

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, NOV. 24, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The arrival of the steamer *Canadian* gives a definite form to the rumors which reached us last week from the Crimea. The report of an attack by a corps of about 30,000 Russians on the right flank of the Allies, is confirmed, as is also the discomfiture of the Turks, and the capture of three redoubts.—Reinforcements, however, rapidly arrived on the scene of action, and the Russians were repulsed with great slaughter—as was also a sally of about 8,000 men from Sebastopol. In the meantime the siege has been progressing favorably. The attack on the sea side had resulted in the silencing of the guns of the Quarantine Fort, and of several other powerful batteries. The loss on board the fleet was great. Of the English—killed and wounded, 328—of the French—216. The ships engaged were much cut up in their hulls and spars. The bombardment from the land side has been very effective; the city was on fire in several places, and most of the buildings were a heap of ruins. The Russian vessels in port had sought shelter from the storm, by creeping close in under the walls, but would soon be accounted for satisfactorily. The speedy fall of Sebastopol is announced as certain; the defences are spoken of as destroyed, and the fire of the besiegers is so close and hot that it is impossible for an enemy to show himself without being picked off. The practise of the French riflemen is described as exceedingly beautiful. Cholera, we regret to say was making great ravages, and the reinforcements on their way will not arrive before they are needed.

The *Canada*, from Liverpool of the 11th instant, brings the following:—

“Latest from the seat of war reports Sebastopol not yet taken. The siege progressing slowly but surely.
 “Reliable accounts of the engagement at Balaklava, on the 25th Oct., have been received. It was a more serious affair and far more disastrous to the English forces than at first supposed.
 “Lord Palmerston had left London for Paris on a secret political message.”

From the rest of the Continent we have little of importance. The attitude of Russia towards Austria is daily becoming more menacing, and war is looked upon as inevitable. The French Emperor has accorded permission to M. Soulé to pass through France, and thus we suppose the quarrel of the diplomatists is likely to be soldered up.

The *N. Y. Times* assigns the objects of the late Congress of American diplomatists. The first was to see if it were possible to take advantage of the recent troubles in Spain, and obtain from the parties in power the cession of the Island of Cuba; the second to ascertain the general state of feeling in Continental Europe towards democracy. The *Times* adds that, as to the first object—the acquisition of Cuba—the Congress has been a failure, and that Espartero has declared himself very decidedly on this point. The result of the inquiries into the political state of Europe is, that there is an utter absence of democratic feeling, and that in Spain there are no republicans. Revolution is pronounced impracticable in Paris, and hopeless in Austria; even, in Hungary, the only feeling towards Kossuth is one of contempt for a blathering coward—a ready speaker, but a poor fighter. Italy is declared to be sick of Mazzini-ism, and Europe is pronounced to be *not ripe* for freedom.

The following appeal to the Catholics of Montreal from their beloved Pastor will not, we are convinced, be made in vain. Numerous as are the calls upon their charity, always have they been cheerfully responded to; and to-day, that our venerable Bishop comes before us, and implores our help to enable him to repair the disasters of the great fire of 1852—to build up the Cathedral, or Mother church of the Diocese, and to provide a fitting abode for himself and body of clergy—we are sure that the Catholics of Montreal will not belie their old reputation, and will show by their zeal in forwarding the good work that, not without good cause, has their City been styled the Rome of North America. In this confident hope then we publish the following notice to the Faithful of Montreal:—

“His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal—who has lately left his Episcopal City for Rome, whither he has been summoned to take part, as the Representative of the Ecclesiastical Province of Quebec, in the venerable assembly of Bishops convoked by our Holy Father the Pope, to meet at the end of this month in the Capital of the Christian world—having found himself obliged to abandon his intention of calling personally at the doors of the houses of all the Catholics of Montreal, to take up with his own hands their contributions towards the rebuilding of the Cathedral, and the reconstruction of the Episcopal establishments, has requested the Committee actually named for the

same purpose, to continue the good work already so cheerfully commenced. His Lordship relies on the generosity of the City for these important ends; and trusts to be able to gladden the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff by showing to him the alacrity of his people in coming to his aid. This present notice is given by His Lordship that each one may prepare himself to respond therunto, as shall be most to the credit of this great city.

“The Committee therefore take this opportunity of informing all the Catholics of Montreal that, on Monday next, they will commence taking up, from door to door, the subscriptions of the citizens; who are notified, in case they themselves should be absent from their homes, to leave the amount of their subscriptions in the hands of some person of their household, charged to deliver it to the collectors. The collectors will be, members of the Clergy, accompanied by some of the residents of each quarter, and their visits will be made in the following order:—1st—St. Antoine Ward; 2nd—St. Anne's Ward; 3rd—West Ward; 4th—Centre Ward; 5th—St. Lawrence Ward; 6th—St. Louis' Ward; 7th—St. James' Ward; 8th—St. Mary's Ward.

“The Committee has much pleasure in reminding the Catholics of this City, that His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal has often repeated to his diocesan, in his several Pastoral Letters, that if every family in the Diocese would but give him during the ensuing four years the trifling sum of Four Dollars, or little more than a penny per week, he would be enabled by means of such a subscription, which would not be onerous even to the least wealthy, to restore the Episcopal buildings of Montreal in a manner worthy of the City. The Committee therefore trust that all classes will promptly respond to the appeal of their venerable Bishop; and will thus show to the world what great things can be accomplished by small means, accompanied with union.”

A friend writes to us from Quebec, that Mr. Maguire is being made the victim of an infamous conspiracy, and that no means are left unemployed to procure his dismissal from his situation. Mr. Maguire is an Irishman and a Catholic, and hence the hostility of which he is the object; for Paddyism and Popery are unpardonable sins in the eyes of liberal and enlightened Protestants. Our correspondent says:

“The fanatics and bigots here, aided by a few lawyers, are busy in an attack upon our worthy police magistrate. No less than four petitions, all emanating from the same quarter, though purporting to be from different persons, have been presented to parliament, complaining of his conduct. Their presentation has been entrusted to Mr. Ferres—the Mister Brown of Lower Canada—and he is to move for a committee of enquiry, which, no doubt, will be granted.”

Though the motives which have led to this attack upon Mr. Maguire are transparent, his friends have no reason to object to the line of action that his enemies have adopted. An innocent and unjustly accused man can have nothing to fear from an enquiry, however rigorous, into his conduct; and the prayer for a committee of enquiry, if granted, will, we trust, redound to Mr. Maguire's credit, and the confusion of his calumniators.

But what are our Irish Catholic friends about at Quebec?—and how is it, that, whilst their Protestant fellow-citizens are so active in demanding justice from the Legislature for the wrongs which they pretend to have received at Mr. Maguire's hands, the former take no steps to secure themselves against Mr. Sheriff Sewell; the particulars of whose conduct must surely yet be fresh in the memories of our readers. They cannot yet have forgotten how, last year—when the trial of the parties implicated in the Gavazzi riots at Chalmers' church was to take place before the Court of Queen's Bench—the Protestant Sheriff falsified the Jury panels, excluded the name of every Irish Catholic from the lists, and thus very nearly managed to secure an iniquitous verdict against the accused; and how, when this villainy was detected, his miserable tool—the deputy—endeavored to bribe the lawyer engaged for the defence. Now here indeed is a case calling for the active interference of the Legislature. Our Courts of Law have been degraded, and still are polluted, by the presence of this same Sheriff Sewell; very general contempt has been brought by him upon the administration of justice in Canada; and whilst he is allowed to retain his office, it is impossible that respect for, or confidence in, our legal tribunals can be restored, notwithstanding the unsullied integrity of the Judges on the Bench.

Now, is it possible that the Irish Catholics of Quebec are so thoroughly cowed by their Protestant neighbors, as to allow this infamous attack upon their rights as citizens to pass unnoticed? Can it be, that they will not take the same steps to procure redress, for the crimes of Jury-packing and bribery—crimes well established against Protestant Sheriff Sewell and his deputy—as have been taken by the signers of the petitions against Mr. Maguire? One of these petitions is now before us, in which it is asserted, “that it is necessary for the well being of this community, and the interests of the public at large, that the said John Maguire should be forthwith removed from a situation which he has shewn himself to be incompetent to fill.” How much more then is it necessary, for the well being of the community, for the interests of justice, and for the sake of maintaining the respectability of our Courts of Law and restoring confidence in trial by Jury, that Mr. Sheriff Sewell should be forthwith dismissed from a situation which he has shewn himself to be incompetent to fill; and in which he has inflicted deep, lasting, almost indelible disgrace upon the administration of justice in Canada—brought trial by jury into suspicion—and the Court of Queen's Bench into disrepute? It is not for us to tell the Irish Catholics of Quebec how to act in the premises; but this we may say that, if they do not show themselves at least as active in demanding a committee of enquiry into the conduct of Mr. Sheriff Sewell and his deputy, as are their Protestant fellow-citizens in instituting proceedings against Mr. Maguire, they will richly deserve to be insulted and trampled upon by their Protestant lords and masters

on all subsequent occasions; and that it will be in vain for them to expect sympathy or assistance from others. However, we have too much confidence in the good sense, and honest pride of our Quebec friends, not to feel assured that they will yet take the proper steps to give their enemies a lesson against Jury-packing and bribery for the future. “So mote it be.”

A writer in the *Montreal Sun* over the signature “A Friend To Education,” asks—“Why, should the Province be burdened with the expense of two or three Normal Schools, and two or three sets of Principals and Professors?” We reply, because, Protestants or Non-Catholics would conscientiously object to a Normal School conducted on Catholic principles; whilst, on the other hand, Catholics would equally object to a Normal School conducted upon Non-Catholic or Protestant principles. Now the State is bound to respect the conscientious convictions of all its subjects, and must therefore, if it taxes them, or in any shape takes of the public funds for educational purposes, give to both Catholics and Protestants schools of which, respectively, they can avail themselves—to Catholics, Catholic schools, to Protestants, Non-Catholic schools.

There is another alternative, and that is the Voluntary system; which if good in religion, must be equally good in education. Indeed the man who can assert it in one case, and not in the other—who can contend for State support for education, and condemn it for religion—who can advocate a connection betwixt School and State, and repudiate it betwixt Church and State—must be either a fool or a hypocrite, an idiot or a knave—probably a little of both. The duties of the State towards the Church are the same as towards the School, and it has no more business or right to interfere with education than with religion. If, then, the State objects to giving to the two different denominations into which society is divided—Catholics and Protestants—their respective schools, it must adopt the Voluntary system, and recognise the right of every man to clothe, and feed his own children, and provide them with education and religion, without being compelled to pay for the feeding, clothing, schooling, or churching, of any other man's children. This would be the logical results of carrying out the principle that it is desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State. We do not believe this proposition to be true; we believe that any document in which it is to be found bears a lie upon the face of it—whether it be an Act of Parliament, or a profane jest book: but whether true or false, it is at least equally desirable to remove all semblance of connection betwixt School and State.” Education is not a legitimate function of the State; and freemen will never allow any form of civil government to interfere with their absolute right over the education of their children—absolute indeed, not as towards God and His Church, but as towards the State and Parliament.

The extract which we gave last week from Archdeacon Wilberforce's work, upon resigning his preferments in the Parliamentary Establishment, will have prepared our readers for the announcement that he has been admitted into the Catholic Church. This happy event took place at Paris, and in the presence of His Lordship the Bishop of Southwark. We find in the *Catholic Standard* a brief notice of the illustrious convert.

Mr. Wilberforce, son of the late Wm. Wilberforce, is elder brother of the Government Superintendent of Oxford, better known as “Slippery Sam.” At Oxford, Mr. Wilberforce took the highest honors, and was for some time a Fellow of Oriel College, where he enjoyed the friendship of Dr. Newman. As an author he is known to the world by his “History of Erastianism,” and his writings on the “Incarnation,” the “Eucharist,” and the “Royal Supremacy”—during the preparation of which he was led, from the study, to the acceptance of Catholic doctrines, and to the renunciation of the heresy in which he had had the misfortune to be brought up. Mr. Wilberforce is a widower, and it is said that he will soon be admitted to Holy Orders, for which he is now preparing.

The Protestant press is naturally much surprised, much shocked, and much grieved, at the defection of such a man, so long one of the brightest luminaries of the Establishment:—

“It is lamentable to think”—says one High Church paper—“that men of such signal devotedness to God as the late Archdeacon Wilberforce as well as the late Archdeacon Manning undoubtedly were, should have met with so much in the Church of England in her present anomalous position as a State Establishment to furnish a plea for their secession. If we belong to the Church Catholic there are certain great Catholic verities which we must never repudiate or even compromise—verities which are inherent in the faith once delivered to the Saints and which cannot be impugned without more or less weakening, not to say, in some degree denying that faith. It is owing to the compromise, if not the repudiation, of these verities, or some of them, in the Church of England under the Erastian and puritanical influences to which she is unhappily subjected, that men zealous and devoted like Wilberforce and Manning—have so lamentably become perverted and lost. God forbid that we should say anything uncharitable. A more pious, conscientious, self-denying, son of the church, than Archdeacon Wilberforce, has seldom, if ever, been in her Holy Orders: and his learning and ability as a theologian have been universally acknowledged. The loss of such a man is therefore on every account to be deplored; and it may well become the Protestant church in both hemispheres to see if there be not causes in her present system, cooperating to repel Catholic minded men, sincere and earnest, and Godly as we know they have been, from a communion in which they were once, most undoubtedly, shining lights, and whose withdrawal cannot but be felt as a great calamity.”—*N. Y. Churchman*.

Strange is it that our Protestant cotemporary can-

not see the reason of these defections which he deplores, but which he would fain attribute to everything but their right cause. No one ever heard of a “pious, conscientious, self-denying” priest in the Catholic Church—a learned man, Godly, and a theologian of acknowledged abilities, abjuring Romanism, and professing Protestantism. No one would dream of calling Achilli, Gavazzi, the Monk Leahy, or to go further back, Luther, Cranmer, or any of the priests who have abandoned the *Romish* Church—“pious, conscientious, self-denying, sincere or Godly men.” All liberal minded and well informed Protestants now admit that the priests who have come over to them from Popery have, without a single exception, been previously notorious for their impurity, their scandalous conduct, their hypocrisy, and double dealing; and that the only converts of whom the Protestant church can boast, have been made from the ranks of the drunkards, and of those of whose crimes and filthiness of conversation, it is impossible publicly to speak, but amongst which, adultery, incest, and fornication, may be enumerated as the least disgusting. There is nothing mysterious, nothing to excite our wonder, in the conversion of an Achilli to the Holy Protestant Faith; it is the most natural thing in the world, and is amply accounted for by the simple fact that, betwixt Catholicity and the vices of an Achilli there is an irreconcilable antagonism; just as betwixt Protestantism, and the same worthy there is an irresistible sympathy or attraction.

The very same causes then that drive men like Achilli out of the Catholic Church, to Protestantism, attract men like Manning and Wilberforce—men who are “pious, conscientious, learned, self-denying and Godly.” These men leave the Protestant world because they feel that there is not their proper place; because they are “pious, conscientious, learned, self-denying, and Godly;” and because they know that a church which—as does the Church of England—“compromises, if it does not repudiate, certain great Catholic verities inherent in the faith once delivered to the Saints,” and which “we must never repudiate or even compromise”—cannot be a part or branch of the “Church Catholic.”

Instead of wondering then, or lamenting, over the loss of such men as Wilberforce and Manning, the Protestant church would do well to ponder the lesson it teaches. Men “of such spiritual devotedness to God,” as, even Protestants admit them to be—men, “pious, Godly, and self-denying”—do not leave Protestantism to embrace Catholicity from impure or worldly motives: if in error, their errors must be of the head, not of the heart, the fruits of ignorance, not of moral depravity. But the talents, learning, and abilities of these same men, are universally admitted, even by the Protestant world; they cannot therefore have erred through ignorance; and if neither through ignorance nor yet through malice have they erred, then have they not erred at all; and we are driven, perforce, to acknowledge the Almighty power of God, as manifested in the self-denying heroism of these men, who renounce wealth, and distinction, and honors, and ease, and friends, and all that the world has to offer, for a life of mortification, hardship and constant self-denial—for the contumely, and reproach, and poverty, which await them as members of a Church which is everywhere spoken against, and which imposes as a condition of membership on all who seek admission within its fold that they shall take up the Cross and bear it to the grave.

MR. M'GEE'S LECTURE.

On Friday night last, Mr. M'Gee delivered his first lecture before the “Young Men's St. Patrick's Association,” on the “Future of America.” Though the night was wet and stormy, the room of the Odd Fellows' Hall was densely crowded, to hear one so justly esteemed as a lecturer as is Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee. The following is a brief, and necessarily a very imperfect analysis of this eloquent discourse:—

Mr. M'Gee began by observing that a well-known man of genius, the only one who has invented a tradition for America, makes his hero, on waking up on the banks of the Hudson, ask, “Where am I?—where am I?” The popularity of this legend rests upon the fact, that it is a type of the changeability of American life. Every one who remembers twenty or thirty years of life in the United States, feels inclined to cry out, every now and then, with Rip Van Winkle—“Where am I?”

It had been said by some writers—among them some whom he (the speaker) greatly respected—that American nationality was “a fixed fact.” He could not subscribe to that opinion; for on comparing the Republic of to-day, with the Republic of Washington's time, he found two different states of society; and there was no evidence yet, that the next generation might not find the general character as thoroughly altered fifty years hence, as it unquestionably was in the past fifty years.

The Republic under Washington was not at all democratic, in the present sense of the term. It was largely aristocratic; Washington himself drove with six horses, with outriders and men-in-livery, to open the first Congress. Democratic ideas came in under Jefferson, were derived chiefly from the French revolutionary school, and triumphed in the administrations of Madison and Jackson, which were within the memory of most men now living.

The difference between the aristocratic republic of Washington, and the democratic republic of Jackson, the speaker defined to consist in the importance attached by the former to manners, blood and education; qualities which the latter President, and his school, pretended wholly to disregard.

While this change in the political spirit of the Republic had been going on, other, and even more extraordinary social changes were in progress. The forms of government remained the same, but the