

## CONGREGATION DE NOTRE DAME.

The Sisters of the Congregation de Notre Dame have recently purchased the beautiful property of Monklands, former residence of Lord Elgin, where they intend opening a Boarding School, by the first of next September, under the title of *Maria Villa*.

The advantages of this site for healthfulness, pleasure grounds, *bosquets*, gardens, &c., render it one of the most desirable spots in Canada, it might be added, in North America, for a female Academy. The building at Monklands not having been erected for a Boarding School, only a limited number of pupils can be admitted for the first year.

The course of instruction will embrace all the requisites and accomplishments of female education.

The Prospectus can be had at the *Pensionnat* of the Congregation de Notre-Dame, Montreal.

On Sunday last, the annual procession of the Blessed Sacrament took place; and we are happy to say that everything passed off with the greatest decorum. The procession, issuing from the Parish Church, passed down Notre-Dame Street, across the Hay Market, up St. Radegonde Street to St. Patrick's Church—where Benediction was given; and then returned by De Bleury, Craig and St. Joseph Streets. His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal officiated.

At Quebec, we learn that the usual processions have passed off quietly. We trust that this may be accepted as a sign that the angry feelings of last summer have pretty nearly subsided.

## PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

Since the opening of the Session the time of the House has been consumed in long debates upon the Address, in reply to the Governor's speech; and in discussing the different amendments proposed, in which the conduct of the Ministry was strongly censured. On Tuesday evening, Mons. Cauchon's amendment was carried by a majority of 42 to 29 against the Ministry. The House then adjourned until Thursday to enable the present Cabinet to decide what line of conduct it should adopt in consequence. M. Cauchon's amendment, to which another amendment by M. Sicotte was added, was couched in the following terms:—

"That the House sees, with regret, that your Excellency's Government did not intend to submit to the Legislature, during the present Session, a Bill for the immediate settlement of the Seigniorial question, or one for the immediate settlement of the Clergy Reserves."

On Thursday, the Governor went down to the Houses, and announced his intention to prorogue Parliament, with the view to an immediate dissolution. Thus, by a clever dodge, have ministers managed to escape the difficulties of a prolonged Session.

We have received from Dr. Brownson a communication from which we make the following extracts. We hope that the *Journal de Quebec* will have the goodness to insert them; and thus lend his powerful aid to counteract the dangerous influence of the malicious slanders of the *Canadien*:—

"I saw from the *True Witness*, that the *Canadien* had charged me with having said that 'Protestant marriages were null'; but I supposed that your contradiction would be sufficient. I never entertained, and I never have expressed, in any form, or in any place, by word or writing, any such sentiments—which you know I could not, as a Catholic, entertain. I was myself married as a Protestant, to a Protestant, by a Protestant minister, and have never been re-married or had any ceremony of rehabilitation performed since I became a Catholic. Surely I do not look upon myself, or my wife, as living in prostitution."

"What the story has been made out of, I cannot imagine; but there is not a word of truth in it, and you are authorised to deny it, in the most positive and unequivocal manner you can devise. If the *Canadien* has any respect for Catholic honesty, and fair dealing I shall expect it to retract the charge which it should have known better than to have believed it possible for any Catholic, in my position, to have made."

We are happy to see that a determination exists on the part of the proper authorities at Quebec, to trounce the mercenary scoundrels who have so long made their profit out of the sufferings of the unfortunate emigrants. A case was lately brought before the Police Court, by W. A. Buchanan, Esq.,—who deserves much credit for his vigilance—charging the master of an emigrant vessel, with issuing to his passengers, fetid, putrid water from old dirty molasses casks; though, at the time, he had sound, wholesome water on board the ship. When applied to by the passengers—who complained of the loathsome abomination that was given them to drink, and of the sickness it produced amongst them—he heartlessly replied, "that he did not care."

The case was fully proved, and the ship-master was sentenced to pay a fine of £20 sterling, or suffer imprisonment for a month. We regret that the latter was not added to his fine; a few weeks' imprisonment, with hard labor, and with oakum and bilge-water, for their diet, is just what some of these fellows deserve; it would teach them "to care" for the sufferings of their unfortunate passengers.

We regret to learn that the new Catholic Church at Cobourg has been destroyed by fire; and from what has transpired we fear that this calamity must be attributed to religious bigotry. "We do not know," says our informant, "to what cause this is owing, for we have always endeavored to live on good terms with our Protestant brethren. God knows how our poor people will be able to repair the loss."

We have been requested to state that our correspondent, *An Irish Catholic*, is not in Holy Orders, and is, not at present, a member of any of our Ecclesiastical, or Collegiate institutions.

The views put forward, more than a year ago by the *True Witness* as to the hopelessness of any substantial reform in the educational system of Upper Canada, until its administration be placed in other hands, are now, it seems, adopted by the Catholic press of the Upper Province. Sad experience has convinced them that, from Dr. Ryerson, no justice to Catholics can be expected. We copy from the *Toronto Mirror*:—

"The education of the youth of Canada is unfortunately placed under the sole and irresponsible direction of one individual, the leader of a sect the most bitterly and vindictively hostile to Catholics of any existing in the British dominions. The *Christian Guardian*, as its organ, in every number, bears ample proof of this assertion, and its violent and reckless articles against 'Romanism' not only infringe the laws of Christian charity, but set all the courtesies of social life and the maxims of truth equally at defiance."

"The dictum of the Chief Superintendent is the *ultima ratio* in all disputes or misunderstandings. It must be final, because there is no appeal; and where Catholic interests are concerned, it is sure to be adverse. If the law will bear any sinister interpretation, the ingenuity of the most specious sophistry is promptly applied to give it an injurious effect, and to justify the oppression."

"Catholics are now well aware of this horrid grievance, aggravated, as it is, by proud, insulting, and dictatorial arrogance, and must, in consequence, at once unite in a manly and determined remonstrance for deliverance from the tyranny of the educational department, and for the uncontrolled direction of their own educational establishments. They seek no interference with others, quite content if only left in peace to the management of their own affairs. The Protestants of Eastern Canada are entirely free from molestation in the direction of their 'Separate Schools.' Forming a small minority of the population, they are not subjected to any annoying or counteracting influence from the majority, who differ from them in religious belief. The Catholics of Western Canada claim a similar immunity from all adverse interference. The numerous sections of Upper Canada, however discordant among themselves, have one common point in which they can unite. Opposition to Rome concentrates their energies for attack on Catholic institutions. Their mutual dissensions and bitter recriminations are suspended whilst warring with the common enemy. The Methodist incumbent of the Educational Department, while under the plausible appearance of a spurious liberality, he imposes on ministerial confidence, and surreptitiously defrauds Catholics of their educational rights, is firmly sustained by men of varying creeds, who would neither recognise his religious teaching nor join with him in the forms of devotion. This, however, is no business of ours. It is sufficient for us to know that such combinations against the rights of Catholics exist; that the great J. the Minister of Education, is the head that plans, directs, and actuates the whole. The other agencies are mere plastic tools, in his hands, moulded at his pleasure, and when required made subservient to his purpose."

"Catholics can now distinctly see the originator of the wrongs under which they labor in respect to their educational rights. One powerful and hostile influence has been wielded against them. To get rid of this influence by every constitutional means within their power, must be their one sole and undivided aim."

"The individual who engrosses the sole direction of Education in Upper Canada is amenable to no authority. He constitutes not merely an *Impertum in Imperio*, but a power superior to the State. His will is the supreme law, and his office is exercised without limitation or responsibility. The Czar Nicholas is not more absolute in sway, nor more proudly dictatorial in the promulgation of his ukases. From such a power, swayed by the most rancorous sectarian hostility, what justice can Catholics expect? Bitter experience has amply demonstrated that their educational rights have been daringly withheld, and that when the venerated Chief Pastor of this diocese remonstrated against the foul oppression, he was met by that supercilious and arrogant sneer of insult, so characteristic of little minds."

"Every stretch of authority has its limits, and the time has arrived when Catholics everywhere throughout Western Canada must protest against this system of iniquity. From every locality let petitions be forwarded at once, praying the Legislature for relief from the tyranny of the Educational Directory, and for the just and indispensable privilege of entrusting the education of the Catholic youth of Canada to Catholic hands alone. Above all, let it be strenuously urged that no measure of relief can be satisfactory unless all foreign influence is completely excluded. Dr. Ryerson, in his Report on 'Separate Schools,' boasts that he alone prepared the present defective law, which was submitted to the approbation of Parliament, and sanctioned as a matter of course. 'I can also confidently affirm,' he says, 'that it (the Supplementary Act) was prepared by myself and submitted to the consideration of the Government without previous consultation with any member of it.' And again, 'The responsibility of others, whether Ministers of the Crown or private members of the Legislature, was in sanctioning substantially that which was submitted to them.' Most solemnly do we protest against a repetition of the monstrous anomaly. Let not our bitterest enemy be entrusted with preparing the law that must regulate the education of Catholic children."

"Whatever measure may be submitted to Parliament should receive the unqualified approbation of the Prelates and Pastors of the Church. After the numerous disappointments already experienced, no Legislative remedy could be received with confidence from which such approbation is withheld."

How it Works.—A Catholic of Brantford, writing to the *Catholic Citizen* of Toronto, gives us some insight into the workings of the present School Laws:—

"The town of Brantford is divided into five wards. In each ward there is a stately school house, built at the expense of Catholics as well as Protestants, &c. Now that the Pastors of the Catholic Church, one and all, have decided that Catholic parents cannot safely send their children to those Common Schools any longer for instruction, the parents begin already to be very sensible of the wisdom of the decision, as could be gathered from their exclamation of joy yesterday,

saying, 'Oh, when would our children be so happy if they were going to the godless Common School?' But now, after erecting these stately brick buildings, in some of which there is not, at present, a solitary child, must they bear in silence to see more than 50 of their female children pinned into a small Vestry-room, the length of which does not exceed 23 feet and the breadth not 7½ feet, and the male portion of the same school crammed into a small, low cottage adjoining. The truth of this I will vouch for. Now, let me ask any man of common sense is this 'Religio, Scientia, Libertas,' or rather, is it not the renewal, as far as possible, of the persecution of the primitive Christians, hunted or retiring into caverns in order to preserve liberty of conscience and the free exercise of their religion."

"To whom, Mr. Editor, can you inform me, can we attribute this state of things? Is it to the Liberals or Conservatives, or to the pious and reverend framers of the wily, harassing, unjust, and mock Supplementary School Act of 1853? I say wily, because it is as difficult to know its way as that of a serpent on a rock, or a ship tossed on sea. That it is harassing can be easily seen by the 2nd clause of the 4th section of 'Supplementary School Act,' requiring what is impossible. That it is likewise unjust can be seen by the 1st proviso of the 4th section, obliging Catholics, after withdrawing, to continue to build high schools of brick. That it is a mock can be gathered from the 5th proviso of the same 4th section Supplementary, promising to extend its liberality to Separate Schools established, or intended to be, from the 1st of January, 1853. The Catholic Separate School at Brantford has been set apart by the Municipal Corporation in June 1853. Since that period has it received one cent from the Government fund for education? No! Has it received a cent of the taxes paid since by its supporters? No! a cent. I repeat again, is this 'Religio, Scientia, Libertas?' What a mock motto. In this state of things, how can candidates ask for Catholic support. We are British subjects, in a free country, the land of our adoption. We ask no favors, no liberality, but we promise to strain every nerve to put men into office who will obtain equal and just rights, and who will distribute them with fair and impartial justice."

## THE MONTREAL FREEMAN AGAIN.

To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

Montreal, June 21st, 1854.

DEAR SIR—Although you have very properly declined any further controversy with the *Montreal Freeman*, I trust you will permit your correspondents to "say their say"—that is if any of them can muster courage to raise their head in presence of the awful, the tremendous, the terrific scribe of the *Freeman*. Why, Mr. Editor, my heart sinks within me (priest and all as I am!) while I think of the dread anathema launched against you and us, (whoever we may be!) who go up to do battle against the Philistines. I thought, in my simplicity, that the letter which appeared in the *Freeman* some few days ago signed "Papist," was the richest thing of its kind that even "the writers of the *Freeman*" could bring forth; but, my stars! there is a certain composition in the shape of an editorial in this day's issue of that paper, which really does "out-herod Herod." This precious concoction is a most delectable mixture of the coolest impudence, the most bare-faced and arrogant assumption, the most glaring absurdity, and the most rancorous malice; (I beg your pardon, Mr. Editor, for banding over to some "person unknown" this latter qualification so plentifully heaped on you since this ridiculous controversy opened;) the whole overlaid with such a character of solemn gravity that even an "ecclesiastical person" cannot help laughing. Now, dear Sir, this gem of editorial writing is specially addressed "To THE IRISH READERS OF THE TRUE WITNESS; and I make it my earnest request that, if possible, every 'Irish Reader of the *True Witness*' will read it. None of the 'conspirators' of the *True Witness* could produce anything half so well calculated to shew up 'the writers of the *Freeman*.' Let our people all read that article—black as Erebus in malice, and below contempt in its drivelling nonsense;—"the Irish Readers of the *True Witness*" have, in general, no lack of intelligence or good sense; let them be the judges. They, and the whole united province are witness that no man, or set of men, (much less "the writers of the *Freeman*") ever wrote you down on any one question; and they will, therefore, duly admire the audacity of the *Freeman's* cool assumption that he has done so. When, and where, and how, has he even attempted to argue with you on the subject in question—i.e., the "Clergy Reserves?"

As for his specious pretext of considering the interests of "two respectable and industrious young men," I have only to say that I regret the young men aforesaid have not been more fortunate in their speculation as regards the *Freeman*; but the fault is not yours nor mine; it is their own misfortune perhaps, rather than their fault, not to have had a proper Editor for their paper; but as such has been the case, the interests of the whole Catholic body must not be sacrificed to that of any "two young men," no matter how "respectable," or how "industrious." If the *Freeman* should again become what we all wish to see it, there will be none more ready than the "select few," who take sides with the *True Witness*, to welcome the change. For the present, things must take their course; but before the sympathy of the Irish is evoked for their "countrymen and co-religionists," it would be necessary for them to answer a few simple questions satisfactorily. In the first place—why did they (the proprietors of the *Freeman*) employ a Protestant, without any principle, as far as I can see, to edit a paper intended for circulation amongst Irish Catholics?—why did they permit place-holders to write articles for their paper, representing the views of certain ministerial personages rather than those of the Irish readers of the *Freeman*; and then get up a quarrel with the *True Witness*, because it would not adopt the peculiar views of certain disinterested parties?—why, above all, did they admit into their columns over the signature of "Papist," a letter attacking, by implication, the whole body of the Irish Clergy, and audaciously threatening them with ecclesiastical censure on the bare supposition (and a most unfounded one, too!) that your *Irish Catholic* correspondent was a priest?—why do all these things, and then complain of being hardly treated, because Irish Catholics are not to be made fools of?

With regard to the "insignificance" and "unscrupulousness" and "malevolence" of your correspondents, they are well content to let the whole country be their judge, on the data presented to them in your columns.

As for your sins—the "metaphysical subtleties," the "glaring sophistries," the "false logic and interpolations," whereby, it seems, you are wont "to bewilder the judgments of your readers"—I can only beg of you to oblige your readers with an act of contrition at your earliest convenience; and to appease the *Freeman* by promising to "be a good boy, and take care of yourself" for the time to come. Do not, I beseech you, play "Will-o'-the-wisp" any longer, leading people's "judgments" scampering after you through the mire of doubt; for the chances are that some of them may find themselves weltering in "the Slough of Despond" some of these fine days, like honest John Bunyan's unlucky "pilgrim."

But it seems there is to be "a legal inquiry" instituted as to your sayings and doings, and my sayings and doings, and the sayings and doings of the whole "select few" who are "working in the dark" against the *Freeman*, its owners, its "writers," and all. Now, that is what I call a capital joke; just as if the greatest enemies the *Freeman* has were not precisely its own "writers." You or I, or the "select few" could do it little harm if it pursued the straight-forward, independent, manly course, which a paper started as an Irish organ should pursue. But the fact is, that the whole thing is so supremely absurd that, with worthy Dominie Sampson, I can only hold up my hands in rapt admiration, and exclaim, "Prodigious!!"

Suffer me in conclusion to give you a word of advice in the language of an old Scottish proverb—"ne'er fash your head about it." Mr. Editor; leave your cause and mine to the "judgment" aforesaid; that is the best test of our joint deserts. The "writers of the *Freeman*" will very soon find out that the "select few" who condemn their course, and approve of that of the *True Witness*, comprise the great mass of the Catholic population of Canada.

Yours respectfully,

AN IRISH CATHOLIC.

P.S.—Allow me to notice one other little slip of the pen in the *Freeman's* late curious address to "Irish Readers." He takes good care to insinuate, or rather to assert, that you said he was an Orangeman. If truth were any object with him, he would find that you were careful to say "that you had no knowledge whatever of the editor of the *Freeman*—that you did not even know if it had an editor—but that public rumor, not the *True Witness*, said, that he was a Protestant and Orangeman. The "Orangeman" is denied; but the "Protestant" is tacitly admitted. Here then, Sir, you have the whole secret of the "Protestant" *Freeman's* hostility to the Catholic *True Witness*.

The *Montreal Freeman* having volunteered a gross attack upon Mr. Burke, and having declined giving insertion to the following justification of his conduct, we have been requested to publish it. This we willingly do, as an act of justice to the writer; though we do not pledge ourselves "to endorse the note."

"To the Proprietors of the *Montreal Freeman*."

Montreal, June 20, 1854.

"GENTLEMEN—A member of your editorial corps has honored me with a notice in the *Freeman*, which will be deemed a compliment by those who know how precious are the legitimate business moments of the gentleman, and how severely he is harassed by official duty; the monotonous routine of his literary pursuits at Quebec requires the relief of an occasional essay for the press; it is to be hoped that his labor has as salutary an effect upon the circulation of the *Freeman* as on that of the paper he honors officially. To the proprietors of said paper his efforts are at times expensive; they feel, at least, that he is no common 'penny-a-liner.' As an editor, it would not be wholly improper for this gentleman to cultivate an acquaintance with the facts pertaining to any case on which he expatiates. This opinion may be taken for what it is worth; my reason for offering it is simply because he has disseminated information through the columns of your paper, which (to be explicit, if not polite) I must characterize as gross falsehood. I allude particularly to the statement, that I opposed the Government (meaning the present administration) by my writing in the *Bytown Gazette*; and that I opposed Mr. McLachlin at the last general election. My very limited contribution—as editorial—to the journal named, contains nothing that could be tortured into a sense to justify the charge; rather the reverse. As a correspondent of that paper, I have eulogised the Ministry and Ottawa Members for reducing the duty on red pine, in the only article I wrote in that way within the last three years. As to the other charge, I believe you are aware that Mr. McLachlin gave it an unqualified contradiction, in the presence of some of your respectable citizens in Montreal within some short time past. I think, Sirs, that an imaginative writer may find wide enough field in impugning the motives of those he opposes, or in the invention of an amiable disguise for every foolish or vicious act of those he serves, without venturing so boldly on the domain of stubborn fact. Truth, always powerful, is there invincible. However, I should indulge your imaginative editor with the silence of contempt in his dangerous recreation; but that his masters show so palpable a design to 'lie' me down. In the capacity of gentlemen, some members of the Government have had the audacity to assert, and that without qualification, that the charges referred to are true. I will be plain, and place those gentlemen alongside your editor as disseminators of falsehood;—it is a trumpet up tale—a pretext to justify intolerance and violation of principle."

As your paper has been the medium of giving currency to these false charges above referred to, I request you will do me the justice of inserting this letter in your columns.

Your obedient servant,

JAMES H. BUNKE.

## WHY WEAR BOOTS AND SHOES THAT DON'T FIT?

EVERY one must admit that the above indispensable article, WELL MADE and SCIENTIFICALLY CUT, will wear longest and look the neatest. To obtain the above, call at BRITT & CURRIE'S (Montreal Boot and Shoe Store,) 154 Notre Dame Street, next door to Dr. J. Sadler, corner of Notre Dame and St. Francois Xavier Streets, where you will find a

## SUPERIOR AND SPENDID STOCK

TO SELECT FROM.

The entire work is manufactured on the premises, under careful supervision.  
Montreal, June 21, 1854.