

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. Sacrament 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, SEPT. 1, 1854.
 NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Parliament was prorogued by Her Majesty in person on the 12th ult. Mr. Spooner's last attack on the Maynooth endowment was a decided failure.—The British Government has enough difficulties to contend with abroad, without provoking the hostility of its Catholic subjects at home.

The Allies in the Baltic have, it seems, at last struck a decided blow. On the 7th and 8th ult., the French and British troops landed in force on the Island of Aland, and after some hard fighting made themselves masters of the strong fortress of Boomerund on the 16th. Two thousand Russian prisoners are said to be amongst the fruits of this victory; the French loss is put down at 160 men killed. From the seat of war in the South, we have nothing new. The heads of the Austrian columns were on the point of entering Wallachia.

On Tuesday next will commence our Canadian Parliamentary campaign.

THE QUEBEC COLONIST AND THE TRUE WITNESS.

If to elicit the truth be the sole legitimate end of controversy, would it not be well for the Quebec Colonist to confine himself strictly to the question at issue, betwixt him and the TRUE WITNESS?—that question being:—

"Is, or, is not, Mr. Hincks' Bill"—for the settlement of the Clergy Reserves question—"so worded as to prohibit the County Municipal Councils from appropriating one farthing of the funds, accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves, to Catholic separate school purposes?"

The TRUE WITNESS affirmed that it is; and supported his position:—

1st. By a comparison of the provisions of Mr. Hincks' Bill, with those of the at present existing School Laws. By the former, the application of the funds accruing from the secularised Reserves, is restricted to purposes to which the funds of the County Municipalities are at present applicable; by the latter, the funds of the County Municipalities are not applicable to Catholic separate school purposes; therefore we concluded that, according to Mr. Hincks' Bill, the funds accruing from the secularised Reserves are not applicable to Catholic separate school purposes, although they are applicable to Non-Catholic school purposes.

2d. We supported our position by an extract from Mr. Hincks' speech—as reported in his confidential organ, the Toronto Leader—in which the framer of the Bill in question, was represented as boasting that, the aforesaid funds, once given over to the Municipalities, "could not be applied to sectarian purposes." Now every body knows that, amongst "Liberal" Protestants, Catholic separate schools are invariably styled "sectarian;" just as the Catholic Church in communion with the Apostolic See is styled the "Romish" Church.

3d. We cited the language of the Toronto Leader, the Ministerial organ of Upper Canada, to the effect, that, Mr. Hincks' Bill was so drawn up as to prohibit sectarian schools sharing in any appropriation of the funds accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves. Now, it is a legitimate presumption that the Toronto Leader is well acquainted with the views of the framers of the said Bill.

On the other hand, the Quebec Colonist, contends that Mr. Hincks' Bill is not so worded, as to prohibit Catholic Separate schools from sharing in any appropriations from the funds in question. Having given our arguments, in support of our position, it is but fair that we should allow the Quebec Colonist to be heard in reply, and in support of his position. We copy from the Colonist of the 25th ult., in reply to the TRUE WITNESS of the 18th.

"We will not split hairs with the TRUE WITNESS in arguing upon the school question; our doing so would not edify our readers no more than a discussion with him bandying the same kind of expressions he makes use of so freely. When the School Question comes up, we will be found at our post ready to do battle for Catholic rights, and the equality and freedom of education."

"The TRUE WITNESS says—"in order to enable our readers to decide between the TRUE WITNESS and the Quebec Colonist, we place side by side, extracts from our Quebec cotemporary of the 11th inst., and from the Toronto Leader, the Ministerial organ of Upper Canada." What do we care about the Toronto Leader, more than the TRUE WITNESS does about the Montreal Gazette, or the Toronto Globe? Not as much. Is it not as ridiculous for the TRUE WITNESS to endeavor to make us responsible for the writings of a paper published in Upper Canada, supported by Protestants, owned by Protestants, and edited by Protestants?—The Quebec Colonist should have added—and the avowed

exponent of Mr. Hincks' policy—"as it would be for us to make the TRUE WITNESS responsible for the publications and views of the Montreal Gazette edited by Mr. J. M. Ferries of indecent notoriety, or of the Globe, edited by Mr. George Brown, according to our cotemporary, as honest a politician as Mr. Hincks"—Arcades ambo, &c.—"both of whom are as warm opponents of the Ministry as the TRUE WITNESS. Of course we differ from the Leader in the way we regard this question, though we are not prepared to endorse the statement of the TRUE WITNESS that in speaking of sectarian schools, Catholic schools are necessarily pointed at"—what then do Protestants in general, and Mr. Hincks in particular, mean by sectarian schools in Upper Canada, if not Catholic separate schools?—"and however much the Leader may enunciate the views of members of the Government from Upper Canada, or may be prepared to sustain them in carrying any measure, having for its object or having the effect of preventing freedom of education to Catholics in Upper Canada, it is a different affair with us, and the Government may count upon our uncompromising hostility to any such measure, when, and wherever it may be introduced, in every way that we can make such opposition available."—Quebec Colonist.

Now, after a careful perusal of two columns of verbiage, we have been unable to detect another passage, in which the Quebec Colonist attempts either to refute our arguments, or to sustain his position, on the ONLY question actually at issue betwixt the Colonist and the TRUE WITNESS. "Is—or is not—Mr. Hincks' Bill so worded as to exclude Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada from any participation in the funds accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves?"

We leave the case in the hands of our readers: appealing to their cool judgment, and leaving it to them to decide—whether the arguments of the TRUE WITNESS, or those of the Quebec Colonist, the more resemble those of an honest man, who, conscious of having truth on his side, and courting the most rigorous enquiry, scorns to distract attention from the one question at issue, by the introduction of impertinent and utterly irrelevant matter; by their verdict we are content to abide. Either the TRUE WITNESS, or the Quebec Colonist, must be attempting to deceive them most egregiously, on a simple but most important matter of fact, palpable to the meanest intelligence.

We have not space at our command this week to go over the grave charges which our cotemporary brings against the TRUE WITNESS. Yet, though in no wise connected with the subject matter in dispute betwixt us—viz—the effects of Mr. Hincks' Bill upon the separate school system of Upper Canada—we may venture to promise a reply to them in our next. To one charge, that of having prevented the election of an Irish Catholic member for Montreal—"one with whom Catholic interests would be safe"—a communication from B. Devlin, Esq., which will be found in another column, is a sufficient answer. Mr. Devlin is the only Irish Catholic whose name we ever heard mentioned in connection with the representation of Montreal during the late elections; and he acquits us of all interference with his views. It was indeed rumored in May last, that Mr. Hincks intended to send us up one of his clerks from his office in Quebec, to be made an M. P. of: but the proposition was so preposterous, such an insult to the good sense and independence of the electors of Montreal, that it was laughed down at once, without the necessity of any interference on the part of the TRUE WITNESS. Every one felt that, though the gentleman alluded to was a most amiable and exemplary person in private life, "Catholic interests would not be safe" in his hands, because of his subordinate position, because in the House he would be a mere puppet, in the hands of his employer—Mr. Hincks—the avowed enemy of Catholic Freedom of Education, and who expressly declares that he will have no political connection with Catholics who are under the influence of the Bishops of the Catholic Church.

But we are falling into the error which we condemn in our cotemporary: that of wandering from the question. Stick to that we beg of you Mr. Colonist; and remember that the matter in dispute betwixt us is—not the Terrebonne election, the Gavazzi riots, nor the captivity of Smith O'Brien; but simply this—"Does Mr. Hincks' Bill exclude Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada from all share in the funds accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves?"

"Non de vi, neque crede, nec veneno
 Sed his est mihi de tribus capellis
 Tu Cannas, Mithridaticumque bellum
 Et perjurii Punici furoris
 Magna voce sonas
 Jam dic Postume de tribus capellis."
 —Mars. lib. vi. Esp. 19.

WHAT THEY THINK IN UPPER CANADA.

We continue to lay before our readers, extracts from our Catholic cotemporaries of Upper Canada. It will be seen that the Catholics of Toronto entertain opinions, respecting the conduct of the Lower Canadian press, very similar to those on the same subject enunciated by the TRUE WITNESS. We congratulate our brethren in the Upper Province in having such able and independent advocates as the Catholic Citizen and the Ottawa Tribune; both journals merit, and we trust may obtain, the hearty support of Irishmen and Catholics.

Under the caption "Danger from Within," the Catholic Citizen writes as follows:—

"We are still of opinion that sufficient healthy element has been introduced into the new House to guarantee the certainty of the same measure of justice being meted out to Catholics in the Upper Province which is measured to Protestants on the matter of Education in Lower Canada;—to speak more plainly, we believe that a majority of the House previous to their election, avowed their sense of the justice of the claims preferred by U. C. Catholics, and that the

only danger to be apprehended is that, now that Mr. Hincks has thrown off the mask and openly avowed his hostility, journals avowedly claiming to uphold Catholic interests, are found base enough to abandon principle, and to continue to support the men who have declared their hostility to that which the Catholic Church holds necessary for the maintenance and security of the faith.

"The immediate result of this policy will be, that very many members who owe their seats to Catholic votes, in the Upper Province, votes only given with the guarantee of supporting Catholic claims, may now contend that in supporting Mr. Hincks' measures, (these measures being advocated by journals professing in the Catholic interest,) they are not forfeiting their pledges. This excuse, too, may be urged with considerable plausibility; and if the claims of Catholics, and their demands for justice are disregarded, we broadly assert that, to the adhesion of such journals as the Montreal Freeman, La Minerve, the Quebec Colonist, Le Canadien, and we grieve to say, our Toronto Mirror (whom we would fain have excluded from this sad list) to the Hincks policy, will the grievous frustration of Catholic hopes alone be attributable.

"In bright and honorable contrast to those journals stand the Montreal True Witness, and our new cotemporary, The Ottawa Tribune. We may remark with respect to the opposition now made to the Ministry by the former of these journals, that professedly not a political paper, except when Catholic interests were concerned, its present vigorous tone and action in reference to politico-religious questions has only been called forth by the urgent necessity of the case.

"The style in which the True Witness handles the defaulters from truth and the right cause is one well calculated to show to them the shame and disgrace which must inevitably follow the course they are pursuing; and our cotemporary has, besides, lost no time in expressing his condemnation of Mr. Hincks' outrageous violation of principle and justice.

"A few extracts will, however, do more to prove to our readers the vigor of the True Witness's articles than any mere praise.—We accordingly subjoin some:—

The writer here gives some extracts from the True Witness.

"For outspoken sentiments such as these, the True Witness has drawn upon itself the ire of the hireling quasi Catholic press of Montreal and Quebec; it is pleasing, however, to know that this abuse is productive of good, inasmuch as such abuse tends only to raise, if possible, the True Witness still higher in public estimation.

"We entirely concur with our esteemed cotemporary, that justice can only be obtained through the advocacy of an independent Catholic press.

"We have been accused of misunderstanding Mr. Hincks as to his opinions on Separate Schools; but in answer to the accusation, we can only observe that if such be the case the honorable gentleman expressed himself in terms sufficiently ambiguous to mystify the True Witness, the Ottawa Tribune, and our selves, and in proof of this we submit an extract from the Tribune:—

"A similar triumph might just as well have been secured by the Reformers in Toronto, Bytown, and other places; and the absence of a triumph in these places was owing to the unfortunate circumstance that there had not been unanimity in the Reform ranks.

"For instance, he had been opposed to Separate Schools, as his friend, the Postmaster General could bear witness; but he had been unable to prevent the existence of Separate Schools."—Two extracts from Hincks' Speech at London.

"What a triumph it would have been to the Reformers of Bytown, to secure the return of a supporter of Francis Hincks, the man who, to gain an extension of power, avows his past opposition to Separate Schools, when he ever publicly and privately before pretended to favor them. Mr. Hincks exposes his real character. We wish those Catholic journals in the Ministerial service to justify their conduct in supporting him. If the Catholic body through Canada West acted like those of Bytown and Toronto, Mr. Hincks would have little chance of making capital out of his new professions."—Ottawa Tribune.

"We heartily endorse the sentiments contained in the last sentence of the above, and believe that Mr. Hincks, thrown overboard by the Catholics of the Province of Canada, would be politically dead in twenty-four hours."—Catholic Citizen.

In justice to the Toronto Mirror, whom the Citizen seems inclined to suspect of a servile adherence to the "Hincks" policy, we must say that in his issue of the 25th ult. the Mirror takes a decided stand against that policy; and frankly accepts the policy advocated by the Citizen, the Tribune, and the TRUE WITNESS, viz., opposition to any and every Ministry, irrespective of party-names, that does not make "justice to Catholics" part of its Ministerial programme. It will be seen, too, that the Mirror agrees with the TRUE WITNESS in attributing the present iniquitous school system of Upper Canada, to the "consummate skill" of the "leader of the present Ministry;" and to the fact that Dr. Ryerson has been hitherto allowed supreme control in all matters pertaining to education:—

"That is exactly a question for a Catholic mind: Shall the parent be at liberty to have his child instructed in the principles of religion and morality, or must he acquiesce in a system of infidelity 'as by Law Established'?" Viewed in this light, is it not a monstrous proposition to think that any Legislature could pass a measure so tyrannical, or refuse to recognise the just claims of their opponents? In Lower Canada, where the great majority are Catholics, the Protestants enjoy the liberty of educating youth in their own faith, and receive their share of the public allowance for educational purposes; but in Upper Canada, where Catholics offer to be content with about one half of what is their due, they have to endure perennial opposition. Perhaps one reason for this anomalous state of things is the fact, that the generality of Protestants do not fully understand the nature of the Catholic claims, for it must be remembered that great efforts have been made to mislead them. Another may also be found in the consummate skill displayed by the leader of the present Ministry, in changing his former position on this question, and allowing Mr. Ryerson to get in a measure most oppressive in its operation. Now, both these reasons can, in our opinion, be easily obviated; the first, by placing the just demands of the Catholic, fairly before the public, with their firm determination to seek for justice; and the latter, by the

simple statement that in future, Catholics will not support or put faith in any party not pledged to establish freedom of conscience and freedom of education."—Toronto Mirror.

The Mirror is right; this is the only safe ground for Catholics to occupy; the only ground upon which they can give battle with any reasonable prospects of success. The party with whom Catholics have been long in the habit of co-operating, have become so confident of success, that they no longer think it worth while to conciliate their former allies, or to disguise their hostility to Catholic claims. In that they call themselves—"Liberals"—"Reformers"—they think that they have a right to count on the support of Catholic voters. They may yet find themselves mistaken.

Indeed it cannot too often be repeated, or brought before the notice of the Catholic public, that, though all Protestant parties would persecute Catholics if they could, their most dangerous enemies are to be found amongst the "soi-disant" Protestant "Reformers;" who are not even at the pains of concealing their animosity towards us. Mr. Hincks, their leader, is "opposed to separate schools;" and their organs of the press plainly tell us:—

"That on no subject affecting the general interests of the people of Upper Canada, are the 'Reformers' of the Province so generally agreed as in condemning the Sectarian school principle."—Lambton Observer.

From the Protestant "Liberals" then, it is clear that we have nothing to hope. They have had undisturbed possession of the reins of Government for several years, and during that period what have we gained? what has been won to the cause of Freedom of Education? They have given us the "Act Supplementary" at the instigation of the Rev. Mr. Ryerson; for which we give them all the thanks that they deserve when we pronounce that measure—"a snare and a mockery." The spirit of Protestant democracy is one of bitter hostility to Catholicity. Everywhere it is the same. In Baden, in England, in the United States, and in Canada, a Protestant "Liberal" means the enemy of the Church. For a season, and whilst he has some object in view, he may disguise this hatred; but sooner or later the mask must fall, and the malignity of Protestant "Liberalism" be exposed to sight.

"The Roman Catholic Clergy have no social affections; they are cruel-hearted, and have a cruel nature against all beings of mankind." (Loud cheers.) "Don't call yourselves priests, Roman Catholic Clergy: call yourselves murderers." (Applause.) "The Romish Clergy are a Clergy of blood and slaughter; THEY ARE THE SOULS OF SATAN, THE SOUL OF THE DEVIL HIMSELF." (Enthusiastic cheering.)—Gavazzi's Lectures, June, 1853.

At a meeting of the City Council, held last week, His Honor the Mayor congratulated the public on the disappearance of the epidemic from which we have suffered so severely. His Honor acknowledged, in glowing terms, the assistance he had received from the Clergy and religious institutions:—

"I should be doing violence to my feelings, and great injustice to the clergy of this city, on the present occasion, were I not to bear witness to their zealous efforts to succor the poor and sick during the pestilence. At its outbreak, I was visited by His Lordship the Anglican Bishop, to confer upon the best means of alleviating the distress of the sufferers. His Lordship keenly felt the misery and want to which the city was exposed. His Lordship, the Roman Catholic Bishop, also called on me several times, offering all possible assistance. He had been round the Catholic institutions, enjoining them to open their doors to all who might apply, irrespective of creed or race, and rigidly to respect the religious predilections of the patients. These most philanthropic injunctions were, I know personally, fully carried out. His Lordship also requested me to state that the Sisters of Charity were prepared to assume the duties of nurses, when and where required, and also wished me to inform the officers of the Montreal General Hospital, that if their assistance was wanted, it had only to be intimated to them. Fifty beds were put aside for cholera patients in the Hotel Dieu Hospital, and a whole ward assigned to the same beneficent purpose in the St. Patrick's Hospital. His Lordship likewise assured me that, if required, he would convert the large school-house near his late palace, into a Cholera Hospital, and furthermore, requested me to represent to the Corporation, that he was at all times prepared to co-operate with it, in carrying out every measure that would tend to usefulness, during the epidemic.—The Reverend gentlemen of the Seminary were incessant in their attendance upon the sick, advising and cheering the desponding, and proffering assistance to all alike. The devotion of the Sisters of Charity to the sick and destitute of all classes was most admirable—at all hours, and at all places, these incomparable women were seen dispensing succor and consolation, and performing the most menial services, oftentimes in places which ordinary individuals would shun with horror."

The Mayor then alluded to the very extraordinary conduct of the Managers of the Montreal General Hospital, at the commencement of the disease:—

"I have also great pleasure in stating thus publicly, that the Governors of the Montreal General Hospital did not persist in their intention of excluding cholera patients, as they had intimated."

From this it would appear that the Managers of this public institution, supported in a great measure by a grant of money from the Government, barbarously refused admittance to Cholera patients. Out of this disgraceful and inhuman resolution they were at length shamed by the conduct of the Bishop of Montreal, and of the much-abused Sisters of Charity, who heroically offered to expose themselves, to the risk—not of contagion, disease, and death, for these they care not—but of the brutal, unmanly, insults which the attendants and Managers of the Montreal General Hospital are so fond of offering to the Catholic religions who attend that Institution; and the long-continued repetition of which led to the establishment of a St. Patrick's Hospital, where the fever-stricken might be allowed to die in peace, and where the Priests of God's Church might administer