

force an obnoxious educational system upon, their Protestant fellow-citizens; but they know their strength as well as their rights; and they know also, that *united*, they can make the one felt, and can enforce the other. It is then the duty, as it is the interest, of all the Catholics of Canada, without distinction of Upper, or Lower—of French, or Irish—to unite, and organise a system of stubborn resistance to "State-Schoolism." The cause of the Catholics of Upper, is the cause of the Catholics of Lower, Canada; and it is the duty of the latter frankly to come forward, and to encourage and assist the former in their hour of need. We believe that neither the Executive, nor yet the Legislature, are hostilely disposed towards the claims of the Catholics, for Freedom of Education; but it behoves us, at the same time, to take care that these claims be heard. For this purpose it is in contemplation to procure the signatures of the Catholics of Montreal to a petition to the Legislature, in which shall be declared their sympathy with their unjustly used brethren of the Upper Province, and their request that, to the Catholic minority in Upper Canada there be accorded the same liberty in the matter of education, as is enjoyed by the Protestant minority in the Lower Province—that schools, to whose support Catholics are compelled to contribute, shall be, in the matter of books and masters, and in all their internal arrangements, wholly and solely under Catholic control. More we do not ask—less we will not accept.

THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The *Christian Guardian*, the Methodist organ of Upper Canada, "freely declares his inability to comprehend what the Bishop of Toronto means by the religious liberty of conscience" and the "blessed principles of religious liberty." He also quotes an article from the *Rambler*, in which the writer disclaims all pretensions to "liberty" and speaks of the Catholic Church as having always avowed, and as still avowing, the most profound antipathy to the principle of "religious liberty"—that is, as Protestants understand it. The sentiments of the *Rambler* with respect to "religious liberty" are the sentiments of every true Catholic, and yet, every true Catholic is an advocate of, nay, is ready to shed his heart's blood for, the principle of "religious liberty," as he understands it. The confusion arises, not from that the Catholic is inconsistent, but from that the Protestant cannot understand him; by "religious liberty" Catholics and Protestants mean two different things.

In asserting the principle of "religious liberty," the Protestant claims for man total exemption from the control of the Church; that man be not subject to religion.

In asserting the principle of "religious liberty," the Catholic claims for the Church total exemption from the control of man; he means, that religion be not subject to the passions or caprices of man, whether of the individual, or of the State.

Thus the Protestant by "religious liberty" means the serfdom of the Church, and the supremacy of man; whilst by the same words, the Catholic asserts the supremacy of the Church, and the duty of every man to submit himself thereunto; for it is precisely in submission to legitimate authority that true liberty consists. Then by the words—"right of conscience"—the Protestant, if he means anything, means the right of every man to worship God as he thinks fit—the Catholic means the duty of every man to worship God in the manner that He has appointed; and that every man be allowed to fulfil this duty without let or hindrance from the State, or any other third party.—Clearly Catholics and Protestants attach very different meanings to the phrases—"right of conscience," and "religious liberty."

In practice, as well as in theory, we perceive again a marked difference betwixt Catholic "religious liberty" and Non-Catholic "religious liberty." We will cite one or two instances for our contemporaries, nor need we cross the Atlantic to find them. In Lower Canada, the great majority of the people is Catholic; in Upper Canada, it is Non-Catholic. In Catholic Lower Canada, no Non-Catholic is compelled to pay one farthing for Catholic churches, or Catholic Schools; Non-Catholics have their separate schools, supported by a fair share of the annual grant from the Legislature, and entirely under Non-Catholic control. With this system, no Catholic desires to interfere: our Non-Catholic fellow-citizens have nothing to be thankful for; they enjoy only that, to which their civil rights as citizens entitle them, and of which no Catholic desires to deprive them. This is an instance of Catholic "religious liberty." In Non-Catholic Upper Canada, Catholics are compelled, by law, to pay for the support of Non-Catholic Schools—in which Non-Catholic Trustees compel Catholic children to practise Methodistical, and other Non-Catholic forms of worship, and to join in the reading of corrupt and Non-Catholic versions of the Bible—in which lying and Anti-Catholic histories are used—and of which the teachers are notoriously "immoral" and grossly "ignorant" persons—whose opinions and conduct it would not be for the advantage of the young to imitate and imitate!—(School Report, p. 66);—and who are selected, owing to a most abominable system of favoritism, almost entirely from amongst the most rabid enemies of Catholicity—Methodists and Presbyterians—the very tag-rag and hobtail of the conventicle. This is one instance of Non-Catholic "religious liberty" which we recommend to the attention of the *Christian Guardian*.

Again, Non-Catholics in Montreal have their Non-Catholic College—the McGill College—incorporated by act of Parliament, assisted by grants from the public funds, and endowed with certain privileges; to all this, we never heard any objection from the Ca-

tholic majority. But the Catholics of the Lower Province also desired to have a College of their own. So at their own expense, without any assistance from the public funds, and without seeking any peculiar privilege, the Catholics of Lower Canada built, established, and at last obtained an act of incorporation for, a Catholic College—the College of St. Marie.—But immediately arose from the friends of Non-Catholic "religious liberty" a howl of indignation, as if some great wrong had been done unto them, in that the Catholic majority were at last admitted to a slight share of the advantages which their Non-Catholic fellow citizens had long enjoyed; as if the Non-Catholic principle of "religious liberty" had been violated, as, no doubt, it had, for the great principle of Non-Catholic "religious liberty" means simply—the right of the Non-Catholic to wallopp his Catholic nigger, *ad libitum*.

Here is another specimen of Non-Catholic "religious liberty," which occurred the other day at the funeral of the Earl of Shrewsbury—the representative of one of those ancient Catholic families, by whose loyal hearts, strong arms, and good swords, the name of England was made world-renowned, and the liberties of England firmly established, long ere any of the miserable Orange "parvenues" who now a-days degrade Britain's aristocracy, and make her nobility contemptible, had obtained the power of persecuting and insulting better men than themselves. We copy from the *Dublin Weekly Telegraph*:—

"The leaders of the procession having reached the gate of the park, the clergy and religious ranged themselves at either side of the pathway, within the walls, whilst the funeral car passed out. The public way lay without, and should be crossed, before the ashes of the departed Earl could reach their resting place; and although that way, and the road were for miles around it had been his, the external honor which religion rendered to the Premier Earl of England, should be there suspended. Under the persecuting laws of the country he had loved and served, his body must not be borne across a few yards of one of the public roads of his own estate, attended by the priests and priests of his Church, unless they were stripped of the consecrated habitations of religion, and which even custom has connected with the idea of funeral ceremonial. On that very soil, which he had cultivated, from wild uncultivated, and fertilised and cultivated—amongst his own people, whom he had made happy and prosperous by his presence, and whom he had blessed by his own example—his earthly monument must be borne to its grave almost unattended. For, on the free soil of the British Isles, the profession of the Faith of Christ is as a blot on the conscience of its noblest and best, and its public maintenance is the mark not alone for the community of the intellect, and the savage insults and violence of the mob, but for fines, penalties, and persecutions. The funeral procession, in fact, broke up at the gate, the cross, the emblem of man's salvation, was obliged to be literally decapitated, and the choristers and clergy returned to Alton Towers, save those who were necessarily required to officiate at the burial."

With this last specimen of Non-Catholic "religious liberty" we will for the present bid farewell to the *Christian Guardian*.

Our loyal contemporary of the *Gazette*, may, perhaps, again cry out against the "disloyalty" of the *True Witness* for its assertion that, in case of war, "there is not a nation in Europe on whom Great Britain could rely as an ally—not one that would not heartily rejoice in her humiliation and defeat." We have good authority however on our side, for what we say, as will be seen by the following extract from the first volume of Sir Archibald Alison's continuation of the "History of Europe" Cap. 1 Sec. 29:

"Great Britain no longer appeared as the champion of order, but as the friend of rebellion; revolutionary dynasties were, by her influence, joined with that of France, established in Belgium, Spain and Portugal."

England became indifferent to the jealousy of the other Continental nations, and in the attempt to extend the spread of liberal institutions, or the sympathy openly expressed for foreign rebels, irritated beyond forgiveness the cabinets of St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Berlin. Our efforts to revolutionize Europe have ended in the establishment of military despotism in all its principal States, supported by fifteen hundred thousand armed men; our boasted alliance with France, in the placing of it in the very front rank of what may, any day, become the league of our enemies."

The *True Witness* never ventured to say any thing more disloyal than this.

TO THE REV. DOCTOR EYERSON, CHIEF SUPER-INTENDENT OF EDUCATION FOR UPPER CANADA.

Buckingham, 28th January, 1853.

REV. SIR—I have had the pleasure of reading the published correspondence between yourself and His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, and your official "Report" upon the system of education pursued in the schools under your charge.

I would not obtrude myself on your notice, neither would I make any comments on your letters, but that the glaring inconsistency of your argument has long escaped that censure which it deserves.

Assuming in your correspondence the title of a Canadian and a patriot, you indulge in a strain similar to that in which in former days you defended yourself against the odious charge of having violated a great Canadian constitutional right, when you endeavored, as far as was in your power, to render nugatory, rights, which Canada acquired after a painful and protracted struggle.

I, for one, protest against your assuming the title of a patriot; for I well remember, and will ever remember, the hypocritical varnish of your defence of Lord Metcalfe—a defence which all your antecedents in politics rendered unexpected; and in your present correspondence, with the Bishop, I can trace the same inconsistency, accompanied with the same violence.—Far from expressing your inability to remedy the abuses complained of, you plainly intimate your intention to defend and perpetuate the system from which they spring; and throughout the correspondence you studiously endeavor to disparage the Bishop in the eyes of both Catholics and Protestants, attributing his action and ideas, on the school question, to his foreign birth and education.

In vain has the Bishop told you, that nothing but a faithful obedience to the duties of his divine commission compels him to act as he does. You attempt to ignore that commission, and tell him in reply—"That as Jehovah does not authorize any one human being to lord it over the faith of another human being, but makes every man personally accountable, and therefore gives him an equal right with every other man to judge and act for himself in the matters of his eternal salvation; so our law does not permit any parent, or his child, to be lorded over by others in matters of religious faith, instruction, or devotion." Or, in other words, that as Jehovah has left us to the freedom of our own will, either to save or damn ourselves, so the law of this country protects us in that freedom.

But where, in the whole correspondence, has the Bishop attempted to lord it over the faith, instruction, or devotion, of those not of his flock. All that he requires is, that the youth under his charge shall not be contaminated by reading, or hearing read, books, dangerous to their faith or morals.

"Let your mixed schools," says the Bishop, (letter No. 4) "be without immediate danger on the treble part of teachers, books, and fellow-pupils, for the respective faith of all the children, which is seldom the case in this sectarian country, and I will tolerate, even recommend them." Surely, Doctor, you would not consider this a dangerous, or unreasonable, request for perfect equality of rights. To this you reply—"Your Lordship has furthermore been pleased to designate Upper Canada—the country of my birth and warmest affections—"this sectarian country;" and after making as much capital as you could out of the expression, you quote a standard English Lexicographer, and the *Dictionnaire National de l'Eschelle*, to disprove it. But you say nothing as regards your compliance with the Bishop's request. And in your same letter (No. 7) you write—"Your Lordship says, 'we must have, and we will have, the full management of our schools as elsewhere.'" And to this you reply—"On this passage I remark, that I am not aware of Lower Canada presenting a better standard than Upper Canada, of either religious or civil rights, in the management of schools, by any portion of the community. A popular municipal system not yet being fully established in Lower Canada, the school system there is necessarily more despotic than here, and the Executive Government does many things there, which appertain to elective municipalities to do here; and to accomplish what is indicated by your Lordship, would involve the subversion of the municipal system and liberties of the people of Upper Canada."

So, Doctor, the municipal system and liberties of Upper Canada would be subverted by Catholics obtaining the management of their own schools. Surely, Doctor, you are not sincere in this statement; or are the municipal system and liberties of Upper Canada based on the withholding from Catholics the management of their own schools. I do not believe it. But, Doctor, you write for effect.

Again you write (letter No. 7)—"Your Lordship has represented God as laid down to our schools, as He was in Athens;" and then you say in reply—"By the passages of the Scriptures which you have quoted as well as by your remarks upon our school regulations, you intimate that I place facts before heaven, and the gain of the world before the gain of the soul."

Now, Doctor, if, as you infer, the Bishop charged you with placing earth before heaven—the gain of the world before the gain of the soul—why not reply for yourself—since by your own admission the charge was only made against yourself—Here is your answer—"I remark, that I believe a majority of the members of the Council of Public Instruction, by whom the regulations were made for our schools, in regard to religious and moral instruction, are as deeply impressed with the worth of the soul and the value of heaven as your Lordship." Now, what was your object in defending a majority of the members of the Council from a charge made not against them, but, as you intimated, against yourself only.

I am surprised you were not more explicit, since, in the concluding paragraph of your same letter, (No. 7) you say—"I have not thus rendered myself liable to blame, for having passed once in silence any one of the many topics, which your Lordship has thought proper to introduce; but have carefully noticed each of them."

In letter No. 9, you write—"Your Lordship quotes the late Dr. Murray, late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, who, referring to the former school system in Ireland, under the direction of a body called the 'Kilmore Place Society,' says it was required in all the schools for the education of the poor, that the sacred Scriptures, without note or comment, should be read in the presence of all the pupils of the schools; and you then ask, 'if this is not the case in our mixed schools,'—I answer, it is not the case." And in letter No. 7, you say—"So far from God being unknown in our schools, the authorized version of His inspired Word (the text book of the religious faith of a large majority of the people of Upper Canada) is read in 2,667 out of 5,000 of them. So the Scriptures, without note or comment, are read, as you admit, in 2,667 out of 5,000 schools in Upper Canada."

And in your correspondence, it appears that there is no provision made for excluding from the schools any book that the parents of the children wish to send. I quote from your letter (No. 7). "Thus far the Council of Public Instruction has never, in any instance, exercised the power of prohibiting the use of any book, containing itself with recommending and providing facilities for cheaply procuring the best books for the schools, as the most likely as well as the most quiet way of superseding the use of objectionable and defective books."

Do you mean to say that this is the system pursued in the National Schools of Ireland? I unhesitatingly answer—No. The Board of National Education (not like the Council of Public Instruction) has prescribed what books shall be read in the National Schools, and no others can be introduced; and thus the children are protected from the introduction of sectarian books by any party.

Believe me, Doctor, had it been otherwise the late "incomprehensible Dr. Murray," as well as other Catholic Bishops, would not have suffered the youth under their charge to attend them. And believe me, also, the Bishop of Toronto knows better than yourself what the conduct of the late Bishops Power and Murray would be, if either of them were alive, and in the Bishop's present position.

And, Doctor, you must yourself be aware that the National Board of Education for Ireland has published, for the use of the National Schools, a book of Scripture lessons, which is the only portion of the Scriptures allowed to be read in the schools; and that a day is set apart in each week for teaching the children the catechism of their respective creeds.

In the mixed schools of Upper Canada, you admit there is no uniformity of books; nor have the Council of Instruction made any regulation to that effect—any child may bring what books his parents please to send. In 2,667 of the 5,000 schools, the Bible, without note or comment, is read; and this confused system of education you declare to be the same as that practised in the National Schools of Ireland, where all is harmony, order, and uniformity. There are hundreds in this country, as well as myself, who know by experience that your assertion is false—I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

VERITAS.

THE MONTREAL PROVIDENT AND SAVINGS BANK.

To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

DEAR SIR—The efficiency of some of the Directors of the late *Montreal Provident and Savings Bank*, in allowing themselves to be again elected *Officers of the French Canadian Missionary and other Evangelical Societies* of this city on a late occasion, induces me to inquire of you if the plan is to be carried out which was proposed some time ago, of publishing in pamphlet form an abridgement of the "Report published by order of the Legislative Assembly of this Province, on the gross misapplication of the funds of the said Savings Bank, by the Directors of that institution;" in many cases to their own private use. There are several persons prepared to subscribe to a fund to be applied in circulating, gratuitously, a number of copies of the abridged Report among our citizens, and throughout the province generally, to show them more clearly what manner of men are elected office-bearers of the so-called religious societies on Anniversary Week just passed, and the peculiar honesty of those vessels of election, whom our evangelists delight to honor. This becomes the more necessary, as I understand the late Directors of that swindling concern have spared no pains, and have been at considerable expense, in buying up every copy of the "Report;" they could by their hands upon. I, therefore, call upon all who hate the cant and hypocrisy of the conventicle, and the peculiar notions of morality inculcated by the Editor of the *Montreal (false) Witness*, in defending the conduct of the swindlers, who have robbed the widows and orphans of Montreal of their substance, to come forward now, and assist in the publication of the proposed abridgement of the "Report;" by so doing they will serve the cause of morality and honesty, and be an effectual means of preventing the same or other parties (whose ideas of honesty have been acquired in the *Montreal Witness* school of morality) from again, vampire-like, living on the hard-earned savings of the poor of our city.—Yours truly,

A VICTIM.

QUEBEC MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.—Among the returns of the municipal elections of Quebec, we find W. Quinn, Esq., for the St. Peter's Ward, and M. Connelly, Esq., for the Champlain Ward. The former return was vigorously contested by J. W. Leacraft, Esq.; but Mr. Lamson, by whom Mr. Connelly was opposed, seeing that he could not command even a respectable minority, had the good sense to retire, on the evening of the first day's polling.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Quebec, M. Enright, £5; N. Lancaster, A. McGill, 12s 6d; Chatham, W. Eden, 3s 1d; Richmond, C. W., P. Cavanagh, 6s 3d; Pictou, Rev. M. Lalor, 10s; Bytown, J. Stenson, £1 5s; Long Point, E. Quinn, £1 2s 6d; Thorold, J. Heenan, £1; St. Martin, M. A. Primeau, £1 5s; St. Athanasie, P. Murphy, 12s 6d; Warwick, G. McGauran, 12s 6d; Grafton, T. Keenan, £1 5s; Rawdon, E. Corcoran, 6s 3d; Rev. Mr. Pominville, £1; St. John Chrysostom, P. P. Pominville, 10s; Danville, T. Donegan, £1 8s 1d; Stonfville, J. McCann, 10s; Hamilton, F. L. Egan, 10s; Darford, T. O'Reilly, 15s; Tyendinago, D. Hanly, 6s 3d; Pakenham, Dr. McGillis, 6s 3d; West Point, Rev. J. V. Foley, £1; Paspebiac, P. Hughes, 12s 6d.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

The Session re-opened on the 14th inst.; no important business has as yet been transacted. On the 15th, Mr. Drummond gave notice of the second reading of the "Charitable Corporation Bill," for Friday, the 18th, and of the Seigniorial Tenure Bill, for the 25th inst. Several important despatches were communicated; amongst others the following, on the subject of the "Clergy Reserves." The *Quebec Morning Chronicle* has taken the liberty, and, anticipating, perhaps without reason, the actualisation of the Reserves, indulges in the most gloomy prognostics:—

"The alienation of the Clergy Reserves will destroy all Church establishments, and ultimately all Christianity—the Maine law, Mormonism, Universalism, Shaking-Quakerism, or some other *ism* will shortly usurp the present influence of the Acolytes, and Bishops, of this part of Canada."

Dawson's Street, January 16, 1853.

My Lord,—I have the honor to acknowledge your despatch of the 22nd December last, addressed to my predecessor, and forwarding an address to the Queen from the Commons of Canada in Provincial Parliament assembled, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves.

The address was laid before her Majesty by my predecessor, and your Lordship is already aware from what has recently passed on this subject in the Imperial Parliament, that her Majesty's advisers had taken the matters contained in it into their consideration, and were preparing to communicate with you respecting it, when the recent change in the administration interfered with their intentions.

In consequence of that event, it became my duty to bring the subject under the attention of my colleagues at the earliest opportunity, and I have now to inform you Her Majesty's Government have determined to advise her Majesty to accede to the prayer of that address. In arriving at this decision they have left it to her duty to keep open the question whether or not, any alteration in the present mode of the mode of appropriating the funds, derived from these reserves, established by the 3rd and 4th Vict. Chap. 78.

They do not deny that they place in the regret expressed by Lord Grey in the despatch of the 27th Jan. 1851, that any desire should be entertained to disturb a settlement, devised with a view to reconcile conflicting interests and feelings, and which was hoped might have been accomplished, that object, but they are fully satisfied that measures calculated to rectify would justify withholding from the Canadian people through their representatives, the right of dealing as they may think proper with matters of strictly domestic interest.

They will therefore be prepared to follow the course already indicated by Lord Grey in the despatch above referred to, viz.—To recommend to Parliament to pass an act giving the Provincial Legislature authority to make, subject to the preservation of all existing interests, such alterations as they may think fit in the present arrangements respecting the Clergy Reserves. Her Majesty's Government are induced to make this reservation solely from those considerations of justice, which they rejoice to find so fully recognised in the addresses which have been from time to time presented to the Crown.

That such was to a great extent the view originally entertained by the British Parliament of this question, appears evident from the provisions of the original constitutional act of 31, Geo. 3rd, by which a wide discretion was left to the then Canadian Legislature to alter or repeal its provisions. That liberty, it was thought proper in framing the act of 1810, to withdraw, but in restoring it Her Majesty's Government, are but reverting to the general principles of policy, which were recognized in 1791, in this instance, and which have been habitually adopted and adhered to in others; principles on which alone they conceive the Government of Canada can or ought to be conducted, and by the maintenance of which they believe the sentiments of loyalty and attachment to the existing connexion with this great Empire, which now animate the Colony, can be most effectually confirmed.

The language of these addresses is such as to give every ground for confidence that the powers to be thus given to the Provincial Parliament, will be exercised with caution and forbearance towards the feelings and interests of all classes in those two great districts which are now happily united under the single legislature and Government of Canada; but I must repeat that it is not from a reliance on this confident anticipation, however strongly they may entertain it, that Her Majesty's Government have come to their present decision, but because they are satisfied on more general principles that the Parliament of Canada, and not the Parliament of the United Kingdom, is the body to which the functions of legislation on this subject, must for the public advantage be committed.

You will take an early opportunity of communicating the contents of this despatch to the Legislature.

I have the honor, &c.,

NEWCASTLE.

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTION.—Yesterday, at the termination of the day's polling, the following is as near the state of the poll as could be ascertained:—East Ward, 118; Centre, 38; West, 72; St. Ann's, 231; St. Antoine, 88; St. Lawrence, 117; St. Lewis, 220; St. James, 108; St. Mary, 199;—Total, 1291. Mr. Wilson has received, of these, upwards of 800 votes—the "equipose" is divided between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Southam.—*Herald*, 17th.

THE BRIDGE.—We yesterday morning, were enabled to communicate (by ship) a telegraphic despatch, received from Quebec, containing the very gratifying intelligence that arrangements have been made with Messrs. Jackson & Co., by which the erection of a bridge across the St. Lawrence, opposite Montreal, had been secured—and that Mr. Stephenson, the engineer of the far-famed Miami Bridge, was now on his way here, for the purpose of designing and building a Tubular Bridge, for the Grand Trunk and other lines of railroad, which centre in our city.—*Id.*

SERIOUS RIOT AND OUTRAGE NEAR SHERBROOKE.—We regret to learn, that, on Tuesday last, Mr. Sheriff Bowen, being upon the line of railway in the vicinity of Sherbrooke to execute a warrant, with his assistants, was attacked and most brutally beaten by some of the laborers employed on the road. Mr. Bowen, we are sorry to hear, had two of his ribs broken, and now lies very ill; and one of his assistants was so seriously wounded as not to be expected to recover. He was struck on the head and had his skull fractured. We hear that a requisition for troops has been made to the military authorities here, by the Magistrates of Sherbrooke.—*Id.*

DREADFUL DEATH NEAR STRATFORD, C. W.—The shanty of Daniel Mahany, Lot 25, 8th con. of Ellice, was burned to the ground on Sunday afternoon last, and sad to narrate, two of his children, a girl about two and a-half years and a child (boy) eleven months old, were burned to death.—*Globe*.