

## REMITTANCES

TO

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND &amp; WALES

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on  
 The Union 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, 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. . . . \$2½ do.

Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS  
AND  
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1856.

To OUR DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS.—We again find ourselves compelled to call upon our friends to pay up, without delay, the arrears by them due to this office. The amount of these arrears is very large; and in consequence, we are often put to considerable inconvenience. We trust this announcement will suffice, and that we may not be again forced to address our readers upon this subject. We are preparing a list of delinquent subscribers, which we intend, when completed, to hand over to a lawyer with instructions to take immediate steps to enforce the payment of all arrears.

A signal triumph for the cause of "Freedom of Education" has lately been achieved in the British House of Commons, by the rejection of Lord John Russell's plan of "State Schoolism" fashioned upon the model of the Yankee or Massachusetts system, of which Dr. Ryerson is the prophet in Canada, and Mr. George Brown the zealous apostle. We are not without hopes that the moral effects of this victory may be felt in this country; and that the friends of educational liberty may thereby be roused to fresh and more vigorous exertions.

"State-Schoolism" can thrive only under absolute governments or despotisms. Amongst freemen, in communities in which what the *Times* calls "an old hereditary notion of liberty" still subsists, the servile doctrine that the State has the right to educate, can never find acceptance. Only under despotic forms of government—whether monarchical or democratically despotic, it matters not—can such a right on the part of the State be asserted, or such an outrage on "individual liberty," be tolerated. It may suit Boston or Moscow, the docile serfs of a Russian Czar, or the still more abject slaves who crouch beneath the tyranny of Yankee "public opinion;" but it will ever be repudiated by the freeman, and the Christian whom Christ hath made free.

The position occupied by the opponents of Lord John Russell's scheme in the House of Commons was identical with that taken up by the Catholic press on this Continent. Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Henley, who were the principal speakers on the question, clearly laid down, and by unanswerable arguments established, the great principles—that education is no more a legitimate function of the State than is religion—that the State has no more right to establish schools, than to establish churches, or to set up schoolmasters than to make priests. And that, whilst it does well to make material provision for the support, both of education and religion, it is bound to do so in such a manner as to offer no violence to the conscientious scruples of any, even of the humblest of its citizens. Wherever these principles are recognised—and wherever the voice of freedom can make itself heard there are they recognised—"State-Schoolism" is impossible.

As against the State, we assert the inalienable right of every man to worship God, and to educate his own children as he pleases. We deny any right on the part of the State, to tax any one of its citizens for a system of religion or of education to which he is conscientiously opposed; and we assert the duty of the State, if it makes any pecuniary provision for religion or education, to make it in such a manner as that all its citizens shall be equally able to avail themselves of it, without doing violence to their conscientious, even if erroneous, convictions; and for this reason—that the functions of the State being limited to the material order, it can take no cognizance of questions of conscience, or of the validity of conscientious scruples. More especially must this hold true of a State which "has not even the semblance of connection with the Church"—as is the case in Canada.

It is only by prominently asserting these principles—and certainly not by quibbling about matters of detail—that the battle of "Freedom of Education" ver "State Schoolism" can be successfully waged in this, or in any other country. If we once concede to the State that to it belongs, as a legitimate function, the education of the children of its citizens, it is absurd to quarrel with the manner in which the State exercises that right.

Of course these principles are irreconcilable with any system of *Common Schools*, in a State whose citizens hold not only contrary, but contradictory, opinions upon all the great moral and religious questions of the day. We do not, we have never sought to conceal this; nor have we ever pretended, whilst advocating "Freedom of Education," to have the slightest respect or esteem for *Common Schools*.

*Common Schools* and "Freedom of Education" are mutually contradictory; and he who is a friend to the one, must be opposed to the other.

Not that we necessarily advocate the "Voluntary" system because we oppose the Massachusetts or *Common School* system. The "Voluntary" system has no doubt many advantages; and if allowed a fair trial would, we have no doubt, in a very short time suffice for all our wants. Rather than submit to have the Massachusetts system imposed upon us and our children, rather than wear such a degrading yoke around our necks, we would, it is true, prefer to see all "semblance even of connection betwixt State and School" done away with; and the cause of education left entirely and unrestrictedly, to the operation of the "Voluntary System." And certainly, if to the working of that system, the interests of religion may be safely entrusted—if the Church can thrive without any the slightest assistance or interference from the State—it is absurd to suppose that the far less important interests of secular education would suffer, or that the School would languish, should State aid be withheld from it, and education like religion be left to be supported by the voluntary contributions of the people. He who insists upon the necessity of State provision for education, and denies the necessity of a State provision for religion, must perform of two things admit one—Either that secular education is of more importance than religion—or that men are more easily moved to provide for the wants of their souls, than of their bodies, and care more for eternity than for time—which is absurd. All experience shows that, whilst men require no persuasion to induce them to attend to their secular interests, it is always hard, and often impossible, to persuade them to take any heed of their immortal souls. We conclude therefore that—if the cause of religion can be safely entrusted to the operation of the "Voluntary system"—there can be no risk whatever in committing to the same system the cause of secular education.

But neither for religion nor education do we advocate the "Voluntary system as the best possible; though from unfortunate causes, from civil and religious dissensions, and from the duty of the State to act impartially to all its citizens—it may sometimes be the only one possible. We believe however that another system is possible in Canada; a system certainly most dissimilar to that which the Legislature has been hitherto attempting to enforce, and which it has copied from Massachusetts; but analogous to, if not identical with, that which obtains in England; and of which the essential feature would be—that the State should give pecuniary assistance, without respect to creeds, to all Schools in proportion to the number of pupils therein receiving their education. Of course under such a system, the State would have the right to exact proofs from all schools claiming to share in the public funds, that they were what they professed to be, institutions for giving secular, as well as religious education. In this there would be no difficulty; for though the Church attaches far more importance to the latter—yet, as man is both soul and body, she will not overlook the culture of aught that appertains to the one, because she insists upon the paramount importance of paying strict attention to the culture of the other.

To such a scheme a strenuous opposition would of course be offered by the friends of "State-Schoolism;" not because they desire to secure the advantages of a good and cheap education to all classes of population; but because their object is to prevent them or any portion of them, from receiving a Catholic education. Their great object is to proselytise, not to educate; and to them schools are desirable, in so far only as they tend to Protestantise the pupils. Thus only, can we account for the fact that, amongst the Anglicans of Upper Canada, are to be found some of the bitterest opponents of Free Education, and the upholders of a system which their own Church, both in Canada and in England, loudly condemns for its infidel and immoral tendencies. "No matter," argue these gentlemen, "we are perfectly willing to accept this infidel system with all its faults for ourselves, if we can only impose it upon Papists—if by its adoption, we can only succeed in infidelising and demoralising the children of our Romish neighbors, as well as our own." To such lengths will men who call themselves Christians, allow themselves to be carried by their insane hatred of the Catholic Church!

To the arguments of these gentlemen it is scarce worth while replying. Yet we cannot allow to pass unnoticed an appeal made by Mr. Cameron, to the sense of justice of the French Canadian Catholic members of the House, against the countenance by them given to their co-religionists of the Upper Province on the School question; and which appeal, the *Toronto Colonist* informs us, produced an "electric effect." In substance it amounted to this—Would the French Catholics of Lower Canada be the instruments of tyrannically forcing a system of education upon Protestants of Upper Canada? To this "electric appeal" the reply is very simple. Neither in Lower, nor in Upper Canada do Catholics desire to force any system of education whatsoever upon their Protestant fellow-citizens.—They repudiate any such design; and recognise, to the fullest extent, the right of the Protestants of all Canada to arrange in all its details their own school system, without interference from others. But, whilst admitting this absolute right of the Protestants of Upper Canada, we deny to them the right of "tyrannically enforcing" the same system upon Catholics, who are conscientiously opposed to it. Protestants are at liberty to tax themselves to any amount for the support of schools of which they approve; and in the exercise of that liberty, not a voice will be raised against them. What we deny is, their right to tax Catholics for the support of such schools; and if French Canadian Catholic Members take an active part in the discussion of the Upper Canada School

Question, it is not with the view of tyrannically forcing any particular system upon Protestants, or of depriving the latter of their right to adopt for themselves whatever system they please—but to prevent them from "forcing upon Catholics a system of education" which the Church condemns, and to which all Catholics are conscientiously opposed. This is the only interference on the part of French Canadian Catholics of which the Protestants of Upper Canada have any cause to complain; and by their complaints they clearly shew that with them, liberty means, not so much perfect freedom to tax themselves, and to manage their own affairs without interference from others, as the "right of walloping their own niggers." But this is it always. There is no tyranny so cruel, so grinding, and degrading as the tyranny of a Protestant majority.

"ONLY AN IRISHMAN."—Our Yankee neighbors, it would seem, attach but little value to the life of a "mere Irishman." To shoot them down with revolvers, without provocation, is becoming indeed a fashionable sport; in which even Yankee legislators indulge; and upon which the great Yankee public looks with a very lenient eye. The last case we have met with in the public journals, occurred at Washington on the 8th inst.; when the Honorable Mr. Herbert, a Yankee Member of the House of Representatives, shot an Irish waiter by way of amusement before breakfast. We glean the following particulars from the *Washington Star*:

The Hon. Mr. Herbert having called for his breakfast at Willard's hotel, was civilly informed by an Irish boy in waiting that it would be necessary to get an order from the office to have a breakfast sent up from the kitchen. Hereupon, like a free-born Yankee, the Honorable Mr. Herbert politely told the boy "to clear out you Irish son of a b—;" and turning round to another waiter, Thomas Keating—also a "mere Irishman"—he addressed him—"and you, you damned Irish son of a b—, clear out too." Thus addressed, this Thomas Keating had the insolence to remonstrate against such language. The scene that followed is thus described:—

Herbert, on being answered by Thomas, rose and struck him on the neck behind, with his fist. Thomas Keating seized a plate and threw it at Herbert. Herbert seized a chair and threw it across the round table at Thomas Keating, striking him with it. They then clinched and fought. Another Californian, whose name we have not heard, came in at the door and ran to Herbert's assistance, and also struck Thomas Keating with a chair. Patrick Keating, the brother of Thomas (and the steward of the house) at that time coming into the room, ran to his brother's assistance and seized Herbert, who immediately drew a revolver. The other Californian at that time was striking both the Keatings with a chair. As Herbert drew his revolver, Patrick Keating seized it by the barrel, and they struggled over it for some moments, until the French cook of the house came in and separated Herbert and P. Keating, who let go his hold of the pistol barrel. Thomas Keating and the other Californian were mingled in that particular part of the fray between Herbert and Patrick. After Patrick let go the barrel of the revolver, Herbert seized Thomas (who had clinched him and was struggling for the pistol) by the collar, and putting the pistol to his breast, shot him through the lungs, killing him in five minutes. After the shot, one of the other servants threw a piece of chinaware at Herbert, but none of the others interfered. Herbert and his Californian companion left the room and house immediately, by the Fourteenth street door, where Herbert took a hack and drove away. Subsequently he delivered himself up at the office of Justice Daniel Smith in Eighth street. His examination for killing Thos. Keating, aged about 34 or 35 years, (who leaves a wife and two children) will take place at the guard house at 4 P. M. this afternoon; Messrs. Bradley and Carlisle are counsel for Herbert. The two Keatings were civil men, and were favourites with the boarders in the house.

Great sympathy was felt for the Honorable prisoner of course, who was warmly defended by a large body of talented and independent Yankee lawyers.—The result of the investigation is as yet unknown; but it is most probable that the prisoner will be declared to have merited well of his country, and to have acted, as, under the circumstances, a free-born Yankee should always act towards the "rascally Irish." However, as it is not agreeable to be addressed as "a damned Irish son of a b—," or to be shot through the lungs for remonstrating against such language, it would perhaps be a wise precaution on the part of the Irish, to keep away from the glorious land of civil and religious liberty for the future; and to seek for employment in less progressive countries, where the life even of a Popish Irishman is looked upon as of more value than that of a dog.

The *New York Times* thus comments upon this disgraceful murder, and its still more disgraceful accessories:—

"It is only one among instances which are constantly occurring, to show that we have blackguards and bullies, instead of gentlemen, in our high places of public trust. That a Member of Congress should go into a public dining-room and use the language employed by Herbert towards a servant, is disgraceful to the civilization of the country. We boast constantly of our superiority over other countries in everything that implies progress and an advanced culture—pray, what would we say of a Member of the British House of Commons who would say to a waiter at table—what Herbert said to Keating—who should enter into a personal scuffle with a servant in a dining-room—to say nothing of drawing a pistol and shooting him dead? Our press would teem with denunciations of the barbarism and demoralization of a country where such scenes could happen—and they would be perfectly just and merited. Yet such things happen here constantly—and we become highly indignant if they are treated by foreign travellers or writers as at all characteristic, or as implying any fault or defect in our social life.

"We are unjust to ourselves in thus tolerating and apologizing for transactions which cover us with black and deserved disgrace. We owe it to decency and to our National reputation, to clear our skirts from such defilement. It is folly to say that these cases are exceptional and cannot be prevented. Congress itself—the members of it who hold such acts in proper abhorrence,—could remedy them effectually, by letting that abhorrence be manifest. Let any man guilty of the gross indecencies which marked Herbert's demeanor at the outset of this affair be properly branded with the displeasure and the censure of his associates, and he would speedily learn that the conduct of a gentleman was a requisite of his position. As it is, the bully and the gentleman are permitted to stand upon a common level. In this instance Herbert is surrounded by Senators and Ministers, countenanced by their attentions

and in his efforts to escape responsibility for having shot an Irish waiter. That he will be subjected in any case to more than a nominal punishment is not anticipated by anybody.

The murderer has been released upon bail.

The following, from the *N. Y. Times*, will show the danger to which the unfortunate immigrant is exposed upon his arrival in the "Land of Promise," and the necessity for the active exertions of the friends of the "Colonisation Movement" inaugurated by the Buffalo Convention:—

EMIGRANT RUNNERS.—Our columns yesterday reported one incident in a controversy which has raged for a year past, and in which the public at large ought to take a much deeper interest than they have done hitherto. All understand that a ship arrives at our port every few days, containing from 200 to 800 emigrants,—many of them utterly ignorant of this country and its people. Nineteenths of them are on their way to the West; and they are of course dependent upon somebody for advice, for board while here, for the care and removal of their luggage, and for direction as to the routes they shall take to reach their destination. The condition and necessities of these people were seized upon by a class of men,—sharp, active, intelligent, reckless and utterly unscrupulous,—who made it their business to rob them of their money, under pretence of giving them aid. They were overcharged enormously for everything,—for board, for care of their luggage, for cartage, for Railroad tickets, freight, &c. In this way quite an army of "emigrant runners," as these sharks were called, was organized:—and the most infamous instances of extortion and plunder were of daily occurrence. To such an extent had this most outrageous system of robbery been carried, that it at last attracted the attention of the State Legislature:—and a law was passed, in 1855, giving the Commissioners of Emigration entire control of emigrants upon their arrival,—authorizing them to designate a place at which emigrant ships should be obliged to land, compelling railroad and steamboat companies to fix a price for which they would be transported, and enabling the Commissioners of Emigration to take such precautions as should keep them entirely away from the ruffian runners, and protect them effectually against their brutal extortions. Castle Garden was leased and fitted up for this purpose: and for the last ten months, through the vigorous and energetic labors of the Commissioners, tens of thousands of emigrants have been received, protected and forwarded to their places of destination. But this has been done against the fierce and relentless opposition of the whole gang of runners,—at the peril of life, and under constant threats of personal violence from the ruffians whose victims were thus snatched from their hands, and who have found both representation and support in our City Government. On Wednesday last, as was stated yesterday, Jacob L. Smith, a Councilman from the first Ward, himself formerly an Emigrant runner by trade, procured from the owners of a ship coming in, an order for admission to her, which was reinforced by the acting Mayor, Isaac O. Barker, who gave him full authority to board any vessel and open communication with the passengers. Under Smith's direction these emigrants were taken to Castle Garden, as the law required—but their luggage was landed at another pier, and they were thus taken entirely out of the hands of the Commissioners of Emigration, and handed over to the tender mercies of the ruffian crew. The disgraceful feature of this transaction is the part taken in it by our City authorities. Our City Government is in duty bound to enforce the State Law, and to lend to the Commissioners of Emigration, all needed aid in the discharge of their duties. That it should ignore all these obligations, and interpose its authority, for the express purpose of subjecting emigrants to extortion and plunder, is almost inconceivable. But in this instance it did precisely that. What excuse the acting Mayor may have for his share in the transaction, we are not aware. The owners of the vessel, we are glad to know, will be held amenable for their violation of the law.

FRUITS OF "COMMON SCHOOLISM," OR THE "GODLESS SYSTEM."—A correspondent of the *Day Dawn*, a Protestant paper, published in Orono, C. W., writes as follows, upon the morals of the rising generation:—

"I have mixed a good deal with the middle and lower classes; and have known from observation something of the highest classes, and conceive that the all-prevalent crime of the majority is the constant habit of swearing and profanity, and what is worse, the pernicious and debasing practice of impure conversation. Now, who can stand where half a score of boys are at play, without, in a few seconds, hearing an oath? There are thousands in our towns and villages who cannot read, who cannot pronounce a tithe of the words of our language, but whose mouths are apparently full of oaths and curses. On the least occurrence that ruffles their temper, or calls for any manifestations of joy or surprise, they burst out as a volcano; and many I have met with, whom had I only heard them, and not see the mantle of clay that surrounded them, I could easily have imagined were importations, without a drawback, from the nether world. To youths from twelve to twenty, the oath seems to give a degree of importance to them and their assertions; and the burden of their conversation is one continuous imprecation. Indeed, at a little distance from a group, I have often heard only the fearful curse; the other syllables had been confused and indistinct, but rising above all, clear and sharp, was intoned the curse."

So much for our *Common Schools*. "By their fruits shall ye know them," here, as in the United States: where, if man or boy opens his mouth, you may safely wager that it is with the intent of discharging either his beastly saliva, or the still more beastly oath.

The *Montreal Witness* quotes with much glee, the statistics as given by last week's *TRUE WITNESS*, of the "Religious Houses" of Montreal—in evidence of the pauperising tendencies of Popery. We would remind our cotemporary, that the greater part of the pauperism of this country is of *British*, not of *native* growth, and that it is annually imported in the shape of a vast pauper immigration, which again is the product of British Protestantism. Had our Canadian convents and religious establishments, only Canadian pauperism to relieve, their task would be, comparatively speaking, an easy one. As it is, they have to provide for, not only the poor of this country, but the thousands of unhappy destitute creatures, whom British misrule in Ireland has driven from their native land. This consideration, should check our cotemporary's disposition to chuckle over the amount of pauperism in Popish communities.

FRENCH MISSIONS.—A Protestant of the name of Dr. W. Harvey writes to the organ of the Wesleyans, complaining bitterly of the rapid progress made by the French Jesuit Missions in the Feejee Islands. These emissaries of the "Man of Sin" are fast despoiling the Methodists of all their trophies.