

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; the Bank of Ireland, Dublin; the National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
 By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street, Montreal, February 9, 1854.

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

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Pacific brings European news up to the 31st ult.; but there is nothing very important from the seat of war. Silistria still holds out, though closely invested, and hard pressed; unless the Allies look sharp, it is to be feared that this important post will have fallen, before they enter upon the campaign. In the Black Sea, the Fleet was blockading Sebastopol; and Sir Charles Napier in the Baltic was knocking some of the Russian forts about the ears of the garrison. The report of the capture of the castle of Gusanawerna seems to have been premature. The following is the substance of the news per Arabia:—

The Russians have admitted that Silistria can not be captured for a fortnight at least. They have made three attempts to carry it by assault, and have been repulsed with great loss. They tried to force a passage over the Danube at three different places; but were also repulsed. Omar Pascha, after a conference with St. Arnaud and Raglan, had marched with 80,000 men to raise the siege. It has been decided by a Council of War that the allied armies should advance to Adrianople.

Austria had positively demanded of Russia the evacuation of the Principalities. Greece had accepted the demands of the Four Powers. A change of Ministry had taken place, favorable to the Allies. The Queen is reported as nearly demented on the subject.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.
 LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL CHAMBER.
 Quebec, June 13, 1854.

This day, (Tuesday), at 3 o'clock, p.m., His Excellency the Governor General proceeded in State to the Chamber of the Legislative Council in the Parliament Buildings. The Members of the Legislative Council being assembled, His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the Legislative Assembly, and that House being present, His Excellency opened the 2nd Session of the 4th Parliament of the Province of Canada with the following

SPEECH:

Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

"During the recess the Province has sustained, I regret to say, serious loss by fire, in the destruction of the House of Parliament and other buildings which were subsequently secured for the temporary occupation of the Legislature. The best arrangements under the circumstances have been made for your accommodation. Her Majesty the Queen, our Most Gracious Sovereign, having failed in her anxious and protracted endeavors to preserve for her people the blessings of peace, has felt herself called upon, by regard for an ally, the integrity and independence of whose empire has been recognized as necessary to the peace of Europe; by the sympathies of her people with right against wrong, and by a desire to avert from her dominions most injurious consequences, to take up arms, in conjunction with the Emperor of the French, for the defence of the Sultan. The manifestations of loyalty to the Sovereign, and sympathy with the Parent State, which have been so general throughout the Province at this juncture, will, I am confident, be heartily responded to by the Legislature. The cordial co-operation of England and France in the war is well calculated to call forth the sympathies of the inhabitants of a country mainly peopled by the descendants of these two powerful Empires.

"Having during my recent visit to England been honored by the Queen's command to endeavor to effect the settlement of various important questions bearing upon the interests of the British North American Provinces, which have been long pending between the Government and the United States, I proceeded to Washington, when, after some frank discussion with the authorities, I was enabled to conclude a treaty, which now awaits ratification; upon terms which, it is my firm conviction, will prove in the highest degree advantageous to the Colonies generally, as well as to the United States. A measure to give effect to that treaty will be submitted for your approval.

"I will communicate to you a dispatch which I have received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the addresses to the Queen from the two Houses of the Legislature, on the subject of the constitution of the Legislative Council, transmitted by me at the close of the last session of the Provincial Parliament, in order that they might be placed at the foot of the Throne.

Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

"The public accounts for the past and current year, and the estimates for the present, will be submitted to you without delay; and I rely with confidence in your willingness to make the necessary provision for the wants of the Government. The prosperous condition of the revenue may suggest to you the propriety of making such reductions in the tariff as may be compatible with security to the public credit and efficiency in the public service.

"Hon. Gentlemen and Gentlemen:—During my sojourn in England, I was much struck by the proofs which I received in all quarters of the increasing interest in Canadian affairs, and I trust that my acquaintance with the Provinces, derived from long residence within them, may have enabled me to render some service in spreading more widely a knowledge of its resources and of the feelings of the inhabitants. Although a state of warfare has a tendency to restrict operations, involving large expenditure of capital, I feel confident that the credit of Canada has attained a position in English opinion which it never before had, and that to enable you to retain it, nothing is required but prudence in your undertakings, and the maintenance of the high character for fidelity to money engagements, which the Province has at all times borne."

The Montreal Freeman seems determined to earn his wages; and really, to do him justice, if to rail at the TRUE WITNESS in good set terms be the service expected at his hands, in return for Government patronage, his purchasers have no right to complain of their bargain. Whether, after all, he is worth purchasing—whether he be not too dear at any price—is another question into which we do not purpose entering.

He is a terrible fellow—though, is the Montreal Freeman, when his blood is up—as may be judged from the savage manner in which he assails the TRUE WITNESS; leaving the latter, scarce a whole bone in his body, and tearing the very breeches off him, in his noble fury. See in what a butcher-like style he cuts up his adversary.

The TRUE WITNESS is, in the first place, likened unto a dog—the dog that returneth to his vomit;—then he is denounced as a "false" WITNESS, as "an alien to the sod"—as an animal, an "original animal," and as a convert from Protestantism—and, unkindest cut of all, he is exposed to the gaze of men and angels, as "a breekless sans culotte"—a mere bare-legged adventurer. We suppose that we ought, after such treatment, to feel ourselves pretty "catawampusly chawed up;" indeed, if the latter charge against us be true, we see not how the TRUE WITNESS can ever show his face in decent society again. But we will notice the several complaints of our indignant cotemporary, separately:—

"We charged the True Witness with intentionally bearing 'false' witness against the Freeman, and this charge the Witness has not, and dares not, discuss.—Our cotemporary inserted extracts from a correspondent's letter published in the Freeman, and with malice prepense, attributed these extracts to the writers of the Freeman."—Montreal Freeman, 10th inst.

This is not strictly true. In citing, from a leading article of the Freeman—in which the editorial "we" was pretty freely made use of, and the employment of which is generally supposed to distinguish a correspondence from an editorial—we attributed "the extracts" to a writer in the Montreal Freeman; and we still think that we were perfectly correct in so doing. Here are the very words of the TRUE WITNESS, on the 12th ult.:

"The Montreal Freeman of Saturday last contains an article, professedly written by a Catholic, in which the writer," &c. &c.

Thus, without attributing the article in question to any person in particular, we carefully distinguished it from one of the usual editorial articles, which we should have noticed with—"The Montreal Freeman says," or "writes." We were thus careful, because, in common with the rest of the world, we have no certain knowledge of the editor of the Montreal Freeman; nay, no one knows if it has any regular editor at all. Public rumor, indeed, assigns this place to a gentleman who is as much "an alien to the sod" as is the editor of the TRUE WITNESS; and who, enjoying the inestimable advantages of being a Protestant and an Orangeman, loses no opportunity of casting in our teeth the fact of our conversion from Non-Catholicity. But why make a fuss about the matter? The extracts from the Montreal Freeman, either express, or do not express, the sentiments of the editor, or editors, of that journal. If they do express those sentiments, the TRUE WITNESS would have done them no wrong in attributing to them those sentiments; and if, they do not, how is it that the Montreal Freeman has not only never disclaimed, but rather, making them the subject of a laudatory editorial, has done his best to endorse them? If the Freeman will but disclaim the sentiments of this writer, whose attack upon the TRUE WITNESS appeared in his columns of the 6th ult., the latter journal will do him full justice; but until he does so, we shall hold him responsible, and shall feel ourselves authorized to attribute those sentiments, to him. It is however rather too absurd to suppose that we shall allow an unknown editor to shirk all responsibility for what appears in his columns, by laying it upon the shoulders of an anonymous correspondent.

Will the Freeman venture to assert that the writer of the letter from which we quoted, is not also the writer of some of his editorial articles? And if he is, is he not then one of the writers both in, and of, the Freeman? Were not, for instance, his editorial of Wednesday last, and his attack on Mr. Burke, written by the "Roman Catholic gentleman of long standing," who, on the 6th ult., figured as a correspondent of the Freeman?

Another complaint of the Montreal Freeman against us is, that we have attributed his hostility to the TRUE WITNESS, and his sudden change in politics, to the mollifying influences of Government patronage; to the fact, not to put too fine a point on it, that he has been bought up by the present Ministry. This opinion, which we share with our Upper Canadian cotemporaries, is based upon the following facts. During the time that it was under the management of its original talented editor, the Freeman pursued an independent line of policy; and without setting itself up as a decided opposition journal, yet hesitated not to criticise freely the measures of the Govern-

ment. On the Clergy Reserves question, it took decidedly "anti-secularisation" ground; and advocated the same policy that the TRUE WITNESS has always advocated, and for advocating which he is now exposed to the hostility of the Freeman. In those days the Freeman, enjoyed the confidence of the public, though but a trifling share of Government patronage; "Crown Lands" advertisements absorbed then but little of its columns. Since then, however, the policy of the Freeman has entirely changed: it warmly advocates "secularisation" which it then condemned, though every one of common sense knows that that measure, if carried, will be fatal to Irish Catholic influence in Upper Canada, and will render a satisfactory arrangement of the School question impossible; whilst, at the same time, a reference to its advertising columns will show that this tergiversation on the part of our cotemporary has been appreciated, and thankfully acknowledged, by the dispensers of official patronage. Putting, then, this and that together, we think that we are warranted in our conclusion, that the Montreal Freeman has been bought and sold.

Nor does our cotemporary attempt to deny the facts—that the policy of the Montreal Freeman has undergone a complete revolution, and that this change has occurred simultaneously with a great accession of Government patronage. But he attempts to justify this sudden change upon the grounds that there has been a change of editors; and that a man is "not accountable for the acts of his grandfather." Now the value of this plea we are prepared to admit, if our cotemporary will also admit that he is as little the original, the honest independent Freeman, as a man is his own grandfather. If, however, he still claims to be the same identical Freeman whom the Irish supported, and trusted in, a few months ago, he must also acknowledge himself to have retained the same responsibilities, and to be bound by the same obligations—just as the individual of mature years, is responsible for the acts of the same individual in early youth; unless, indeed, our cotemporary pretends that he has been changed at nurse. In that case his plea of "irresponsibility" may be admitted.

Here we are content to let the matter rest, in so far as the consistency of the Montreal Freeman is concerned. At its first appearance, either that journal was honestly and independently conducted, in accordance with the pledges of its prospectus—or it was not. By the avowal of the present editor, the Montreal Freeman is not conducted on the same principles to-day, as it was then. Therefore, if under its former editor, the Montreal Freeman was worthy of the respect and confidence of Irishmen, to-day it is not; or, if to-day it is—then must it have been dishonestly conducted under its original editor. We leave this point to be settled between the present and former editors of the Freeman; it is a question which concerns them more nearly than it does the TRUE WITNESS.

We have little more to say. We admit the fact of our conversion from Non-Catholicity; but repudiate with honest scorn the reproach conveyed by the epithet "breekless" which our opponent applies to us. In itself it is not a great thing, this same deficiency in "breeches;" but no man likes to be accused unjustly, and we feel loath to allow ourselves to be thus refused a place amongst the "gens braccata." Still we can manage to bear up under it, and feel thankful that it is no worse, for, it is better, after all, to be "breekless" than "turn-out." Besides, how many, and great men have been "breekless?" Not to mention Adam, before the fall, and hosts of others, we may refer with just pride to the illustrious Brian O'Lynn, of whom the bard of Erin sings, that he "had no breeches to wear." Shall we then be ashamed to be likened unto Brian O'Lynn? Should we not rather be proud of our illustrious sans culotte predecessor?

Here we take our leave of our cotemporary, assuring him that we have no desire, and no intention, to prolong a controversy which he has forced upon us. He may rail at us as he will; henceforth we shall not notice him, nor his scurrilities. We regret much that a journal, which commenced so well, has turned out so badly; and that the confidence of Irish Catholics has been so sadly abused; but having warned our readers of the fact, we think that we have done enough in the premises. Here, for ever, we conclude a controversy which is as unprofitable to our readers, as it is unpleasant to the "breekless" editor of the TRUE WITNESS.

We are glad to see that the Canadian inserts our contradiction of the impertinent calumny against Dr. Brownson, which appeared in his columns a few days ago, over the signature of the "three stars." We will not again allude to a subject so disagreeable; but trust that both the editor of the Canadian, and his collaborators, will be more careful for the future how they attempt to discuss questions of Catholic dogma, and moral theology. They should bear in mind that though the Church incurs no risk from the most furious assaults of her bitterest foes, she can not but be seriously and injuriously affected by the injudicious advocacy of such champions, as the Canadian and his correspondent aforesaid. "God defend us from such friends!" Catholics may well exclaim—"we can defend ourselves from our enemies." Our Quebec cotemporary admits also the justice of the reasoning of the TRUE WITNESS on the Reserves question, as seen from our point of view; and adds—that all who do not admit the system of the "double majority"—from whence flows the duty of leaving each section of the Province free to regulate its own affairs—must come to the same conclusion; if they would reason "correctly." But continues the Canadian, we say to the Canadian, arrange your affairs as you like, and we will arrange ours after our own fashion. Canadian, 5th inst.

To this arrangement we have but two objections to make—1st—That it would, if consistently carried out, leave the Catholic minority of the Upper Province, at the mercy of the Protestant majority; and 2nd—that though our Upper Canadian friends would no doubt gladly avail themselves of it for the purpose of getting rid of all interference from the Catholic members of Lower Canada, it is very certain that they will not feel themselves bound by it, to abstain from imposing their own policy upon the Lower Province, whenever it is in their power to do so. The Protestant demagogues of Upper Canada openly proclaim their intention, to "secularise," not only the "Clergy Reserves," but all ecclesiastical endowments—Catholic as well as Protestant—in the Lower, as well as in the Upper Province; and no man, with intelligence above that of an idiot, can for one moment doubt that, if the "Reserves" be "secularised," the property of the Catholic Church in Lower Canada will be subjected to a similar treatment by Upper Canadian Voluntaries—and this, the clamors, or "clamorations," of the Canadian, in favor of the "double majority" system, notwithstanding. Our brethren of Upper Canada tell us plainly that they do not intend to allow the "double majority" system to impose any obligations on them, though they are perfectly willing to claim all its advantages; and with no ambiguous language they declare that the Lower Canadians shall not be free to manage their own affairs. The latter have been well forewarned; would that we could add, that they were also; forewarned.

The confidence which the simple-minded Canadian places in those magic words "double majority"—as if by any mere political contract it were possible to secure the interests of Catholicity from Protestant encroachments—would be ludicrous, if it were not dangerous. It reminds us of the infatuation of the Lord Mayor of London during the great Protestant riots of the last century, as recorded by Dickens, in his Barnaby Rudge. That worthy official, when applied to by a gentleman whose house was menaced with destruction by the mob, offered the applicant for protection, the services of a superannuated, crippled constable—"a man not very old for his time of life, except in his legs; and who"—so at least deemed the Mayor laboring under a delusion about constables, and the divinity which does hedge them, analogous to that with which the Canadian is afflicted in the matter of the "double majority"—"if put up at a window by candle light, might frighten the rioters very much, and strike them with awe." Just as much respect as the Protestant rabble of London would have felt for the aged, and impotent peace officer above-mentioned, will the demagogues of Upper Canada entertain for the "double majority" system, when it interferes with their designs upon our Popish institutions; and the life, the national life of Lower Canada, is in her Popery.

No, No, Mr. Canadian; we must have some better guarantee for the security of our institutions, than your "double majority" system; a system from which the Upper Canadians will derive all the advantages, leaving us only its obligations. If we wish to see our institutions respected, we must make it the interest, as well as the duty, of a large portion at least, of our Protestant fellow-citizens to respect them. When it is the interest of the latter to act truly and honestly towards the Catholics of Lower Canada—and above all, when it is out of their power to act otherwise—then, and then only, will the prudent Catholic trust them.

Even if practicable, we should however object to this "double majority" system as immoral, and ruinous to Catholic interests. For instance, our coreligionists of Upper Canada call loudly upon us to aid them in their efforts after "Freedom of Education," without our assistance they must still groan under the iniquitous burdens imposed upon them by a tyrannical Protestant majority. But, according to the doctrine of the Canadian—"the Upper Canadians should be left free to arrange their own affairs," without interference on the part of the Lower Province. It is the business, the great object, of the "Liberals" of Upper Canada, to deprive Catholics of "separate schools;" and we of Lower Canada, according to the Canadian, should stand meekly by, nor stretch out a hand to the succor of our persecuted brethren. Out upon such a miserable, sneaking, unmanly, and Anti-Catholic policy—a policy as certain to result in the destruction of those who adopt it, as it is unworthy the acceptance of any honest man.

That each section of the Province should be left free to arrange its own affairs is perfectly correct; but then the affairs which it should be thus left free to arrange, should be its own affairs exclusively; and not, either directly or indirectly, the affairs of the other section of the Province. A question which like that of "secularisation" involves a great principle, and intimately concerns the interests of the Church, cannot be said to be peculiar to either Upper or Lower Canada: it is common to both, and the wishes of the people of the one section are as much entitled to respect, as are the wishes of the people in the other. The assertion which we constantly hear repeated that the "Clergy Reserves" question is a peculiarly Protestant and Upper Canadian question, involves a palpable self-contradiction. It is only upon the supposition that these Reserves are national property; the property of the whole community; that the Legislature can have the right to "secularise" them; and therefore, if the property of the whole community, no section of that community can claim the exclusive right to their disposal. If, however, the "Clergy Reserves" be not part of the national domain, but the exclusive property of some, or of all the Protestant sects of Upper Canada, it is equally clear, that to "secularise" them at all, would be a gross violation of the rights of property, as much so as would be the confiscation to the State, of the Catholic Church property of Lower Canada, to be reassigned and in Lower