

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.**

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 10, 1854.

**THE RESERVES' BILL.**

This Bill has elicited much warm debate in Committee. Amendments have been proposed, both in a Conservative and anti-Conservative sense, which have always been lost by large majorities. Of these, one of the most important, as affecting the very principle of the measure, to the effect:—"That it be an instruction to the Committee to leave out the words 'all semblance of connection between Church and State' in the third section of the Bill"—was made by the Hon. Mr. Cameron in a powerful speech; but was, of course, rejected by the House; by the radical and democratic party, because it sees in the recognition of the "desirableness of the removal of all semblance even of connection between Church and State," a guarantee for the speedy overthrow of all ecclesiastical institutions; by the Ministerial party,—not because in their hearts they approved of it, not because they themselves believed in the desirableness of that which they declared to be "desirable"—but simply because they have not courage to do what they know to be right; and because in their ears the bellowing of a brute majority overpowers the still small voice of conscience. Alas, that bearded men should be so weak!

Nothing indeed could be more miserable than the *niaiserie* with which the Ministerial supporters of the Bill attempted to meet the keen logic of their adversaries. "If, indeed," argued the latter, "you really do believe it to be 'desirable' to remove all semblance even of connection between Church and State—as by your votes you pretend that you do—why do you not honestly and consistently carry out your principles to their last consequences, and apply them to Lower, as well as to Upper, Canada? Why not at once blot out from the Statute Book, all laws, all enactments, by which Christianity is recognised, or the duties of religion enforced? Why maintain tithes—why make, from the funds of the State, grants to ecclesiastical bodies—why enforce the observance of Sundays and other Holydays—if you believe that betwixt Church and State there should be no connection? Why not declare Matrimony to be only a civil contract? You cannot shelter yourself under the plea, that your principle is meant to have merely a particular, and local application, for you put it forth in general terms; and it is not the melancholy necessity, but the desirableness, of doing away with all connection between Church and State that you so prominently assert. Had you indeed contented yourselves with saying, that—seeing the numbers of hostile religious denominations into which the Protestant population of Upper Canada is broken up, and the consequent impossibility of making such a division of the public property as should be just and satisfactory to all—it was necessary that, in Upper Canada, all pecuniary State assistance to the Church should be abolished—you might have saved your character for consistency: you might still have continued to defend the intimate connection which at present exists between Church and State in Lower Canada, without making yourselves ridiculous. But this your masters—the Browns, and others whose puppets you are, doing as they bid you, voting, and moving as they pull the strings—would not tolerate; and therefore have they compelled you to vote black, white, and to drink the cup of degradation to the very dregs."

Such in substance was the argument with which the unhappy Ministerialists were assailed, whilst no man pitied them—for weakness, tergiversation, and inconsistency, are contemptible and deserve no pity. Everything may be forgiven unto a man that is a Minister, except want of pluck. Weakness and indecision of character, venial offences in the individual, constitute the one unpardonable sin of the statesman, for which neither the highest talents nor the virtues of private life, can in any degree atone. We say it with regret, not from any hostile feelings towards the Ministry. Alas! why should they render it absolutely impossible for us to respect them?

We need not go into the miserable twaddle by which it was attempted to be shown that "it was desirable," and "that it was not desirable," to abolish the semblance even of connection between Church and State. We need not recall how low men fall, how abject they appear, when they act contrary to the dictates of conscience. The sorry figure cut by too many of our French Canadian Catholics during the late debates is a subject, not for reproach, or recrimination, but rather for sorrow. Who, indeed—that honors the French Canadian character, and would fain see it honored by others—but what must hang the head for shame when he reads their speeches, and counts their votes on the Clergy Reserves' Bill? The subject is an unpleasant one, and we willingly drop it: but we cannot allow one statement made by Sir Allan McNab to pass uncontradicted. He assigned as his reason for voting against his conscience—for declaring white black, and black white—"that the verdict of the country had been given in favor of secularisation." This is not true. The verdict of the country, that is of the population entitled to vote, has not been given at all; and it is because it is with good reason feared, that that verdict, if pronounced, would not be in favor of secularisation, that the Clergy

Reserves' Bill has been most indecently and dishonestly forced through a House which in no sense is a fair or full representation of the people of Canada; and which is therefore, according to its own showing, utterly unqualified to legislate upon the great interests of the community. Legislation by a body so constituted, is a mockery of justice, a grievous wrong to that large body of citizens, declared entitled to the exercise of the Franchise, and who nevertheless have been most unjustly deprived of the power of exercising that right, on the most important questions that ever have been, or will be, presented to the people of Canada.

We have noticed too, with much regret, though with little surprise—for we know what promises and pledges made on the hustings are worth—that, during the debates in Committee, not one amendment has been proposed, having for its object to secure the right of the Catholic supporters of separate schools in Upper Canada, by making it obligatory upon the County Municipalities—to whom the Funds accruing from the secularisation of the Reserves are to be handed over—to give to separate schools established in accordance with the provisions of the law, a share of the funds thence derived and devoted to educational purposes, in proportion to the attendance on such separate schools. This was in substance the prayer of a petition presented on the 21st September, to the House of Assembly, by the Bishop of Toronto, and the Catholic Institute of that City, in accordance with a Resolution agreed to at a meeting of the Institute to the effect—"That:—"

"Any Legislation on the subject of the Clergy Reserves, which may either apply the whole or any part thereof to the support, or for the advantage of Public Common Schools—or which may allow of their application for that purpose—without expressly providing that in such case all Public Separate Schools, shall be entitled to participate equally with Common Schools, would, by depriving a large proportion of the population of advantages enjoyed by the remainder, be unjust in principle, and most oppressive in practice; and will therefore be opposed by the Toronto Catholic Institute by every constitutional means at its command."

Now, the Bill as it stands, does allow the application of the Reserves' Funds to educational purposes; because it makes them over to the Municipalities, with power to apply them to all purposes to which their Funds are generally applicable; but it makes no provision for securing to separate schools any share in the advantages which will be enjoyed by the common schools, in consequence of this application of public property to general municipal purposes. The consequences were ably pointed out by one of the speakers at the meeting of the Toronto Catholic Institute already referred to. He showed how the revenue derived from the Reserves would be sufficient for the support of the common schools in the Municipalities, thus doing away with the necessity of school rates upon the supporters of common schools; and perhaps enabling them to dispense altogether with the Legislative School Grant—the only assistance given by the State, in which separate schools are allowed to share.

"In this case" continued the speaker, "what would be the position of Separate schools, isolated from all benefits conferred upon the others? They could only be sustained by a direct tax on their supporters, from which all other classes would be exempt—one of the most unjust and aggravating instances of class legislation which it is possible to inflict."

And yet this is the injustice which men, who on the hustings, pledged themselves to exert their influence to procure justice for Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada, are doing their best to inflict on their betrayed and injured Catholic supporters: a more glaring and aggravated instance of dishonesty, and violation of pledged faith it is difficult to conceive.

The claims of the Catholic schools of Upper Canada are so evidently just, that it is only necessary to state them, in order to convince any unprejudiced mind. The Legislature has recognised the right of these schools to share in all Legislative School Grants, or Grants made from the public funds, for educational purposes. But if the Reserves are secularised they form part of the public funds; and in so far as any part thereof is made applicable to common school purposes, it is a Legislative Grant, and a Legislative School Grant—in which the right of separate schools to share is already recognised. We want then no new law: we assert no new principle; we demand only that the principle embodied in the existing laws be fully carried out; and that—in all Legislative Grants, whether from the Reserves or General Revenue, whether made to County Municipalities or other bodies, and which are made applicable to school purposes—Catholic separate schools be entitled to share, in accordance with the provisions of the 16th Vic., c. 185, Sec. iv. Is there no independent member in the Legislature who will move an amendment to the Clergy Reserves Bill, to this effect? Is there not one, who is prepared to redeem in the House, the solemn pledges, made on the hustings, and to which he owes his election?

**"WHY HAVE WE NO SISTERS OF CHARITY?"**

A strange question this in the mouth of a Protestant, and an Englishman; yet one that has been asked more than once of late, and will be asked many a time by our maimed and suffering soldiers. War has its dark, as well as its bright side: and the dark side is now forcibly presenting itself to that nation which, but a few weeks ago, was furiously applauding the filthy Drummond and his beloved colleague, the prosy Spooner, for their foul attacks and revolting obscenities against those same "Sisters of Charity," the want of whose kindly services in our military hospitals is now most bitterly deplored. As a nation, Great Britain is perhaps unsurpassed for her resources. She can equip fleets bristling with all the appliances of

war; and for courage and dexterity, her soldiers and sailors have no superiors. With her enormous wealth she can control all the Cabinets of Europe, and subsidize all the nations of the earth; but one thing she cannot command—those services which are given, not for money, but for love, and which look for their reward, not on earth, but in Heaven. "We have not Sisters of Charity"—complains one writer in the London Times, agitated at the horrors of the bloody field of Alma, and the still more tragic spectacle of the hospital and troop ship—"we have not Sisters of Charity—at least, not such as will do as the French Sisters do; but the wealth of Great Britain can purchase, what she cannot get for charity and love."—Englishmen, who believe as firmly as does our cousin Jonathan, in the Omnipotence of the Dollar, will find themselves for once out in their calculations. The services of "love" will not be procured for an annual stipend, neither will high wages convert the hireling into a Sister of Charity. The hireling will be still a hireling, "at least she will not do as the French Sisters do."

"Why have we no Sisters of Charity?" is now the Englishman's cry. Sobered by suffering, and convinced by bitter experience that in the hour of need Exeter Hall cannot help him, he begins to whine, and cry out for the assistance of those whom, but a few short months ago, it was his highest pleasure to insult and persecute. "Sweet are the uses of adversity;" and we trust that the cry which has been raised on the shores of the Euxine, and on the green slopes of the Bosphorus, may be heard and responded to in England; and that it may have the effect of teaching Protestants, that, in spite of all their vaunted progress in the *matériel* of civilisation, they lack one thing which Catholicity only can supply, and which they can only hope to obtain by welcoming home again the long discarded faith. We have the more confidence in the effect upon the English Protestant mind of the harrowing disclosures from the East as to the miserably insufficient and utterly hopeless condition of our hospital establishments, and of the inestimable services of Popish Nuns, because, as will be seen from the following extract from the London Times, the body, as well as the soul, suffers from the want of those essentially Popish institutions which Protestants have hitherto been accustomed to abuse as "Marks of the Beast," and as repugnant to the great commandment "increase and multiply."

Let us see how our poor soldiers, wounded at Alma in their country's service, are provided for by that great and wealthy nation in whose cause their blood has been spilt. We copy from the Times' correspondent.

"It is impossible for any one to see the melancholy sights of the last few days without feelings of surprise and indignation at the deficiencies of our medical system. The manner in which the sick and wounded have been treated is worthy only of the savages of Dahomey"—[Not of sound British Protestants]. "The sufferings on board the *Vulcan* were bad enough. There were 800 wounded and 170 cholera patients, and these were attended by four surgeons. The scene is described as terrible. The wounded seized the surgeons by the skirts as they picked their way through the heaps of dying and dead; but the surgeons shook them off."

"Numbers arrived at Scutari without having been touched by a surgeon since they fell pierced by Russian bullets on the slopes of Alma. Their wounds were stiff, and their strength exhausted as they were lifted out of the boats to be carried to the hospital." "But all other horrors sink into insignificance compared to the state of the unfortunate passengers by the *Colombo*. This vessel left the Crimea on the morning of the 24th. Wounded men were being placed on board, for two days before she sailed; and when she weighed anchor, she carried the following numbers—27 wounded officers—422 wounded soldiers, and 104 Russian prisoners—in all 553 souls. About half of the wounded had received surgical assistance before they were put on board. To supply the wants of this mass of misery, were four medical men, one of whom was the surgeon of the ship—sufficiently employed in looking after the crew, who at this place and season are seldom free from sickness. The ship was literally covered with prostrate forms so as to be almost unmanageable." "The worst cases were placed on the upper deck, which in a day or two became a mass of putridity. The neglected gun-shot wounds bred maggots, which crawled in every direction, infecting the food of the unhappy beings on board.—The putrid animal matter caused such a stench that the officers and crew were nearly overcome, and the captain is now ill from the effects of the five days' misery. All the blankets, to the number of 1,500, have been thrown overboard as useless." "The vessel is quite putrid, but a large number of men will be immediately employed to clean and fumigate her."

Even in the hospitals, the condition of these poor mutilated creatures—alive, yet crawling with maggots putrid ere death—is not much better: for the same authority informs us:—

"The worn out pensioners who were brought out as an ambulance corps are totally useless, and not only are surgeons not to be had, but there are no dressers and nurses to carry out the surgeon's directions and to attend on the sick during the intervals between his visits."

Nor let it be said that these horrors and sufferings are inseparable from war. They are caused, partly by the want of surgeons, but mainly by the want of dressers and nurses to wash the wounds of the patients, and to minister to their necessities during the intervals between the surgeon's visits. Now it is just this want that the "Sisters of Charity"—the "she devils," "corruptors of youth," as the great Protestant champion Gavazzi styled them, amidst the deafening cheers of an enlightened Protestant audience—are so admirably fitted to supply. These we have not; and hence the long agonies which our poor fellows are doomed to endure, ere kind death steps in to put an end to their tortures. But not so it is with our Catholic Allies. Better soldiers never carried a musket, and their care for their sick and wounded is no less admirable than their desperate valor in the field.

It is still from the Times, the Popery abominating Times, that we quote.

"Here the French are greatly our superiors. Their medical arrangements are extremely good, their surgeons more numerous, and they have also the help of the 'Sisters of Charity' who have accompanied the expedition in incredible numbers. These devoted women are excellent nurses, and perform for the sick and wounded all the offices, which could be rendered in the most complete hospitals. We have nothing. The men must attend on each other, or receive no relief at all."

If it be asked—whence this difference?—the answer is—not because, naturally the English are less humane than the French, or that the former are indifferent to the sufferings of their gallant countrymen;—but that the former are a Protestant, the latter a Catholic, nation. Our wounded soldiers are left to die like dogs on the field which their valor has won, or to rot away neglected, maggot eaten and putrid, because there is none to tend them—because there are no "Sisters of Charity" to pour wine and oil into their wounds. The sufferings of our soldiers abroad—as the loathsomeness of pauperism at home—are but parts of the price which we must pay for the blessings of Protestantism, and the indulgence of our evangelical hatred of conventual establishments. The groans from the hospitals at Scutari, are a fitting accompaniment to the ravings of Exeter Hall, and furnish a eloquent commentary upon the wisdom, forethought and Christian charity of the leaders of the late anti-Nunnery crusade in the British Legislature.

"Why have we no Sisters of Charity?" asks "A sufferer by the present war," in the columns of the London Times—as if the reason was not obvious.

"It is a reproach to us," he says, "to have made so little provision for our gallant and loved countrymen, while the Priests and Convent Sisters are doing much good among the French. It would be well if we could learn from the Roman Catholics the art of making the comforts of religion, and the ministry of charity, more accessible to all. Why have we no Sisters of Charity?"

Because you are Protestants, and "Sisters of Charity" are an abomination to Protestantism. For the last three hundred years you have insulted and persecuted them, whenever you dared, whenever you had it in your power. Even now, you are doing your best, by your iniquitous legislation, by your beastly insults, and unmanly treatment, to drive them from the land. You denounce them, and encourage every impure apostate whose sins have driven him to seek a refuge in your midst from the punishment due to his crimes, to denounce and revile them: you behave to them, you speak of them, as if they were rogues and prostitutes, and their asylums, brothels. You indulge habitually, in language towards them, which, if any feul mouthed ruffian were to use it towards your sisters and daughters, would provoke you, if you had a spark of manhood in your bosom, to fell the blackguard to the ground. Aye! and even whilst receiving at their hands, favors unpurchaseable, unpayable with gold, you turn upon your benefactors, and like curs, fly at those who do you kindness; but in your hour of suffering, you whine out, "Why have we no Sisters of Charity?"

In the meantime the British hospitals are without, and are likely to be long without, the "Sisters of Charity." Yet let it not be thought that fanaticism is lulled to sleep, or that Exeter Hall will fail to "improve the occasion." The sad condition of our Popish Allies has excited the sympathy of our amiable Protestant brethren; and encouraged no doubt by the success of their "Hundred Missionaries" scheme in Ireland, they have determined to despatch forthwith a brigade of pedlars laden with Protestant Bibles to the benighted French soldiery. Who, then, can deny the vitality of Protestantism? It leaves its gallant soldiers to die like dogs, putrid and maggot eaten, but sends out Bible-readers and corrupt versions of the Scriptures to Popish strangers. We fancy that General Canrobert will know how to deal with these gentry if they get inside his lines.

**THE "PRIEST," AND THE "MILLER OF GLENGARRY."**

We have received from an esteemed correspondent the particulars of certain occurrences, which have lately excited no little interest amongst the brave Scotch Catholics of Glengarry, and which may perhaps prove interesting to our readers.

On Easter Sunday last, the Rev. Mr. McLachlan, the deservedly esteemed Catholic Priest of Alexandria, read to his flock a Pastoral Letter from the Bishop, exhorting the laity to assert their claims for perfect "Freedom of Education," and warning them against the dangers to which the faith and morals of their children were exposed in Non-Catholic schools. The preacher therefore called upon his people to take the steps necessary for establishing a separate school; assigning as a reason, that the teacher of the common school was a Protestant, and certainly not a person to whom Catholics could safely entrust the training of their children. Amongst the congregation was a certain Mr. D. A. Macdonald, to whose name is commonly affixed the somewhat aristocratic appendage, "of Glengarry," a title to which he has about as much right as he has to that of Bishop of Montreal. The thing is not, in itself, of much consequence; but still, as "of Glengarry" is a time-honored name amongst Scotchmen, and has been long borne by a race of loyal and gallant gentlemen at home, it is a little annoying to see it so misapplied in Canada.

Well then, divine service being over, this gentleman—by way, we suppose, of showing his gratitude towards the pastors of the Church, by whom he was fed and educated, and to whose charity he owes all he has in the world, the power of insulting his benefactors included—placed himself in a conspicuous position in the vicinity of the Church, and, with the air of an old feudal chieftain, summoning his vassals and clansmen around him warned them in the most impressive manner against being guided by their pastor; denounced separate schools, and graciously pro-