

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, Dublin, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, 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. \$2 do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 8, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Univers* announces a meeting of the Bishops of Christendom at Rome, for the month of October, to assist at the deliberations on the Immaculate Conception, and to participate in the declaration of the dogmatic definition so long anxiously expected by the Christian world. "It is probable," says the *Univers*, "that the 8th of December next will see the accomplishment of this universal wish."

From the seat of war we have little to report. The capture of Bomarsund, with but little loss to the allies, has been confirmed; the laurels, the first of the war, belong to the French.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

The House was opened by the Governor-General on Tuesday: the first business was to choose a Speaker, and after a warm contest between the friends of M. Cartier the Ministerial candidate, and of M. Sicotte, the nominee of the opposition, the last named gentleman was elected. On Wednesday the Houses met again, and His Excellency delivered the usual Speech from the Throne.

He had much satisfaction in meeting them, and congratulated them upon the increase in the numbers of the members of the Legislative Assembly. He called their attention to two Acts of the Imperial Legislature: one empowering the Canadian Parliament to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council; the other removing the restrictions which prevented them from dealing with the Reserves. On this question, His Excellency remarked—that:—

"From an early period in the History of Upper Canada, this provision which was originally intended for the support of the Protestant Faith, has been a source of discord and agitation in that section of the Province. It is most desirable in the interest of religion and social harmony, that a final and conclusive adjustment of this long pending controversy, should take place without delay. The subject was distinctly brought before the people of the Province at the late Election, and their opinion upon it expressed in no equivocal manner. I trust therefore, that you will be able without difficulty, to agree upon a measure for accomplishing this object which will give general satisfaction."

On the Seigniorial question, the Speech recommended great caution, and a due regard to the legal and equitable claims of all parties. It then recommended the assimilation of the Municipal Institutions of Lower Canada to those of the Upper Province; and announced the intention of the Government to lay before the Legislature, the Copy of a Treaty regulating the commercial relations of Canada with the United States.

The debates on the Address may be expected to occupy some time, and to elicit much party feeling.

THE CATHOLIC INSTITUTE OF TORONTO & THE "RESERVES" QUESTION.

We are happy to see that the Catholic Institute of Toronto has taken a decided stand against Mr. Hincks' plan for dealing with the Reserves—as unjust, and highly dangerous towards the separate schools, which will thereby be deprived of all share in a portion of the public revenue appropriated to school purposes. The *Catholic Citizen* gives an account of the proceedings, from which we make a short extract.

In the absence of His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, President of the Institute, the chair was taken by the Vice President, who explained the objects of the special meeting. Mr. McCurry then having been moved to the chair, Mr. Feehan addressed the meeting. Admitting the power of the Legislature to alter the present distribution of the Clergy Reserves, he contended that the funds thence accruing, when secularised, became public property, in which all classes of the community were equally entitled to share. But he considered that the measure proposed by Mr. Hincks would, in its operation, be productive of the most gross injustice to a large portion of the population; that it would inflict, and perpetuate evils of the gravest character. The Municipal Councils would, no doubt, apply the special revenue proposed to be placed at their disposal, for common school purposes: but there was no chance that Catholic separate schools would be allowed to share therein. "What would be the consequence?"

"The revenue derived from the Clergy Reserves would most likely be quite sufficient to support all common schools in the various municipalities; if not, it would certainly allow of the taxation for their support to be very much reduced. Perhaps, in course of time, an increase in the value of the revenue would render the present Government Grant also unnecessary. The Clergy Reserves fund, applied solely to

the benefit of common schools, would make them self-sustaining, and no burden whatever to rate-payers. In this case, what would be the position of separate schools, isolated from all benefits conferred upon the others? They could be only sustained by a direct tax on their supporters, from which all other classes are exempt—one of the most unjust and aggravating instances of class legislation which it is possible to inflict; which, to a great extent, would be destructive of separate school education altogether; or would render its continuance dependent upon a degree of self-sacrifice, and submission to oppression, which no government has a right to demand, or a people to render. The opponents to the common school system are both numerous and influential; many besides the Catholic population are equally, or nearly so, averse to it. But the Catholics, as has been frequently the case before, have to fight the battles, while they do not desire to enjoy the exclusive advantage from the result. They contend that all who are opposed to the common school system should be perfectly free to adopt another which they approved; that no degrading restrictions should harass the operation of one system more than the other; that all should be equal in the sight of the law, as they are equitably and constitutionally."

After a long and lucid discourse, Mr. Feehan proposed the following Resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Hayes, and was carried unanimously:—

"That any Legislation, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves, which may either apply the whole or any part thereof to the support, or for the advantage of Public Common Schools, or which may allow of their application for that purpose, without expressly providing that in such case all Public Separate Schools in existence at the time, or established subsequently, shall be entitled to participate equally with Common Schools, in proportion to the number of their respective supporters, would, by depriving a large proportion of the population of advantages enjoyed by the remainder, be unjust in principle and most oppressive in practice; and will therefore be opposed by the Toronto Catholic Institute, by every constitutional means at its command."

By this Resolution, the Catholic Institute of Toronto, has given its verdict upon the controversy between the *True Witness*, and the *Quebec Colonist*. Without pronouncing any opinion upon the question of "secularisation" in general, it pledges itself to oppose Mr. Hincks' plan, in particular, by every constitutional means at its command—Because:—

1. Catholic separate schools will be thereby excluded from any participation in the public funds, accruing from the secularised Reserves, and, by the County Municipalities applied to educational purposes.

2. Because such exclusion is unjust, oppressive in practice, and threatens to be destructive of the separate school system altogether.

The *Quebec Colonist*, who, it will be remembered, denies that Catholic separate schools will be excluded from all share in the secularised Reserves fund—and who professes to be unable to see anything unjust, or oppressive towards Catholics, even if they were so excluded—deprecates the conduct of the *True Witness* in that he "persists in mixing up the Clergy Reserves question, and the separate school question."

—*Colonist*, Aug. 25th. The Catholic Institute of Toronto, on the contrary—a society whose opinions are entitled to the highest consideration, not only as an organisation of the leading and most influential Catholics of Upper Canada, but as a society presided over, and sanctioned by, the highest ecclesiastical authorities—finds these two questions so intimately connected, that, in order to secure the continued existence of separate schools, it feels itself compelled to oppose Mr. Hincks' Bill for the secularisation of the Reserves, by every constitutional means at its command. Here, again, we see a most marvellous discrepancy between the independent Catholics of Upper Canada, and the nominally Catholic journal of Quebec. As of contraries, both cannot be true, one or the other—the Institute or the *Colonist*—must most certainly, be actively engaged in upholding a lie.

That the Catholic Institute of Toronto will not allow its Resolution to remain a dead letter—that it will act, as well as speak—and that the other Catholic societies throughout the Province, will follow its example—cannot be doubted. "The constitutional means at our command" are very obvious; and though, owing to the treachery of some from whom we had the right to expect assistance, to the apathy of others, and to the fear of embarrassing the Ministry which exists in certain quarters, our chances of success have been much diminished, these "means" are still amply sufficient, if wisely employed, to effect our ends.

In the first place, we must petition, in the sense of the Resolution of the Catholic Institute of Toronto; in the second place, an amendment to Mr. Hincks' Bill must be proposed in the Legislature—providing that:—

In all sums accruing from the secularised Reserves, and applied by the County Municipal Councils, to any educational purposes whatsoever, the separate schools in every such Municipality—established, or to be hereafter established, in accordance with the provisions of the School Laws at present existing, or hereafter to be enacted—shall be entitled to share, in proportion to the average attendance of children attending such separate schools.

It will not be sufficient that the County Municipal Councils shall have it in their power merely to apply a portion of the said revenue to separate school purposes; because it is morally certain, from their composition, and their hostility to Catholicity, that such application will never be made, if they have the power to withhold it. What we have the right to ask, and what we must ask, is, that such application of the funds at their disposal, shall be obligatory on the County Municipal Councils; that, if these bodies apply any of the funds at their disposal from the secularisation of the Reserves, to educational purposes at all, the separate schools shall receive their

fair share of the said funds, in proportion to the number of children attending them. The next question is—What constitutional means have we at our command—to enforce compliance with our reasonable demands?—how shall we secure the adoption of such an amendment to Mr. Hincks' Bill?

Of the members returned for Upper Canada, a majority owe their election to Catholic votes; to votes given on the express understanding that the recipient, should use all his influence in Parliament to secure to the Catholic minority full freedom of education, and a participation in all benefits, by the State conferred upon the Protestant majority. We have therefore the right to expect, that men who owe their seats in Parliament to Catholic votes, shall redeem the pledges given on the hustings, and support the amendment which, in due time, will be laid before them. Another election is at hand; an election under the new Franchise Law, when the Catholic vote will be far more numerous, and important than it is now. It will be the duty therefore of Catholics to mark closely how their present representatives act, and vote upon Mr. Hincks' Bill; and if it shall appear that the latter oppose, or do not actively assist to carry, an amendment, giving to separate schools an equal right with common schools to share in all sums accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves, then it will be the duty of Catholic voters at the next election to take good care that the members so opposing, or not actively supporting, their just demands, shall never again have it in their power to pursue a similar conduct. Their names must be published, and thus held up to the execration of every Catholic in Canada, as the names of men who have forfeited their pledges.

In the Lower Province, most of the members are Catholics in name; many of them are, we believe, Catholics in more than name. Now, no Catholic—that is, no one who is in heart and soul attached to his Church, and who appreciates the benefits of a sound religious education—will hesitate to support an amendment framed in the spirit of the Resolution of the Toronto Catholic Institute. Amongst the members of the administration, there are Catholics, whom we should be loth to suspect of indifference to the interests of their co-religionists of Upper Canada; who would rather, if necessary, throw up place and salary, than retain office at the expense of their faith as Catholics, and their honor as gentlemen. With the *Catholic Citizen*, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that M. Morin—a gentleman hitherto so universally respected even by his political opponents, who, in the words of our Toronto cotemporary, "is avowedly, from principle, sensible of the value of religious education"—will allow himself to be a party to the carrying of a measure which must inflict a fatal blow on the system of education which the Prelates of Canada have long labored to establish. No; M. Morin will not so act; he will not so belie all his honorable antecedents; he will not surely approve himself such an enemy to Catholic education, as to refuse to lend his support to an amendment, of which the sole object will be to give to Catholic and to Non-Catholic schools in Upper Canada an equal right to share in the general revenue of the country, according to the respective numbers of children attending such schools! This is all we ask; we shall be false to ourselves, and to our religion, if we accept less.

We know that it will be objected—that such an amendment will be destructive to Mr. Hincks' Bill; that it involves a principle irreconcilably at variance with the fundamental principle of that Bill; that it establishes the principle of "Secularisation" as opposed to "Secularisation," and that Mr. Hincks has irretrievably pledged himself to the latter principle; that the striking feature of Mr. Hincks' Bill, that which in the eyes of "Liberal" Protestants, constitutes its chief merit, is, the skilful manner in which it is so worded as, without once directly alluding to schools, to exclude all Catholic separate schools from any participation in the public funds which it proposes to place at the disposal of the County Municipal Councils—that Mr. Hincks cannot consent to the introduction of such an amendment without violating his publicly given pledges; and that, in all probability, he would rather abandon his Bill altogether, than consent to see it so mutilated. All this, and more, we readily admit—But what of it? What then? As Catholics, we are not bound to support Mr. Hincks' Bill; we are not bound to accept the principle on which that Bill is founded; we are not ourselves pledged to secularisation, nor are we bound to assist Mr. Hincks to redeem his pledges; we are not bound to sacrifice the educational interests, the souls and salvation of our children, for the sake of Mr. Hincks or of Protestant "Liberalism." But, as Catholics, we are bound to secure ourselves, our children, and society, from the dangers to be apprehended from a system of mixed, or Godless education, condemned by the Catholic Church; we are bound to employ every "constitutional means at our command" in the cause of morality and religion, for the good of the Church, and, *ad majorem Dei Gloriam*. To these, even the claims of Mr. Hincks upon our support must be postponed.

The Quebec Colonist reproaches us:—

1. As having helped "to cause the whole district of Montreal to return rouges and infidels to Parliament."

2. As having had a share in "ousting M. Morin at Terrebonne."

3. As a "warm opponent of the Ministry."

4. As having sustained the Ministry in opposing the liberation of Smith O'Brien; thus placing ourselves in opposition to the Irish Catholics in this Province.

5. As having applauded the verdict of the Jury

which acquitted the person who was tried for firing from the steps of Zion church on a crowd of people, inoffensive at the time, near it, and murdering an Irish Catholic named Walsh. [According to the ordinary rules of composition, it would appear, that "the crowd of people, inoffensive at the time," were amusing themselves with the murder of an Irish Catholic.]

6. As having condemned the conduct of those Irish Catholics, who collected in the vicinity of Zion church on the evening of the 9th of June, and forcibly resisted the police.

7. As being a Tory in general.

1. The first accusation carries its own refutation with it. The members for Montreal, Messrs. Doria, Holton, and Young—"rouges and infidels" as the *Colonist* calls them—are "Liberals" of the first water; the supporters of secularisation; and profess the same policy as do the Ministry; with whom they will be found voting on every important question, in which the rights of property, or the interests of religion are involved. Betwixt them, and the present holders of office, there may be private jealousies, and personal pique; but in principle they are all one. The only difference is—the one are in the receipt of official salaries, and wish to retain them; the others are out of office, and long to get in, in order to do a few little "jobs" for themselves.

2. We call upon our cotemporary to show in what manner we had any share in ousting M. Morin for Terrebonne; or to point out a single instance in which that gentleman's name has ever been mentioned in the *True Witness* except in terms of respect.

3. We deny that the *True Witness* is a warm opponent of the Ministry. It cares too little about them to be "warm" either for or against them; and even the *Canadian* admits, that, except on the "Clergy Reserves" and "School" questions, the *True Witness* has generally appeared favorably disposed towards the present Ministry, and has never manifested any desire for a change. This is perfectly true; little as we admire the political honesty of Mr. Hincks in some respects, we would not be at the trouble of removing him to make room for Mister George Brown; and still less for Mr. Sandfield MacDonald, or any of the "rouges."

4. This charge is for sustaining the Government, in opposition to the Irish Catholics of the Province. The falsity of this will best be shown, by referring to the language employed by the *True Witness* on the occasion alluded to. Speaking of the opposition offered by certain members of the Government to a motion made by Mr. Lyon Mackenzie for an Address to the Crown, in behalf of the Irish Exiles, we qualified that position as "unbecoming, and gratuitously offensive."—*True Witness*, May 27th, 1853; and we openly expressed our disapproval of it, as bad in policy and bad in taste. If the *Colonist* calls this "sustaining" the Government, the Government itself entertains, we suspect, very different opinions. At the same time, and in the same article, we expressed our opinions very freely as to the motives which actuated the framers of the Address in question. We knew, and every body in Canada knew, that the whole thing was a humbug; got up with the view of making a little political capital, and of obtaining a little notoriety for its promoters, by an affected sympathy with Smith O'Brien; whose cause, so far from improving, they were doing their best to injure; and for whom they could have entertained no real respect, or they would have scorned to make use of his name as a "cat's-paw," to serve their own dirty and interested ends. What! was it not an insult to a gallant, honorable gentleman like Smith O'Brien, that his cause should be pleaded in Canada by Mr. Lyon Mackenzie?

5 and 6. The next charges against us, are, that we applauded the finding of the jury who acquitted the person accused of the murder of James Walsh; and that we condemned the conduct of those Irish Catholics, who, in spite of the entreaties and warnings of their friends, and in defiance of the reiterated injunctions of their Clergy, assembled in the vicinity of Zion church on the evening of the 9th of June; and who, when bidden to disperse, forcibly resisted the police. These charges are perfectly true. We did, and do applaud the finding of the jury; because it was strictly in accordance with the evidence laid before them. We did, and do condemn the conduct of those men, who, calling themselves Catholics, attended the lectures of Gavazzi, knowing at the same time, that the design of the lecturer was, if possible, to provoke them to a breach of the peace.

Whether such language, on our part, be popular, or unpopular, is a matter of little moment, so long as we know it to be right, and just. We care not whom it pleases, or whom it displeases; and in similar circumstances, we should most assuredly follow the same line of conduct. Every man has the right to be considered innocent until proved guilty; much more then has one, who has been declared "Not Guilty" by a jury of his fellow-countrymen, the right to be treated and spoken of as innocent. The *Quebec Colonist* very probably cannot understand this, nor appreciate the principle upon which a gentleman always feels himself obliged to do justice to an opponent. How should he?

We thank God, lastly, that we were never so wanting in our duty as, from fear of giving offence, to refrain from condemning that which we knew to be wrong in the conduct of Catholics. We say again, and the *Colonist* may make the most of it, that it is the duty of all citizens to keep away from all meetings where the public peace is likely to be disturbed; and above all, that no Catholic can be present at the lectures of a fellow like Gavazzi, without thereby violating the laws of his church, disgracing himself, and causing scandal to religion—and this, whether the persons so offending be Irish, or of any other origin. This we have said, and say again; and to show that we are not ashamed of our language, and do not intend to retract one syllable, we give