

we think that the course "John Toronto" has adopted is well calculated to bring about the consummation he so much dreads. If he desires his civil rights, and those of his sect, to be respected, he should abstain from all attacks, direct or indirect, upon the civil rights of his Catholic fellow-citizens; if he dreads the adverse vote of the Catholic members of the Legislature, he should at least avoid wantonly offending them by threats of retaliation; if he really wishes to convince us of the integrity of his intentions, he should refrain from the dishonest artifices which, for the second time, we have pointed out. And above all, if he were wise he would not expose, as he has done, the rottenness of Protestantism, and its utter inability to sustain itself, unless upheld by State-endowments. All that Catholics ask of the State is, non-interference; they ask not the State to give to their Church, but only that they be allowed, by their voluntary contributions, to provide for her support; that by Mortmain laws, and other iniquitous enactments, restraints be not put upon their right to do as they will with their own. Not so with Protestants; they must have State help, forsooth—government grants, or they fall. "Help us," is their cry to the Legislature; "give us of the public funds, or we perish." What a melancholy picture of the helplessness of Protestantism does not this letter of "John Toronto" give us. He estimates—we don't vouch for the truth of his calculations—he estimates the total value of the Anglicans' share of the revenues accruing from the sale of the lands of the Province at £25,000; no great sum it must be admitted, for the most numerous, and the most wealthy, of the Non-Catholic sects of Upper Canada. But should this be withdrawn—if the Public Treasury should cease to allow this trifling pittance, "the successors of the present Incumbents will have to eat their scanty morsel in bitterness and sorrow," and, "in the meantime, many of our people will fall away to Romanism, or Dissent, and their blood will be on the heads of those who favor this fatal measure." What means "John Toronto" by this awful threat? Is salvation only to be found within the pale of the establishment? or is the Grace of God limited by Acts of Parliament? Catholics, we know, are in a bad state, but is there no hope for Dissenters? Are Methodists, and Presbyterians, and Baptists, and all other Non-Catholic sectaries, in danger of damnation, that "John Toronto" lays their "blood on the heads of those" who recognise that, to the Colonial Legislature belongs the right of deciding how the revenues arising from the sale of Colonial Lands shall be appropriated? "John Toronto" is far too severe upon his brother Protestants; bishops, by Act of Parliament, are not so necessary to salvation as he, in his vanity, imagines.

But why this outcry against the robbery of their church, on the part of the Anglicans, when by their own showing, in the pages of our cotemporary, the *Canadian Churchman*, to whose columns we are indebted for "John Toronto's" letter, they are not—their clergy are not—their church is not—entitled to one penny of revenue accruing from the "Clergy Reserves"? These revenues were set apart for the support of a Protestant church, and of a Protestant clergy—and the *Canadian Churchman* stoutly denies that the Anglican church is, or that its clergy are, Protestant. In the same number of our cotemporary as that in which appears "John Toronto's" letter, appears also an article from an Anglican, the purport of which is to show that the "church of England openly and palpably rejects the right of private judgment," and that it equally disavows the title of Protestant. "Our Church," says the writer, "has no claim to the epithet Protestant." Well, be it so; and it follows that it can "have no claim" to an endowment made expressly to a "Protestant" church; and that, whatever may be done with the revenues granted to a Protestant clergy, no wrong can thereby be done to the clergy of a church which disclaims "the epithet Protestant." We admit the ingenuity displayed by Anglicans in upholding the proposition, that "of contraries both may be true;" but we fancy that it will puzzle even the *Canadian Churchman* to show how his church, which is not Protestant, which rejects the "obnoxious phrase," can any longer continue to receive funds, set apart for the maintenance of a Protestant church, and the encouragement of the "Holy Protestant Faith," without becoming justly obnoxious to the reproach of being an impostor, a robber, and of receiving money under false pretences. Perhaps our cotemporary will be kind enough to help us out of this dilemma; at present it appears to us that "Our Church" should be called upon to disgorge—to restore to their rightful owners—the Protestant church, and the Protestant clergy—the sums which it has so long unwarrantably, dishonestly indeed, appropriated to its own use. If the church of England be not Protestant—and the *Canadian Churchman* disclaims the "obnoxious epithet"—what interest has it in the disposal of the "Clergy Reserves"?

The TRUE WITNESS has no intention of entering into a controversy with *Le Canadien* upon the merits, or demerits of the present ministry. The former journal disclaims, all sympathy, with "les brailleurs pharisaïques," to whom *Le Canadien* alludes, or any hostile intentions towards the government. It is perfectly ready to believe that, individually, there are many members of the present administration who recognise the justice of the demands of the Catholics of Upper Canada, and who would be well pleased to see those demands complied with. But the good intentions of individuals are not the subject of discussion. The question is—"Is the 'Act Supplementary' in its present condition calculated to relieve the Catholics of Upper Canada from the burdens imposed upon them, through the interpretation given to the words of the 'School Act' now in force?" The great fault of that Law is, that it is ambiguously worded—

that is, that it is susceptible of two different interpretations; and that, of course, that interpretation, which is most hostile to Catholic interests, is the one adopted. To remedy this, the one thing needful was, to avoid, in the "Act Supplementary" all ambiguity of language—to draw it up in the clearest terms possible, so as hereafter to leave no power, to men like Mr. Ryerson, to defeat, by their dishonest interpretations, the good intentions of the framers of the measure. With a man like Mr. Ryerson at the head of the Educational department of the Upper Province, invested with almost absolute, and irresponsible, power, it was above all things necessary that the intentions of the Legislature should be clearly, and unmistakably set forth. This has not been done in the "Act" under discussion; and it is of this ambiguity that we complain. Ambiguity for ambiguity, we would as soon have the ambiguity of the old Law, as the ambiguity of the "Act Supplementary."

Two courses were open to the Ministry to pursue. They might have declared that the demands of the Catholics of Upper Canada supporting separate schools, for exemption from all taxation for any other school purposes, were unreasonable; and have asserted the right of the State to tax Catholics for a Non-Catholic system of Education. This would have been extremely distasteful to the Catholic portion of the community, no doubt; but it would, for that very reason, have pleased the other party, and would at least have entitled the Ministry to the credit of boldness. Or, the Ministry might have professed to recognise the justice of the claims of the Catholic minority for "Freedom of Education," and have embodied the principle in their "Act Supplementary," by the simple enactment that, for the future, the supporters of separate schools should be liable to no taxation for other school purposes whatsoever. This course, though it would have mortally offended the Brownites, and "les brailleurs pharisaïques," would have proved acceptable to the Catholics, who would in return have testified their readiness to support a government, honest enough, and bold enough, to legislate upon the principle—"That the majority have no right to compel the minority to support a system of education to which, the latter are conscientiously opposed, and of which, they can make no use, without doing violence to their honest, even if mistaken, religious convictions."

But, unfortunately for themselves—we do not say unfortunately for Catholics, because our cause is the cause of truth and justice, and must ultimately prevail, in spite of all the despotic efforts of a brute majority—unfortunately for themselves, Ministers by way of offending neither party, have adopted that most ridiculous of all ridiculous modes of procedure—the *via media*. The result is that, without conciliating the Catholics, they have alienated the Protestant interest. By the IV clause, they have provoked the *Globe*; and by the V clause, which every body knows was a concession to the influence of Mr. Ryerson, of whom it seems that Ministers are not a little in awe, they have destroyed all those hopes to which the IV clause was calculated to give rise.

Le Canadien tacitly admits this ambiguity—or susceptibility to two conflicting interpretations—which the TRUE WITNESS urged as a reproach against the "Supplementary Act." "Charity demands," says our cotemporary, "that we should await the result of the discussions, and representations, which may yet take place on the subject, before condemning the Ministry for mere ambiguity of language." On the contrary, we are inclined to opine that in the circumstances "ambiguity of language" is the greatest fault of which the framers of the "Act Supplementary" can be guilty. "Ambiguity of language," in the old Law, has been the cause of all the disputes on the School Question in Upper Canada; and the "Act Supplementary" threatens to perpetuate the disputes by continuing their cause. Even with an impartial Chief Superintendent of Education, "ambiguity of language" would be dangerous; but with a Methodist like Mr. Ryerson, notorious for his Anti-Catholic prejudices, and justly odious to the Catholic population, because of his insolent demeanor towards their Bishop, and unjust conduct towards themselves, the least "ambiguity of language" is, and must be, fatal to the cause of "Freedom of Education." If the present government will persist in outraging the feelings of Catholics, by keeping so violent, and unscrupulous, a partisan as Mr. Ryerson in a situation for which, above all men, he is unfit, and which he has abused by trampling upon the rights of his Catholic fellow-citizens, they are, at least, bound to frame laws, for his guidance, and our protection, as free from all "ambiguity of language" as possible. This they have not done, and hence our complaints.

With a very few words *Le Canadien* has it in its power to silence these complaints, if ill founded. He is, to a certain extent, the organ of the Ministerial party at Quebec, and is, no doubt, well informed as to the real intentions of Ministers upon the School Question. The complaint of the TRUE WITNESS is—that from the "ambiguity of language," of the "Act Supplementary," it does not clearly appear to be the intention of its framers, that Catholics in Upper Canada, supporting separate schools, shall be exempt from all taxation for any other school purposes whatsoever. If ill founded, our cotemporary can effectually silence this complaint in his next issue; he has but to say, that it is intended to exempt supporters of separate schools from all taxation for any other school purposes whatsoever—whether for the payment of teachers, purchasing of school sites, or building, repairing, or defraying the expenses of school-houses. If this be the intention of Ministers in bringing forward their "Act Supplementary," why don't they avow it? If it be not their intention, upon what grounds, would we ask, does *Le Canadien* expect us to put confidence in them?

We fully admit the proposition of *Le Canadien*

that, to legislate satisfactorily upon the School Question, so as to give satisfaction to all parties, is an extremely difficult, perhaps an impracticable, task. But the question is not about giving satisfaction, but about doing justice. It is difficult to legislate indeed; but it is not difficult to make an open and straightforward avowal of intentions. In this avowal at least there should be no "ambiguity of language." Honesty is the best policy for statesmen; for when they do not avow the best, we may always be sure, especially when the interests of the Catholic Church are concerned, that they entertain the very worst, designs. All we ask therefore is to know the real intentions of the framers of the "Act Supplementary;" if they persist in their "ambiguity of language," we shall conclude that our suspicions of their ulterior designs are well founded; if, on the contrary, they will speak out frankly, the TRUE WITNESS will not be backwards in doing justice, and in gratefully acknowledging the obligations which all friends of "Freedom of Education" are under to a Ministry boldly and frankly defending the principle—"that the majority have no right to do violence to the religious convictions of the minority." This at least was the substance of the very able speech, of Mr. Richard's upon his moving the second reading of the "Act Supplementary," which we gave last week. In that speech the honorable gentleman fully recognised the principle of "Freedom of Education," and asserted the propriety of granting all that Catholics desire—all indeed that they have a right to ask, viz:—that they shall be allowed absolute control over the education of their own children; and that, whilst they seek not to compel Protestants to pay for the teaching of Catholicity, they be not compelled to pay for the teaching of any form of Protestantism, or Non-Catholicity. Mr. A. G. Richard's speech was manly, and free from all ambiguity; why should not his "Act Supplementary," in which the principle enunciated in the speech should be embodied, be as free from ambiguity? In fine, ambiguity is not a venial sin as *Le Canadien* would seem to insinuate; it is a sign of weakness, and what sin to a Ministry so unparadiseable as weakness? It is a sign too of an intention to deceive somebody, or some party; either the Catholics, or the Protestants—or, perhaps, both; and it is hard to place confidence where we know there is the intention to deceive.

ASSAULTING A CATHOLIC PRIEST.

We regret to be obliged to state, that on Monday last a most wanton and brutal assault was committed upon the Rev. Mr. Murphy, one of the priests attached to the St. Patrick's church of this city, while engaged in the exercise of the sacred functions of his office; the perpetrators of the offence being, as may be readily supposed, ruffians of the very lowest class of society. The Reverend gentleman is, however, we are happy to say, quite recovered from the injuries he received; but the feeling of indignation to which this cowardly outrage has given rise, has not, we fear, altogether subsided. And indeed had it not been for the exertions of some of our Priests, the consequences might, we fear, have been most deplorable, for no sooner was it known that the Rev. Mr. Murphy had been beaten, than hundreds of indignant Irish Catholics rushed to the spot where the crime was committed, determined to wreak vengeance upon the dastardly cowards who dared to insult their beloved pastor. Fortunately, however, the timely arrival of two or three Irish Priests prevented them from carrying their purpose into execution. And no other damage we believe was done than the breaking of a few panes of glass in the house from which the cowardly assailants of the Priest had issued; and a moderate kicking inflicted upon one of the ruffians.

Since then, however, three of the parties implicated were arrested and held to bail; but in consequence of the Rev. Mr. Murphy not appearing to prosecute them, the scoundrels were discharged. And here we sincerely hope the matter will be permitted to rest; for we verily believe the rascals are not worthy of further notice, or even a decent thrashing. Besides, we can assure our Catholic friends, that every respectable Protestant in the community condemns the act, and regrets its occurrence as much as we do. And, therefore, we again hope that the peace and harmony which have hitherto prevailed amongst us, will not be disturbed by the act of a few worthless characters.

We know not upon what authority the statement was made last week by several of our cotemporaries, that a clause was to be, or had been, inserted in the "Clergy Reserves" Bill, declaring that the property of the Catholic Church in Canada was to be considered equally with the "Clergy Reserves" the subject of Colonial legislation. We have looked in vain for a confirmation of the above assertion throughout the debates as reported in the *Times*, and can find no authority for it. On the contrary, we find that Earl Grey is reported to have spoken as follows, when touching incidentally upon this very topic—the right of the Catholic Church in Canada to the property it now holds—"He did not think the noble Duke was quite right in saying that the Catholic Church would be left on the same footing as the Protestant Church. If the Parliament of Canada, after secularising the property of the Church of England, was to deal with the property of the Church of Rome, the Bill might be on their lordships' table for the 30 days prescribed by law, but there was little chance of its getting any further."—*Times*. The *Catholic Standard*, though giving a full report of the debates, says nothing about this additional clause; we copy his views upon this measure as a fair sample of the opinions of the Catholics of England on this disputed question; it will be seen that they disclaim any desire to secularise:—

"The Bill does not directly or indirectly interfere

with the lands called the Clergy Reserves, nor does it propose, suggest or recommend their secularisation. It merely abandons a mischievous 'Mother-country' policy, by removing the last vestige of Downing-street distrust and inter-meddling, and leaving the local parliament free to legislate according to its judgment upon a purely local matter. We should hope this freedom will not be abused, and that the property of the Protestant Church in Canada will not be diverted for any purpose, or upon any pretence, from its legitimate use; but, for Lord Derby, and the Bishop of Exeter, who derive a large income from the spoliation of the Catholic Church in this country, to talk of sacrilege, and robbery, in reference to the supposed alienation of the Canadian Clergy Reserves, is about as cool a piece of assurance—we don't use the phrase offensively—as we remember to have met with."

On another page will be found a letter from His Lordship the Bishop of Birmingham, giving an account of his arrest, and that of the Very Rev. President of Oscott, for the sum of £4,000. As trustees for property belonging to one of their missions, His Lordship and the other reverend gentleman, were shareholders in the Monmouthshire, and Glamorgan-shire, Bank. Through great mismanagement this Bank failed about two years ago, leaving the two ecclesiastics responsible for a large sum. Since then they have made every effort to meet their liabilities, parting even with their vestments, but in vain. It was then thought that by thrusting the reverend Prelate into jail, the amount of the debt would be wrung out of the Catholic laity; but it seems that it is not the intention of the Bishop to permit this; rather than that his Diocese should suffer loss, he will willingly submit to the painful process of passing through the Insolvent's Court.

Among the "popular delusions" of the day there is none more erroneous than that a newspaper is an article of spontaneous production. This we would wish to impress upon the minds of our patrons, particularly those to whom we forward accounts. We are subject to a heavy weekly outlay, and we hope subscribers will remit us their subscription (due) with the least possible delay.

We have not received the *Christian Guardian* for several weeks. How is this, friend Guardian?

M. & Co., Baltimore—Letter received but not the *Metropolitan*. Hope it has met with no railroad accident. Your request shall be attended to at our earliest convenience.

The following gentlemen have kindly consented to act as agents for the TRUE WITNESS:—Grenville, Rev. M. Byrne; Thorold, Mr. J. Heenan; Isle aux Noix and vicinity, Mr. J. Sheridan.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Quebec, M. Enright, £5; Grenville, Rev. M. Byrne, £1 18s 9d; Norwood, Rev. J. Furelly, 15s; California, B. Murphy, 12s 6d; Free Port, U. S., A. R. McDonald, 12s 6d; St. Charles, Dr. Leprohon, 12s 6d; Gananoque, Rev. J. Rossiter, 15s; Port Daniel, T. Carberry, 6s 3d; London, J. G. Norris, £2 13s 9d; Hawksbury, W. Lawlor, 12s 6d; N. Lancaster, R. McDonald, 10s; St. Johns, T. Busher, 12s 6d; Hungerford, P. Casey, 6s 3d; Duffin's Creek, J. Redden, 12s 6d; New Glasgow, E. Carry, 6s 3d; L'Orignal, D. Cremin, 6s 3d; Cornwall, A. Stuart McDonald, 12s 6d; St. Andrews, Rev. G. A. Hay, £1 5s; Trenton, J. Sullivan, 6s 3d; Bytown, A. Whelan, 6s 3d; Peterboro, B. Boyd, 4s 9d.

FATAL ACCIDENT.—We are sorry to learn that, on Saturday last, as the Railroad Train was approaching St. John's from Rouse's Point, about two miles from the former place, it run over the body of a man, who apparently, had been asleep on the track. The engine was immediately stopped and the train backed to the spot where the body was found—quite dead. The sufferer was unknown to any one present and was, apparently, a stranger. We have not yet heard the result of the Coroner's inquest.—*Montreal Herald*, 17 inst.

A man was found drowned in the Steamboat basin yesterday—name unknown.—*Id.*

We learn that the Special term of the Court of Queen's Bench, which was begun at Sherbrooke last week, for the trial of the rioters on the Railroad, was abruptly brought to a termination on Monday. Mr. Devlin, counsel for the prisoners, challenged the whole array of jurors, as having been irregularly summoned; and the result was their discharge, the setting aside of the bills already found, and the adjournment of the Court to the 13th of June. Some of the prisoners were admitted to bail, and the rest remain in prison. A great deal of excitement prevails there.—*Sun*.

From the same source we learn that the laborers on the Railroad have struck for higher wages—refusing to strike a blow for less than 5s. per day.—*Com. Adver.*

THE CROPS.—We have favorable accounts from our several correspondents of the Wheat crops in Upper Canada. The unusual coldness of the spring has not been unfavorable to its growth.—*Commercial Advertiser*.

ANOTHER MURDER.—At St. John's, on Sunday, the 14th inst., a man, of the name of Lilly, killed a woman in an instant, with a blow from a poker. The crime, it appears, was the result of a drunken brawl.—*Id.*

A horrible murder was perpetrated on the St. Lawrence & Atlantic Railroad, near Sherbrooke, on Monday the 7th inst. A laborer named James McGee, was lying in a state of beastly intoxication on the track, with his face downwards, when another laborer, named Philip Sullivan, came up and struck him several blows on the head with a pick-axe, scattering his brains. An inquest was immediately held by the Coroner, M. de Tonnacour, and a verdict of "wilful murder" returned against Sullivan. The wretch has managed so far to elude the pursuit of justice. Our informant states that the means for apprehending a fugitive in that section seemed to him exceedingly poor—the authorities being furnished with no sufficient detective force.

Died.

After a short illness, at his residence, English River, in the Seigniory of Beaucharnois, on 5th May, (Ascension Day), Mr. John Devine, senr., aged 72 years.