon us. But if we do adopt the servile line of policy advocated by our Ottawa cotemporary, we may at once, and for ever, resign ourselves to the fate with which we are menaced; and which—if we do not vigorously exert ourselves to stave it off—we shall have most richly deserved. The question then which presents itself for the consideration of Catholics is simply this—Which shall we prefer?—the interests of the Church, or those of the Ministry? the souls of our children, or the quarterly salary of M. Cauchon?

We attach no importance to the “dread” which, according to our cotemporary, even well meaning Protestants entertain, “that the Catholic body, in seeking ‘Freedom of Education,’ aim at the subversion of the ‘Common School’ system.” If by the “Common School” system is meant a system of mixed schools, to the support of which Catholics and Protestants are alike compelled to contribute—and we confess that this is the only sense in which we understand the words—we have no hesitation in avowing that we do aim at its subversion. Why! what is it that

we ask for? Is it not for a “Separate School” system?—and is not a “Separate School” system, the very contradictory and therefore destructive, of the “Common School” system? It is no use mincing terms—the two systems are incompatible one with the other; where there is a “Common School” system, there can be no “Separate School” system; and where the latter exists, the former is necessarily defunct. In contending for “Separate Schools” for ourselves therefore, we do aim at the subversion of a “Common School” system; and why should we fear, why should we be ashamed to own it?

Not that we aim at the subversion of a School system which shall be “Common” to all Protestants, but from whose operation Catholics shall be exempt. Such a system Protestants have of course the right to adopt without our interference; but such a system would not be a “Common,” but a “Peculiar,” or “Separate” School system; for it would be a system peculiar to Protestants, and to Protestants only. A “Common” School system means a system universally applicable to the whole community, and in which all its members, are included without exception, and without distinction of creeds or origins. In this, the only legitimate sense of the words, we have no “Common School” system at the present moment, either in Upper or Lower Canada. Our actual system is a variety—a very imperfect one we admit—of the “Separate,” or “Denominational” system; and this system, we—Catholics—desire to perfect, extend, and perpetuate. Its enemies—who really aim at the subversion of our actual school system—are the fanatics who seek to substitute the “Common,” or “Mixed” School system in lieu thereof. We then, are the true Conservatives, and, at the same time, Reformers; our opponents are simply Destructives. This answer should suffice for those who charge us with aiming at the subversion of the “Common” School system. Our object is not so much to subvert it—because it does not yet exist—as to prevent its adoption; because its adoption, in Canada necessarily implies the subversion of the system actually existing—that is, the “Separate,” or “Denominational” system.

The *London Times* inserted lately a letter from one of its correspondents at Rome upon the subject of the Irish Catholic Episcopate, which has given rise to much discussion in certain quarters. Not that anything appearing in such a journal upon Irish or Catholic affairs, is, of itself, entitled to much respect; but because it is strongly indicative of the policy of the present Government, and of its ulterior intentions.

To sow disunion betwixt Clergy and laity, to inspire the latter with mistrust of their spiritual leaders, is, and ever has been, the policy of the British Government towards Ireland. Next, its object is to detach both Irish Clergy and Irish people from Rome, the centre of Catholic unity, by representing the latter as indifferent to their wants, and hostile to their best interests. It is for this end that the *Times*’ correspondent, in the letter above alluded to, suggests, and urges, the propriety of a *Concordat*, or agreement betwixt the Holy See and the British Government; in virtue of which the latter would have a voice in the nominations to vacant Bishoprics in Ireland; and in return for which the existence of Irish Catholic Bishops, and Archbishops, would be graciously acknowledged at the Castle, a Charter granted to the Catholic University, followed *per-haps* by a partition of the ill-gotten wealth of the “monster establishment,” amongst the different religious denominations—in the proportions of one-fourth to the Roman Catholic Clergy, or Church, one-eighth to all the other religious denominations, and the remaining five-eighths between the educational and charitable establishments of the country.” Such are the terms upon which it is proposed that the Catholic Church in Ireland should surrender her independence into the hands of a hostile Protestant Government; such is the price which that Government would willingly pay to obtain control over the Irish Episcopate. That these propositions have been made by the British Government, is unlikely; but that they have been seriously entertained in certain influential quarters at least, would seem probable from the prominent position assigned to them in the columns of the “Great Thunderer” of the British press. As the Catholic Hierarchy of the British Empire is now a fixed fact, which all the beastly howlings of Exeter Hall cannot overturn, it is now proposed to acknowledge it, in the hopes that, like the Protestant Hierarchy, it may become a useful tool in the hands of the Ministry of the day; and as long experience has shown that the Catholic Clergy of Ireland cannot be intimidated, or put down by persecution, the British Government hopes now to corrupt and degrade them to a level with the official nominees of the Anglican Establishment. We need hardly add that, by the Catholic press of the Empire, this insidious proposition is scornfully rejected. The Catholic Church will not consent to wear the fetters of the Protestant Government of Great Britain, even though those fetters be made of gold.

“BUTTONS” AS AN AGENT IN REGENERATION.—Our evangelical brethren, it is well known, do for the most part reject the Sacrament of Baptism as the agent of Regeneration; it is consoling to know however that they have found an admirable substitute in “Buttons.” This we learn from a Report published in the *Montreal*

*Herald* of Wednesday last, of the proceedings of a great meeting of delegates from the Sunday Schools of Canada and the United States, held at Kingston on the 11th inst.

The propounder of this new and startling theory of Regeneration—or that process whereby man is said to be made a new creature, or born again, not of water and the Spirit, but of Buttons—was a Mr. Thomson of Rochester, forty years Sabbath School Teacher; and who, amongst many other strange things, “had seen God pour fourth His spirit upon these schools like rain upon the trown grass.” The speaker delivered a glowing eulogy on a Mr. Robert Raikes—who we believe in his day did an extensive business in the evangelical line; and in the course of his remarks propounded his valuable theory of Regeneration:—

“He had asked”—he said—“a large manufacturer of buttons to make a Sunday School button, with Robert Raikes’ head, and the word ‘Try’ stamped upon them. He might sell 100,000 in the United States, besides those that would be wanted for Canada and England. If a boy had such a button as that, it would make a new boy of him.”

Should not this stir our “Brummagen” manufacturers to exertion in the manufacture of buttons? They—as it is well known—deal largely in the idol business, supplying the heathen population of India with beautiful little brass and cast iron gods—should they not do, at least as much for Christian boys’ souls? should they not at least try the experiment, seeing that it involves no great outlay, and that their regenerating buttons would be sure to meet with an extensive sale all over North America?

Some sceptical persons may feel inclined to doubt whether the process of sowing a “Sunday School Button” on a boy’s breeches will make the wearer a “new creature” in the Lord; and will perhaps, in the hardness of their hearts, contend that neither the garment nor the boy will be changed or renovated thereby. But of the following process, for converting bad Catholics into good Protestants, there can be but one opinion. The speaker who recommended it, was a Rev. Mr. Denison (of Buffalo). We again copy from the Report of the *Montreal Herald*.

“The teachers”—said Mr. Denison, when recommending his plan at which strange to say the Roman Catholic Bishop had taken alarm—“would go to the children with a bible in one hand, and a loaf of bread in the other; and when he approached the parent in this guise, and took him by the hand, it became easy to pour the word of the living God into his heart”—(to say nothing of course of pouring warm soup and strabout into his bowels.) “The man thus assailed”—in heart and belly—“would throw off Popery, and would be brought into that liberty wherewith Christ made his people free.”

We confess we have far more confidence in a “loaf of bread,” than in “Buttons,” as an instrument of conversion amongst Papist of tender years, and strong digestion. The “belly” is always naturally Protestant; and a Protestant appeal to that organ, coming in the “guise of a loaf of bread,” is sure of an attentive hearing. Thus though Mr. Thompson may believe in “Buttons” for the remission of sins, we think that “His Reverence the Roman Catholic Bishop” to whom the Rev. Mr. Denison alluded, has good cause “to take more alarm at that effort”—(the loaf-of-bread-in-one-hand-and-the-bible-in-the-other-effort)—“than at any other which has yet been made” by the Holy Protestant Church.

Mr. Alex. de Valdeck feels very much offended with the remarks of our Guelph correspondent; and in an angry communication to the *Toronto Colonist* would seem to insinuate that he has been made the victim of Popish intolerance; the truth being that Mr. Valdeck has simply made himself ridiculous by his ignorance, or wilful misrepresentation, of European history.

Mr. Valdeck—and it is for this that he was taken to task by our Guelph correspondent—asserted in his lecture delivered on the 23d ult., in the Guelph Court House, “that the Turks advanced to Vienna the capital of the Austrian dominions, laid siege to that city, and that the Hungarians came to the assistance of the besieged, and freed not only Austria, but all Europe from the Turkish yoke.”

Now this statement is either true; or it is a lie. If it is true, Mr. De Valdeck can easily establish its truth by historical records; and this he is challenged to do. If it is a lie, then has he no right to complain of the manner in which he has been spoken of by the Catholic press. For the man, who, ignorant of history, presumes to lecture others upon historical topics, must be a fool; and he who, acquainted with the real facts of history, distorts or misrepresents them to suit his purpose, is a knave. Mr. Valdeck may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases.

As to the facts of the case, we still reiterate our assertion that the Hungarians did not raise the siege of Vienna when besieged by the Turks.—That the first siege in 1529 was repulsed by the brave garrison; and that in 1683, it was by the arms of the Poles led by John Sobieski, and not by the Hungarians, that Vienna was saved, and Europe delivered from the dread of the Ottoman yoke. Instead then of whining about being the victim of Popish persecution, it is for Mr. Valdeck to show, when, and under what circumstances, the Hungarians ever rescued Vienna from the grasp of the infidel; and in what single particular an injustice has been done him, either by the TRUE WITNESS, or any other member of the Catholic press in Canada.

We pause for a reply; reminding Mr. Valdeck that the sole question at issue, is—“Did, or did not, the Hungarians raise the siege of Vienna when beleaguered by the Turks?”

THE case of the “Swaddler” Pepin, who, as we mentioned in our last, was caught with another man’s young run-away wife—and who, refusing to give her up when called upon to do so, received a good kicking from the injured husband—is now undergoing investigation at Quebec.—It seems certain, however, that the row had nothing to do with religion; but originated entirely in the efforts of poor Jacques to reclaim, and recover possession of his wife from the man with whom he caught her, and who, as the *Chronicle* says, had made a “prosechyte” of her. Whether such a creature was worth fighting about at all, is perhaps doubtful.

The *Montreal Witness* is very angry with us for saying that Pepin—the fellow who was caught with Jacques’ wife—was hired by the *French Canadian Missionary Society* as a “swaddler.” This our cotemporary has the good taste to deny; and jealous of the honor of the Society, he indignantly repudiates all sort of connection with Pepin. Our mistake, however, was very natural; for the Quebec *Morning Chronicle*, from whom we received our information, in speaking of the said Pepin, described him as a “French Canadian Protestant Missionary;” and as being “connected with a Society for Missions among French Canadians.” The natural inference was, that the Society thus spoken of, was the “French Canadian Missionary Society.”—However, as the *Montreal Witness*, in the name of that Society, assures us in his issue of the 25th inst., that Pepin “was never in any sort of connection with it,” we willingly correct the error into which the report of the *Morning Chronicle* had led us; and take this opportunity of congratulating the *Montreal Witness*, and F. C. M. Society, upon their good taste in repudiating “any sort of connection” with this M. Pepin.

STARTLING, IF NOT BLASPHEMOUS.—We read in the *Montreal Witness* of Saturday last, that, lately “in Newhaven, there were assembled within the College walls a company met for the very same purpose”—praying, “And even while yet they prayed the *Holy Ghost* came down.”—Such is the style in which these blasphemous fanatics make free with the Third Person of the ever Blessed Trinity!

MR. LOVELL’S “CANADA DIRECTORY.”—We have received from Mr. Lovell a supply of “specimen pages” of this useful and important work, the object being to show what its character will be when published early in September next. Amongst those specimens are some twenty-five pages from that portion of the work devoted to our city, shewing the admirable arrangement and the fullness of the information it will give on all matters within the objects of the publication. They also contain many pages from the Toronto section of the work, being, in both instances, preceded by a concise, historical and statistical sketch of the city. These sketches are well done, and contain much valuable and interesting information, proving that the editorial charge of the work is in able and competent hands. On the whole, we have no hesitation in saying that, when issued, Mr. Lovell’s Canada Directory will be able creditable to the publisher and valuable to the public in both sections of the Province, as well as to all having business or social relations with our country.

A Concert will be held in the Mechanics’ Hall on Tuesday evening next, for the benefit of the Orphans of the Providence Nunnery. Several of our best Amateur Singers have promised their services.

THE STATE-SCHOOL CONTROVERSY.

We would call the attention of our readers to the subjoined letter upon the subject of the correspondence which has lately passed betwixt the Reverend M. Bruyere on the one hand, and the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education for Canada West, on the other. It will be seen that it is intended to publish the said correspondence upon the subject of “Freedom of Education v. State-Schoolism,” in a pamphlet form; and the aid of the public is requested in order to enable the Rev. M. Bruyere to carry out his useful design. The pamphlet will contain about 80 pages; and the cost of publication will be Twenty five pounds for the first thousand copies, and Fifteen pounds for every subsequent thousand. If the publication is large, of course a still further reduction of price may be expected. It is to be hoped that throughout the Province, Catholics will show their zeal for the good cause by encouraging, as far as is in their power, the circulation of a pamphlet in which the cause of “Freedom of Education” is so boldly and ably defended. Persons desirous of subscribing should apply to Mr. Lynn the Bishop’s agent at Toronto, stating the number of copies for which they are willing to subscribe. We give below a letter upon this subject from the Rev. M. Bruyere to the editor of the *Toronto Leader*, followed by a communication from His Lordship the Bishop of London, C.W., on the same subject:—

THE RYERSON BRUYERE CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “LEADER.”

Dear Sir,—In compliance with your suggestion of the 12th inst., I hastened, on the same day, to inform you that I acceded to the proposal made by you, that the whole of the late correspondence between Dr. Ryerson and myself should be published in pamphlet form. I invited, at the same time, my distinguished antagonist to join with me in bearing an equal share of the expenses attending the publication. Several days have now elapsed since the suggestions were made public. Hitherto nothing has issued from the Education Office to indicate what course the Chief Superintendent of Education intends to pursue. If his stern silence on the matter is to be taken as a criterion of his feelings, I am inclined to think that he does not approve of the publication of our correspondence. Of his reasons for objecting to it, Dr. Ryerson is, doubtless, the best judge. But, as I have my reasons for acting differently, I beg leave to inform