

REMITTANCES.

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES. THE TRUE WITNESS... HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacramento Street.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCT. 24, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The North American arrived at Quebec on Wednesday with four days later news. Parliament has been further prorogued to the 13th November; the Central American question was again exciting public attention; in other respects there is nothing of interest from Great Britain.

From the Continent we have rumors of prevailing discontent in France, and a consequent projected increase in the garrison of that city. The Anglo-French expedition to Naples had not sailed; though the British squadron had left Gibraltar for the Mediterranean. The King of Naples will, it is said, be supported heartily by his subjects in case of an attack being made upon his dominions; and it is hinted that Louis Napoleon would be right glad to settle matters amicably through the intervention of the Sovereign Pontiff.

As the day for the election of President draws near, the excitement in the United States increases. The late elections in Pennsylvania are thought to be decisive in favor of the Buchanan candidate, and fatal to the prospects of the Fremonters.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS.

We published lately some extracts from a remarkable article which appeared in the last number of the Westminster Review, which, in spite of the Montreal Witness, we still contend is the leading, and most ably conducted, Protestant periodical in the British Empire—upon the subject of "Missions;" with the object—firstly, of showing; by Protestant testimony, that Protestant missions had invariably been productive of more evil than good;—and secondly, of indicating the causes to which these lamentable failures were attributable. By so doing, we have provoked the strictures of the Quebec Gazette and the Montreal Witness; and with the last-named journal, apparently laid ourselves open to the suspicion of sympathizing with the peculiar religious views of the Westminster Review; to whose charge our evangelical cotemporary lays a fearful array of enormities; amongst which "infidelity" and "gratuitous slanders" are perhaps the most conspicuous.

It is not for us to take up the cudgels in defence of the Westminster Reviewer's truthfulness; only this would we remark—If the testimony of Protestant against Protestant is open to the suspicion of partiality and prejudice, because of the mutual jealousies of the different Protestant sects—a fortiori, must the testimony of Protestant against Catholic be liable to the same objection; if, because of his opposition to Methodism and Calvinism, the Westminster Reviewer is an unreliable authority when treating of their moral effects upon their respective professors—how much more must not Methodists and Calvinists be unworthy of credit, when taking up their parable against Popery. To the Catholic, the religious doctrines of the Westminster Reviewer must of course be exceedingly obnoxious; but, at the worst, they are not so dishonoring to the Creator, as are those of Calvin, whose God is but an Omnipotent Devil; nor is there in them anything to prevent their holder from being a perfectly credible witness in the natural order.

But the facts so discreditable to Protestant missions, related in the Westminster Review, are not given on the Reviewer's authority; but on that of modern Protestant travellers, and well known writers—such as Commander Wilkes of the United States Navy;—Captain Beechey, R.N.;—Bayard Taylor, author of a work on "India, China, and Japan;"—H. Melville, author of "Omoo;"—Miss Martineau; all Protestants, that is, Non-Catholics—all agreeing in the main, as to the effects of Protestant missions; but, according to the Montreal Witness, because they cannot mouth his particular "Shibboleth," or repeat his peculiar formula of orthodoxy, all "licentious travellers, enemies of the missionaries," and "averse to Godliness." It will be seen that our cotemporary has a very simple and wholesale way of discrediting an unfavorable witness; he puts him down as an infidel, and therefore expects us to conclude that he must be a liar.

The Montreal Witness should stick to this process, as better adapted to his intellectual calibre, than the following attempt at argument:—

"The whole case, however, can be disposed of in a very summary manner. The same argument which serves to prove to infidels the credibility of Gospel history, namely, the absurdity there is in supposing that the sacred writers could have either deceived themselves, or attempted successively to deceive others, by bearing testimony to events which never occurred, can also be used in reference to Protestant missions. We have the reports of missionaries published regularly in profusion, and from all quarters of the globe, and every one of them is in contradic-

tion of the statements of the Review, and gives them the lie. Now, were the Review's statements correct, it follows that all these missionaries, say every one of them, without exception, must be arch impostors, writing, deliberately, falsehoods, and that they have formed together a vast conspiracy, extending to the ends of the earth, to delude the people."—Montreal Witness, 15th inst.

As this argument involves the whole question of the evidence of the truth of historical Christianity, and betrays a lamentable ignorance on the part of the writer as to the nature of the proofs which establish the credibility of the Gospel narrative—(not doctrines)—we will endeavor to show its fallacy.

The Gospel narrative is credible, because attested by eye witnesses who could not be deceived, nor deceivers, upon the points therein related; and because it was uncontradicted by cotemporaries—who had the best means of knowing whether the facts therein stated were false or true—and whose interest it was to establish that they were false.

The witnesses to the truth of the Gospel narrative could not be themselves deceived; for the events therein related were of such a nature as to preclude the possibility of deception. When they tell us that they saw one man rise from the dead, after having been three days in the grave—that they saw another, immediately and completely cured of a severe bodily disease of long standing—they testify to facts upon which, as falling directly under the cognisance of their natural faculties, it was impossible that they were themselves deceived.

Neither could they have been deceivers; for they had not only no earthly interest in telling their marvellous story, but every possible inducement to refrain from publishing it. The witnesses to Christ's Resurrection knew that toil, persecutions and imprisonments, stripes and a cruel death, were their inevitable fate, if they persisted in their narrative; but that case, worldly honors, and the favor of the great ones of their nation, would be theirs, if they would but retract. Yet not one retracted; all persisted, even unto the death, in testifying to the truth of the Resurrection of Christ crucified—a fact upon which it was impossible that they could have been themselves deceived. So with all the other events recorded in the Gospel narrative.

And the truth of their story was not impugned by their cotemporaries, whose interest it was to impugn it. Neither Jews nor Pagans denied the fact of the marvels recorded by the Gospel historians. They admitted the facts; but attributed them to demoniacal influences, and the arts of magic. We have therefore the strongest of reasons for believing that the events recorded in the Gospel narratives did occur.

But in the case of the "Reports" of modern Protestant Missionaries, all these reasons which compel us to yield our assent to the historical truth of the New Testament are wanting.

In the first place, the events recorded in the said "Reports" are of such a nature that it is very possible—nay, exceedingly probable—that the witnesses thereunto are themselves, in many instances, deceived.

In the second place, the said witnesses have the strongest worldly motives to deceive others; because, so far from being thereby exposed to persecution, it is only by impressing upon the minds of their hearers that their missions to the heathen are prospering, that they can expect to draw their annual or quarterly salaries from the various missionary societies of which they are the paid agents.

In the third place, their glowing accounts of the state of their converts are invariably contradicted by cotemporary writers, who have visited their missions, and who can have no interest whatever either in their success or their failure.

The facts testified to by Protestant missionaries, as establishing the success of their efforts to convert the heathen, are, for the most part, not cognisable by their natural faculties. They tell us that the heart of such and such a Chief has been touched by Divine grace—and that the Spirit has done great things amongst his young men—that King Hokey-Pokey, has become a new creature in the Lord—and that his prime minister, Wankey-Fum, in spite of occasional backslidings, and an inveterate habit of making a beast of himself with liquor, is undoubtedly a "vessel of election." Statements such as these form the staple of Protestant Missionary "Reports;" and without imputing dishonesty to the writers, we may surely refuse to give any credit to them; seeing that the witnesses themselves have no possible means of knowing with certainty the spiritual state of their nominal converts, because such knowledge is not attainable by means of their natural faculties. Upon this set of facts the Missionaries may therefore be themselves deceived.

Or sometimes we may read of a general smash amongst the idols; that some horrid monster with an unpronounceable name, and a head as big as a punchon, has been broken up for firewood; that its former owner has donned the bifurcated garment, whilst his favorite wife conceals her smutty features within the recesses of a "poke," or coalscuttle bonnet. Here are a set of facts, for which, as coming within the range of their natural faculties, we will take the Missionaries'

word. We admit the breeches; we believe in the coalscuttle bonnet, aforesaid, and in the breaking up of the wooden divinity—which by the bye, would have made a capital figure head for some of our new steam frigates; but we are not therefore prepared to draw the inference that souls have been won to Christ. To disbelieve in a hideous combination of wood, feathers, and shark's teeth is one thing—and a very short intercourse with the crew of a whaler, or of a man-of-war's jolly boat, will suffice to shake the confidence of the South Sea Islanders in their idols; to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and to keep His Commandments, is another. Now the fact is, that in the South Sea Islands, the destruction of idolatry—or at all events of its open and visible practice—was generally the work, not of the Missionaries, but of the first white discoverers. Upon this point we cannot however do better than quote the words of the Rev. Mr. Cheever, himself an American Protestant Missionary of the evangelical type, and author of a work on Polynesia, known as "The Island World of the Pacific." After dilating upon the immorality of the first visitors to the natives of Polynesia, he goes on to say:—

"In the providence of God, however, the looseness, the utter abandonment, and practical infidelity of those who stopped among them had one good effect. It was to undermine the power of the idol-priesthood, and to loosen the oppression of the tabus. They, the foreigners, were seen to eat forbidden food on tabudays, to pay no sacrifices to the Gods, and habitually to break the tabus with impunity. The natives naturally reasoned upon this—it cannot be so fatal as the priests tell us, to violate the tabus; the foreigners do not die when they break them; why should we?"—p. 86.

An incidental good effect of the very profligacy, so depraving, of abandoned foreigners at the Hawaiian Islands, undoubtedly was to induce the natives to abandon the system of idolatry and tabus; and it is at the present time a notable and world known fact, as it was then so strangely providential, that while the first American missionaries were upon the high seas on their way to the islands in 1819 to try what scoffers called a novel experiment of knight-errant humanity, the idol gods were disowned, their temples burned, the great wall of tabus broken down, and the way prepared, so far as that went, for the reception of the true God."—pp. 88, 89.

The destruction of idolatry is therefore evidently not due to the missionaries; and thus whilst we admit the other set of facts adduced by them—we do not find therein any proof of the success of their missions.

The Protestant missionaries have also every conceivable inducement held out to them to deceive others, with glowing accounts of the conversion of the heathen. Not only do they expose themselves to no risk of persecution by so doing; but their daily bread, their comfortable luxurious homes, the silk dresses and gorgeous bonnets of their wives and daughters, depend upon their success in impressing upon their gullible countrymen in England and the United States that their missions are bearing abundance of fruit. The missionaries therefore, as interested parties, are incompetent as witnesses. Not only they may be themselves deceived, but they may also be deceivers.

And that they are so, we have not only the positive testimony of all disinterested travellers who have visited their missions, but occasionally, the valuable, because reluctant admissions of the missionaries themselves. The great seat of modern Protestant missions, are the Islands of the Pacific; and it is a fact, that the natives of these islands are rapidly disappearing—not because their supply of food has diminished, or become more difficult of access—but simply because of their incredible and indescribable immorality. In the words of the Rev. Mr. Cheever—"certain it is, they are dying off fast, rotten with disease." This one fact is conclusive as to the moral, as well as the physical depravity, of the converts made by Protestant Missionaries. There is therefore no "absurdity in supposing" that the writers of Protestant "Missionary Reports" are, sometimes, themselves deceived—often deceivers—and always very unreliable witnesses as to the success of "Protestant Missions."

How far the editor of the TRUE WITNESS is justly obnoxious to the reproach incessantly urged against him, by the Journal de Quebec, of having dragged the names of the Prelates of Upper Canada into a newspaper discussion, will be apparent from the subjoined document, which was published during the course of the past summer by the Toronto Mirror, and the TRUE WITNESS; and which—with episcopal sanction,—we again publish, as a conclusive answer to the following insinuations which appeared in the Journal de Quebec of the 16th inst.

Our cotemporary asserts—that—

"With the object of diverting public attention, he (the TRUE WITNESS) tries to make it appear that his cause is that of their Lordships the Bishops of Toronto and of Hamilton."

"We regret that the editor of the TRUE WITNESS—who is never backwards in giving lessons to others—has not comprehended how unbecoming it is thus to cast the names of two members of our episcopate into the midst of a newspaper discussion. He should have felt that the field of journalism does not offer a proper battle field for Bishops; and that in wishing as he does, to hold them responsible for his own wrongs, he has been guilty of a temerity which these respectable Prelates may of their charity pardon, because he knows no better—but in which, as a Catholic journalist he should not have indulged himself."

For all reply to the above balderdash we publish—and as we said above, with express episcopal sanction—the following document from their Lordships the Bishops of Upper Canada; and which at their express request, was published in

the Catholic journals of this Province some months ago, addressed to Mr. Felton and the gentlemen who voted for his amendment, on the 12th of June 1856:—

"GENTLEMEN.—In reply to the false reports circulated relative to your noble move in the School question, we beg to declare, that—in the Bill first introduced by Mr. Bowes—in the notice distributed on the 12th inst to the members of the House—and other documents trusted to your high sense of justice—you have, not only the claim of the Board of the Roman Catholic School Trustees elected by the Roman Catholics of Toronto, but you have also THE TRUE WITNESS, re-echoed by several organs of the press in Upper and Lower Canada, AND BY THE FORMER EDITOR OF THE Journal de Quebec; you have the claims of the tens of thousands of Catholics who in 1855-56, from Upper and Lower Canada, the Archbishops, and Bishops at their head, petitioned the Parliament in order to obtain for the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada equal rights of freedom of education, and whose petitions still stand in all their force, as long as it is evident for any man of candor that the Separate School Bill of 1855, AGAINST WHICH BISHOPS AND THE PRESS PROTESTED WITH ALL THEIR ENERGY, is contaminated with the six infamous shackles, mentioned by the Toronto Mirror of the 6th inst., and which are as follows:—

"1st. So as to exclude Catholic supporters of separate Schools from the municipal assessment for school purposes, which right is granted to the Protestants of Lower Canada.

"2nd. Maintaining an annual notification, very difficult in a widely settled country, and even in the cities; which notification is not required from the Protestants of Lower Canada.

"3rd. Containing the tyrannical obligation for Catholics to contribute to Protestant Schools, school-houses and libraries. No such contribution is demanded from the Protestants of Lower Canada.

"4th. Defrauding Catholics of their just share of any School fund, except the Government grant. No such fraud is perpetrated on the Protestants of Lower Canada.

"5th. Annulling the election of School Trustees when their Separate School is not established in two months. No such frivolous and vexatious enactment exists in the Protestant Separate School Law of Lower Canada.

"6th. Rendering doubtful the right of Catholics to apply their school taxes to the Separate School of a neighbouring section. This is the most iniquitous clause in the whole Bill, for by it Catholics about Toronto, Ottawa, Guelph, &c. have been taxed twice; once for their own Schools, and once for Protestant ones. No such infamy as this is tolerated in regard to the Protestants of Lower Canada.

"Therefore Dear Sir, by supporting OUR Bill, and defending the honourable position you and other members took in the House on the 5th of May and 12th of June, you cannot but deserve the highest consideration and the deepest gratitude of one half of the population of the Province."

† AR. M. D. DE CHARRONNEL, Bishop of Toronto.

† JOHN FARRELL, Bishop of Hamilton.

From the above it is clear:—

1. That the TRUE WITNESS has not dragged the names of the Catholic Bishops of Upper Canada into a newspaper discussion on the School question; but that these Right Reverend Prelates themselves have proprio motu, come forward, through the columns of the press, to make known their grievances to the public; and that the TRUE WITNESS in citing them as his authority, has only acted in accordance with their express wishes and we may add, their reiterated injunctions.

2. That whether well or ill founded, the complaints urged in the columns of the TRUE WITNESS against the Upper Canada School Law of 1855, are not his, but the Bishops' complaints; that they have "protested with all their energy" against that measure, which M. Cauchon and his ministerial friends support; and that they look upon Mr. Bowes' Bill, which M. Cauchon opposes, as their Bill—"OUR BILL"—they call it.

3. That we have merely republished, at their Lordships' request, and in their very words, the said complaints; and that in ridiculing them, and treating the said complaints as false or unfounded, the Journal de Quebec is in reality, casting aspersions upon those whom he professes to surround with his veneration and respect.

4. That the cause which we have had the honor to advocate—very imperfectly we admit—is, not our cause, but that of their Lordships the Bishops of Upper Canada; that in suppressing their public letter, and the complaints therein urged against the present School Law of Upper Canada, the Journal de Quebec has been guilty of the "Suppressio veri;" and that in insinuating that the TRUE WITNESS has introduced the names of the above mentioned Prelates into a newspaper controversy without authority, and with the object of diverting public attention from the real question at issue, he—the Journal de Quebec—has been guilty of the "suggestio falsi." He knows well that—though the editor of the TRUE WITNESS, and he alone, is responsible for the manner in which the discussion has been carried on betwixt us—the Bishops of Upper Canada are responsible, and openly avow themselves responsible, for the matter or substance thereof; for it is they, who, by their public documents given to the world by their express authority, through the columns of the newspaper press, have furnished us with that matter. We have but reiterated their complaints, and enumerated their grievances—and in their own words.

This we trust will suffice to show the utter falsity of the Journal de Quebec's insinuations against the TRUE WITNESS; to clear the latter from all suspicion of having dragged, without authority, the names of the Bishops of Upper Canada into a newspaper discussion; and to prove that the Journal de Quebec in defending the conduct of his Ministerial patrons on the School question, is carrying on a war of insults and reproaches against those whom he surrounds with his respect and veneration—but whose letter published by us above, he dares not—we say it advisedly—lay before his readers.

Having justified ourselves personally, we will

reply to one or two of his remarks in the issue from which we have already quoted.

The complaint urged by us against the actual school law of Upper Canada—that the Catholic minority are thereby debarred from the right of constituting their own school districts, whilst that right is fully accorded to the Protestant minority in the Lower Province—is no "new grievance;" but was pointed out by the Bishops of Upper Canada long ago, and was published by us in our issue of the 27th of June last. Neither is the peculiar permission granted to the Trustees of Separate Schools in Upper Canada to receive into their schools, children from other school districts, any compensation for this injustice; for though it enables the Trustees of Separate Schools in one district to secure the required school attendance of 15 children—yet it does not exempt the parents resident in one school district in which there is no Catholic school, who send their children to the separate school of another district—from all taxation or assessment for the Protestant school of the district in which they reside, and to which as Catholics they cannot send their children. And thus it often happens—as pointed out by their Lordships the Bishops of Toronto and Hamilton—that Catholic parents "have been taxed twice"—once for the support of the school in another district to which they do send their children, to which they pay school fees, and to which they ought to be allowed to pay the whole sum taken out of their pockets by the State for school purposes; and again, for the support of a Protestant school to which they do not send their children, situated in the district in which they reside, but in which perhaps there is not the required number of Catholic heads of families to establish a separate school. Now what their Lordships ask, is, that to the Catholics of Upper Canada, as to the Protestants of Lower Canada, the right be secured by law, of constituting their own school districts as they please; or at all events, that Catholic parents sending their children to the Catholic separate school of another district, shall, upon paying to the Trustees of the latter the full amount which the law exacts from them for school purposes, be exempted from all taxation or assessment for the support of the Protestant school of the district in which they reside, but which they cannot as conscientious Catholics, allow their children to attend.

With reference to the case at Ste. Foy, alluded to by our cotemporary, we know nothing, save through his columns; and be most pardon us if we place but little reliance on any thing he says. If however the facts be as stated by him—if a Protestant minority were compelled by a Catholic majority in Lower Canada to contribute, against their will to the erection of a Catholic school-house, we have no hesitation in saying that an injustice was perpetrated upon the former; and that the Lower Canadian Law requires altering. Under no circumstances should Catholics be able to tax Protestants, or Protestants to tax Catholics, for either school or church purposes.

In reply to another question addressed to us by the Journal—how is it that the TRUE WITNESS pretends that the Trustees of dissentient schools, availing themselves, with respect to the distribution of the school funds, of the 26th section of the Act of 1846, instead of the 18th section of the Act of 1849, were also at liberty to constitute their own school districts, seeing that that privilege was only granted by the last-named Act?—we would remark, that in virtue of the 26th section of the former Act, Trustees of separate schools had full power to constitute their school districts as they pleased. For, after prescribing the mode of procedure for the election of said Trustees, it provides that they—

"shall have the same powers, and be subject to the same duties as School Commissioners, but for the management of those schools only which shall be under their control."—(That is, they shall have no right to interfere with the management of schools under the control of the School Commissioners.)

To ascertain therefore the power of the Dissentient Trustees in virtue of the Act of 1846, we have but to ascertain what were the powers of the School Commissioners. Now, by section 18th of the Act of 1846, it is enacted that the said Commissioners—

"May at their discretion alter the limits of school districts already existing, and erect new ones from time to time."

But, as we have shown, for the management of schools under their own control, the Trustees of separate schools had, in virtue of the Act of 1846, the same "powers" as had the School Commissioners: therefore they also had the "power" to alter at their discretion the limits of existing school districts, and to erect new ones; in other words, "to constitute their own school districts."—Q. E. D.

As a corollary, which flows from the provisions of the Lower Canada law, securing to Trustees of Dissentient Schools the right to limit their own School districts, we should remark this—viz., that the clauses requiring in every school district a certain number of children of school age, offered no obstacles to the establishment, by Protestants, of separate schools in Lower Canada. For, as any number of them could always elect their Trustees, and as these Trustees could always extend the limits of their school district to any