

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowmant, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool. HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., Montreal, March 1853. St. Sacramento Street.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,

At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum. To Country do. . . . \$2½ do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

Anonymous communications can never be taken notice of.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 51, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The alarm occasioned by the threatening aspect of affairs in the East is subsiding; it is still hoped that the question may be amicably settled. The Times says:—

"It is certain that the alarm occasioned by the state of affairs in the East, and which has so profoundly agitated the public mind for the last few days, has this day, to all appearance at least, diminished. There is seldom smoke without fire, and in the rumors of a more favorable kind now in circulation, though they may not be entirely depended upon, may probably be found something good. At all events the general opinion is that the eastern question will be arranged in an amicable manner, and without any immediate dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Among other rumors in circulation is one to the effect that the French fleet has been countermanded."

On the night of the 19th ult., a fire broke out in one of the towers of Windsor Castle, and was not extinguished without great difficulty. The fire is attributed to the over heating of the flues. The first report of the Commissioners to inquire into the Law of Divorce, as practised in England, has been published. Its most important suggestions are:—That a new tribunal—to which all matrimonial questions, now determined in the ecclesiastical courts, shall be transferred—shall be constituted to try all questions of divorce; and that a verdict at law, and an ecclesiastical sentence, shall not be considered as preliminary conditions which must be complied with before a divorce—a *vinculo matrimonii*—can be obtained; and that said divorce shall be allowed for adultery only.

Mr. Lucas, in the Tablet of the 26th ult., attempts to define the position of the Irish members towards the present ministry. He denies that they have abandoned any part of the policy of last September, and insists upon the wisdom of the system of tactics laid down in the autumn—"to depart from which, by one tittle, or by one hair's breadth, would be at once, the most incredible baseness, and the most incredible folly." Mr. Lucas seems to doubt the intentions of the Aberdeen ministry upon the "Landlord and Tenant" question, and denies that they are entitled to any support, or favorable consideration from Irishmen, because of any thing that has passed in the formation or transactions of the said Land Committee. "Any man," he says, "who pretends that any thing that has passed in that committee which gives the Ministers the slightest title to our support—which pledges the Ministers in any way to give us the substance of Sharman Crawford's Bill, or an equivalent for that substance—or which gives us a reason to believe that the present ministers will set at rest, or provide a remedy for, this mighty and fundamental grievance—pretends that which has no foundation in fact." "Opposition then," concludes Mr. Lucas, "must be the policy of the Irish members towards the present government." The political news from England is of no importance.

To the Catholic the most important intelligence is the restoration of Holland, after long years of apostacy, to the rank of a Catholic and Christian country. By the "Allocution" of the Sovereign Pontiff it will be seen that Holland as well as England, has, through the mercy of God, been restored to its high place in Christendom, from which it, by transgression, fell. Pius IX has restored in the XIX, the work of Sierguis I in the VII, century; and that the same supreme authority, which appointed Willibrord first Bishop of Utrecht, then raised to the dignity of an Episcopal See, has thought fit to build up again the places long laid waste by heresy. This new Papal Aggression has long been expected: already the Catholics compose two-fifths of the population of Holland, or nearly 1,200,000; the Catholic Clergy alone reckon 1,554 members, and every day witnesses the return of numbers of humble penitents to the Church of Christ. In vain has the government persecuted and oppressed its Catholic subjects by every means in its power! they have defied the power and malice of their persecutors. They have been long excluded from every office of honor, or emolument, and deprived of all political privileges; to the open persecution of the State must be added the meaner, but not less galling persecution of the individual; secret Protestant societies were formed with the express object of discouraging the growth of Popery, by depriving the poor convert of the means of earning a livelihood by his daily labor. In fact, in Holland, as in every country where it has had the power, Protestantism has shown itself to be, what it is in Ireland at present, and what it would be in England and in Canada

to-day, if it dared. But in Holland, as in England and in Canada, Catholics are rapidly becoming too numerous, too powerful, and too well aware of their numbers, and their power, to permit themselves to be wronged; they are no longer content to sue as suppliants, for what they know they are entitled to as freemen, and can obtain as their right. In this country, for instance, we demand exemption from all taxation for Protestant school purposes: if this be not accorded to us quietly, we must take it.

THE NEW SCHOOL BILL.

In so far as it goes, we consider this Bill to be an improvement upon, because more explicit than, its predecessor of 1850. But, in that it is not explicit enough, in that it still leaves it in the power of Protestant Trustees to tax Catholics for Non-Catholic School purposes, we do not think that it will fulfill the intentions of its framers; if those intentions be, to give satisfaction, and to do justice, to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada.

Mr. A. G. Richard's Bill is entitled—"An Act Supplementary to the Common School Act of Upper Canada,"—and to a certain extent it embodies the principle enunciated by the Catholics of this city in their petition to the House of Assembly, in favor of "Freedom of Education." "That it is as unjust, and as repugnant to the principle of Freedom of Education, to compel Roman Catholics to pay for the support of schools to which they are conscientiously opposed, as it would be unjust, and destructive of all Freedom of Religion, to compel Protestants to pay for building, and the support of Roman Catholic Churches." This principle, which no man, not even "Mr. George Brown," dares contest, is, in a measure recognised by the IV. clause of the new Bill, which enacts:—

"That in all Cities, Towns, and Incorporated Villages, and School Sections, in which separate schools do, or shall, exist according to provisions of the Common School Acts of Upper Canada, persons of the religious persuasion of each such separate school, sending children to it, or supporting such school, by subscribing thereto, annually, an amount equal to the sum which each such person would be liable to pay [if such separate school did not exist] on any assessment to obtain the annual Common School Grant for each such City, Town, Incorporated Village, or Township, shall be exempted from the payment of all Rates imposed for the support of the Common Public Schools of each such City, Town, Incorporated Village, or School Section, and of all Rates imposed for the purpose of obtaining the Legislative Common School Grant for such City, Town, Incorporated Village, or Township."

By the same clause it is subsequently provided—That such separate schools shall share in the Legislative School Grant, *only*, according to the average attendance of pupils, as compared with the whole average attendance of pupils on the Common Schools—that the exemption, specified above, shall not extend beyond the period of "such persons sending children to, or subscribing, as aforesaid, for the support of such separate school—and that the Trustees of such separate schools "shall be a corporation, and shall have the same power to levy, and collect School Rates, or subscriptions, from persons sending children to, or subscribing towards the support of, such separate school, as the Trustees of a School Section have to levy and collect School Rates, or subscriptions, from persons sending to, or subscribing towards the support of, the Common School of such section."—Persons belonging to the religious persuasion of such separate schools, and sending their children thereto, or subscribing towards the support thereof, are prohibited from voting at the election of Trustees for the Common Schools in the City, Town, Incorporated Village, or School Section, within the limits of which such separate schools shall be situate.

The VI. clause enacts:— "That the Trustees of each School Section shall have the same authority to assess, and collect Rates for the purpose of purchasing School sites, and the erection of School Houses, as they now, or may be, invested with by law to assess and collect Rates for other school purposes."

Comparing this clause with the IV., it will be seen that it is difficult to decide whether it be the intention of the framers of the Bill, under consideration, to allow the Trustees of each School Section to retain the same authority, to levy Rates, for purchasing School sites, and building School Houses, as they now, in virtue of the interpretation put upon the word—"School Fund," possess;—or whether it be intended that persons sending children, and subscribing, to the support of the separate school, shall be exempt from all such Rates, levied for the aforesaid purposes. If the latter be the intention of the Government, it is by no means clearly expressed; if the former, this "Act Supplementary," is but a mockery of justice, a piece of hypocritical humbug, better calculated to give fresh offence to, than to stifle the old complaints of, the Catholics of Upper Canada. Government need not attempt to deceive themselves as to the real intentions of Catholics; they will never be content, will never cease from agitating, until, in school matters, they be placed on as good a footing as before the Law, as are their Non-Catholic fellow-citizens of the same Province. They ask no special favors; they claim no privileges; but they are determined upon having equal rights; and that their schools shall be treated with as much—not more, but as much—consideration, by the State, as are the Common Schools, supported out of the public funds. It is therefore necessary, that all invidious distinctions between "Common," and "Separate," Schools, be done away with; that the latter be, not *barely* tolerated as a necessary evil, but that in all respects as before the law, they be considered as fully entitled to the same privileges, and their Trustees invested with the same authority, as are the Common Schools, and their Trustees. Until this be granted, it is but cant and humbug to talk about "Freedom of Education."

Without directly impugning the intentions of the Government in drawing up the clauses of this Bill, we must remark, that, unless they be rendered more concise and explicit, the aforesaid intentions may easily be neutralised, by the dishonesty and bi-

gotry of those to whom is committed the charge of carrying the provisions of the Bill into execution.—The old Act of 1850 if fairly and honestly administered might have proved, not unbearable, by Catholics. It recognised in the XIX clause the right of Catholics to have separate schools supported by a fair share of the "School Fund;" and by its XIV, proselytising, and all attempts to coerce the conscience of the pupils, was prohibited. On paper, the Bill looked fair enough, but in operation, it has been most oppressive. In practice, Catholics have been deprived of the rights recognised by the Bill; and their children—whenever the Trustees thought they could do it without attracting too much notice—have been compelled to attend at, and join in, Protestant religious exercises. And so will it be with every measure—no matter how fair its provisions—whilst so notorious, and unscrupulous, a religious partisan, as Mr. Egerton Ryerson, Methodist Minister, is entrusted with the control of our entire educational system. Our Legislature may pass good and just laws, but Jack-in-Office, who has the consummate impudence to tell, better men than himself, that to him—to Mr. Egerton Ryerson—"the educational interests of all classes have been entrusted," will contrive to render them of none effect. It is not so much a *new law* that we want, as a *new man*. And of this the Government may be assured, that it is impossible for Catholics to put any faith in its good intentions, whilst it continues to entrust the educational interests of Catholic children to a man who, however estimable he may be in private life, is known in public chiefly as a hireling scribe, and ministerial hack, as a venal and time-serving politician, and an unscrupulous religious partisan, and therefore as the most unfit person that could have been selected, to fill an important, and influential situation. "That such an office should ever have been conferred upon such a person as Mr. Egerton Ryerson, is unaccountable, and can be looked upon by Catholics only as a premeditated insult to their religion, their clergy, and themselves. If, therefore, Catholics hope to get justice in practice, as well as in theory, they must begin by agitating for, and insisting upon, Mr. Ryerson's dismissal from office—for why should they be compelled to pay a Methodist Minister for insulting their beloved Bishop, and trying to corrupt their children? Until Mr. Ryerson be dismissed from the office which he holds, and for which he is most unfit,—until that office be filled by some liberal, and impartial, person, Catholics can put no faith, in the fine words of any ministry, or legislative enactments of any Parliament; nor can the difficulties of the educational question be set at rest.—It is not a new "Educational Law" we want, so much as a new "Chief Superintendent" of Education.

THE LIQUOR LAW.

The great argument of the advocates of this law, the only one which has any show of reason about it, may be thus expressed:—

The State has the right, and it is its duty, to suppress the vice of drunkenness; now drunkenness can be suppressed only by putting a stop to the sale of intoxicating liquors.

But the only way to put a stop to the sale of intoxicating liquor is to pass a prohibitory enactment.

Therefore the State has the right, and it is its duty, to pass such an Act.

Now the whole force of this argument consists in the assumption—that the *only* way to put a stop to the sale of intoxicating liquors is by positive legislative enactment—that there is *no moral influence*, no *power* higher than the law of the land, capable of checking the evil complained of. This may be true in Protestant countries and amongst Non-Catholic communities; but is false when asserted of countries, or people, in, and over, which the Catholic Church retains her legitimate influence. But a few years ago our French Canadian Catholic population, through the contaminating influence of Yankee and British example, were rapidly become, in many of our country districts, a very drunken and dissolute set. Intoxication was a common vice in most of the rural parishes, and in the words of the *Canada Temperance Advocate* the roadsides presented "but a continuation of tavern signs." The evil kept rapidly increasing, as the intercourse betwixt the Catholic inhabitants of Lower Canada, and their Protestant neighbors became more frequent; and the whiskey bottle threatened rapidly to complete the work which the proselytising evangelical societies had commenced. In another generation, Lower Canada, to all appearances, would have been thoroughly demoralised, and therefore thoroughly Protestantised, or Non-Catholicised. But the Church saw the danger, and was equal to the emergency.—She called upon her pastors to make a rigorous stand against the daily increasing corruption, and both by word and deed, by precept and example, to save their flocks from the destruction that menaced them. Nor did the Church speak in vain. Relying solely upon her spiritual weapons, and the promises of her Divine Spouse—she vigorously addressed herself to the task.—And what has been the result?—We will let the *Canada Temperance Advocate* speak:—

"We have seen of late, nothing more refreshing or more gratifying to the friends of Temperance, than the recent official publication in the *Pilot*, of all the licenses granted in the first and second divisions of the District of Montreal, for the year ending May 1, 1853. In this immense District, extending more than a hundred miles from the Province line to the western extremity of the County of Two Mountains, and in width near another hundred miles, from the Upper Canada line to the District of Three Rivers, and more densely populated than any other part of Canada licensed drinking houses have nearly disappeared, except in this City, and in the villages of Lachine, St. Eustache, St. Johns, Laprairie, and Sorel. There is not a single license.

* It would be more correct to say—"The sale of intoxicating liquors can be suppressed only by the suppression of drunkenness."

taken out for the Canadian division of Beauharnois, or for any place in the entire Counties of Leinster, Berthier, Richelieu, (except Sorel,) Verchères, St. Hyacinthe, or Rouville, all densely populous. In other counties there are no licenses taken out for the parishes of St. Anne, Pointe Claire, St. Genevieve, Terrebonne, St. Jérôme, Ste. Scholastique and dozens of others. Nor is any one licensed to sell spirituous liquors in the large villages of Berthier, L'Assomption, Terrebonne, Veitchères, Varennes, Boucherville, St. Charles, or St. Athanase, to which list may be added dozens of smaller villages and road side places, which were once but a continuation of tavern signs;"

and he might have added that, a drunken man, or woman, is rarely to be seen in any of the rural districts of Catholic Lower Canada.

Now this salutary change is owing, under God, wholly and solely to the moral and religious influences of the Catholic Church; to the State, to Parliament, to Magistrates, Constables, or common informers, we offer, because we owe no thanks. It is the work of the Church and of the Church alone; it is the fruit of Popery, that base degrading Popery, as our tabernacle friends call it—which presses upon, and crushes, the poor Canadian habitant. It will be seen too at a glance that the districts in which the triumphs of Temperance have been the most complete, are the districts in which Romanism is the most rampant, and which have been the least polluted by contact with Protestants. In the Eastern Townships, and wherever there is a large Protestant, or Non-Catholic community, drunkenness is pretty nearly as rife as ever. From the statements then of the Protestant *Canada Temperance Advocate* we are entitled to conclude that it is not true that "the only way to put a stop to the sale of intoxicating liquors is to pass a prohibitory legal enactment; and that the argument, founded upon the impossibility of repressing drunkenness by any other means, is utterly worthless, in so far as Catholic communities at least, who have access to the Christian Sacraments are concerned.

It may be said that a prohibitory measure is necessary to prevent the disease breaking out amongst the Catholic French Canadians again. We answer—the same influences that could effect the cure, can always, if vigorously exercised, prevent a relapse. The Church has but to employ the same means, which induced the Canadians to renounce dram drinking, and which, as the necessary consequence of that renunciation, pulled down the signs of the taverns, no longer wanted, because abandoned by their customers,—to guarantee her people against a return of the old complaint. It is always a less arduous task to *preserve* health, than to *restore* it when lost; the Church has done the latter; she will have no difficulty, if unmolested by men, in accomplishing the former.

"APPEAL TO THE CATHOLICS OF THE DIOCESE OF MONTREAL FOR THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHEDRAL AND EPISCOPAL BUILDINGS DESTROYED BY THE FIRE OF JULY 8TH, 1852."

This appeal, which is about to be translated into English, will, we hope, meet with a cheerful response from all the Faithful of this Diocese. The condition to which the fearful calamity of last summer has reduced our beloved Chief Pastor, is well known. In a few hours, the Cathedral, the Palace, and all the Episcopal edifices—the trophies of our Bishop's unwearying energy, and of his people's generous devotion—were swept away. Since that melancholy day, without Cathedral, without house of his own wherein to lay his head, our venerable Prelate has been obliged to have recourse to the charity of the Faithful for food and shelter. This should not be; it is unjust to our Bishop, and if longer allowed to continue, it would be highly discredit to the Catholic laity of the Diocese. The immediate wants of the sufferers have now been relieved: the prompt assistance, of the Colonial government, and of the Corporation, the labors of the Relief Committee, the never-failing charity of our Clergy and devoted Sisterhoods, and the liberality of all classes of the community, without distinction of origin or religion, seconded by the substantial sympathies of our brethren, throughout, not only Canada, but the United States, and many parts of Europe as well, have, to a great extent, repaired the evils of the disastrous 8th of July. Montreal rises from her ruins, and in a few months, all traces of the fearful calamity will be well nigh obliterated. Shall then the ruins of the Episcopal edifices of Montreal be allowed to remain to tell the tale, that her Bishop is still without a Cathedral, and without a home—that the Catholics of this great, populous, and wealthy Diocese—the wealthiest in North America—are so busy with their rail-roads, and mills, so intent upon their sensual gratifications, that they have no time to give a thought upon, that they have naught to spare for, the service of their God, and the support of their holy religion? Shall the stranger who visits our fair city, be permitted to cast this reproach in our teeth? No.

And how shall it be prevented? This "Appeal" shows us how, and how easily, it may be done.—Without calling upon others for help—without imposing any heavy burden upon ourselves—we, the Catholics of this Diocese, are numerous enough, and by the blessing of Him who is the giver of all good things, wealthy enough, to restore the Episcopate of Montreal to its former splendor. We have, within ourselves, means in abundance; it would be an insult to our Faith to doubt that we also have the will.

Here is the plan which the writer proposes:— In the Diocese of Montreal, there are upwards of 100 parishes, containing, on an average, 200 persons capable of subscribing a dollar a year, little more than a penny a week, for 4 years. At the end of 4 years, this trifling subscription would amount to the sum of upwards of £20,000. Amongst the 35,000 Catholics in the city of Montreal, there are surely 10,000, or one-third, to whom an annual subscription of one dollar would not prove burthensome. In 4