

Catholics, who insist upon their right to separate schools, who, clearly recognising the indisputable fact—that the duties of the State in the matter of education are precisely the same as its duties in the matter of religion—that it has no more legitimate control over the School than over the Church—or over the Teacher than over the Priest—contend that, whilst the State has the right, and is in duty bound to make material provision for the support of religion and education, for the establishment of schools and churches, amongst its subjects, it is at the same time bound to respect the rights of conscience; and, in extending its helping hand, to manifest no partiality in favor of one particular denomination, no prejudices against another. From these principles flows the consequence that—if the State taxes its subjects for the support of schools or churches—or devotes any portion of the public funds to educational or religious purposes—it is bound to furnish the subjects whom it taxes with their money's worth; or in other words, to give them all schools and churches, religious and educational establishments, which they can accept, and make use of, without doing violence to their conscientious convictions. In fact, the Church question and the School question are essentially one; what is true of the first, is true of the latter; and every argument which is good against State-Churchism is equally good against the precisely analogous and equally objectionable system of State-Schoolism.

But there is also a third position, which is neither logical nor intelligible, yet which is nevertheless held by a pretty large party in the country—by men who boast of their moderation—who dislike extreme views, and who seem to think that the height of human wisdom, is, to deny that two and two make quite or exactly four. That they nearly make four, is good sound moderate doctrine; to assert that they do so exactly, is to hold and put forth, extreme views. Amongst these moderate men we must include the supporters of the present Liberal Ministry on the Education question.

These men admit the justice of Catholic claims, to a certain extent—and within certain limits. They admit our right to separate schools; and have formally recognised it in the XIX. Sect. of the School Act; and in the IV of the "Act Supplementary." But here they stop; and by no means can they be brought to admit the logical consequences of their own premises; that if Catholics are—because of their conscientious scruples against Non-Catholic schools—entitled to separate schools at all, their separate schools are entitled to enjoy as much favor, countenance, and assistance from the State, as are the common, or Non-Catholic schools; and should participate in every privilege awarded by law to the latter. At present, these men to whom we allude, occupy this ridiculous and anomalous position. Admitting our right to separate schools, (if we are taxed in any shape for the support of schools,) they deny to us the full enjoyment of that admitted right, by clogging it, as we have already shown, with innumerable unjust and injurious restrictions. This position is absurd, and should at once be abandoned. Either Catholics in Upper Canada are entitled to separate schools, and therefore to every privilege which their Non-Catholic brethren enjoy; or they are not entitled to have separate schools at all.

We can understand therefore the argument of those who would altogether abolish those schools, as evil. We can understand that of those who insist upon maintaining them; but we cannot understand, nor yet respect the conduct of those who, admitting the right of Catholics to separate schools, treat those schools as if they were an evil to be repressed at the earliest convenient opportunity; and the great object of whose legislation seems to be to render, impossible to practice, that which in theory they profess their willingness to establish.

And yet this has hitherto been the substance of all legislation for separate schools in Upper Canada. Our Liberal friends grant us those schools, but hampered with so many restrictions that their enjoyment is practically denied. We have already signalled a few of those odious restrictions, and might easily signal many more. As for instance the hardships to which the Catholic supporters of separate schools in Upper Canada are subjected, by certain clauses of the existing School Act; hardships from which the Protestant supporters of separate schools in Lower Canada are exempt.

In Lower Canada the Protestant dissentient minority are entitled to receive direct from the Superintendent, not only their share of the General School fund, but a similar share of the Building Fund as well.—12 Vic., C. 50, Sec. 18. In Upper Canada, on the contrary, the Protestant majority have the power to tax the Catholic minority for building Protestant school houses, and purchasing sites for Protestant schools. In the sums so raised, Catholics are not entitled to share; and as, of course, they cannot conscientiously send their children to a Protestant school-house, they can get no value for the money thus unjustly and arbitrarily extracted from their pockets. *vide*, "Act Supplementary."—Sec. IV. VI.

Again, by the Upper Canada School Act, Sec. 27, the County Municipal Councils are authorised to levy by assessment—upon Catholics, as well as upon Protestants—"such sum or sums of money as it shall judge expedient for the establishment and maintenance of a County Common School Library." These Municipal Councils being almost exclusively Protestant in their composition, it may easily be conceived how perfectly useless these Libraries must be to the supporters of Catholic separate schools. In Lower Canada, no Catholic majority has the power of levying any sum or sums of money from the Protestant minority for the establishment and maintenance of Common School Libraries.

We might go on, for ever, contrasting clause by

clause of the respective School Acts, showing the many and important differences betwixt them, all to the disadvantage of the Catholic minority of the Upper Province; all calculated, and intended, to impose on the said minority, some burdens from which the Protestant minority of the Lower Province are free. But we have said enough; and may we trust confidently assert that we have proved—in the first place, the truth of our position—that the Catholics of Upper Canada are not dealt with in the matter of separate schools as are the Protestants of Lower Canada; and in the second, the falsity of Dr. Ryerson's statement—that the existing provisions of the Law secure to the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, "all that is granted to the dissenting minority of any municipality in Lower Canada, all that can be equitably asked for by such minority in any municipality of Upper Canada."—*School Report*, p. 21.

We have yet to notice some of the objections of the opponents of Freedom of Education. The arguments of these gentry are not very formidable; but such as they are, we will reply to them in our next.

We have been asked for our authority for attributing to Mr. Hincks the insulting language towards Catholics, upon which we slightly alluded in our last. We reply, that our authority is the same as that on the strength of which we have denounced the language of Garvazzi and the Rev. Mr. Orr—viz., the uncontradicted reports of the public press. We never heard Garvazzi; we were not present at the election for South Oxford; but we have as little reason to doubt the accuracy of the published report in one case, as in the other.

Besides, when a public man allows, for weeks, a report of one of his public speeches to go the rounds of the public press, without contradiction or correction, he assumes the entire responsibility of the report; he thereby accepts the language attributed to him, and makes it his own; more especially is this the case, when the reported speech is calculated to serve the political ends of the speaker. Now, every body knows why, in Upper Canada, Mr. Hincks seized upon the opportunity to sneer at the ignorance of Papists, and at their "opposition to progress," because "under the influence of their clergy;" every body knows that the speaker's object was to make a little political capital amongst Protestants, and to get a few Protestant cheers from the fanatics round the hustings. Mr. Hincks' motives are very transparent.

Quite in keeping with his language on the hustings, was his language—as reported in Mr. Hincks' own organ, the *Toronto Daily Leader*—at a late political dinner at London. We copy from our Ministerialist cotemporary. Speaking of the opposition, which in Lower Canada has been offered to secularisation, Mr. Hincks said:—

"It had been represented that because nine Bishops in Lower Canada had signed a Protest against secularisation, the people there were opposed to it. It was true that the Bishops had taken that course. Whatever course these Prelates might have taken, the LOWER CANADA MEMBERS OF THE CABINET WERE NOT UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE BISHOPS; AND IF THEY WERE, HE AND HIS UPPER CANADA COLLEAGUES COULD NOT BE CONNECTED WITH THEM."—*Toronto Daily Leader*, August 7.

We do not know whether the Lower Canada members of the Cabinet will feel obliged to Mr. Hincks for representing them as bad Catholics; and as putting themselves in opposition to their Pastors. But this we know, that Mr. Hincks fully substantiates every word used by the TRUE WITNESS of last week. We said, that henceforward, no honest Catholic—that is, no Catholic subject to the influence of his Prelates—would ever trust Mr. Hincks again, or acknowledge him as a colleague. Mr. Hincks tells us he will have no connection with Catholics who are "under the influence of the Bishops."—Nothing but rebels and traitors to their Church will suit Mr. Hincks' turn.

Again, on the subject of separate schools, Mr. Hincks—speaking before a Protestant audience, and desirous of turning their anti-Catholic prejudices to account—is reported by the *Toronto Leader* of the same date, to have delivered himself, on the same occasion, as follows:—

"HE HAD BEEN OPPOSED TO SEPARATE SCHOOLS, AS HIS FRIEND THE POST MASTER-GENERAL COULD BEAR WITNESS; BUT HE HAD BEEN UNABLE TO PREVENT THE EXISTENCE OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS."

This language is susceptible of but one interpretation; and that not very flattering to the penetration of those who have allowed themselves to be duped by the idea that Mr. Hincks was favorable to Catholic claims for Freedom of Education. We have said, all along, that Mr. Hincks was opposed to our Separate Schools—that he tolerated their existence, only in so far and so long, as he could not prevent it—that, if he could, he would, deprive the Catholics of Upper Canada of their separate schools.—We have been condemned for thus frankly giving expression to our opinions; and have been accused of making factious opposition to the Ministry. And now Mr. Hincks himself comes forward, and, unasked, avows the very sentiments which we have all along attributed to him.

Mr. Hincks having thus clearly defined his position as towards Catholics, has equally clearly defined the proper position of all honest Catholics as towards him. He declares that he will "have no connection" with Catholics who are under the influence of their Bishops; it follows, therefore, that no Catholics who are under the influence of their Bishops—that is, no Catholics worthy of the name—will have, for the future, any connection with him. It is impossible to serve both God and mammon—it is impossible to be obedient to the Pastors of Christ's Church, and, at the same time, to retain any connection with Mr.

Hincks. The conditions which the latter exacts from all Catholics, seeking for service under his standard, are, that they shall be rebels against ecclesiastical authority, and apostates to the Faith. Are there many men in Canada, calling themselves Catholics, who will accept service under Mr. Hincks on such terms? We hope not.

Mr. Hincks, too, is opposed to separate schools for Catholics; and tolerates them only so long, and in so far, as he is "unable to prevent their existence." But Catholics are bound to support those schools, and to resist every attempt to suppress them. At a late meeting of the Catholic Institute of Toronto, that admirable society, acting with the sanction of the highest authority, pledged itself to oppose every man who was not prepared to do full justice to Catholic claims for Freedom of Education; and called upon the Catholics of Lower Canada for sympathy and assistance. Our duty then, towards one who is opposed towards separate schools, and who seeks but the opportunity to suppress them, is clear. We cannot be both faithful followers of Mr. Hincks, and obedient sons of the Church. If Mr. Hincks is right, in his opposition to separate schools, then His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, the Fathers of the Provincial Council of Quebec, and the Catholics of Toronto, are most grievously in error in seeking to maintain them. Whom then shall we follow?—The Prelates of the Church, or Mr. Hincks? May we not say with the prophet Elias—

"Usquequo claudicatis in duas partes? Si Dominus est Deus sequimini eum; si autem Baal"—that is Mr. Hincks—"sequimini illum."—*III. Reg.*, 18, 21.

A friend, for whose opinions we have the highest respect, writes to us on the subject of Mr. Hincks' Clergy Reserves Bill, and—without impugning the correctness of our statements as to its inevitable effects on the separate schools of Upper Canada, if passed in its present form—ventures to indulge a hope, that the Bill will be so modified, as to do justice to Catholics, and in the disposal of the funds accruing from the "Reserves," to place the separate schools in as good a position as that occupied by their wealthier rivals. We differ from our esteemed correspondent for the following reasons:—

There is one amendment indeed by which substantial justice might be done to the claims of our separate schools; to the effect that, the separate schools in every County Municipality should be entitled to share in every grant, made by the County Municipal Councils from the funds accruing from the Clergy Reserves, for school purposes, in proportion to the number of children attending such separate schools. But this amendment would never be allowed to pass; because it would strike at the very principle on which Mr. Hincks' measure for settling the Reserves question is based.

Every body is for a settlement of that question; and the difference, is, that whilst some are for absolute secularisation, others are for *sect-ularisation*; or a fair and equitable division of the disputed property amongst all religious denominations, leaving each at liberty to devote its share of the proceeds to religious or educational purposes, as it might please. Now, to allow Catholic separate schools to receive a separate share of this property, would be to establish the principle of *sect-ularisation*, as opposed to secularisation; a principle repugnant to the principle upon which Mr. Hincks has framed his Bill, and which we may therefore be sure he will never tolerate. Besides Mr. Hincks is opposed to Separate Schools.

When we see the Heads of Departments indulging in sarcasms and insults against the Pastors of the Church, it is to be expected that their underlings will follow suit. It was therefore with no surprise, though with much disgust, that we read in the *Canadian* of the 31st ult. an intemperate sally against the Catholic Clergy of Lower Canada for their supposed interference, during the late elections. "It is of no use," says the *Canadian*—"deceiving one's self further, since it is notorious that a considerable number of the rural Curés and Vicars have interfered actively in the election, in opposition to the views of the Government."

Ah! there's the sin of it *maitre Canadian*. It is not the interference, you complain of; but the *anti-Ministerial* interference. This the *Canadian* looks upon as most intolerable; and the Curés and Vicars guilty of such conduct are forthwith denounced as men—"who have the presumption to deem themselves learned in politics—give advice right and left—a *tort et a travers*—and seek to direct public opinion, by means of *chained-up* information"—*science toute machée*—"which they derive from an extravagant partisan. If this conduct be blameable amongst private individuals, it is in the highest degree reprehensible and dangerous in a Priest."—*Canadian*, 31st July.

He is a pretty fellow is this *Canadian*, to read our Catholic Clergy a lecture on their duties! It is a wonder the Ministry don't make a Bishop of him at once; his head is just the head for a Government Mitre.

We read in the *Canadian* that the Hon. M. Morin is likely to be returned for the County of Bellechasse. On the Clergy Reserves question, we have frankly recorded our dissent from M. Morin; and greatly regret that secularisation should be countenanced by him. But, at the same time, he is one whom we can ill afford to spare from the Legislature. Even M. Morin's political opponents—personal opponents he has none—must admit that his retirement from public life would be a loss to the country, and that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to replace him. Indeed, the only reproach we have ever heard urged against the Hon. gentleman, is, that he does not make himself sufficiently prominent; that he does

not at once, and boldly assume that position to which his talents and his estimable endowments entitle him. M. Morin is not a man who should condescend to play second fiddle to any man, or set of men.

Our city cotemporaries are agitating the question of a House of Refuge, or Emigrants' Home, for the myriads of helpless, destitute, and too often diseased creatures that are daily landed on our wharves.—There is no doubt that an establishment of the kind is greatly wanted, both in the interests of the immigrants themselves, and for the sake of the city.—Whether Cholera and kindred diseases be, or be not, infectious, or communicable by intercourse with a diseased person, is a question into which we purpose not to enter. But there can be no doubt that long sea voyages, with low diet, are predisposing causes, and that crowded lodging houses, bad ventilation, and filthy apartments, soon become veritable pest-houses, from whence the seeds of disease are scattered in every direction.

By almost universal consent Quarantine is looked upon as a humbug; as a remnant of ignorance and barbarism; intellectual for good, potent for evil; a standing reproach to the enlightenment and philanthropy of the XIX. century. If, for Quarantine establishments, we were to substitute some places of refuge, wherein, under a proper system of surveillance and classification, newly landed immigrants might find a temporary shelter, in which their more immediate wants might be attended to, and proper medical assistance furnished to the sickly—no great additional expence would be inflicted on the country, and much would be gained in the cause of decency and humanity. We trust that, at the next meeting of Parliament, the attention of the Legislature may be drawn to this important question.

THE QUEBEC MARINE AND EMIGRANT HOSPITAL.—The Steward and Matron of this institution have resigned: assigning as their reasons several grave charges against the management of the Institution. We suppose the Government will order an inquiry: until then we shall refrain from hazarding any remarks upon the conduct of the parties implicated.

We have to return thanks for a list of all the Post-offices in the Province, on the 1st January, 1854.

#### Remittances in our next.

CHOLERA.—Of the whole 127 cholera interments last week, sixty-three were emigrants; if, therefore, these and the children whose deaths are set down to the same disease be set aside, the mortality from cholera among the adult residents will appear to be very trifling. The decrease of deaths from cholera, in three weeks, has been as follows:—Week ending July 23, 111; week ending July 30, 8; week ending August 5, 20; total decrease as compared with week ending July 16, 149. The total deaths from cholera sum up since the 23rd of June to 1128.—*Herald*, 8th Aug.

We regret to announce the death of Mr. Unsworth, late Station-master at St. Hyacinthe, of the prevailing epidemic. Mr. Unsworth died on Saturday morning.—*Herald*.

MELANCHOLY ACCIDENT.—Monday afternoon, while some of the men employed in the erection of the new Mechanics' Institute, were engaged in raising a large stone for the upper story, the machine used for the purpose gave way, and precipitated with it a man named Gooley, among the stones on the street, whose death from the fall was almost instantaneous. Another person employed in the same work was very seriously injured by the fall of the hoisting machinery, but not so dangerously but that hopes are entertained of his recovery.—*Transcript*.

On Sunday afternoon, our city was visited with a severe thunder storm and lightning. No injury was sustained, with the exception of a man of the name of Kirk, through whose house, in Inspector street, the lightning passed, and burnt one of his legs, while reclining on a sofa. A cab man of the name of Leahy, while in the yard, (next door to Kirk's,) and disengaging his horses from the cab, both animals were struck with lightning, but not so seriously but that they recovered in a short time.—*Id.*

ACCIDENT AT TORONTO.—Four persons, named Miller, two Dunlops, and Stephens were drowned at Toronto on Thursday, by the capsizing of a sailing boat.

THE ICEBERGS OF THIS YEAR.—The news last received confirms the apprehension that upwards of 100 vessels have been embedded in the ice in the Atlantic, and that many of them have been crushed and lost; and an opinion gains ground that the missing steamer City of Glasgow was among the latter number.—*Herald*.

#### Birth.

In this city, on the 8th inst., the wife of Mr. William Owler, of a daughter.

#### Married.

In this city, on the 31st ultimo, by the Rev. Mr. Connolly, Alexander Herbert, Esq., Advocate, to Mary Dunn, (late Mrs. McCurney) both of this city.

#### CONVENT OF LONGUEUIL.

THE Sisters of this Institution beg leave to inform the public that they are obliged to increase their terms of Boarding, and that the conditions for the future shall be as follows:—

	\$	s.	d.
Boarding and Tuition	18	0	0
To those not residing in Lower Canada	20	0	0
Music	4	2	6
Drawing and Painting	1	7	6
Washing	2	2	6
Stationery	0	10	0

The Re-Opening shall take place on the 31st AUGUST. It is earnestly requested of Parents and Guardians to be punctual in sending their children at the appointed time. Longueuil, August 8, 1854.