

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND.

SHORT SIGHT BILLS from One Pound upwards, negotiable in any part of the United Kingdom, are drawn on the Union Bank of London, London. Bank of Ireland, Dublin. National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street. Montreal, February 9, 1854.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON, At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes. TERMS: To Town Subscribers, \$3 per annum. To Country do, \$2 1/2 do. Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 8, 1854.

STATE SCHOOLISM.

A Friend to Education undertakes to refute our position—that the duties of the State towards the School, are the same as its duties towards the Church, and that State has no more right to interfere with education than with religion. He argues:

1. "No country can be prosperous without an intelligent population."—Montreal Sun, 1st inst.

2. "Consequently it is the duty of the State to render its assistance to an impartial and general education of those who are too poor to obtain it for themselves."—ib.

3. Therefore, the "Friend to Education" concludes to the desirableness of a connection between School and State. Let us see how far his argument is applicable to the desirableness of a similar connection between Church and State.

1. No country can be prosperous without a religious population.

2. Consequently it is the duty of the State to render its assistance to an impartial and general religious education of those who are too poor to obtain it for themselves.

3. Therefore, as such assistance can be rendered only in virtue of some connection betwixt Church and State, it is desirable that some connection be maintained.

Now we defy a "Friend to Education" to show any defect or flaw in our logic, to which his own is not equally obnoxious. Is "intelligence"—that is, as he defines it—reading, writing and purely secular instruction—necessary to the prosperity of a community? Much more so is religion. Is a population, ignorant of the arts of reading and writing, dangerous to the stability and progress of society? Much more so is an irreligious, vicious population. Therefore it is more incumbent on the State to render material assistance to the moral and religious, than to the merely secular, education to those of its subjects, "who are too poor to obtain it for themselves."—Q. E. D.

We will go yet further, and with history as our witness, we will contend that the only education which causes a country to prosper, is a moral and religious education; that a country may prosper—and that many countries have prospered—a great part of whose population are, and were, strangers to the arts of reading, writing and arithmetic—as in Europe in the middle ages; but that no country has ever prospered—no matter how "intelligent" its population—[we use "intelligence" as the "Friend to Education" uses the word, to denote merely secular knowledge]—unless its population were at the same time moral and religious. The history of the world, we say, shews that the rise and decay of nations have ever been coincident with the rise and decay of religion, and morality; though the period of their decline has often been illustrated by the rapid spread of "intelligence" amongst their peoples. From these facts we conclude that "intelligence"—as the "Friend to Education" uses the term—does not, unless accompanied with religion, promote the prosperity of a country: but that on the contrary, it often has accelerated, and therefore may accelerate its fall.

We say not this to depreciate, or as if we undervalued the importance of, secular education. Our design is to show that the argument in favor of State assistance to secular education—based upon the connection betwixt an "intelligent" population and a "prosperous" country—is at least as strong in favor of State assistance to religious education; and that as a religious population is fully as necessary to the prosperity of the country as is an "intelligent" one, it is as much the duty of the State to make material provision for, and to render its pecuniary assistance to, the spread of religion, and religious knowledge, as it is its duty to render assistance to merely secular education. But then, admits our "Friend to Education," "it is the duty of the State to render its assistance to an impartial system of education. Here is a point upon which we shall most decidedly not differ: and it is because we contend for "impartiality," that we insist upon the duty of the State, if it renders its assistance at all, either to religion or to education, either to Church or to School, so to render it, as that all its subjects shall be able, without doing violence to their sincere, even though mistaken, conscientious convictions, to avail themselves of that assistance.—If you tax us for School or Church purposes—we say to the State—give us in return for our money, Churches or Schools of which we can make use without doing violence to our religious scruples. We do not feel called upon to prove that our scruples are well-founded; for scruples belong to the domain of conscience, and, in the words of our "Friend to Education," the State cannot take cognizance of,

or regulate the spiritually-moral government of men's hearts and consciences." We cannot then be called upon to plead in defence of our conscientious religious scruples before its bar. In that we have them, we have the right to demand of the State to respect them.

It is thus that the Dissenter in England argues against the injustice of compelling him to pay for a State Church, and a State religion, against which he entertains conscientious religious scruples. The Dissenter has a good cause of complaint against the State—not in that it makes provision for religious purposes—but in that it does not make that provision "impartially." Nor would his argument be set aside by the denial of the reasonableness of his scruples. The Presbyterian may be in error in renouncing Episcopacy—his scruples against Bishops may be most unreasonable—and yet for all that it would be most unjust on the part of the British Government to tax both Presbyterians and Episcopalians indiscriminately for the support of an exclusively Episcopal form of religion. In that the Presbyterian has religious scruples—and not because his scruples are reasonable—is the State bound to respect them, and, if it makes any provision for religion at all, to make it in such a manner that both Presbyterians and Episcopalians shall be able to avail themselves thereof.

Now apply this argument to the separate school question in Canada, as maintained by Catholics.—We complain of being compelled to pay for State Schools, and a State education, against which we entertain religious scruples. We complain not, that the State makes provision for educational purposes—but that it does not make that provision "impartially"—unless "impartiality" consists in cutting down, or stretching out, all men's moral and religious opinions according to one State standard. Nor is our plea invalidated by the denial, on the part of the friends of State Schoolism, of the reasonableness of our religious scruples. We may be in error in renouncing Protestant schools, and our scruples against a Methodist Chief Superintendent may be most unreasonable—Yet for all that, it is most unjust on the part of the Canadian Legislature to tax Catholics and Protestants indiscriminately, for the support of an exclusively Non-Catholic system of education.—In that Catholics have religious scruples, and not because their religious scruples are reasonable—is the State bound to respect them; and, if it makes any provision for education at all, to make it in such a manner that both Catholics and Protestants shall be able to avail themselves thereof.

And this can be done only, by giving to Catholics, Catholic Schools—and to Protestants, Non-Catholic schools. In other words we must have Separate Schools.

THE CHAMPIONS OF PROTESTANTISM.

The old proverb, "when rogues fall out, &c.," has received a remarkable confirmation during the past week, in the squabbles of Gavazzi with another convert to Protestantism, who rejoices in the style and dignity of André Massena, Baron de Camin, Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, &c., &c. From the Scotch press we have been enabled to glean the following particulars.

The said Baron de Camin, has for some time been lecturing in the chief cities in Scotland with great applause, and under the special patronage of the evangelical clergy, against the "Horror of Popery and the Papal Inquisition." He had been—so he declared—an Inquisitor himself, of the Order of St. Dominic, and was fully versed in all the mysteries of the modern Babylon. He was a universal favorite. He held up to the admiring gaze of the old women around him, horrid looking machines which he assured them were "Instruments of Torture;" he tickled the prurient fancies of the young women with those smutty stories and obscene jests in which the good souls so much delight; and for all he had wondrous tales, and thrilling experiences, illustrative of Romish barbarities, and of God's wonderful dealings, Who had been pleased to bring him—the Baron de Camin, and Chevalier of the Legion of Honor—out of darkness into light—transplanting him into the kingdom of His dear Son. The Baron's success was complete; crowds rushed to hear him, and the money flowed in a-pace.

But the dream was too bright to last. The great A. Gavazzi looked with a jealous eye on the Baron, as a poacher on his special preserves. In fact, the French Baron was a bigger liar, and, if possible, a more obscene blackguard than the Italian Patriot; naturally he was a greater favorite with the Protestant public. It seems too, that, in the early part of his career, the Baron had sought to increase the interest of the public in his behalf by representing himself as a convert of the great Gavazzi, for whom he professed warm affection as for his spiritual father who had begotten him, and with whom he professed to be on terms of great intimacy. These pretensions gave Gavazzi the opportunity of, as he hoped, dealing a mortal blow to the reputation of his rival in the art of gulling the Protestant public. He rushed into print, and, through the columns of the Edinburgh Guardian—a Presbyterian paper—and the Glasgow Examiner, proceeded to take vengeance upon the Baron. His letters are before us.

The Italian Padre begins by disclaiming any connection with the "so called Baron de Camin," who, he insinuates, is little better than a rogue, and if a Chevalier at all, not of the Legion of Honor, but of "L'Industrie." Gavazzi then goes on to disclaim the merit of having been the "humble instrument"—"hands of God," and so on; and repudiates with scorn the idea, that he has any intimacy or connection with the pseudo Chevalier. "After a mere accidental intercourse"—says Gavazzi—"I was obliged to exclude him from my house, to save my peace and my honor." Finally he refers the curious to the

French Embassy, in London, where full details of the Baron may be easily obtained.

To these taunts and accusations the Baron de Camin replies through the Scottish Press; in which he retorts upon Gavazzi the charge of being a rogue and a liar:—

"Of him" (Gavazzi)—the Baron says in his rejoinder—"I may say truly that I have more in my power to work upon his damage, than anything he can promulgate against me, if I chose to employ it. With regard to the French Embassy, it is true that he has written or said that which is prejudicial to the truthfulness of my statements, regarding my former position in France, and my high family connexions—there if he circulates that I am not a nobleman, neither an officer of the Legion of Honor, he shall yet tremble for his audacity."

Thus the "Pot and the Kettle" call one another harsh unscriptural names, whilst the unevangelical world looks on, highly amused at the squabble betwixt two such "eminent professors," and eagerly expects still further disclosures. We all know how it is when two old Billingsgate hags fall out; and what extraordinary revelations are brought to light by their zeal to prove one another rogues and prostitutes. So, no doubt, will it be in this quarrel betwixt the leading champions of Protestantism, during the course of which we may expect to learn the true histories of both. "Memoirs of Gavazzi, by the Baron de Camin"—and "A Life of the Baron de Camin, by A. Gavazzi"—will prove, no doubt, invaluable additions to the Protestant literature of the day. We hope that they may be shortly forthcoming.

We publish, as an act of justice to the writer, the subjoined letter from Mr. D. A. Macdonald, on the subject of his dispute with the Priest of Alexandria, the details of which we laid before our readers some weeks ago. In his letter, it will be seen that Mr. Macdonald denies the charge we brought against him, and out of which the whole of the subsequent proceedings sprang; though, in an article from the Cornwall Constitutional—an article written, if not by Mr. Macdonald himself, at all events by one of his friends, and apparently, under his immediate inspiration—the substantial accuracy of our version of the affair, as we received it from our Alexandrian correspondent, is fully confirmed.

The charge against Mr. Macdonald, as preferred in the columns of the TRUE WITNESS, amounts to this—that he—professing himself a Catholic, and being a mere layman, who, "however well skilled he might be, as a miller, or as a retail dealer in groceries or dry-goods, was most certainly not entitled either by birth or education to dictate to the men of Glengarry how they should bring up their children"—did, immediately after divine service—during the course of which the people had been exhorted from the pulpit to exercise their rights as freemen, and to fulfil their duties as Catholics, by establishing a school where the faith and morals of their children might be preserved from the risk of contamination—summon the departing congregation around him, and, most impudently, considering his position, did then, and at the church door, advise his hearers to slight the exhortations of their pastor, and to set at naught the commandments of the Catholic Church, speaking by the voice of her Bishops and the Sovereign Pontiff. He, Mr. Macdonald—in the words of the TRUE WITNESS—"denounced separate schools"—and advised his hearers to retain the mixed school system; whilst, in all their Pastorals, and in the decrees of their Provincial Councils, ratified by the successor of St. Peter, mixed schools have been condemned by the Bishops of Canada, as altogether dangerous to faith and morals—and the Catholic laity have been everywhere exhorted to struggle for the support of the separate schools denounced by Mr. McDonald.

This was the gist of our accusation; and how does Mr. Macdonald meet it? In his letter, he denies having opposed the Rev. Mr. McLachlan's plan for forming a separate Catholic school; he says:—"I never opposed Mr. McLachlan in his attempt to establish a Catholic school." In the Cornwall Constitutional, on the contrary, we read that, on the occasion alluded to, Mr. Macdonald did most warmly oppose Catholic separate schools. He is there represented as having warned his hearers:—

"That, if they wished their children to grow up in harmony and good fellowship, free from the bitterness of sectarian bigotry, they would shun the separate system, so much lauded by the priests, as they would a pestilence."—Cornwall Constitutional.

Of these two contradictory statements, one must be false; we cannot say which—non nostrum lantaz componere lites. For the credit of the Scotch Catholics of Glengarry, we trust that the statement of the Constitutional is exaggerated; and that they did not disgrace themselves, their name, their country, and their religion, by tamely listening to language so indecent. An Irish Catholic congregation at least, would not have submitted to such insolence. Had they been so addressed, in front of St. Patrick's Church on a Sunday after Mass, and told to "shun their Priest's advice as they would a pestilence," we greatly fear that the incautious speaker would soon have become aware of the toe of an Irishman's boot in unpleasant proximity to his sitting part, even if a worse thing did not befall him. Our Irish friends are not the men to allow their Clergy to be wantonly insulted at the church door by any one; and we hope that the Scotchmen of Alexandria are not altogether so tame spirited as the Constitutional represents them.

The Cornwall Constitutional insists too, that, from "his position" and "business habits" the people of Alexandria have always "LOOKED UP TO" Mr. Macdonald "as their best guide" in all "School matters." This we hesitate not to pronounce false.—The men, the Scotch Catholics, of Glengarry, are Macdonnells, not McSycophants; they are not such a

miserable, contemptible set of lick-spittles, as to "look up to" any man, as their "best" guide in the education of their children, because he has managed to amass money by business habits. In the States, the Almighty Dollar, and its possessor, may be so worshipped by the votaries of Mammon; but not so amongst honest, true-hearted Scotch Catholics.—Their religion has taught them that it is not a man's position as a merchant, nor his business habits in the dry-goods line, that can entitle him to be "looked up to;" and their every day's experience must have shown them that the acquisition of wealth, by no means implies the possession of any estimable or honorable endowments—either moral or intellectual—on the part of the acquirer. No—put into plain English—the language of the Cornwall Constitutional means just what the TRUE WITNESS stated—that Mr. Macdonald fancies himself entitled—on account of his business habits, and the dollars he has accumulated—to be "looked up to" by the Scotch Catholics of Alexandria as "their best guide" in all "school matters." This it may indeed mean; but we trust that it will not be taken as evidence that our Scotch friends are the sordid, mean spirited sycophants whom the Cornwall Constitutional describes as "looking up to" Mr. Macdonald "as their best guide." When Scotchmen do "look up," we trust they have manly pride enough to look a little higher; and when Catholics do prostrate themselves in worship, it is before some object nobler than a man of "business habits." We say this, not in disparagement of Mr. Macdonald, but in vindication of the Scotch Catholics of Alexandria, so foully libelled by the writer in the Cornwall Constitutional—but who, we trust, will shew at the next election how unfounded is the degrading imputation cast upon their honor as Scotchmen, and their fidelity as Catholics.

With these remarks, we publish Mr. Macdonald's letter, though we see no reasons for retracting or modifying a single expression in our article of the 10th ult. We still look upon Mr. Macdonald's conduct, as most unbecoming. As insolent and overbearing, in the highest degree, to the people of Alexandria, to whom he had the impertinence to set himself up "as their best guide" in matters pertaining to the education of their children—and as unpardonable on the part of one who professed himself a Catholic. As a "British freeman," Mr. Macdonald had the right, no doubt, when, where, and as he pleased, to give utterance to his opinions on the separate school system; no one, least of all the TRUE WITNESS, will attempt to deny this right, or to limit its exercise.—But we do deny to any man, and to all men, the right to play the hypocrite—to profess one thing, and to practise another. We do deny even Mr. Macdonald's right to call himself a Catholic, whilst stigmatising as pestilential the separate school system—sanctioned by the Church, recommended by the Bishops, and lauded by the priests; we do deny his right to set his feet even inside a Catholic church, when, at the door, he exhorts his hearers to shun the counsels therein given by their legitimate pastors "as they would a pestilence;" in fine, we do contest—his right to profess a religion which he evidently abhors—and his claims to be "looked up to" as "their best guide" by others. As a "British freeman," he is at perfect liberty to hold, and give utterance to, his peculiar opinions. But, as he cannot hold them without ipso facto ceasing to be a Catholic—if he wishes to be deemed an honest man, if he does not desire to be "looked down upon" and despised by every honest man as a hypocrite—let him, in the name of common sense, whilst retaining those opinions, renounce his profession of Catholicity, and cease to bring scandal upon our holy religion:—

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir,—I have just been shown your paper of the 10th inst. containing a fierce personal attack on me, in reference to a suit for slander, instituted by me against the Rev. John McLachlan, Catholic Priest of Alexandria. I do not intend now to answer your remarks, at any length, as the strange romance you have hashed up has so disguised the matters at issue between your Rev. client and myself, that they can scarcely be recognised by any one acquainted with the real facts of the case. I shall in a short time, however, procure the necessary documents &c., to enable me to publish an authentic statement of the whole affair, including the incidents arising from, or connected with the original subject of quarrel. I will then request you to give insertion in your paper to my version of the contestation, which I imagine you will not hesitate to do, on the common principle of fair play towards friend and foe, which all public journalists profess to act up to.

Permit me, in the meantime, to correct one or two inaccuracies into which you have fallen, and which require no confutation by documentary evidence—at least in Glengarry. In the first place, it is absolutely false that I was "separated" by or at the expense either of the Pastors of the Catholic Church, or any church whatever. But suppose that I had been, does it follow that I must exhibit my gratitude by acting at once contrary to law and the dictates of my conscience. Such may be your opinion, but it is not mine. As regards your sneer about the "Chief of Glengarry," by which appellation you are pleased to dub me, you only show your ignorance in venturing on such an absurd fiction. Be it known unto you—since you have mooted a subject so important—that I do not belong to the Glengarry branch of the sept or clan, and that every man, woman and child in our county would laugh at such a pretension on my part, as heartily as they do at you for supposing that I could assert such a claim.

I am perfectly willing to be judged by my countrymen and the public generally, on the merits of the dispute between me and the Rev. John McLachlan; nor will I shrink from the contest he has forced upon me. My object was and is to prevent him from illegally and unjustly tyrannising over my Protestant neighbors, who happen to be in a minority in the village of Alexandria; exactly as I would do my utmost to shield a Catholic minority under similar circumstances. But why should you or your Reverend instigator attack others through me? Neither my brother, Mr. J. S. Macdonald, member for the County, nor I, have ever said that we held the Catholics of Glengarry "under our thumb." But this falsehood is only in character with many similar calumnies arising from the same source.

In conclusion, I may as well here state that I never opposed Mr. McLachlan in his attempt to establish a Catholic school in Alexandria. But I certainly did oppose his scheme of converting the Common School of the village into a Catholic school, because the School-house was erected at the joint expense of Catholics and Protestants, and because, chiefly by his plan of teaching purely Catholic doctrines in his intended school, the Protestants would virtually be left without the means of educating their children at all. But I shall explain this and other matters more fully on a future occasion.

I am, Your obedient servant, D. A. MACDONALD. Montreal, 16th Nov., 1854.