

REMITTANCES
TO
ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable at any Town in the United Kingdom, are granted on The Bank of London, London, Dublin, The Bank of Ireland, Edinburgh, The National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh, By HENRY CHAPMAN & Co., St. Sacrament Street, Montreal, December 14, 1854.

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEB. 20, 1857.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

THE Persian war will, it is hoped, be terminated by the capture of Bushire. From China we learn that Yeh remains obstinate to the persuasive eloquence of powder and shot; that the Chinese have burnt all the factories at Canton; and that it is decided to bombard the City. Sir John Bowring had applied to the Indian Government for reinforcements.

The European news is not of much interest. The British fleet has evacuated the Black Sea, in compliance with the terms of the Paris Conference; and, on their side, the Russians have abandoned the Island of Serpents. Verger, the assassin of the Archbishop of Paris, has paid the penalty of his crime. On the scaffold his firmness forsook him; and, it is to be hoped, that he died penitent. A French fleet is about to be sent out to the China Seas to exact satisfaction for the murder of a Catholic missionary. At Naples, an unsuccessful attempt had been made to assassinate the Archbishop, by another apostate priest.

From New York we learn that the proceedings of the Coroner's Inquest on the body of the late Dr. Burdell have terminated in the commitment to prison of Eckell, Mrs. Cunningham, and young Snodgrass. The evidence is, if not conclusive, certainly very strong; and throws much light upon the fashionable morals of New York, the Holy City of Dollardom.

CRIME AND IGNORANCE.—That ignorance is the parent of crime is a delusion—or rather a cant phrase of the XIX century—which the actual social condition of the United States must speedily dissipate. In no country in the world is education more generally diffused: in none is there a greater amount of aggravated crimes against person and property, especially amongst the educated classes. Nor are the U. States singular in this respect; for, from the criminal statistics, both of the Old and New Worlds, it would appear that, in proportion to their numbers, the educated classes of society furnish by far the greater number of criminals. Murder and forgery are indeed so common now-a-days, that it would almost seem as if they formed part of a liberal and fashionable education: charged for perhaps as extras, as in less enlightened times, was the case with music, drawing, and dancing.

It would be tedious, and it is unnecessary, to adduce statistics in support of our assertion.—Who, in fact, that has any acquaintance with the records of the criminal tribunals, in Great Britain or the United States, or who has not forgotten the hideous revelations of the last few months, can doubt that the greater part of the serious crimes against person and property are perpetrated, not by the poor and ignorant, but by the wealthy, and in the ordinary acceptance of the term, the educated classes of society? We need only refer our readers to the Redpaths and Palmers, to the Huntingdons and other scoundrels, with whose names the newspapers must have made them familiar, as a convincing proof that crime is neither the sign, nor the result, of any mere intellectual deficiency.

This fact has been very forcibly impressed upon the public mind by the late horrid tragedy in New York. A Dr. Burdell, an inmate of a boarding house in one of the chief streets of the city, is murdered in cold blood; and in the course of the investigation which necessarily ensues, we are made acquainted with the moral aspect of society in the great commercial capital of the enlightened Republic. The details are too revolting for publication in our columns; but they are such as to leave no doubt on the mind of the reader, of the wide spread, and deep seated immorality of the wealthy and educated classes of the United States; and they reveal to us a state of society certainly without a parallel in the annals of any professedly Christian community; and to find a counterpart to which we must revert to the most corrupt epoch, of the most corrupt nations of ancient Paganism.

How to account for this startling phenomenon, and which has so signally given the lie to all the predictions of modern philosopherism, is a sore puzzle to the journalists of the United States. They admit that, in the annals of the world there has never been an epoch—marked by so many poisonings and assassinations, resulting from pure cupidity—*New York Herald*—as the present. But, instead of concluding from these facts that modern society is relapsing into barbarism, they deduce the startling conclusion that “in proportion as a community approaches its highest point of social development, crimes of this character

will keep pace with it.” This then, is the last word of the “Gospel of Progress;” and, as we think all will allow, a most cheerless Gospel it is. All that a community has to look forward to, as it approaches its “highest point of development,” is, a proportionate increase of crime; and in the words of the *New York Herald*—“it is reserved” for this highly developed community “to give crimes of this character a permanent place on its calendars, and to shock the world by the spectacle of atrocities dictated by the vilest and basest of objects.” Crime then, according to this theory, is the product of civilisation; and the vilest atrocities are the inseparable adjuncts of modern social development. Of Protestant civilisation and Protestant progress this no doubt holds true.

Our New York cotemporary also sees clearly that the old theory that “ignorance is the mother of crime” went suit his turn here, nor account for the remarkable monopoly of serious crime by the educated classes. Therefore, not to ignorance but to the “Pulpit,” not to any mere intellectual defect, but to moral depravity, does he attribute the rapid demoralisation of the upper classes of society—of the wealthy and educated. Of the Protestant Pulpit of the United States he says:—

“Who that has watched the course of ‘shining lights’ of the different religious denominations for the last dozen years, but is forced to the reflection, that the christianity which these men teach has but little resemblance to the chastening, the elevating and benign doctrines inculcated by the Great Master whom they profess to serve? Their christianity is a dry, soulless and technical creed, and not a religion of peace, charity and good will amongst men. It is a christianity in which the ‘pulpit drum ecclesiastic’ and the click of the Sharpe’s rifle are heard, as substitutes for the voice of gentle reproof to the sinner, and of hope and encouragement to the patient. Unlike the good pastor of Chaucer, who conducted his flock to heaven by a silken thread, the parsons of our day, deal in polemical bitterness and harsh condemnations of those who differ with them. Out of such seed what fruit are we to expect? A low tone of public morality, and the prevalence of crime in quarters where ignorance and poverty cannot be said to exist, are the results that we must look for.”

This hypothesis—that the increase of crime is attributable to the Protestant Pulpit—is at least more reasonable than that which treats it as the direct and necessary consequence of civilisation and social development. But it is chiefly valuable in that it is a tacit acknowledgement that the old theories about the necessary connection betwixt crime and ignorance, are nearly exploded amongst the thinkers of the present day. One great step therefore towards the overthrow of “State-Schoolism” has been gained; and as it is upon the ruins of “State-Schoolism” that the glorious edifice of “Freedom of Education” must be erected, the friends of the latter system have abundant reasons to rejoice in the salutary change that is taking place in the United States upon the most important social question of the day. Hitherto the stronghold of our enemies has been the gratuitous assumption that ignorance necessarily begets crime, and that education necessarily tends to diminish it. Driven from this post by the force of facts, the “State-Schoolists” will now have to meet us in the open field, where their defeat is inevitable. All we ask is a fair field, and no favor; and though the result may be delayed, though the contest may yet be prolonged a few years, truth and justice, and common sense must at last prevail; and we shall have the pleasure of seeing “State-Churchism” and “State-Schoolism” consigned to the same ignoble grave.

UNDER the significant caption of “*Outrage in St. Roch’s—Brutal Assault*”—the *Quebec Morning Chronicle* of the 16th instant, gives the following particulars of a row, in which a Mr. Pepin, one of the agents of the *French Canadian Missionary Society*, cuts a very ludicrous figure:—

“On Friday afternoon, Mr. Pepin, a French Canadian Protestant Missionary, was assaulted in St. Roch’s, under the following circumstances:—It appears that at about three o’clock that day he called upon the family of a man named Bilodeau, in St. Francis Street, for the purpose of conversing with them on the subject of religion. He has, for about seven years, been connected with a society for missions among French Canadians; and, since his return from the States more than a year ago, has been in the habit of visiting the locality. Bilodeau has two daughters, one of whom is married to one Louis Jacques, and the other to a man named Cloutier. Some four months ago M^{rs}. Jacques’ marriage took place; but, after living with her husband for a few weeks, she separated from him, for causes alleged to be constitutional, as well as others, in no way, however, relative to her creed, which would appear to be now different from that of her husband. On leaving Bilodeau’s house, Mr. Pepin, accompanied by M^{rs}. Jacques, one of his proselytes, proceeded to M^{rs}. Cloutier’s residence, in St. Joseph Street, and, on their way thither, they perceived Louis Jacques in the neighborhood. A strong feeling of indignation had been caused in the locality by the presence of Mr. Pepin, and Jacques was persuaded to recover possession of his wife. He observed her in Cloutier’s house, and, persisting in his endeavors to obtain admission, it being the hour when the ship carpenters were returning from work, a crowd soon assembled. According to different representations, there were from 100 to 200 persons collected, all French Canadians. Whether they came for the purpose of assault, or not, so soon as the door was opened to admit Jacques they gained access to the house, and a regular fight commenced between the more violent of them and Mr. Pepin. He was struck, kicked and driven into the street; then hooted and called till he made his escape to a house in the vicinity. Although he met with the worst usage, his injuries are not of a dangerous character: he was badly cut on the head and kicked in the face. Some persons who had endeavored to assist him, it is said, were also ill-treated. From the above, the Protestant, and therefore

* Is not the word “face” a misprint?—Printer’s Devil.

to Catholics, the most unfavorable, version of the affray, it must be clear to every unprejudiced person—not only that there was no “*Brutal Assault*” committed by Catholics upon the person of a Protestant Missionary—but that, if M. Pepin did get a good thrashing from the hands, and a sound kicking from the feet, of the injured husband, with whose run-away wife the saintly man was detected in very close intercourse, and whom he, to all appearance, was persuading not to return to her lawful home—he got no more than what he richly deserved; and what every husband of a young run-away wife would, under similar circumstances, inflict upon the fellow with whom he caught her.

Let us look into the facts of the case, as recorded by our Protestant cotemporary; premising that we have no knowledge whatever of the business, but what we gather from his columns.

Louis Jacques, a French Canadian, and a Catholic, marries a young woman, the daughter of a fellow-countryman named Bilodeau, who was also a Catholic, at the date of the marriage. A few weeks after the ceremony, his young wife runs away from him, her lawful husband to whom she had pledged her faith, and whom she had vowed before Almighty God to love, honor, and obey during life. No ill usage, no infidelity, on the part of the husband, is so much as insinuated as an excuse for the infidelity of the wretched woman.

Shortly after this, the faithless wife turns up in the company of a M. Pepin, one of the “*sweatlers*” in the pay of the F. C. M. Society; the *Morning Chronicle* tells us she was one of his “*proselytes*.” For decency’s sake, we will admit the propriety of the term; and shall henceforward invariably employ it, when ever we shall have to speak of a young woman who runs away from her husband, and is detected in company with another man. The phrase is an admirable one; for whatever may be the case with regard to “graven images” it is not forbidden in the Ten Commandments to make “*proselytes*.”

Well, poor Louis Jacques falls in with M. Pepin, and his “*proselyte*.” Evidently unacquainted with the peculiar “privileges” of the saints, besides being altogether an unregenerate person, Jacques demands that his wife—“*proselyte*” though she be—be restored to him; a demand which we contend he had the right to make, and to enforce, according to every law of God and man. This demand was resisted; M. Pepin secretes his “*proselyte*”—as we must call her—in the house of a man named Cloutier, married to a sister of the aforesaid “*proselyte*”; the outraged husband persists in his demand; a crowd collects, whose sympathies are naturally excited in favor of the man thus infamously treated; force is resorted to; a “*regular fight*” commences; and M. Pepin, the evangelical Missionary who was detected with another man’s wife, is, as the *Chronicle* says, “struck, kicked, driven into the street, hooted and cuffed.” The editor of the *Morning Chronicle* may call this a “*Brutal Outrage*” if he pleases; but we should like to know how he would serve a man whom he detected in company with his run-away wife; and whether he could not be very much inclined to apply a horse-whip to the fellow’s back.

Let us, for instance, reverse the facts of the story. We will suppose the case of a Protestant—the editor of the *Morning Chronicle* to wit—married to a young Protestant woman;—we will suppose that within a few weeks after marriage she abandons her husband’s bed and board, and is made a “*proselyte*” of, by a Romish priest; that the injured husband detects the said priest in company with his unhappy “*proselyte*”; that he insists that his wife be given up to him, and that the priest refuses; that the husband persists, and is abetted by a crowd of Protestants, acquainted with the facts of the case; that a “*regular fight*” occurs; and that, in the scuffle, the aforesaid Romish priest has his “*proselyte*” forcibly taken from him, and restored to her husband—receiving in return a shower of blows and kicks, so that he is unable to sit at his ease, without a soft cushion, for a month afterwards.—Would—we ask—would the Protestant press, under such circumstances, qualify the conduct of the husband and his friends, as “*A Brutal Outrage*,” or a “*Brutal Assault*”?

We trow not. We should be told—that a husband has a right, good before God and man, a right which the law of every civilized community recognises, to demand possession of his wife—that if this rightful demand be opposed by force, the husband is at liberty by force to make it good—that if any one, no matter who, opposes him, he has the right to knock him down—that in pursuit of his wife he has the right to force his way into the house wherein she is secreted—and that he must be a tame-spirited scoundrel indeed, who could let another man take away his wife from him, without making an effort to regain possession of her.

Now this is just what poor Louis Jacques did, and is by the Protestant press reviled for doing; but this we contend he had a perfect right, in law, and in conscience, to do. And this also we firmly believe, that, under similar circumstances—if any Protestant husband in the community had been treated by a Romish priest, as M.

Pepin treated the unfortunate husband of his “*proselyte*,” neither the fear of man’s law, nor of God’s law—neither respect for the *soutane*, nor for the plea of “*proselytism*,” would save his reverence from a sound kicking and cuffing.

MORAL.—We abhor violence; but the plain fact of the matter is this. If men will make “*proselytes*” of other men’s wives, they must make up their minds for a sound kicking from the husband, when detected; if young married women will elope from their husband’s homes, and go about town as other men’s “*proselytes*,” rows will occur—as the history of the world generally, and of Troy in particular, clearly proves; and if evangelical societies will employ as their servants, fellows who, in the words of the Apostle, “*creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins and led away with divers lusts*,” it becomes the duty of every husband, of every father of a family, to kick the impertinent intruders off his premises.

Since writing the above, we have seen the *Journal de Quebec* of the 17th inst.; in which it is stated that one version of the affray is to the effect, that the husband, Jacques, found his wife and Pepin together in a room, of which the door was locked. The *Morning Chronicle* of the 18th, having learned more about the business, also admits that “*there appears to be something more in the matter than has yet been laid before the public, of a private, rather than of a religious character*.” The Italics are our own. Comment is unnecessary.

The *Toronto Ecclesiastical and Missionary Record* (Protestant) has the following remarks upon the influence of Common School Teachers, in the truth of which we cordially concur:—

“The influence of our Common School Teachers for good or evil can scarcely be overstated. In some respects it exceeds that of ministers of religion. For only three or four hours each week do ministers come into direct contact with their hearers. For six hours each day the school teacher comes into direct contact with his scholars. During each week, therefore, the teacher’s influence is made to tell eight or ten times longer on the minds of the scholars than that of the minister on the minds of his hearers. It is to be remembered also that the youthful minds of scholars are likely to receive deeper impressions than are likely to be made on the minds of a congregation, most of whom have reached the age when habits and opinions are almost irrevocably fixed. We advert to this subject, and we trust not in vain, for the purpose of impressing upon teachers themselves the solemn responsibilities which attach to their office; for the purpose also of calling the attention of parents, guardians and trustees to the importance of selecting men of high moral and religious character for the instruction of the young; and still further for the purpose of reminding Christians generally of the necessity of special prayer on behalf of those to whose hands the work of education is entrusted in our Common Schools.”

A stronger and more conclusive argument against “*State-Schoolism*,” as an infringement of the rights of the parent, and an intrusion upon freedom of conscience, we have nowhere met with, than is contained in the above extract from our Protestant cotemporary. And it is just because the facts are, as therein stated—because the influence of the School Teacher is so powerful for good or for evil over his pupils—that we, Catholics, and parents, claim, as our duty, and therefore as our inalienable right, perfect freedom to select for ourselves, those to whom we will commit the education of our own children; and of choosing for ourselves, those whom we invest with an influence so powerful for good or evil, that it “*can scarcely be overstated*.”

But this right we cannot enjoy in its integrity, if by the operation of any system of School Laws, we are compelled to pray for the support of a School and Teacher to which, and to whom, we have conscientious objections. The rich, indeed, may be able to pay for two schools; one to which they do send their children, in whose Teachers they place confidence, and to whom therefore they can safely entrust the training of their offspring; and another, in whose Teachers they have no confidence, and to which therefore they cannot, consistently with their first and most sacred duty as Christian parents, send their children. But how must it be with the poorer classes? with those, whose means are but barely sufficient to support one School, and one set of Teachers? Either they must entrust their beloved little ones—an account of whose souls will one day be demanded of them by Almighty God—to Teachers in whom they have no confidence, but whose “*influence for good or evil can scarcely be overstated*,” or they must be content to see their children growing up in ignorance. Can any man, not the apostle of intolerance—not the advocate of “*broad Protestant principles*”—dare to defend such a system, as in accordance with justice, or with the first principles of civil and religious liberty?

It is quite true. The influence of the School Teacher over his youthful pupils is almost unlimited; and therefore is it that we protest against any, and every system of legislation which, directly, or indirectly, tends to deprive, or to fetter, the individual parent in the exercise of the right of choosing for himself the teacher who shall be invested with such a tremendous power “*for good or for for evil*.” But the “*Common School System*” does, in the majority of cases, altogether deprive the individual parent of this right. Therefore we denounce “*State-Schoolism*” as an injustice, as an outrage upon our rights as parents, and our consciences as Catholics. We will not—so help us God—we will not entrust

any man with an almost unlimited “*influence for good or evil*,” over the tender minds of our children, unless we choose him ourselves; unless he be one in whom we ourselves can place almost unlimited confidence. Therefore we will never—so help us God—desist from our active opposition to a system which, if carried out, must inevitably deprive us of this our natural right as parents, and impede us in the fulfilment of our religious duties, as Catholics.

We are told by the Protestant advocates of “*State-Schoolism*,” when it suits their turn, that the fears entertained by the Catholic parent, of the proselytising influences of “*Common Schools*,” are purely chimerical; that, as the “*Common Schools*” of Upper Canada are conducted, there is no danger of the religious convictions of any of their attendants being tampered with. But how can this be; or what security can Catholic parents have, if—as our above-quoted Protestant cotemporary maintains—“*the influence of the ‘Common School Teachers,’ for good or evil, can scarcely be overstated*”—if “*in some respects it exceeds that of ministers of religion*”?—If this “*influence*” be so great, with what confidence can a Protestant parent entrust his child to a Catholic teacher, or a Catholic parent subject his children to the almost unlimited influences of a Protestant? The very fact, that, independent of the works used in the school as class books, the influence of the teacher is so great “*for good or for evil*,” is a conclusive argument against “*Common Schools*,” and “*Common School Teachers*,” in a mixed community like ours.

We start with these premises, which no Christian will deny. That the parent alone is responsible, and is responsible to God alone, for the soul of his child—that God will one day call him—and not the State, not the Municipal Council, not the Board of School Trustees—to account for the manner in which he has fulfilled the sacred trust committed to him when God made him a father; that, if this trust has been unfaithfully, or negligently fulfilled, he—and not the Chief Superintendent of Education, not the Municipal Council, not the Board of Trustees—will be damned; and that an Act of the Provincial Parliament of Canada, will not be admitted before the Judgment Seat of God, as a valid plea for neglect of duty, and violation of His laws.

Are these things so? Are the duties of the parent, and his responsibilities, so great? Then it follows, that the State has no right to interfere betwixt parent and child; or directly, or indirectly, to deprive the former of the right, and the sole right, of selecting for himself, individually, the Teacher of his child, whose “*influence for good or evil*,” is so tremendous that it “*can scarcely be overstated*.” But, by taxing the parent for the support of a School, and School Teachers, to which, and whom, any father of a family in the community is conscientiously opposed, the State does interfere betwixt parent and child; and does prevent the former from the full exercise of his right of selection in the most important business of life. Therefore “*State-Schoolism*” is an infringement of the rights of the parent, is an outrage upon conscience, and an insult to God Himself—Who holds the parent, and the parent alone, responsible for the “*influences, for good or evil*,” to which the child is by him subjected.

This, in short, is the sum of the matter. Our duties, as Christian parents, towards God, are but another form of expression for our rights as freemen against the State; for it is not less true that the individual has rights against the latter, than it is that he has duties, which he cannot shuffle off, towards God. These duties constitute our rights; and, in the matter of the education of our children, wilfully or timidly to abnegate, or renounce any of these our rights as against the State, is equivalent to a wilful or cowardly neglect of our duty towards God.

THE “*CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN*” ON PROSELYTISM.—“As ye would that men should do unto you, do also to them in like manner,” is a precept which does not seem to find very general acceptance amongst our separated brethren; if we may be permitted to judge from the manner in which they treat Catholics, and their indignation when they receive similar treatment at the hands of their brother Protestants. Of this the *Christian Guardian*, in a long and savage article upon “*Proselytism and its Results*,” affords an admirable illustration.

Our Methodist friends tell us for example, that it is their duty to interfere with Catholics, and to use every exertion to bring us, poor Papists, over to their way of thinking on religious matters. But with what voice do they speak, when the measure which they mete out to us, is measured out to them again, by the members of some Non-Methodistical sect? Listen to the indignant language of the *Christian Guardian*, when remonstrating against the conduct of a Clergyman of the Anglican sect, who, it would appear, has been tampering with the faith of the followers of Wesley in the Niagara district of Upper Canada:—

There is a point beyond which endurance ceases to be a virtue, and where submission would be a sin; and when we are insulted, assailed, and misrepresented, we conceive it to be no violation of apostolic precept or christian propriety to stand up in defence of the right. Such a position is manifestly consistent with all reason and the highest principles of patriotism and Christianity; for although we are professedly Christians and Methodists, we are no less—in common with the rest of mankind—the subjects of an inviolable, inflexible determination to maintain our lawful rights by whomsoever those rights may be assailed: “*nemo me impune lacessit*.” But some of our readers may be impatient to know the occasion of the foregoing remarks; and, to satisfy their curiosity, we may say at once, that they have been elicited by the most unwarrantable interference of certain ministers of the “*Protestant Episcopal Church of Canada*,” with the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

And he adds:—
“In our opinion, the conduct of some intemperate High Churchmen, in their attempts to encroach upon