

In estimating the amount legally due to the Roman Catholic Trustees, assuming the School Fund to be the Government appropriation and an equivalent amount raised by assessment (which is the evident meaning of the act); reckoning the total fund at £1000, and their proportion according to the average attendance as shown by the official returns (about 1-14th) the sum would be only £70. But assuming that the School Fund embraced the Government appropriation, and the whole of the local assessments for school purposes (which your Committee do not allow,) the sum apportioned to the Roman Catholic Separate Schools, under the compromise of last year, exceeded not only the amount to which they were legally entitled, but the whole amount of the school tax, paid by the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the city.

From a recent return submitted to this Board by the Secretary, after much tedious investigation, the following facts, gathered from authentic statistical documents, exhibit that the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the city, while reckoned at upwards of one-fourth of the population, contribute only about one-twelfth of the taxation. From the return referred to, your Committee find that the total annual value of the taxable property in the city amounts to £186,988 5s.—of this the proportion held by Roman Catholics is £13,750 10. The total net amount of School Tax for last year, at 2½ currency in the pound, was £1,800; the net proportion contributed by the Roman Catholic inhabitants was £156. 10s., were the sum thus contributed by the Roman Catholic inhabitants to be placed at the disposal of the Committee now superintending their separate schools—together with their legal share of the Legislative Grant—the sum would fall short of £200.—last year the amount was rated by compromise at £220.

While your Committee cannot too strongly reprobate the principle recognized by the present School Act, of giving a legislative sanction to separate schools, without any just cause for their existence (as in Lower Canada,) they would seek most earnestly, but by other and better means, to guard the rights of every class in the community. Your Committee fear that to continue to carry out the principle that the State should provide means to inculcate sectarian religious dogmas in our public schools, will result, not only in the various Boards of Trustees being required, according to the plainest principles of political justice, to meet the demand of other religious bodies for the establishment of denominational schools, but perhaps, even, in the entire destruction of our educational system.

Your committee having reason to believe that some members of the Board regard the compromise of last year, relative to the separate schools as having extended morally into this; and having their views upon the case at some length, while they cannot recommend an appropriation beyond that which the law evidently allows, deem it to be their duty to commit the adjudication of the amount to the whole Board.

All which is respectfully submitted.  
 J. LESSLIE, Chairman.  
 WM. McMASTER,  
 D. PATERSON,  
 WILLIAM SHEPHERD,  
 WILLIAM HALL,

It was moved by Mr. Leslie, seconded by Mr. Paterson, that with reference to the application of the Rev. Mr. Mitchell, the incumbent of Trinity Church, to be permitted to give religious instruction, at stated times, to the children of the Church of England within the female school recently established in the North Park, this Board would regard the allowance of a *præceptor* in the case of any one religious teacher as virtually extending the same to all: that, moreover, as an arrangement of this kind would necessarily interfere with the regular exercises of the school, and create much difficulty and confusion, the permission be not granted. Motion carried—yeas, 8; nays, 3.

Dr. Workman moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, that the draft of the school regulations submitted by the local superintendent, and referred to a special committee at the last meeting, be withdrawn from said committee and referred to the standing committee on Free Schools. Carried.

Mr. Leslie, seconded by Mr. Paterson, moved that the committee on sites be authorized to arrange the claim of Widow Hannam for dower on the lot recently purchased from Mr. Robertson, and report proceedings thereon at the next meeting. Carried.

The Board went into committee on the report of the committee relating to Roman Catholic separate Schools. The committee rose and reported upon the report.

It was then resolved, on motion of Mr. McMaster, seconded by Mr. Patterson, that the report of the committee on Free Schools be adopted, and that the opinion expressed therein relative to the school fund be submitted for the opinion of the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. Brewer, seconded by Mr. Patterson, moved that the Chairman of the Board be authorized to obtain the opinion of the Attorney General as to the correct legal meaning of the "School Fund" as mentioned in the School Act, especially with reference to separate schools.

One hundred copies of the report were ordered to be printed for the use of members.  
 The Board then adjourned.

RETRENCHMENT—THE WAY THINGS ARE DONE IN THE WEST.

The Chatham *Planet* gives the following interesting expose of the manner in which political partizans are rewarded by County officials, at the expense of the Municipality. Surely if newspapers cannot be sustained without such meanness on one side and downright chiselling and making free with the public money on the other, they should be allowed to go to the wall:

It will be remembered by those who watch the doings of the County Council, that advertisements for tenders would be received until the first of May, to do the annual printing of that body, have appeared in this paper. During the late session tenders were received, opened and read—one from Mr. Scobie of Toronto, offering to do the work for the sum of £14, one from Mr. T. A. Ireland for £30, and one from this office for £20. We had supposed the tender of Mr. Scobie being the lowest, that gentleman would have got the job, as is usual where there is no scheming, but there is more than one Joe Hume in our County Council. Mr. T. A. Ireland was notified (unknown to us) that he would be allowed to tender a second time, which he did on the third of May, and offered to do the work for £16. Now they were in a fix. Mr. Ireland's tender being £4 lower than our tender, and £2 above Mr. Scobie's tender, which were opened and publicly read on the first day of the sitting of the Council. It was now discovered that it would be better the time should be from the 1st May, 1852, to the 1st May, 1853, instead of from January '52 to January '53, as the notice stated; forthwith we were asked to tender

again, being ignorant of what we have previously stated; of course our second tender was the same as the first, with exception of the date. In the meanwhile our Clear Grit contemporary is advised to reduce his tender, which he did to £10. Last year the Council acted in the same contemptible manner. The *Advertiser* got the printing at £2 10 more than we offered to do it for, and what was the result? Why, the proprietor and publisher of the *Advertiser* has the beggarly meanness to petition the Council this session to remunerate him, which they actually did by voting him £7 10s, actually paying Mr. Ireland £27 10s for what we offered to do for £17 10s. Did any one ever hear of a more scandalous transaction? Will any person having a proper estimate of his own character ever tender to such a body for either material or work?—The fact is, the Council is a miserable cheat! They do these things to hoodwink the public, to make a display of economy. They are mighty efficient in such small matters such as this, where a want of principle proves party attachment.

A FIGHT AT CHAGRES.—A Chagres paper gives the following account of a bloody fight at that place, between a party of Jamaica negroes, and the native blacks. The row began on the American side of the river, at a negro fandango, and the natives getting the worst of it, their countrymen assembled in large numbers and marched to the scene, when the work of destruction commenced:—"Glass bottles were hurled at the natives, and pistols fired, but the natives forced their way in, and, after tearing everything in the house to pieces, attacked the Jamaicans with their machetes and knives. The Jamaicans were forced to retreat after being cut in the most frightful manner. One poor fellow had both arms cut off just below the elbow; some had their fingers cut off, and some their back and face horribly mutilated. Such yelling and screeching!—it appeared to me as if some wild beasts were devouring the whole population. There were some three hundred and fifty Jamaica men, at the same time, up the river. Had they been here the slaughter would have been awful. They fought desperately on both sides for two hours, but the drum on the fort sounded for the troops to muster, and some sixty came over and charged on the mob. The troops took possession of the field of battle and arrested some twenty of the ringleaders and took them to the fort."

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1852.

MY DEAR BRETHREN OF THE HOME AND SIMCOE DISTRICTS:

It is my intention (D.V.) to visit, for the purpose of holding Confirmations, your several Parishes and Stations, in accordance with the following list.

I remain, &c.  
 JOHN TORONTO.

June, 1852.			
Friday,	4th	Thornhill	11 A.M.
		Vaughan	3 P.M.
Saturday,	5th	Markham Village	1 P.M.
		Col. McLeod's Church	5 P.M.
SUNDAY,	6th	Newmarket	11 A.M.
		Saint Albans	3 P.M.
Monday,	7th	Lake Simcoe	
Tuesday,	8th	Orillia	10 A.M.
		Medonte	3 P.M.
Thursday,	10th	Penetanguishene	1 P.M.
Friday,	11th	Craig's (Oro)	10 A.M.
		Barrie	3 P.M.
Saturday,	12th	Innisfil	11 A.M.
		West Gwillimbury	3 P.M.
SUNDAY,	13th	Tecumseth	11 A.M.
Monday,	14th	Lloydtown	11 A.M.
Tuesday,	15th	St. Luke's, Mulmur	10 A.M.
		St. John's, Mono	3 P.M.
Wednesday,	16th	St. Mark's, Mono	10 A.M.
		Boulton's Mills	5 P.M.
Thursday,	17th	Gore of Toronto	10 A.M.
		Norval	3 P.M.
Friday,	18th	Nassagaweya	11 A.M.
Saturday,	19th	Nelson	11 A.M.
		Wellington Square	3 P.M.
SUNDAY,	20th	Oakville	10 A.M.
		Palermo	3 P.M.
Monday,	21st	Hornby	11 A.M.
		Streetsville	4 P.M.
Tuesday,	22nd	Etobicoke, Dundas-st.	11 A.M.
		Weston	3 P.M.
Wednesday,	23rd	Tullamore	10 A.M.
		Pine Grove	2 P.M.

Toronto, 24th May, 1852.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS

We publish to-day the Report of the Committee of the Board of School Trustees, on the application of the Roman Catholics for a proportional allowance from the Common School Fund, for the purposes of separate schools. This Report has now become common property, is the subject of general remark, and as the enunciation of the Board of Trustees on the whole principle involved in the present system of Free Schools, calls for examination. We fancy that we can detect the pen from which it sprung; and, like many other productions of the same author, it is a most illogical statement of the question.

We cannot suppose for an instant, that the framers of this Report, supposing it to have been concocted by more than one individual, are not sin-

cere in the views it expresses, and therefore we are bound to receive it as an honest expression of opinion on the part of the majority of the committee, and so also as a general declaration of the sentiments of the Free School party; as such we desire to treat it, and shall endeavour to point out, as best we may, the errors and inconsistencies it contains, and the falsity of the system it is intended to sustain.

We would, premise, however, that if in our illustrations of the argument, we frequently use the name of one denomination, we do so because it only is employed in the document before us, because the Roman Catholics have raised the present question, and because the principles involved are the same, whether the reasoning be applied to them or to ourselves. We deem this remark necessary, as we regret to find that our observations on this subject last week have been very disingenuously and unreasonably misconstrued.

The Report commences with some explanatory references as to the position in which the Roman Catholic separate schools are placed. These schools, it would appear were, and are in the Report acknowledged to have been, "appointed by the Board, under the compromise made with the Roman Catholic inhabitants in 1851;" how then can be called a *compromise* which is by law established, as a *right*—a right, he observed, of which the Report complains—we are at a loss to comprehend. "The School Act, in the opinion of your committee, violates the principle, inasmuch as it makes provision for the establishment of sectarian schools."

Then comes the question of the claims of separate schools to aid from the school fund, the basis upon which these claims are founded, and the construction which the committee put upon the terms of the Act, both as regards the manner in which the fund is raised, and its appropriation. We are somewhat disposed to object to the views of the committee on these points, but must for the present pass to the examination of the more important consideration of the general principle, leaving these minor details to a more convenient season.

In the fourth paragraph, this most objectionable passage occurs:—"Yet no ground for such complaint exists, or has been urged against the public schools of this city—they having been established upon a broad Catholic basis, rendering the demand for separate schools utterly indefensible upon any sound principle of political justice."

Now we should very much like to know in what sense the committee here use the term '*Catholic*.' If it is in the common adjective meaning *universal*, then we say that it is an inelegant term to employ—that it is inaccurate. But if it is meant to apply to the religious character of the school system, and this we are led from the context to believe is the true import intended to be implied, then we say it is a willful and wicked de-secration of the term. How can that system be called Catholic which embraces every shade of opinion, every assertion of idolatrous superstition at the one extreme, to naked infidelity at the other. Let the term be restricted to its legitimate and universally received acceptation as applied to doctrine, and we shall at once detect the jesuitry of that reasoning which would amalgamate truth with error; which would insidiously diffuse the pestilential poison of Deism, the subtle and not less dangerous spirit of Atheism, under the cloak of political justice.

"It is one of the recognized principles of civilized society, that all shall contribute to establish and sustain institutions deemed essential by the majority, provided that the demand does not infringe upon the rights of conscience!" It is no infringement upon the rights of conscience, to compel us to contribute to the support of a system, which we honestly and firmly believe to be injurious to the present welfare and eternal happiness of our children,—of our fellow creatures! It is no infringement upon the rights of conscience, to place us at a disadvantage for entertaining that belief, for maintaining our principles, for keeping aloof from such dangerous contamination those over whom we can exercise a natural and legal power of control! But really this "rights of conscience" clause requires a more extended notice than we can afford to give it to-day.

SCHISM.

In these days of spurious liberality, schism, so far from being regarded by popular religionists as a sin, is almost looked upon as one of the cardinal virtues. If a Churchman ventures to protest against an evil which in the Litany he solemnly prays to be delivered from, forthwith he is branded as a semi-Papist or Puseyite, and anathematized for his exclusive spirit and narrow-minded bigotry.

It is not from principle, but from necessity, that sectarians thus virtually ignore our blessed Redeemer's prayer for the unity of His professing followers. Conscience restrains them from casting the stone of reprobation against an error with which they are so deeply tainted. They feel that to protest against schism in others would of necessity be an act of self-condemnation,—an evocation of Nathan's stern and withering retort,—*Thou art the man!*

Occasionally, however, do we find dissenters constrained to testify against the abominable thing. Self-interest urges them successfully to break a silence which expediency had imposed, even as a coward will become valorous when driven by his foeman to the brink of a precipice!

There is before us a volume, entitled, "*Extracts from the Journals of the late Rev. Thomas Coke, L.L.D.*," imprinted at Dublin in 1816, by R. Napper, "*for the Methodist Book-room.*"

Dr. Coke, as many of our readers doubtless

now, was an active missionary of the Methodist society, and paid several visits to North America and the West Indies, the particulars whereof he records in the diaries before referred to.

Travelling in North Carolina, the Doctor lights upon the dwelling of "old brother and sister Willis," whose son, formerly a local preacher, had, it seems, embraced the sentiments of a certain James O'Kelly, "once a most useful presiding elder, but now burning with zeal to make schisms whenever it was in his power." The ex-elder who, bating his schismatical tendencies, does not appear to have been a teacher of erroneous doctrine, "unhappily insinuated himself into the affections of the local preacher," who in consequence prevailed upon his father to permit O'Kelly to preach in his house.

From this point we shall permit Dr. Coke to tell his own story:—

"Our preachers, who are now patterns of unity and concord, have determined to have nothing to do with disputes; and, therefore, whenever O'Kelly and his associates are admitted, they immediately withdraw themselves without the least noise or disturbance. Poor old Mrs. Willis, after dinner, took us into a private room, and, with tears streaming down her cheeks, intreated that the preachers might return there again. But we informed her, at the same time that we endeavoured to console her as far as the case would admit, that it was become an *adjudged case* among us, that we would exercise no ministerial functions among schismatics, or any who supported them; but that we were ready to return to them, as before, if they would break off all connection with the friends of discord and confusion!"

Now had the enunciator of these sentiments been an Anglican Bishop or Rector, what a mark would be presented for the sharpest arrows which the quiver of our contemporaries the *Examiner* and *Christian Guardian* could supply! He would be likened and compared to Bonner and Laud, and "old sister Willis" extolled as a meek sufferer in the great cause of religious liberty!

The Dr. winds up with the following emphatic and truthful sentence, which we would be the very last to denounce as hyperbolical:—

"Oh, what a horrid thing is the spirit of schism! It has, I believe, injured the work of God in the different ages of the world, more than all the outward evils of mankind. It signifies but little to the individuals themselves, whether they be gross sinners or painted sepulchres; but the spirit of schism enters within the vale, nips in the bud all the fair blossoms of grace, eats up the vitals of religion, quenches the whole spirit of revival, and substitutes the spirit of party for the spirit of love."

Well is it for us that we can cite Dr. Coke as the author of the foregoing paragraph! If we had given it as our own there would have been no stint to the cry of *Tractarianism* which unquestionably would have been uplifted against us! Verily there is much wisdom in the ancient adage which declares that "One man may steal a horse with impunity, and another be hanged for merely looking at it over a hedge!"

On his return from America the schism-reprobing missionary paid a visit to Ireland, and being in Armagh inspected the chapel attached to the Primate's palace. Touching this structure, which he greatly admired, the Dr. observes:

"What harm would it do to the Church or the world, if the Methodist preachers were suffered to preach there the everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ?"

Had poor "old sister Willis" overheard this remark she might naturally have asked: "What harm would it do, Doctor, to your Society or the world if James O'Kelly were suffered to preach occasionally in my house?"

DEATH OF THE REV. JOHN GIBSON.

It frequently happens that while engaged in recording the events of passing time, we are compelled to undertake a duty for the performance of which we feel ourselves peculiarly unqualified. Such is our case to-day. On the 14th instant, it pleased Almighty God take unto Himself the soul of our worthy brother in Christ, the Rev. JOHN GIBSON, of Georgia.

We did not know our departed brother intimately enough to enable us to form a very full estimate of his character, but from what we do know of him, we can fully corroborate the estimate of his character given by those who had better opportunities of forming an opinion. Mr. Gibson held the Incumbency of Georgia priest in this Diocese by our Venerable Bishop. He enjoyed the entire confidence, esteem and affection of the congregation to which he ministered, and the warm friendship of a large circle of private friends. The Rev. Septimus Ramsay, of Newmarket, who, at the special request of the deceased, had the mournful satisfaction of committing to the tomb the mortal remains of him whom he so dearly loved and highly regarded, thus speaks of Mr. Gibson:—"He was a man of considerable classical and scientific attainments, possessed of a noble and generous disposition, sanctified by Divine Grace, and was looked up to, and esteemed by all who knew him: by his Parishioners he was universally respected and beloved. The Church has been deprived of a holy and highly respectable Clergyman; the world has lost a citizen of moral worth and sterling integrity. The writer of this paragraph considered the possession