

REMITTANCES.

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, 1856.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 26, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE Steamer *Canada* from Liverpool the 12th inst., and with the mails of the Steamer *America* on board, arrived at Halifax on Wednesday morning the 23rd inst. The *America* sailed from Liverpool on Saturday the 8th inst., but encountering heavy gales off Cape Clear, during which she received some severe injuries, she had to put back to Liverpool; and the *Canada* was immediately sent out in her place with the mails.

The news is of little interest. The Congress of Paris will, it is said, meet during the course of the present month. An unsuccessful attempt has been made on the life of the King of Naples by the Italian Liberals. By a despatch from Bourdeaux we learn that the Captain of the ill-fated *Lyonnais* and fifteen of her crew, had arrived in that port.

Breadstuffs are reported dull; prices nominal, and tending downwards. Asies quoted at \$7 62 for pots; and from \$7 87 to \$8 for pearl.

PRINCIPLES VER. PARTY.

"We are the organ of a party," says the *Journal de Quebec*, "and by no means the defender of any particular minister."

Yes, "Party," and not "principle," is the object of our cotemporary's worship; and hence arises the controversy betwixt him and the TRUE WITNESS, which is the organ of no particular party, and is perfectly indifferent to all. We deal solely with "principles," leaving "party" to the *Journal*; and judging public men, not by their professions, but by their practice—not by the devices inscribed upon their standards, or by the color of their coats, but by their acts—we must naturally expect to find ourselves constantly at variance with the unprincipled political partizan of every hue.

As a partizan, the *Journal* may be quite correct in his enthusiastic support of M. Cauchon—the supporter in his turn of a measure which the *Journal* characterises as "odious" and "treacherous." As a Catholic journalist, untrammelled by any, and independent of all, party ties, the TRUE WITNESS condemns both the measures, and the men, who introduced and supported them.

But—asks the *Journal*—cannot a journalist condemn particular measures of his party, without being forced to abandon it? Undoubtedly he can, under certain circumstances, and where constancy to "party" involves no dereliction of "principle." Members of the same great political party may act honorably together, though differing conscientiously from one another on many matters of detail, but of detail only. Now, our quarrel with M. Cauchon is not at all on a question of detail, but of principle—a principle of vital importance to the citizen, and the Catholic, to society, and the Church. If therefore the *Journal* agrees with the TRUE WITNESS in its condemnation of the "principle" involved in the Drummond-Cauchon amendments to the "Religious Incorporations' Bill," we see not how, without a dereliction of principle, he can support any of the men to whom the country is indebted for these amendments. His plea, as stated above, is valid upon condition only that he disapproves, not of the principle involved in, but of some of the particular details of, the measure which in his issue of the 11th instant, he qualifies as "odious" and "treacherous—*traître*."

We could understand, and make great allowances for, our cotemporary's attachment to "party," did he content himself with supporting the Cauchon Ministry upon the plea that, treacherous, odious, and contemptible as were, for the most part, the men of whom it was composed, their successors would probably be worse; that to turn out the present men, would only be to make room for other devils, seven times more dangerous than their predecessors; and that we should bear patiently with the ills we have—the "odious treachery" of our present office-holders—jest, peradventure, a worse thing should happen us. We might, if this were the line of argument adopted by our cotemporary, differ with him as to the expediency of preferring the false friend, to the open foe; and of retaining in a place of trust, the convicted traitor; but we should not, on that account, suspect the *Journal* of dereliction of principle.

But it is different when he proposes to Catholics, as worthy of their respect and confidence, these same treacherous, timeserving, ministers, who, to curry favor with the Protestant fanatics of the Upper Province, were prepared, and did their best, to brand our Bishops, Clergy, and Religious generally, as a pack of knavish legacy-hunters, greedy death-bed prowlers, and habitual

defrauders of the legitimate heirs of their unhappy, dupes—prostituting for that purpose their sacred offices, and in the holy name of religion, perpetrating the meanest of crimes. It is very different when, not content with asking us to tolerate M. Cauchon—who in every instance during the last session, when the interests of Catholicity were at issue with those of the Ministry, hesitated not to sacrifice the former for the security of the latter—the *Journal* holds him up to our admiration as a truly Catholic statesman. It is very different, when he represents as full of devotion for our holy religion—"notre sainte religion"—and as surrounding the Church and her Ministers with their respect and devotion—men whose Anti-Catholic conduct has provoked the severest condemnation from the highest ecclesiastical authority. Yes—were not the *Journal de Quebec* more devoted to "party" than to "principles," to the Ministry than the Church, he would never have presumed to recommend to us, as worthy of our cordial support, men laboring under the most grievous spiritual censures, inflicted upon them because of their odious and treacherous conduct as statesmen.

But, promises the *Journal*, should any Ministry whatsoever bring forward a similar odious measure, we will oppose it. But how oppose it, except by opposing the Ministry that introduces it? The *Journal* talks indeed about its being the mission of the press to enlighten, lead, and criticise its chiefs; and all this would be very fine, if the sin of which M. Cauchon was guilty proceeded from any intellectual deficiency. But where, as in the case of the "Religious Incorporations Bill" it was the result—not of any error of judgment, but of want of common honesty—not of any intellectual deficiency, but of moral depravity—the mission of the press, rightly understood and faithfully performed, is, to enlighten and lead, not the ministry, but the public; and to caution the latter for the future, against putting their trust in men who had once proved themselves unworthy of it. Now that M. Cauchon's conduct on the occasion above alluded to proceeded from the most dishonorable motives, even the *Journal* will scarcely have the hardihood to deny. "Claqueur Ministeriel" (to use a favorite phrase of the *Journal's* some two years ago)—"Claqueur Ministeriel" as he is to day, he will not have the impudence to defend M. Cauchon's Bill upon the plea that its provisions were requisite—or even that M. Cauchon believed that they were requisite—to restrain the all grasping propensities of the Catholic Clergy. In sanctioning the introduction of this Bill and in voting for it, the *Journal* well knows that M. Cauchon was acting against the dictates, not only of his intelligence, but of his conscience; and that had a similar measure been introduced by Mr. G. Brown—M. Cauchon being out of office—the latter would have opposed it with all that ability for which we cheerfully give him credit. It is because M. Cauchon has become a Minister himself—because he has tasted the sweets of office and salary, and wishes to retain them—that the Commissioner of Crown Lands in 1856, is so very different a personage from the high spirited editor of the *Journal de Quebec* of 1854.

Here then is the sum of the matter. Errors of judgment may be forgiven, but not treachery. Now that M. Cauchon has been guilty of treachery, the *Journal de Quebec* admits—for he himself qualifies the "Cauchon-Drummond" amendments, as "*les traitres amendemens*" of Mr. Drummond. But these amendments were introduced with the knowledge and sanction of M. Cauchon, as well as of the actual proposer; and for them therefore the former is morally as responsible as is the other. If then the amendments were "*traitres*" their authors and supporters are "*traitres*" also; and if "*traitres*," then unworthy the support of any honest man, who prefers "principles" to "party."—Q.E.D.

THE *Aylmer Times* thinks to impale us upon the horns of a dilemma—

"Either Romanism is founded on the Scriptures, or it is not. If the former, then to deny the use of the Bible in the schools is to contradict Christianity, professedly founded on it. If the latter, then Romanism is not Christianity, for there is no Christianity without Christ, and there is no will of Christ revealed but in the Scriptures."

Now, we frankly admit that Romanism, or the Roman Catholic religion, is not founded on Scripture. Romanism is coeval with Christianity; and Christianity is older than any of the Christian Scriptures, and therefore cannot be founded on them. The Catholic Church existed complete and perfect in all its parts, years before a word of the said Scriptures was committed to writing: and therefore no Church, or religious body, which professes to be founded upon those Scriptures, can by any possibility, be the original Christian Church.

The Scriptures, or writings of the New Testament, are not the medium through which Christ appointed His will to be made known unto men. To the Christians of the early days of Christianity, before the Christian Scriptures yet were, the will of Christ was as well known as it is to the Christians of the XIX. century. It is therefore historically false "that there is no will of Christ revealed but in the Scriptures." No such

means were ever appointed by Christ Himself for transmitting to remote countries, and distant ages, the knowledge of His Will. On the contrary, the only means by Him appointed for accomplishing that essentially important end, were, the oral teachings of a body of divinely assisted teachers, with whom He promised to be present "all days;" not merely to the end of the first century of our era—but even to the consummation of all things."

We object therefore to the use of the Bible in our schools, as the foundation of Christianity—or as the sole channel through which the will of Christ is revealed, because—

1st. The Bible is neither the foundation of Christianity, nor the only channel through which Christ's will has been revealed to us.

2nd. Because the Bible which Protestants insist upon using, is, in our opinion, a mutilated and corrupt version of the Sacred Scriptures.

And 3rd. Because, to place the Bible in the hands of young, or of imperfectly educated persons—incompetent therefore to master the almost innumerable difficulties of the most obscure, mysterious, and difficult of all books—is not only in the highest degree imprudent, but leads almost inevitably to dangerous and most pernicious error, if not to infidelity. Therefore is it, that, conscious of these dangers, no Christian parent ever places the Bible in the hands of his child, leaving him to gather from it, as best he may, his religious belief. We appeal to every parent—Protestant as well as Catholic—if this be not the case; and there is not one but will admit that he first began the Christian education of his child, by instructing it in what he believed to be the doctrines of Christianity. We appeal to every one who has any recollection of the process by which his early religious opinions were formed, if this be not the case; and though subsequent Bible reading may have greatly modified those, his first, opinions—that first creed which he learned from his mother's lips—there is not one who will not admit that it was not from the Bible that he drew his first acquaintance with the Christian faith. In general, all Protestants assert the Bible as the source of all their religious knowledge; in every individual instance they admit the falsity of this assertion. It is for Protestant logic to show how that can be true in general, which is always false in every particular.

Another objection which we have to Bible-reading in schools is this—that, as has been often observed, the Bible is like a "nose of wax," and may be twisted into any shape the reader pleases. It may be, and has been made, to say anything, and everything; and just as a mirror reflects the features of every individual gazer, so the Bible-reader is certain to find reproduced therein his own particular opinions, whatever they may be. The Episcopalian finds therein Episcopacy: the Presbyterian looks, and the image reflected back to him is as of a Geneva divine in gown and bands. The Calvinist and Arminian approach, and the heart of each straightway is made glad, as each beholds his own likeness on the sacred surface. So with the Unitarian and the Universalist, the half-crazed "Jumper" and the "Howling Methodist." "Seek, and ye shall find," says the text; and every man finds in the Bible just what he wants, and no more. Interpreted by private judgment, and on Protestant, or Reformation principles, it is the most accommodating of books.

Do we then undervalue or think lightly of the Bible? God forbid. Do we misjudge, or misrepresent our Protestant brethren? Not if Protestants themselves may be believed; not if there be any truth in the subjoined extract from the *North British Review*, the organ of evangelical Protestantism in the British Empire.

The early Reformers according to the *Reviewer*, did not accommodate their doctrines to the Bible, but the Bible to their doctrines. Having made their creeds, and drawn up their confessions of faith, they then proceeded to look for these in the Bible; where, of course they found them—

"In what manner," asks the *Reviewer* "had they—the creeds and confessions of the Reformers—been framed? A certain class of texts having been assumed as the groundwork of Christian belief—then a scheme of theology is put together accordingly, whence, by means of the deductive logic, all separate articles of faith are to be derived. As to any passages of Scripture which might seem to be of another class, or which do not fall easily into their places in this scheme, they were either ignored, or they were controlled, and this to any extent that might be asked for by the stern necessity of the syllogistic method."—*North British Review*, Nov. 1856, p. 33.

As it was in the beginning, so is it now, and will be to the end. A certain class of texts, or Scripture passages, which seem to favor a certain set of opinions are—to the exclusion of all other passages which seem to favor another, or opposite set of opinions—incessantly quoted, dwelt upon, and thus deeply impressed upon the youthful mind; and this process which is called Scripture education, is what is aimed at by the advocates of Bible reading in the Common Schools. It is against this abuse, not against the use, of the Holy Scriptures that the Catholic parent protests—as well as against the unfounded assumption, or rather the anile superstition of Protestants, that the Bible is the sole divinely appointed channel for communicating the revelation of Christ to the world. When they ask us to admit the Bible into the Common Schools, Pro-

testants virtually ask us to admit the validity of their assumption that the Bible is the sole "Rule of Faith." But the whole question at issue betwixt Catholics, and Protestants, who recognise the historic truth of Christianity, resolves itself into this—What means did Christ Himself appoint for transmitting to all nations, and through all time, a knowledge of the doctrines which He had come upon earth to reveal? Did He, for this purpose, refer us to a book, or to a body of teachers by Him appointed to teach, with the promise of perpetual, divine assistance?

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"A Subscriber," writing from the Township of Sombra, complains of the obstacles which have been thrown in the way of the establishment of a Catholic Separate School—of the conduct of one of "our" Trustees—of being compelled to pay for the building, nominally, of a School house, but of a house really, used every Sunday by the Methodists as their place of worship—and of being also taxed for the support of the Protestant school in one school section, although supporting a Separate Catholic school in his own. Our correspondent asks—"What is best to be done in the actual circumstances of the case?"

The injustice complained of by "A Subscriber," is one which has often been pointed out by the Bishops of Upper Canada, and the Catholic press of the Province; but for the maintenance of which the Catholics of the Upper Province are indebted to the Cauchon Ministry, and its venal supporters, in and out of Parliament. An iniquitous law gives to a Protestant majority the power of taxing their poorer neighbors—the Catholic minority—for the erecting and keeping in repair, of buildings employed on six days of the week as Protestant school houses, and on the seventh, as Protestant meeting-houses. Mr. Bowes' Bill was intended to remedy this crying iniquity; but unfortunately for the cause of justice, we had, and still have, in office a set of men determined to perpetuate the abuse, and who have, as they tell us, made up their minds to oppose the said Bill. The only advice we can give to our correspondent, under the circumstances, is, that he, and his fellow-Catholics, avail themselves of their political privileges to procure the overthrow of the present infamous and tyrannical system of "State-Schoolism;" by means of which, under the pretence of making provision for the education of the community, a Catholic minority are, by law, compelled to pay for the building and keeping in repair of the meeting-houses and places of worship of their wealthy Protestant neighbors. To apply for justice to the Rev. Mr. Ryerson is useless; for he is himself a Protestant Methodist Minister: a bitter enemy to Catholics: unscrupulous as to the means which he employs to cheat and oppress them: and ever ready to swear black is white, or white, black, if by so doing he can forward his darling object—which is to convert the actual school system, into one vast proselytising organisation for the perversion of Papists. No; the Catholics of Sombra, as of every township in Canada, need not look to Dr. Ryerson for justice, but must rely upon themselves, and endeavor to bring their complaints before the Legislature. We should therefore recommend our correspondent to have nothing whatever to do with the Chief Superintendent of Education; as to apply to him, would only be to waste time, and patience.

Again—by the existing Separate School Law—so well described by His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto as "A SNARE AND A MOCKERY"—Catholics supporting and sending children to a school in a school section, of which they are not residents, are not exempt from taxation for the support of the Protestant school of the section in which they do reside. For this there is no remedy, except in a change of the law; and this change—at least in a favorable sense—can not be expected from the present Ministry; who, in order to secure their tenure of office, are determined to perpetuate the abuses of the existing system. Here again then our advice is—"Agitate, Agitate, Agitate!" In union, and incessant agitation alone, can we expect to find the means of success in our arduous struggle for "Freedom of Education." We must carry on the war against "State-Schoolism" with the same weapons, and with the same tactics, as those which the great O'Connell recommended to the people of Ireland in their holy struggle against "State-Churchism," and the "Tythe System." What Tythes paid to a Protestant parson in Ireland, are to the Irish Catholic cultivator of the soil—a badge of servitude, and a crying iniquity—that, school rates, and all taxation for the support of a Protestant, or Non-Catholic School system, are to the Irish Catholic settler in Canada; and it is his interest, as it should be his first and most sacred duty, to offer the same constant and uncompromising hostility to "State-Schoolism" in Canada, that his fellow-countrymen at home offer to "State-Churchism" in Ireland. If the Established Church be—as it no doubt is—the curse, the disgrace, the "monster grievance" of Ireland, the established, or common school system, is no less the curse, disgrace, and "monster grievance" of Upper Canada.

Here then is the substance of our advice to the

Catholics of Sombra Township. Draw up a petition, setting forth in clear and concise terms, the hardships of which you complain; procure to it as many signatures as possible; and entrust it to some honest Member of the Legislature for presentation as soon as Parliament meets.—Strengthen the hands of the friends of "Freedom of Education" by your petitions to Parliament; harass your enemies, the friends of "State-Schoolism," by incessant agitation; keep always strictly within the letter of the law; abstain from all violence; and, above all, listen to the counsels of your legitimate pastors. Thus, and thus only, can we hope for the Divine blessing, on our exertions in the sacred cause in which we are embarked.

EDUCATION IN LOWER CANADA.—The *Montreal Herald* of Monday under the caption of "Normal Schools" writes as follows:—

"Our readers are aware that, during the last session of Parliament, a provision was made for the establishment and support of three Normal Schools for this section of the Province—one to be located in Quebec, and two in our own city. We are glad to learn that arrangements are now in progress, by which it is hoped that all three will be opened, and placed in an efficient working condition, within a short time—probably, immediately after the coming Christmas holidays. The Roman Catholic or French School, in Montreal, will, we understand, be accommodated in that—now almost last—relic of the *Ancien Regime*, the Old Government House, and will be under the immediate supervision of the Hon. Mr. Chauveau, our zealous and effective Superintendent of Education; while the Protestant or English School is to be, to a certain extent, affiliated with, and placed under the immediate management of the authorities of McGill College, subject, however, to the official supervision of the Provincial Superintendent of Education.

The Normal School at Quebec has been, we understand, affiliated with the Laval University of that city—subject, we take it for granted, to the official supervision of Mr. Chauveau—the authorities of which have already recommended a list of professors and teachers, for the approval of Government. We need scarcely add how heartily we wish success to these three institutions, than which, we are satisfied, if wisely and efficiently managed, we know of no others so well calculated to advance the moral and material interests of our country."

The reader can hardly fail to be struck with the difference betwixt the tone of the Upper and Lower Canada press upon the School Question. Here, thank God, neither Protestant nor Catholic dreams of imposing his peculiar views upon his neighbor of a different faith; and so far from meditating the overthrow of the "Separate" system, which differences of religion render unavoidable, Catholic can congratulate Protestant, and Protestant congratulate Catholic, upon the success of their respective schools and Colleges.—Thus has harmony been established amongst us; not by ignoring the religious differences which obtain in our mixed population; not by arbitrarily compelling one portion of the community to sacrifice its cherished convictions, for the advantage of the other portion; but by the practice of mutual forbearance, and by mutually respecting one another's rights as parents and citizens. Our children, it is true, attend different, or separate schools; but, so long as the Protestant public is animated by the liberal sentiments to which the *Herald* gives utterance, there is no danger that, as grown up men, they will persecute, or hate one another.

In the Upper Province, on the contrary, on the pretence of keeping up a good understanding betwixt Catholics and Protestants, the former are to be compelled to do violence to their conscientious scruples; and it is expected by Protestants that they will be able to persecute their Popish neighbors into loving them. This is like the famous receipt of Mr. Squeers of "Do-the-boys Hall;" who, by way of maintaining a lively and cheerful spirit amongst his pupils, used to make it a rule to flog some of them regularly every morning. We confess that the plan hitherto adopted in Lower Canada for maintaining a good understanding betwixt Catholics and Protestants, seems more likely to produce the desired results than that which Mr. G. Brown, and the Messrs. Squeers of Upper Canada, generally have hitherto followed; and of which, as yet, the only visible fruits are hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness.

We publish in another place a communication which our correspondent "Shamrock" forwards to us upon the application of the Clergy Reserves Funds; which, he recommends should be applied to the establishing Asylums for drunkards throughout the country; and in which drunkards, not guilty of any offence against the public peace, should be confined until reformed.

If we express our dissent from our friend's views, it is not we assure him, because we doubt the excellence of his intentions, and the importance of the subject upon which he writes—but because we are quite certain that, however plausible in theory, his scheme would in practice be impossible.

In the first place, drunkenness *per se*, is not, and cannot be the subject of civil legislation. The State can punish the drunkard if guilty of violence, or of disturbing, or threatening to disturb the public peace, by brawling or staggering about the common thoroughfares. These it is the business of the State to punish; but with the drunkard, who makes a beast of himself ten times a day in his own house, and refrains from injuring or threatening his neighbors, it has no business to meddle. The duty of the State being to repress injuries, and not to reform morals.