

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. Rowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2 1/2 do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Income Tax is now firmly saddled upon Ireland, and continued, for seven years longer at least, upon the rest of the United Kingdom. On the 5th inst., the House divided upon the amendment, that Ireland be excluded from the operation of this unpopular impost—when the Government was again victorious by a large majority; the numbers being 225 to 61. It is now seen how skillfully the present Ministers have played their cards, and how ruinous to Ireland has been the defection of Keogh, Sadler, and Co. These gentlemen know that a ministerial defeat would be certainly followed by a dissolution; and that the probable result of a fresh appeal to their outraged and betrayed constituencies would, in all probability, result in their exclusion from Parliament; they must therefore vote with the Government on all occasions when their support is requisite, in order to avoid the horrors of a dissolution. On the division, which affirmed the perpetuation of the Income Tax, the ministerial majority was 71; of the Irish members, 2 were absent, 31 voted for, and 72 against the ministerial measure. Had the Irish members been united, and had they all voted according to the wishes, and interests of the people of Ireland, the ministerial majority would have been reduced to 7; and the proposal to subject Ireland to the Income Tax would most likely have been abandoned. Though the debate on the other items of the Budget still continues, no doubts are entertained that it will be carried, and by large majorities.

An amusing fracas took place in the House of Commons during the course of the debate on the amendment proposed by Mr. Lawless, with the view of exempting Ireland from the imposition of the Income Tax. Mr. Duffy, speaking in favor of the amendment, and alluding to the transactions which have passed betwixt the present Ministry and the seceders from the Irish Brigade, remarked:—

“Short as has been my experience in the House, I must say that I do not believe that, in the worst days of the Walpoles, or the Pelhams, more scandalous corruption existed than I have seen practised under my own eyes in corrupting Irish members. (Confusion, and cries of ‘Name, name.’) I will proceed,” continued Mr. Duffy, quietly—“to another part of the question—(renewed confusion, cries of ‘No, no; name, name.’)—I am in the hands of the House”—replied Mr. Duffy—“if the Chairman tells me, on behalf of the House, that it is their wish I should name, I will do so.” (Reiterated cries of ‘Name, name.’)

Mr. Ball, the member for Carlow, then moved that the hon. gentleman's words be taken down; and upon Mr. Duffy rising to explain, the cries of “name, name,” and the uproar, were so incessant, that he could not obtain a hearing. Sir D. Norreys begged Mr. Duffy to withdraw the words, and Lord John Russell insisted that the hon. gentleman was bound to name the members to whom he alluded as having been “corrupted.” The offensive words having been taken down, and Mr. Duffy, having at first declined either to withdraw them, or offer any explanation, was ordered to withdraw; on the motion of Mr. Wortley, it was resolved that the words complained of be taken down, and considered next day. When the “next day” came, Mr. Duffy volunteered an explanation. In speaking of corruption, he had not referred to pecuniary bribes. If the House desired it, he was prepared to give the names of the members to whom he had alluded; but he regretted if he had violated any of the rules of the House. Upon the motion of Lord John Russell, this explanation was accepted as satisfactory, and no body seemed inclined to insist upon the names being given, every body feeling that, though Mr. Duffy's allegations were, perhaps, a little unparliamentary, they were strictly true. The continued refusal on the part of the Lords, to admit the Jews to an equal share of civil rights, with their fellow citizens, has provoked a strong demonstration of popular feeling. The electors of London, whom this adverse vote virtually deprives of the elective franchise, have held a meeting, to take into consideration, and adopt, such measures as shall enable Baron Rothschild to take his seat in the House of Commons, in spite of the opposition of the Upper House.

His Lordship the Bishop of Birmingham, and the Very Rev. the President of Oscott, have obtained their discharge, upon an application to the Master of the Rolls. In support of the application, it was urged and proved by the affidavits of his Lordship, and of his Secretary, that the offers repeatedly made by the Bishop and the Very Rev. Dr. Moore, were reasonable offers, and that it was impossible to obtain more from them—and further, that the object of the managers was plainly shown by the correspondence

and communications which had passed between them, and the Bishop's Secretary and Solicitor, in no one of which had they ever questioned the accuracy of the statements made, but had avowed their confidence that, by coercing the Bishop, the Catholics of the Diocese would come forward with the requisite funds. No evidence having been tendered in opposition to those affidavits, the immediate discharge of the Bishop and of Dr. Moore, was ordered, without costs; his Lordship, in accordance with the offers which he had previously made, agreeing to pay over the £200 he had repeatedly offered, as more than the amount of his, and Dr. Moore's, private property. The event has given great satisfaction to the Catholics of the Diocese of Birmingham, who have set on foot a subscription to relieve their Bishop from his embarrassments.

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster has been lecturing with great effect at Manchester. The Corn Exchange was thronged with men of all creeds and no-creeds, to hear this illustrious prince of the Church; and enthusiastic plaudits—in spite of all the exhortations of the Non-Catholic clergy of the establishment, to “treat him with silent contempt”—greeted his Eminence, both upon his arrival, and at his departure. The subject chosen by the Archbishop of Westminster for his discourse was—“The relation of the arts of design to the arts of Providence”—and the manner in which he treated it was such, as to make, not Catholics only, but Englishmen generally, proud of their distinguished countryman. The most bigoted felt that they were in the presence of, and listening to, a man of transcendent ability, and profound erudition, in fact, to one of the most learned scholars of the XIX century; the most prejudiced, and the most careless, could not but feel the difference betwixt such a man as the Archbishop of Westminster, and the Washpots—the Cummingses—the Stigginses—and the rest of the ignominious fry who yelp against him. In the course of his lecture, His Eminence alluded to the “new exhibition which is preparing,” and in defiance of the cant against opening the Crystal Palace on Sundays, expressed his conviction of the propriety of opening it to the public “for some portion at least of that day on which alone the artisan can enjoy it.”

With May come the Exeter Hall gatherings, and the choicest flowers of Protestant rhetoric. This year the season seems to be backward, and the display has, in consequence, been of a very inferior description. On the 3rd inst., the Church Missionary Society held its annual meetings, but might just as well have left it alone. “The committee hoped”—they are always hoping—“that a brighter day for missionary exertion was at hand”—in the meantime, “they had to lament the paucity of missionaries, and were willing to accept any number of clergymen who might offer themselves.” We miss the long familiar name of “Belial” Achilli, from the lists of the mighty men of valor who figured at these meetings, and where the “noble hearted” Achilli was but a short time ago, the favored guest, and the observed of all observers. This great Protestant champion, Saint and Martyr, since the disclosure of his bestiality, has been abandoned by the most evangelical of his *quondam* friends and supporters: even Sir Colling Smith is ashamed of him, and the gospel shop which he had opened in London has turned out a dead failure. Under these discouraging circumstances, Belial has found that there is nothing more to be done, in the way of spreading pure religion, in England, and has consequently determined to leave those ungrateful shores, where his virtues are no longer appreciated, and to join the noble army of Protestant champions—Gavazzi, Leahy, and Co., now warring against Popery in America. We have not heard if his services have been accepted by the French Canadian Missionary Society.

From the continent of Europe there is nothing new. Every thing is tranquil in France, and the Empress is recovering from the effects of her sickness.

Late arrivals from Australia announce fresh discoveries of new “diggins” of almost boundless extent. The whole country from Yass to Gundagai, along the Murrumbidgee river, and its tributaries, is said to be one vast gold field, extending an unknown distance to the northward; but in all probability, as far as the Lachlan river, and the Canabola mountains. In fact, if the accounts may be relied upon, gold may be had almost any where for the trouble of digging. The newly discovered gold fields are situated in one of the most fertile, and in the best watered districts, of Australia. The arrival at Melbourne of several vessels with passengers from Canada is announced.

SABBATH OBSERVANCES.

Whether “countries which are most noted for Sabbath observance” are “by far the most commercial and prosperous in the world” is an assertion that is not worth while contesting; but that they are “the most moral,” as asserted by one of the witnesses examined before the “Sabbath Labor Committee,” we are strongly inclined to question. It may be owing to want of penetration, but we admit that we have never been able to trace the connection betwixt “commerce” and godliness, or to conclude from “material prosperity” to morality. On the contrary, from the mere fact that certain countries are more “commercial and prosperous” than others, even had we had no other data from which to form an opinion, we should be strongly inclined to doubt their “morality”; that is, if in the much abused word “morality” are to be included, righteousness, honesty, chastity and temperance. Whatever else “commercial” communities may have to boast of, as a general rule they certainly can lay no claim to the possession of a very high standard of morality; the history of the world shows that the invariable tendency of “commercial” pursuits is to lower that standard,—to generate very

lax notions of right and wrong, when interest or profits are at stake,—and to blunt, if not to destroy, all the finer and nobler impulses of our nature. It is difficult to serve both God and Mammon. Neither are material prosperity and success in business to be accepted as an index of a very exalted morality.—Men prosper indeed, sometimes in spite of, but rarely because of, their honesty, or their punctilious regard for the point of honor. “Knavery,”—it has been said, with but little exaggeration—“is the readiest way to riches, and the casting off of virtue is the first step to thriving in the world.” If we would prosper, we must not be over scrupulous as to the means; and if we look around us we shall generally see that the most “prosperous” in a “commercial” community are the least burdened with scruples of conscience. The true commercial motto is:—

Qualibet
Unde habeas querit nemo: sed oportet habere.”
Juv. Sat. XIV.

Judging therefore merely from the fact that the “countries most noted for their ‘Sabbath observances’ are by far the most commercial and prosperous in the world,” we should entertain beforehand a strong suspicion that their morality would not bear a very close scrutiny. And if we examine their history, and rejecting theories, confine ourselves to statistics, and the unromantic, yet instructive records of the police office, we shall find that the facts fully sustain us in our previous opinions.

Great Britain is the country in Europe “most noted for its ‘Sabbath observances;’” and it may safely be conceded that it is the most “commercial,” and, in so far as mere material prosperity is concerned, the most prosperous. As it is the northern part of it especially, where “Sabbath observances” are enforced with the greatest rigor, entitled to the praise of being also the most “moral” country in Europe? What say the witnesses?—

Is Great Britain the most honest, as well as the most commercial, country in Europe? Let us hear Blackwood, a staunch enough Protestant—his testimony cannot be suspected of partiality:—

“The increase of crime is astounding; as is the new savagery which characterises it. There is something wrong. Let us not brag of our prosperity, of our security, or of our honesty, the main virtues, or results of virtues of a well-ordered nation, when people dread the garrote as they walk the streets, robbery at every corner; and even in their own houses, adulteration of every article of meat, drink and clothing. . . . Scarce a day passes but some gross adulteration is detected. Not do the meanest and cheapest substances escape—as if the pleasure of knavery was too great to be resisted, though the profit be the smallest.

“It is time to look into these things with legislative authority; for never before, in the annals of the world, has there been such universal, such wholesale iniquity of this kind perpetrated. I do not profess to know what the quality, or extent of crime is in other countries; I speak of this, and to its disgrace, that it would appear that its general trade habit is fringed with roguery, and that the very roguery is worn as an ornament. . . . In the modern theory of morals, a man may have a thousand obliquities, delinquencies, falsifications, perjuries, treacheries, or what you please; but yet, if he does the one thing he is wanted to do, he may be put down as a truly good man, a thorough good man; nay, perhaps, come in for a share of ‘hero worship,’ and be a man after some people's own hearts.”—Blackwood, April, 1853.

Just the chap to make a Director out of, for a Bible Distributing, or French Canadian Missionary, Society. Clearly, if there be any virtue left in old *Eborac*, honesty is not one of the ingredients in the morality of the most “commercial” and “prosperous” country in Europe. But then it is death upon “Sabbath observance.” How fares it with its morality in other respects? with its chastity, and temperance? We will inquire of the *North British Review*, decidedly an evangelical witness; and leaving the cities, and their commerce, their roguery and prosperity, will take a peep at “*Village Life in England*”:—

“The saddest thing of all”—says the *Reviewer*—“to contemplate in connexion with village and country life, is the condition of the daughters of the poor. . . . In the country, vice”—the writer is alluding especially to what he calls, “the great sin of great cities,”—“does not wear the same filthy and forbidding aspect that it wears in large towns; it is less mercenary, less systematic, less a matter of calculation; but it may be doubted whether, in proportion to the population, there is less of it.”—*North British Review*, May, 1852.

“Purity and simplicity”—continues the *Reviewer*—“are as little the lot of the rural districts, as they are of the large cities, of England. It is from the former that the ‘stews’ of the latter are recruited; and the process by which this is accomplished is detailed at length. Alas! for Sabbath-keeping England. To the Sabbath, and the manner in which it is observed, does the *Reviewer* attribute that general corruption of morals amongst the young women, which he so feelingly bewails. “THESE SUNDAY EVENINGS”—he exclaims—“SEE MORE MISCHIEF THAN ALL THE WEEK-DAYS PUT TOGETHER.” On “these Sunday evenings” is accomplished the ruin for which the victims had, it must be confessed, been previously well prepared. We would ask the impartial reader to contrast the following picture of “*Village Life in England*,” drawn by a Protestant hand, with that given us by another Protestant—Sir F. Head—when describing the chastity, “the almost incredible chastity,” of the daughters of Popish Ireland:—

“Two or three young girls—almost children—may be seen standing together, retailing, or inventing perhaps, highly seasoned gossip; it may be about their equals; it is just as likely to be about their superiors. It runs all very much in the same channel. It relates to something or other that leads in time to the ‘great sin of great cities.’ In their very childhood they become familiar with the name and character of almost every kind of sin. They talk about it in an easy,

careless manner, indeed, for the most part, with obvious pleasure, as something to be gossiped about and laughed at—not to be mourned over and condemned. This is one of the first stages of demoralisation. And almost more frightful than the sin itself, is the light hearted familiarity with which it is canvassed by very young girls, and the obvious leaning towards it that is discernible in all that they say.”—*Ibid*.

In the words of the *Reviewer*, “the consequences may be conjectured.” These consequences are “not marriage.” There are few things, he adds, more remarkable in the villages of Protestant England, “than the small number of marriages solemnised in the course of the year.” But amongst these “few things,” he enumerates “the number of illegitimate children that are born into the world. In some villages, indeed, these events are of such frequent occurrence as to excite neither surprise, nor indignation.” Really, Irishmen and Irishwomen should be grateful to the good kind Protestants of England, who, neglectful of themselves, send their missionaries to convert the poor Papists on the other side of the Channel, amongst whom an illegitimate birth is an event rarely, or never, heard of.—*Vile Sir F. Head's ‘Fortnight in Ireland.’* The generosity of our English evangelicals in this respect is perfectly overwhelming; but perhaps they fear that their own people are irreclaimable; for, adds the *Reviewer*, speaking of the little account that is made of the want of chastity, in Protestant England:—

“This obtuseness of the moral sense, this deadness to shame, makes one almost despair over it. Where the standard of public opinion is so low, there is little hope of practical improvement.”—*Ibid*.

If we turn our eyes northward, we shall behold another people, famous indeed for their “Sabbath observances”—commercial and prosperous, no doubt—but, we fear, with very little morality to boast of, in the ordinary acceptance of the word morality. If, in England, the “Sunday evenings see more mischief than all the week-days put together,”—matters are still worse in Scotland. Indeed there are not wanting Scotchmen, and Protestants to boot, who attribute the debauchery of a Scotch Sunday to its puritanical “Sabbath observances.” In a late debate in the House of Commons upon the “Public-houses (Scotland) Bill,” Mr. Drummond is reported in the *Times* of the 21st ult. as saying:—

“In his opinion the superstitious reverence, and observance paid to the Lord's Day in Scotland, was one of the very great causes of drunkenness in that country. A person could hardly take a walk, or any recreation on Sunday, without being supposed to be doing wrong. He was speaking in the presence of hon. members who knew the fact was as he had stated; and he would say that, if they did restrain the people from the ordinary recreations which, in his opinion, they were religiously entitled to have, they did force them to give way to perpetual drunkenness. In Glasgow alone, 30,000 persons every Saturday night steeped themselves in whiskey and opium, and lay in a perfect state of insensibility until Monday morning.”

Mr. John McGregor, in the course of the same debate, confirmed Mr. Drummond's statements.—“Sunday, instead of being a day of sobriety in Scotland, was a day of drunkenness.” And he added—an assertion which we beg our readers to bear in mind, in connection with what follows, taken from a Scotch Protestant paper, the *Edinburgh Advertiser*—“that, after all, it was not the public-houses that the great excesses were committed, but in secret, and solitary drinking.”—*Times*, 21st April.

The statement of the *Edinburgh Advertiser* is as follows:—

“On Sunday the 6th of March, relays of respectable persons quietly, but resolutely, kept watch at all the open public-houses, taking note of the thirsty multitude who beset their doors. Conscience-stricken at the scrutiny thus evidently going forward, a few of the Sunday-trafficers in whiskey shut shop altogether, and two dozen closed prematurely at nine o'clock instead of eleven. Nevertheless, the number of persons entering these dens of dissipation is enormous and most truly humiliating. Not less than 41,795 persons entered public-houses on the Sunday in question, while 6,609 entered that class of licensed houses called hotels and taverns, which carry on a large public-house trade,—giving an aggregate of 48,405. And as not a few of the whiskey-shops have two entrances, only one of which could be watched at a time, it is probable that the true number of persons entering houses licensed for the sale of liquor, on that day alone, is not under fifty thousand! This is a startling fact; for the whole population of Edinburgh is little more than 160,000. Of course, many of this bibulous multitude made more than one dive into their favorite haunts; but even allowing 16,000 persons to have made a double visit, we shall still have the startling and melancholy result that, one-fifth of our whole population are in the habit of entering liquor-shops on the Sabbath-day!”

One-fifth of the whole population in the public-houses on Sunday! and yet, it is not in them that the “GREAT EXCESSES” of a Scotch Sunday are committed, “but in secret, and solitary drinking.” And this Scotland is a country noted for its “Sabbath observances!” Perhaps the less that is said about its “morality” the better; and certainly, if our Protestant friends were wise, they would be careful not to provoke comparisons betwixt the “morality” of Popish, and Protestant, countries. If anything we have said, prove offensive to Protestants, it is to the foolish attempt on the part of their co-religionists, to depreciate the former, and exalt the latter, that they must attribute it. We have merely cited Protestant testimony in proof of the falsity of the assertion, that “countries most noted for Sabbath observances are the most moral,” as well as the most “commercial and prosperous.” It cannot be imputed to us as sin that we quote *Blackwood* and the *North British Review* in support of our allegations; and we defy our most inveterate opponent to show cause why the TRUE WITNESS should not repeat in Canada, what Scotchmen and Protestants have uttered unrebuked in the House of Commons. Our object is not to give offence, but to enter our humble protest against the