

REMITTANCES

TO

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Bank of London, London. The Bank of Ireland, Dublin. The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, December 14, 1854.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 3, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Baltic* brings news from Great Britain up to the 17th ult. The harvest prospects were good, and every thing was quiet at home and abroad.—The Italian question alone seems to menace the peace of Europe; and even this seems to be forgotten amidst the splendours of the coronation of a Russian Czar. The little disturbance at Neuchâtel has entirely subsided.

On the 5th ult., we stated, in the words of their Lordships, the Bishops of Toronto and of Hamilton, the grievances complained of by the Clergy and laity of Upper Canada, with regard to the provisions of the existing School Acts for that section of the Province. We shewed also, by comparing the different clauses of those Acts with the corresponding clauses of the Lower Canada School laws, that the Catholic minority of the Upper Province are hampered with many restrictions from which the Protestant minority of Lower Canada are exempt: we proved that the law exacts from the former, a number of tedious, harassing formalities, which are not required of the latter, and the neglect of any of which invalidates the whole proceedings taken by the dissentient Catholic minority, with the object of establishing separate schools; lastly, we concluded, from these premises—1st—that the statement put forward by M. Cauchon's organ, the *Journal de Quebec*—to the effect that the Catholic minority of Upper Canada were better treated by the law, in the matter of separate schools, than the Protestant minority in the Lower Province—was untrue; 2nd—that the grievances complained of by the venerated Prelates whom we quoted, were well founded; and 3rd—that the Ministry which had obstinately refused to apply a remedy to the clearly established evils of the existing School system of the Upper Province, thereby arraying themselves in open opposition to the legitimate rulers of the Church, and upon a question vitally affecting the faith and morals of the rising generation, were no longer entitled to the respect or confidence of the Catholic public. We believe also that, if M. Cauchon and his friends will give themselves the trouble to consult a document published by an eminent Canadian Prelate shortly before his departure for Europe, they will find therein a similar opinion, only a little more strongly expressed by His Lordship. Now, the "respect and veneration" that the above named gentry entertain for the Church and her Pastors, is proverbial and admired of all men: they cannot therefore condemn the TRUE WITNESS because it thinks as meanly of them, as does the Bishop of Toronto.

The *Journal de Quebec* also must bear in mind that, in treating the grievances alluded to above, as trivial or unfounded, he condemns, not the TRUE WITNESS—who does but reproduce, and in their very words, the complaints of the Catholic Bishops of Upper Canada—but those Prelates themselves. They are the complainants; and the TRUE WITNESS is but the humble channel through which, in company with the *Mirror* of Toronto, those grievances, or complaints, have been made public. There is, it must be confessed, a striking contrast betwixt the professions of "respect and veneration" towards the Episcopacy, of which the *Journal* delights to make display, and the insolence with which, to please his masters, he treats the members of that distinguished body, when the latter find themselves compelled to condemn the treachery of which they have been made the victims. We will now proceed to notice and expose the sophistries, perversions, and suppressions of truth, of which the *Journal de Quebec*, in his issue of the 25th ult., has been guilty.

Our cotemporary attempts to show that, of the grievances complained of by the Catholic Bishops of Upper Canada on the school question, most are without foundation—and that the Protestant minority of the Lower Province are subject to as many restrictions, in the way of establishing and supporting their dissentient schools, as are the Catholic minority of Upper Canada. At the risk of trespassing upon the patience of our readers, we will examine each one of the *Journal's* statements in detail; citing at length, when necessary, the words of the different School Laws of the Lower Province; and not, like our cotemporary, giving merely garbled extracts therefrom.

In Lower Canada, as we showed, "any number whatsoever" of inhabitants professing a faith different from the majority, may, without more ado, establish one or more separate schools; and name whom they please as Trustees, who are thereupon invested with all the powers and obligations

of the common school commissioners. In the Upper Province, the law exacts first, that a public meeting must be convened by at least five heads of families—then that the meeting having been convened, a majority of the persons present, not less than ten in number, being freeholders or householders, may elect three British subjects as Trustees;—lastly, that a separate school must be established within two months from the date of such meeting; otherwise the whole of the previous proceedings are null and void.

Now, the *Journal* cannot deny that these restrictions, and tedious formalities—from all of which the Protestant minority of Lower Canada are exempt—are imposed upon the Catholics of the Upper Province. But as a set off, he pretends that the former are subject to restrictions from which the latter are free; and that thus perfect equality betwixt the Protestants of one section of the Province, and the Catholics of the other section, is maintained. He asserts, for instance, that whereas the Catholics of Upper Canada can establish a separate school without regard to the number of Catholic children resident in their school district, the law requires in Lower Canada, that there shall be 20 children from five to sixteen years of age in each school district. Here, triumphantly exclaims the *Journal de Quebec*, is one restriction imposed upon the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, from which the Catholics of the Upper Province are exempt.

To this it would be sufficient to reply, that, in Lower Canada, in virtue of the 18th section of the Act of 1849, the Trustees of the Protestant separate schools "have the right to constitute their own School Districts independently of the School Districts established by the Commissioner" of the common schools; and have it therefore always in their power so to circumscribe, or limit, their School Districts as to comprise the required number of children; whilst, in Upper Canada, no such "right to constitute their own School Districts" is accorded to the Trustees of Catholic separate schools. But besides this, the Lower Canada School Law authorises the Commissioners of common schools to dispense with the condition of 20 children of a certain age to each School District—9th *Vict.*, c. 27, sect. xix.; and therefore, as the Trustees of separate schools have, in all respects, the same powers as have the Commissioners of common schools, the former also may dispense with this condition, and establish one separate School District in each Municipality, containing less than the prescribed number of 20 children. The restrictions, therefore, upon the power of the Protestant minority to establish separate schools amounts to nothing, for it may be dispensed with at the pleasure of their own Trustees. Give, however, to the Trustees of Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada, "the right to constitute their own School Districts" as they please—the right which the Protestant minority in Lower Canada freely enjoy—and the former will be but too willing to accept the unimportant, and, in Lower Canada, not indispensable, restriction imposed by the Lower Canada School Law of 1846. The only restriction imposed upon the supporters of separate schools in Lower Canada, from which the supporters of Catholic schools in the Upper Province are free, is this—that, to entitle them to their share of the general, or Local School Fund, their school must have been in actual operation eight calendar months; but this unimportant restriction applies to the schools of the Catholic majority, as well as of the Protestant minority; and therefore imposes no special disadvantage or obligation upon the latter.

Again, the *Journal* pretends that the Catholics of Upper Canada are on a footing of perfect equality with the Protestants of Lower Canada, as respects their separate schools—because—the law exacts *equally* from both, that, to entitle them to a share in the School Funds, their schools must have "been attended by at least fifteen children (periods of epidemic or contagious diseases excepted)."—Act of 1849. Our cotemporary, however, has the prudence to refrain from telling his readers that, in virtue of the Lower Canada School Law of 1849, this condition for receiving a share of the School Fund, is not imperative upon the supporters of Protestant separate schools, because it may be dispensed with. We quote the words of the clause:—

"And be it enacted—That notwithstanding the provisions contained in the twenty-seventh section of the above cited Act—9th *Vict.*, c. 27—the school allowance may be granted in every School Municipality, in respect of every school in the school district whereof the number of children of the age required for attending such school shall amount to at least fifteen, *although it shall not have been actually attended by that number throughout the scholastic year, whenever the School Commissioners shall have endeavored in good faith to carry out the law.*"—12th *Vict.*, c. 50, sect. XIX.

Our honest cotemporary purposely forgets to quote this liberal exception in favor of Lower Canada schools, though, no doubt, well aware of its existence, for the following reasons. Because it proves:—

Firstly—that 20 children of school age are not required in every School District; and that the residence, without the school attendance of children, is sufficient to give a claim to share in the School Fund.

And secondly—that the law exempts the common schools under the control of the Commissioners—and therefore the separate schools under the control of Trustees—from the obligation imposed by 9th *Vict.*, c. 27, sect. XXVII., of being "attended by at least fifteen children (periods of epidemic and contagious diseases excepted)."

Again, therefore, we tell the *Journal de Quebec*, that it is not true that the Catholic minority of Upper Canada are as well treated by the law as are the Protestant minority of the Lower Province.

The *Journal* pretends also, that equal obligations are imposed upon the Trustees of separate schools in Lower and Upper Canada respectively, because in both sections of the Province, the said Trustees are required to make certain periodic statements upon oath. This again we brand as an error; because, in virtue of a clause in the Lower Canada School Act of 1856—a clause previously cited by the *Journal de Quebec*—the Trustees of separate schools in Lower Canada are expressly exempted from this obligation, which is imperative upon the Trustees of separate schools in Upper Canada only. We again quote the words of the Act:—

"After the first day of July 1856 the Trustees of Dissident Schools—shall be exempt from attesting upon oath the statement required of them by the eighteenth section of the said Act of 1849."—19th *Vict.*, c. 14, Sect. V.

We do not accuse the *Journal de Quebec* of the intentional uttering of falsehood; but we must say that he is mighty economical of truth. For instance, when he tells his readers that the law in Lower Canada exacts 20 children of a certain age, for each school district, in virtue of a clause in the Act of 1846—he does not tell them that that clause has been entirely modified by the provisions of a subsequent Act; when he dwells upon the obligation of 15 children to each school, imposed by the 27th section of the former Act, he takes good care not to let his readers know that that obligation has been dispensed with by the 19th section of the Act of 1849; and when he gravely informs them that the Catholics of Upper Canada are as well treated by the law as are the Protestants of the Lower Province, he certainly manifests a marvellous reliance upon their ignorance of the provisions of the School Acts for the two sections of the Province.

The *Journal* admits the validity of the complaint urged by the Catholics of Upper Canada against that clause in the School law which imposes upon every supporter of Catholic Schools the burden of notifying the Clerk of the Municipality of the fact, under penalty of being taxed for the support of the Protestant School of the district; but he asks, where is the hardship of compelling the Trustees of Catholic schools in Upper Canada to furnish the Chief Superintendent, semi-annually, with the names of the children attending their schools? We reply—the formality is unnecessary, because it is dispensed with in Lower Canada—it gives additional and unnecessary trouble to the Catholic Trustees, from which the Trustees of separate schools in Lower Canada are exempt; and it gives to a partial and very dishonest Protestant Chief Superintendent, another chance of defrauding the supporters of Catholic Separate Schools, out of a portion of the funds to which they are legally entitled.

Upon the injustice of compelling Catholics, under any circumstances, to pay for the support of mixed schools, or schools which are altogether dangerous to faith and morals—or for the building of Protestant school houses—we have already expressed our opinions. The *Journal* pretends however, that a Protestant majority can impose an obligation upon a Catholic minority—and that the latter "contract a debt" by the resolutions of the former to build Protestant school houses, or to found libraries. Here is where we are at issue with the *Journal*. No act of a Protestant majority can, under any circumstances, impose any obligation upon Catholics to discharge any portion of a debt contracted by the former. To avoid however the semblance of wrong, we would have no objection to see Mr. Bowes' Bill so worded as to have no retrospective action; and couched in such terms as to exempt all supporters of Catholic separate schools from all taxation for Non-Catholic School purposes, imposed subsequently to the passing of the Act only, and not from the first of January, 1856, as originally proposed. Catholics in Upper Canada, as the *Journal* himself admits, are often too poor to be able to support separate schools, however ardently they may desire to establish them, and however strongly they may be opposed to the unjust and demoralising system of Non-Catholic education. It is then a "legal fiction"—a quibble which every honest man should scorn—to pretend that, because these poor Catholics have not done that which they wished to do, but that which they were unable to do because of their poverty, they have therefore assented to the acts of the Protestant majority, and have become responsible for the payment of a portion of the debts by the latter contracted. The *Journal* assumes that they have, because that they have not signified their dissent, by establishing a separate school. But this mode of signifying their dissent, as he himself admits, is often impossible to the said Catholic minority, because of their poverty. Is it just then, that

they should be still further burthened, that their poverty should be made a pretext for imposing upon them additional taxation? and that their efforts to realise the desires of their hearts, and to fulfil their duties as loyal children of the Church by establishing separate schools, should be rendered abortive by the rapacity of their wealthy Protestant neighbors? To these questions but one answer will be given by the honest man, whose intellect is undimmed, and heart unpolluted, by the quibblings of the Old Bailey pettifogger. It was a wrong, in the first instance, to allow the rich Protestant to tax his poor Catholic neighbor for the support of schools to which the latter was conscientiously opposed, and which his Church has condemned as altogether dangerous to faith and morals; and as no right can be based upon a wrong, so the Protestant majority have not now, never had, and never can acquire, any right to compel a single Catholic to pay for the building of Non-Catholic school houses, or the support of Non-Catholic schools and libraries, to the erection or establishing of which he did not explicitly give his assent.

The *Journal* will thus see, that, with our principles, we have no difficulty in answering the following question which he proposes to us:—

"Suppose that the majority in a school district were Catholic, and that it decided upon building a school house. Would it be just that Protestants, to rid themselves of the burden should declare some months after that they were, not Catholics, and were going to establish a Free school? The TRUE WITNESS would say that justice required that the Protestants should discharge the debt by them contracted before separation, and he would be right."

The TRUE WITNESS would first ascertain whether the said Protestant minority *did* or *did not* consent to the building of the school house. If they did, they did contract a debt or obligation, and should therefore be bound to pay it. If however they did not consent, we hold that—as no Catholic majority has any moral right to contract a debt for Protestants, or any power to impose any moral obligation upon them whatsoever—they, the Protestant minority, had contracted no debt, and were therefore bound to pay none.

In our next we shall continue, and we trust bring to a conclusion, this unprofitable controversy with our ministerial adversary. We may in the meantime assure him that we accept his expressions of disapprobation with our conduct as the highest compliment that he can pay us—indeed as the only one that a gentleman or a Catholic would condescend to accept from the servile back of a thoroughly corrupt and contemptible gang of place-hunters, and greedy officials.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS.

We have seen what are the means at the disposal of Protestantism for missionary purposes, and what its organisation for carrying the blessings of Christian civilization to the heathen. We would next inquire, what have been the results of these gigantic means?—what, the products of the complicated organisation which Protestantism has at its command? These questions we find fully answered by the *Westminster Reviewer*—on this point an unexceptionable, because a Protestant witness, testifying against Protestantism. We still quote from the article on "Christian Missions" to which we alluded in our last.

First, then, it would appear that Protestant missionaries have done a good deal for themselves, in the way of multiplying their possessions, and increasing their own creature comforts; but that for the heathen they have done little or nothing beyond making them tenfold more the children of Satan than they were before the arrival of the missionaries. Upon both of these points, the testimony of modern travellers, as cited by the *Westminster Reviewer*, is clear and explicit.

That Protestant missionaries have made an excellent investment for themselves in the proselytising line—and that the Gospel business as practised by them, is lucrative beyond example—are facts well illustrated by the "Published Report" of the New Zealand Land Commissioners for 1843. From this official document it would appear, "that nineteen church missionaries at that time claimed 192,371 acres; and that to thirteen of them had been actually awarded 20,688 acres."

"This is something"—remarks the *Reviewer*—"very unlike the lot of the missionary of old. It is not easy to fancy Xavier (even if we could conceive of him as a family man) laying field to field for his own behoof." Yes; it must be confessed that the modern Protestant missionary has but few points of resemblance with the old "Romish" and Jesuit preachers of the word of God; and that, if the former has taken up his cross to follow Christ, he has also learnt how to make the transaction profitable for this world, as well as for the next. Self denial and humility are by no means characteristics of the Protestant Missionary.

"Our Protestant Missionaries"—says our authority—"are bound by no vows of poverty and humility; and accordingly we find them possessing lands and houses, managing public and private affairs, and bringing their social position into a wonderful likeness to heathen slave-holding. If the old Catholic missionary was, somewhat like the Pope in other matters, he was like him also

in being *servus servorum*; and there was no helpful office too humble for the Jesuit or the Dominican bent on saving souls. Among Protestant sectaries, the state of things is different. Here is a picture from the life—a view of the mode of life of 'Servants of Christ' in our time.—When 'enlightened individuals' come into the Polynesian Islands, and have broken the idols, and overthrown the customs of the inhabitants:—

"Neat villages, trim gardens, shaven lawns, spires, and cupolas arise, while the poor savage soon finds himself an interloper in the country of his fathers; and that, too, on the very site of the hut where he was born. The spontaneous fruits of the earth, which God in his wisdom had ordained for the support of the indolent natives, remorselessly seized upon and appropriated by the stranger, are devoured before the eyes of the starving inhabitants, or sent on board the numerous vessels which now touch at their shores.—When the famished wretches are cut off in this manner from their natural supplies, they are told by their benefactors to work, and earn their support by the sweat of their brows."

"Not until I visited Honolulu was I aware of the fact that the small remnant of the natives had been civilized into draught-horses, and evangelized into beasts of burden. But so it is. They have been literally broken into the traces, and are harnessed to the vehicles of their spiritual instructors like so many dumb brutes."

"Among a multitude of similar exhibitions that I saw, I shall never forget a robust, red-faced, and very lady-like personage, a missionary's spouse, who day after day, for months together, took her regular airings in a little go-cart, drawn by two of the islanders, one an old grey-headed man, and the other a roguish stripling, both being, with the exception of the flag-staff, as naked as when they were born. Over a level piece of ground this pair of draught bipeds would go with a shambling, unsightly trot, the youngster hanging back all the time like a knowing horse, while the old hack plodded on and did all the work."

"Rattling along through the streets of the town in this stylish equipage, the lady looks about her as magnificently as any queen driven in state to her coronation. A sudden elevation and a sandy road, however, soon disturb her serenity. The small wheels become imbedded in the loose soil, and the old stager stands tugging and sweating, while the young one frisks about and does nothing; not an inch does the chariot budge. Will the tender-hearted lady—who has left friends and home for the good of the souls of the poor heathen—will she think a little about their bodies, and get out, and ease the wretched old man until the ascent is mounted? Not she; she could not dream of it. To be sure, she used to think nothing of driving the cows to pasture on the old farm in New England; but times have changed since then. So she retains her seat, and bawls out, 'Hookee! hookee!' (pull, pull). The old gentleman, frightened at the sound, labors away harder than ever; and the younger one makes a great show of straining himself, but takes care to keep one eye upon his mistress, in order to know when to dodge out of arm's way. At last the good lady loses all patience; 'Hookee! hookee!' and rap goes the heavy handle of her huge fan over the naked skull of the old savage, while the young one shies to one side, and keeps beyond its range. 'Hookee! hookee!' again she cries. 'Hookee! hookee! hookee!' (pull strong, men). But all in vain, and she is obliged in the end to dismount, and, sad necessity! actually to walk to the top of the hill!"

"At the town where this paragon of humility resides, is a spacious and elegant American chapel, where divine service is regularly performed. Twice every Sabbath, towards the close of the exercises, may be seen a score or two of little wretches ranged along the railing in front of the edifice, with two squalid native footmen in the livery of nakedness standing by each, and waiting for the dismissal of the congregation to draw their superior home."—Melville's "Residence in the Marquesas."

But whilst such is the condition of the "missionaries" and the "missionaries' spouses" living as the *Reviewer* says—"in handsome dwellings of coral rocks, amidst groves and lawns, closing the luxurious day with singing hymns about endurance from the heathen for the Gospel's sake"—how fares it with the missionaries' converts? in what state are the simple muttons of the flock, the shepherds and shepherdeses of which live thus sumptuously? "An American voyager," says the *Reviewer*, testifies as follows to the present condition of the Sandwich Islands:—

"Readers of reports," he says, "are led to infer that the arts and customs of civilised life are rapidly refining the natives of the Sandwich Islands. But let no one be deceived by these accounts. The chiefs swagger about in gold lace and broadcloth, while the great mass of the common people are nearly as primitive in their appearance as in the days of Cook. In the progress of events at these islands, the two classes are receding from each other; the chiefs are daily becoming more luxurious and extravagant in their style of living, and the common people, more and more destitute of the necessities and decencies of life. But the end to which both will arrive at last will be the same. The one are fast destroying themselves by sensual indulgences, and the other are fast being destroyed by a complication of disorders, and the want of wholesome food. The resources of the domineering chiefs are wrung from the starving serfs, and every additional bawble with which they bedeck themselves is purchased by the sufferings of their bondmen; so that the measure of gow-gaw refinement attained by the chiefs is only an index to the actual state of degradation in which the greater part of the population lie grovelling."—Id.

In the above picture, we have all the peculiar and unmistakable features of Protestant civilisation—the want of sympathy betwixt rich and poor—the sensuality and selfishness of the former—the degradation and brutality of the other. The *Reviewer* gives us, moreover, some statistics whereby to judge of the results of Protestant missions, on the moral and physical condition of the races subjected to them:—

"As for the results," says the *Reviewer* "on human morals and happiness, we will recur to the great show case, put forth as the best."—p. 17.

"In 1777, Captain Cook found 200,000 people inhabiting Tahiti. He declared his estimate to be rather under than over the mark. Those were the days of wars, human sacrifices, infanticide, and that ordinary recklessness of life which the missionaries profess to have, generally speaking, cured. Aged natives at that time remembered the high-priest Tegenarua, who uttered the prophecy which the people caught up for its strangeness at first, and repeat now for its dread pathos. It is at this day sung in the depths of retreats, where the missionaries cannot overhear:—

"A harrow to sow, — The palm-tree shall grow;
A toro to farraro, — The coral shall spread;
A now ta tarara, — But man shall cease."

A census taken just before the American Exploring Expedition was there, showed the indigenous population to be 9,000. The missionaries called it 8,000. In the Sandwich Islands, the decline of the population is such as history can scarcely parallel, and as every hearer at an Exeter Hall May meeting should be informed of. We are told, not only by native tra-