

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. . . \$2½ do.
 Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
 AND
 CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 27, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Washington* steamer, from Southampton, the 10th inst., puts us in possession of news from the Crimea up to the 4th inst. Marshall St. Arnaud had succumbed to the fatigues of the campaign; and in consequence of his death, the command of the French army had devolved on General Canrobert, whose military capacity is highly spoken of. The plan of the campaign is now fully developed, and seems to promise success. In possession of the harbor of Bella-Clava, the Allies have established a good basis for their subsequent operations, and secured means of communication with the fleet. The heavy artillery, to the amount of 120 guns, has been landed, and, according to a letter from Vienna, its fire was opened upon Sebastopol on the morning of the 4th inst. The attack is being made on the South side, where the defences are supposed to be weakest; and it is to be hoped that a few days of steady firing will open the way for our brave soldiers into the Russian stronghold. The capture of Sebastopol is now reduced to a question of time; and as Prince Menschikoff seems to be put, for the present at least, *hors de combat*, there is we trust ample time at the disposition of the besiegers to bring the struggle to a successful issue, before reinforcements, in sufficient numbers to enable the Russians to assume offensive operations in the field, shall have reached the Crimea. It is not yet ascertained what amount of troops the Emperor can spare for the defence of this important province; but it is certain that the military power of Russia has been much exaggerated. On paper it looks formidable enough, but then it must be remembered that in a vast empire like Russia it is not easy to bring the whole of this force to bear upon any one point. This was well established by the results of the campaign of 1812, in which Russia fought on her own territory for her very existence, and yet was unable to bring more than 200,000 sabres and boyonets into the field. We may therefore reasonably conclude, that, menaced as the Emperor is, on the North by the Baltic fleet, and on the South West by Omar Pacha, he has not many men to spare for the relief of Sebastopol. Perhaps, even whilst we write, the Allied flags are floating triumphantly over the captured city.

From the Baltic, we have nothing new to report. The return of the fleet has been postponed, and an attack upon Cronstadt is still spoken of; but it is to be feared that the time for active operations in those inclement seas has been allowed to pass, and that the people of England will have the mortification of beholding their gallant Armada, which left their shores as if to an easy conquest over the Russian Bear, return with nothing to boast of but the reduction of the second-rate fortress of Bomarsund. Great will be the disgust of the nation, and loud the popular clamor against the ineptitude of the Administration, and the unaccountable supineness of the Admiral. It is generally thought that Sir Charles Napier is growing old; and a saying attributed to him some years ago, when second in command in the Mediterranean—"that he would not give a something or other—for an officer after he was sixty"—is often brought to mind. Sir C. Napier is now at least as old as was Sir Robert Stopford, when the former thus impolitely reflected on the age of his senior officer; "and thus the whiff of time brings in his revenges."

The *Niagara* is reported, but she brings no additional news of any importance. The Allies were firing away on Sebastopol, but up to the latest dates no impression had been produced. Prince Menschikoff is to the North East of the City, awaiting the arrival of Gortschakoff, and Osten Sacken, with reinforcements from Perekop. The Russians are said to have sunk seven line of battle ships at the entrance of the harbor, in anticipation of an attack in that quarter from the Allied squadron.

Further investigations into the circumstances of the Enniskillen Rail-Road catastrophe confirm our anticipations, that it would be found to have originated in accident—the result of rapid driving and drunken drivers. We refer our readers to extracts from the Irish journals, which will be found on our third page. Cholera is abating, the harvest is abundant, and in spite of the failure of some large houses in Liverpool, the prospects for the coming winter are sufficiently cheerful.

We gather from our American exchanges further particulars concerning the essentially Protestant outrage perpetrated by the brave Protestants of Maine on the person of a Catholic priest, for the offence of saying Mass, and preaching to his congregation, within the walls of a private chapel. According to the *Bangor Daily Journal*, the Rev. Mr. Bapst was stopping at the house of a Mr. Kent, some distance

from the village of Elsworth, when about 11 or 12 at night a large body of Protestants broke into the house, seized and stripped the priest stark naked, and commenced reviling him, like genuine Protestants, with every kind of ribald obscenity and blasphemy mingled with beastly, but essentially Protestant allusions to the Blessed Virgin, "who would not save him." But decency requires us to draw a veil over the abominations of Protestantism.

The ruffians then tarred and feathered their victim, and, mounting him on a rail, carried him to a slip yard where, having glutted their vengeance, they left him exposed on a cold and stormy night to the inclemency of the weather. Of course such a proceeding could not have occurred, if the actual perpetrators had not been well aware that they would be supported and countenanced by the strong Protestant feeling of the country. It is in vain for Catholics to expect redress from the laws; and though differing in details from the cruelties generally practised by English Protestants upon their Catholic countrymen, we see nothing in this Elsworth outrage to excite our surprise. Always, and whenever it has had the power, has Protestantism approved itself true to its beastly and bloody origin: the veritable offspring, as Cobbett says, of blood and lust.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

As usual, the debates in the Legislative Assembly are of such a character that it would be neither for the amusement of our readers, nor the credit of the Legislature to publish them. Mr. Brown made a violent attack upon the appointments of Magistrates, and other public functionaries; Mr. Hincks repeatedly gave him the lie, which Mr. George Brown pocketed very tamely, like a man who is used to be treated as a wholesale dealer in slander and fiction. The Hon. gentleman—he is honorable by courtesy—moved for copies of any correspondence between the Catholic Bishops and the Provincial Government on the subject of the "Clergy Reserves."—Granted. Mr. Drummond has introduced his Bill for the settlement of the Seigniorial question, which measure, if we may trust the assurances of the Ministry, is to be advanced *pari passu* with the "Clergy Reserves" Bill; it being generally understood that the votes of Upper Canadians will be given on the former measure, in exchange for the votes of Lower Canadians in support of secularisation.

On Tuesday evening, the order of the day for the second reading of the Clergy Reserves Bill was taken up. An animated debate ensued, Mr. Gamble moving an amendment to the effect, that secularisation was a violation of good faith towards the present recipients of the funds accruing from the Clergy Reserves. Only 12 members supported it. Another amendment by Mr. Powell, for referring the question to a direct vote of the people was rejected as out of order. The motion for the second reading was then carried; the numbers being—For the second reading, 93—against it, 15.

THE SECULARISATION BILL.

It will not pass, says one; it must be carried, cries another; with considerable modifications, adds a third; but that it will pass, and much in its present form, is, we fear, the most probable hypothesis. We do not agree with the *Journal de Quebec*, that any solution of the long agitated question of the Clergy Reserves is preferable to a prolonged agitation; we admit that a solution, and a final solution is necessary; but we doubt much if Catholics should accept the solution propounded by Solicitor General McDonald's Bill.

Yet we fear it is likely to pass, and with the assistance of the French Canadian Catholic vote; because it will be judged—not by its own merits, not by its inevitable effects upon the ecclesiastical institutions of Lower Canada, and the School system of the Upper section of the Province—but solely with regard to its bearings upon the fate of the Ministry by whom it is introduced, and its connection with another exciting question in Lower Canada—the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure. Some will vote for it to keep the present administration in, or rather to keep the *Rouges* and *Clear Grits* out; others will vote for it to secure the co-operation of Upper Canadian members on the Seigniorial question; whilst the *Rouges* themselves will heartily support it, as the first of a series of measures destined to extinguish the too exorbitant pretensions of the *pretresse*, and to prepare the way for other great, and radical social changes.

Of the Upper Canada members, a majority will certainly vote for it. A few indeed of the old Conservative party may oppose it, but their numbers are but small, and their influence still less. Their leading men are willing to throw the Reserves overboard, and the Protestant Conservatives have therefore no right to expect that their Catholic friends and auxiliaries in the Lower Province shall sacrifice themselves in the defence of a cause, which the principals have already abandoned as hopeless. The general feeling is, that it would be useless to prolong the contest.

Such being the case, it seems that the opponents of secularisation have nothing left but to submit with the best grace they can assume, to their inevitable fate. It can hardly be expected of them that they should do more, or that they should join in the joyful acclamations with which the approaching downfall of all ecclesiastical endowments will be hailed by the democratic, and infidel party.

We need therefore say but little of Mr. McDonald's Bill now before the country. It embodies all the most objectionable features of Mr. Hincks' Bill, and differs from the latter chiefly in this—that it explicitly asserts—what the other only implied—that State endowments of the Church are evil, and that the secular power should not lend its assistance to the

support of religion. "Whereas," recites the Bill under consideration, "it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State." There can now be no mistake about the principle upon which the secularisation of the "Clergy Reserves" is advocated.

"It is desirable to remove all semblance of connection betwixt Church and State?" It is desirable to ignore God in the management of our secular concerns, and to proclaim the principle of political atheism. This is the plain meaning of the extraordinary recital in Mr. McDonald's Bill; and which certainly has not been introduced without good reasons, without some ulterior designs, but for the successful prosecution of which it is first necessary to get the Catholics of Lower Canada to solemnly recognise the principle that "it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State." It is a principle susceptible of a very extended application, as Catholics will yet learn to their cost.

Of course it will not stop with the "Clergy Reserves." If indeed "it be desirable" that the very semblance even of connection between Church and State should be removed—and as the aid which the Civil tribunals lend to the Catholic Church in Lower Canada for the payment of tithes to the parochial Clergy, is certainly rather more than the "semblance" of such a "connection"—it does not require a prophet's gift to foresee the mode in which the principle that French Canadian Catholics are now called upon to affirm, may, and most assuredly will, be applied to Lower Canada. Ecclesiastical Corporations exist, in their corporate capacity, *only* in virtue of an Act of the State; but if it be desirable that the very semblance of connection between Church and State should be abolished, the State should at once repeal those Acts, and allow those bodies to die a natural death. Now a Corporation can have no heirs; and dying intestate and without natural heirs, it is easy to foretell what will become of its property. Assuredly the principle embodied in Mr. McDonald's Bill is destined to have a very extended application.

And were it consistently carried out—which it will not be, unless Canada be destined to relapse into the condition of a heathen country—what, we should like to know, would become of State-paid Chaplains to our jails and penitentiaries? If it be indeed desirable that the "semblance" even of connection between Church and State should be abolished, why, in the name of all that is ridiculous and inconsistent, should the State be burdened with the salaries of Chaplains for the Houses of Legislature? Why should such a monstrous piece of humbug, as State-paid clergymen, for wealthy members of Parliament, rich enough to pay their own ministers, and who expressly declare that there should be no connection, or semblance of connection, between Church and State—why should such a piece of humbug, we say, be any longer perpetuated? Why should the business of the State, and its solemn assemblies, be inaugurated with prayer, if it be desirable to abolish all semblance of connection between Church and State? And why should the State busy itself with Sabbath Observance Bills, and other religious enactments? If the principle be true, it must be susceptible of universal application; therefore all salaries paid by the State to Chaplains, and all State enactments enforcing religious observances, should be abolished. If it be not susceptible of universal application, it cannot be true; and if it is not true, it must be a lie, and as such is to be repudiated, as of the devil—the Father of lies and the especial patron of all cant.

We repeat it. Secularisation can only be logically and consistently defended upon the plea that all State endowments, all State assistance to, all State recognition, of the Christian religion—which is embodied in the Church—are essentially evil, and that it is desirable to abolish them, even to the *semblance* of connection between Church and State. This is the doctrine of the Voluntaries with Mister George Brown at their head; but this is a doctrine which no conscientious Catholic can assert, repudiated as it always has been by the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church. "It is not desirable," says the Catholic, "that all connection between Church and State should be severed: it is an evil to be deplored, and a calamity to be averted."

As regards the School system of Upper Canada, Mr. McDonald's Bill is just as objectionable, and as unjust towards Catholics, as was Mr. Hincks' measure. It passes over the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves to the General Funds of the County Municipal Councils, according to population, making them "applicable to any purpose to which such Funds are applicable." Now the "General Funds of the Municipality" are applicable to Common School purposes; but from the composition of the Municipalities we may be sure that they will not be applied to separate or Catholic School purposes; and thus the Catholic separate Schools of Upper Canada will be as effectually debarred from all participation in public funds made applicable to School purposes, as if they had been expressly excluded by the very words of the Act.

We shall return to this subject next week, for we do not think that a measure so important will be allowed to pass without discussion. In the meantime we would call the attention of those of our contemporaries who blamed us some months ago for mixing together the School and Clergy Reserves questions, to this simple fact—that the speeches of the introducer of the Bill, and of the members of the House who took part in the debate on the motion for the first reading of the Clergy Reserves Bill, were almost entirely devoted to the discussion of the School question—that, whether they liked it or no, the supporters of the Bill felt themselves compelled to treat the Separate School question as essentially part and parcel of the Clergy Reserves question. It is thus that, from the beginning, the *True Witness* has always viewed and discussed it: because it is evident that the fate

of our separate Schools—that is, of Catholic education—in Upper Canada is inseparably connected with the solution of the Clergy Reserves question.

"The Clergy Reserves Bill, introduced lately in the Legislature, contains in its preamble the following sentence:—'Whereas it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State.' This gives occasion to show in its true light the Camaleon character of the Church of Rome, inasmuch as her leading organ here, the *True Witness*, does not know how Catholics will reconcile it with their consciences to sanction, by their votes, that 'heretical proposition.' In other countries, England, Ireland, and the United States for instance, Rome has been very anxious for the non-interference of the State in Church matters. But the infallible doctrine of the Church is 'yea and nay,' according to circumstances. Rome wants the union of Church and State whenever she can rob the State, and loathes that union whenever there is a chance of her being restrained by the State."—*Montreal Witness*.

Our cotemporary should pay a little more attention to his categories. It is true that we denounce State interference in Church matters, and it is no less true that we do not deem it desirable to sever all connection between Church and State; but it does not thence follow that we are chargeable with inconsistency, or that the teaching of the Church is contradictory. Connection between Church and State does not necessarily imply any assumption by the latter of authority over the former; and the connection which we contend for, absolutely denies to the State any right to interfere in matters ecclesiastical. The normal position of the Church to the State is somewhat analogous to that of parent to the child; betwixt whom indeed a close connection should exist, but without implying any right on the part of the latter to control, or dictate to, the other. We conceive of both Church and State as existing by Divine appointment, each deriving their authority from one common source, and each bound to support the other. Nor is this doctrine peculiar to Romanists. Protestants not a few, and Protestants of Protestantism, have contended for it both in England and Scotland. Even the Free Church party of the latter country, prior to the disruption, never went so far as to maintain that the rupture of the State connection was desirable *per se*; and Dr. Chalmers, the leader of that party, always deplored the sad necessity which, in his opinion, rendered that rupture inevitable. These men assuredly were Protestants, and yet asserted the very doctrines for upholding which the Protestant *Witness* takes us to task. By the reluctance with which they abandoned the Establishment, after repeated efforts, in the Courts of Law, and in Parliament, to bring about an amicable arrangement, they clearly showed that they did not think it "desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State;" by their relinquishment of their stipends, when it appeared that that amicable arrangement was impracticable, they asserted the principle, that the State has no right to interfere in Church matters. Does the *Montreal Witness* then mean to tax Dr. Chalmers, and his friends, with inconsistency, or the Free Church of Scotland with being of a "Camaleon Character?"

We would call the attention of our Irish Catholic readers, electors of Montreal, to the fact that, upon the late debate on the "Masson College Incorporation Bill"—a Bill to allow a Catholic educational establishment to hold landed property given to it by charitable individuals—the names of Messrs. Young and Holton are to be found, together with those of Messrs. G. Brown, J. M. Ferres, and Mr. McDonald (of Glengarry) on the list of those who voted against allowing the College to hold land for the purpose of therefrom deriving any income. Now as we believe that both Messrs. Young and Holton are not a little indebted for their seats in Parliament, and for the power which they thence derive to throw difficulties in the way of the establishment of charitable Catholic institutions, to the votes of Irish Catholics in Montreal, it is well that the attention of the latter should be occasionally directed to the manner in which they are served by their representatives.

That George Brown, J. M. Ferres and others of a similar stamp, should be found voting against our Catholic establishments, is but natural; and when no Catholic vote has assisted to place these men in the position which they occupy, we have nothing wherewith to reproach ourselves; but the case is different when it is by Catholic votes that the enemies of our Church are invested with the power of doing us hurt. Catholics should always remember that their first duty is towards the Catholic Church; that her claims are superior to all others, that she will brook no rival, and will accept of no divided allegiance. The elective franchise is then a trust which the Catholic will always exercise as a trust for which he is responsible to God, and which he is therefore bound to exercise in the interests of religion and morality—that is, of God's Church. Now this he cannot do by giving his vote for men who have rendered themselves conspicuous for their anti-Catholic prejudices. It is bad enough that we should be wronged by our enemies; but Catholics must be infatuated indeed if they lend their aid to elevate to political power men by whom that power will be employed as a means for inflicting wrong upon the Church. At the next election, we trust that the Irish Catholic voters of Montreal will show their appreciation of the conduct of Messrs. Young and Holton on the "Masson's College Bill."

The hypocrisy with which the opponents of this Bill sought to veil the real motives of their opposition, is far more disgusting than that opposition itself. It is possible, whilst detesting the bigotry, to feel a certain degree of respect for the honesty, of the man who boldly stands up, and avowing his hatred of Popery, declares his intention to oppose its spread by