

REMITTANCES

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

SIGHT-DRAFTS from One Pound upwards, negotiable in 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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPT. 5, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Persia from Liverpool the 23rd ult., arrived at New York on the 3rd instant. The fine weather in England had broken up, and fears for the harvest had arisen in consequence. A trifling advance in the price of breadstuffs was the natural result. On the Continent, the harvest is looked upon as an average one.

From the political world there is little to report. A rumor, not universally credited, was current that France and Great Britain had given in their ultimatum to the King of Naples, on the subject of internal reforms in his dominions; and that, if the latter refused compliance, the representatives of the first named Powers had received instructions to quit Naples. The King, thus menaced, is said to have consented to some of the conditions imposed upon him, but not to all. From Spain there was nothing of importance.

The telegraphic report of the Persia's news contains the following items:—

Napoleon was at Biarritz. He is reported to be urging the claims of Prince Pierre Bonaparte to the throne of the Danubian kingdom, and to be considering what title to bestow on the American descendants of Prince Jerome.

It is said the Emperor of Russia gave his consent to the title of the Duke of Malakoff being bestowed upon Peltissier.

The Russians announce that they will give Kars, Ismail, Reni and Kilia within the stipulated six months.

The Russian Light-house men had been carried off from the Isle of Serpents by an English man of war, and delivered to the authorities at Odessa, who however, merely permitted them to be landed, and said the affair had to be settled by diplomatic negotiations.

The Russians were forcibly re-taking from the Circassians the ports taken by them during the war. They had captured Anapa. The Circassians retreating without resistance.

Count Mornes, the French representative, had met with a distinguished reception at St. Petersburg. A quantity of treasure, valued at \$150,000, buried by the Russians at Sebastopol, had been dug up in safety, having escaped the vigilance of the Allies.

A desperate engagement had taken place between the crew of a Prussian ship of war and some Algerine pirates on the coast of Morocco; eight of the Prussians were killed, and twenty wounded. Prince Adolbut was wounded and his Aide-de-Camp killed. The excitement had revived the talk of a European expedition against the pirates of that coast.

The Central American difficulty seems now at last to be fairly settled, by the simple process—on the part of Great Britain—of abandoning everything in dispute. Great Britain is to cede to the State of Honduras, the disputed Mosquito Territory and Bay Islands; stipulating only for the rights of British settlers. On the other hand, the Government of Honduras engages not to erect, or suffer to be erected, any military establishments or fortifications in the so ceded territory—nor to cede it to any other Power. By this treaty a neutral line of communication across the continent will it is hoped be secured.

The greater fertility of the marriages of Catholics, than those of their Protestant fellow-citizens, is the fact, assumed as indisputable by the Journal de Quebec, and unquestioned by any of the Protestant press, upon which the former bases its arguments—that in the matter of Separate Schools, the Catholic minority of Lower Canada are better treated by the law than are the Protestant minority of the Upper Province. The fact itself we are not inclined to contest; though we deny the inference that our ministerial cotemporary deduces, or pretends to deduce therefrom. Rather would we ascertain to what cause, or causes, is owing the remarkable and universally recognised fact, that "Catholic families are generally more numerous than those of Protestants."

The cause of this difference must be either moral or physical; and the difference itself is conclusive as to either the moral or physical superiority of Catholics over Protestants. We do not pretend—it would be absurd to do so—that Catholics are physically superior to their Protestant fellow-citizens; we must therefore adopt the other hypothesis—that of the moral superiority of the former—as the only possible explanation of the extraordinary difference betwixt the fertility of Catholic and Protestant matrimonial unions—a difference so great and so universal as to justify a distribution of the school funds in that section of the Province wherein Catholics are in the majority; entirely different from that which obtains in the other section, wherein Protestants are the more numerous. We need not pursue the subject further, for it is a very disgusting one. The medical man well knows the reason why Protestant unions are so often barren; and it may yet be fresh in the memories of many of our readers, how, a short time ago, J. M. Ferris, then the editor of one of our leading city Protestant papers—the Montreal Gazette—and now a zealous Protestant member of our

Provincial Legislature, was publicly branded by the verdict of a Grand Jury, for the countenance and encouragement by him given to a filthy itinerant quack; whose mission it was to teach mothers how to destroy their offspring, without danger to themselves, or risk of exposure. Remembering these things, it will not be so very difficult to account for the existence of that extraordinary difference betwixt the fertility of Catholic and Protestant unions. We are much obliged however, to the Journal de Quebec for bringing this fact so prominently forward, and to our Protestant cotemporaries, for their cheerful and unanimous admission of a fact so conclusive as to the superiority of Catholic morality, and the salutary influences of the confessional.

Having thus done justice to the Journal de Quebec upon this point, our cotemporary will not suspect us of being actuated by a captious spirit, if we proceed to take objections to the inference which he thence deduces—that the Catholic minority of Upper Canada are "better treated" by the law in the matter of separate schools, than are the Protestant minority of the Lower section of the Province.

The unfair distribution of the school funds, is but one of the grievances of which the former complain, as our cotemporary must very well know. His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, and other Prelates, have so often given a detailed statement of other hardships to which the Catholic supporters of separate schools in Upper Canada are subjected—that it is impossible that the Journal de Quebec should be unware of their existence. He finds it however more convenient to ignore than to defend them. Hence his very remarkable, if not very honorable silence.

The Catholics of Upper Canada complain of the difficulties that the law throws in the way of establishing separate schools in their section of the Province. And they complain justly; because the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, are not harassed with any such obstacles. In the last named section of the Province—any number whatsoever of inhabitants, professing a faith different from that of the majority, may without more ado, signify their intention to establish one or more separate schools; and may at once, without interference, name any persons they please as Trustees of said separate schools; who thereupon enjoy—in so far as the said separate schools are concerned—the same powers, privileges and responsibilities as do the Trustees or Commissioners of the Common schools. So simple is the process of establishing Protestant separate schools in the Lower Province.—Sec 9th Vict., c. 27.

In Upper Canada, on the contrary, an immense number of petty formalities are required, the neglect of any one of which may vitiate the whole proceedings. In the first place—we quote 18th Vict. c. cxxi—a public meeting must be convened, and that by five heads of families at least; the said heads of families being freeholders or householders resident in the school section, &c.—Sec. 1.

Then the public meeting having been convened, "a majority of the persons present, not being less than ten in number, being free holders or householders" may elect three persons "being British subjects" as Trustees—Sec. 3. But if a separate school be not established under their management within two months from the date of holding such public meeting, then the said election of Trustees shall become void—Sec. XV. So difficult and delicate a task is it to establish Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada.

"Tante molis erat Romanam condere gentem." We ask any one to compare all these tedious, harassing and perfectly unnecessary formalities, with which the Catholic minority of Upper Canada are burdened, with the simple provisions of the Lower Canada school law; and then to say, whether one must not be endowed with the impudence of a highwayman's horse, or of the Journal de Quebec, to assert that the "Catholic minority of Upper Canada, are, in the matter of separate schools, better treated by the law than are the Protestant minority of the Lower Province?" Another burden of which, in a document signed by their Lordships the Bishops of Toronto and of Hamilton, the Catholics of Upper Canada complain—and from which the Protestant supporters of Separate schools in Lower Canada are free, is—the obligation of "maintaining an annual notification; very difficult in a widely settled country, and even in the cities; and which notification is not required from the Protestants of Lower Canada."

Upon this point, we find some excellent remarks in our esteemed cotemporary, the Ottawa Tribune, which we transfer to our columns.—Speaking of the obligation imposed upon every Catholic supporter of separate schools, of notifying the Clerk of the Municipality that he is a Catholic, and a supporter of separate schools—Sec. XIII.—without which notification Catholics, though paying for the support of a Catholic school, are still liable to be taxed for the support of the Protestant school—and which notification is quite unnecessary—our cotemporary observes: "No Catholic is exempt from Common School rates unless he gives this notice. He may be absent from

* No such provision is to be found in the Lower Canada School Law.

home, he may be unable to write, or he may be neglectful. In such case he is taxed to build Protestant school-houses and furnish books full of abuse of the abominations of Popery, or rank with infidelity; and must pay for teachers whose reach it would be contumacious to place his child—Take a large population, such as Toronto, Hamilton, or Kingston, and see the annoyance people are subjected to by this ill-conceived declaration of the law, and when their interest is cared for by some better informed neighbor, it is just probable that the poor man's ear being poisoned by some treacherous neighbors, the friend is likely to be accused of drawing the poor man into difficulty. It is next to impossible to work out the law as it stands in this regard, and there is no necessity for such a provision."

There is no necessity for such a provision; because a certificate from the Trustees of the Catholic separate schools of the Municipality, should suffice to exempt the holder from all taxation for Protestant school purposes. But this process would be too simple; and therefore is it that the law, as it stands at present, requires that the Catholic shall apply to the "Clerk of the Municipality," instead of to the Trustees of his own schools, for his certificate.

Again, the Catholics of Upper Canada protest, and with reason, against the iniquitous provisions of the same twelfth section of the Act of 1855, already quoted, in virtue of which—although supporting their own schools, and building, repairing and furnishing their own school houses and school libraries—they are compelled to pay for the building of Protestant school houses and the support of Protestant libraries, of which course they can make no use. One great object of Mr. Bowes' Bill—which M. Cauchon, and his ministerial colleagues, so prudently smothered—was to apply a remedy to this crying injustice, by exempting supporters of Catholic schools, school houses, and libraries, from taxation for the support of Protestant schools, school houses, and school libraries.

The Journal de Quebec defends this iniquity, and condemns Mr. Bowes' Bill, upon the grounds that the Protestant Trustees would be exposed to great inconvenience, and great risks of error in their accounts, if—trusting to their power to force their Catholic fellow-citizens to contribute towards the school and school houses of the Protestant majority—and if, after having based their calculations upon the above data, and after having contracted for the building and repair of said Protestant school houses—the Catholic minority still had it in their power to throw off the burdens laid upon them by their Protestant task masters. So might the burglar be supposed to complain of the hardship and inconvenience inflicted upon him, if—after having duly supplied himself with crowbars, small saws, centrebits, skeleton keys, and the other implements of his profession—he should find all his anticipated schemes of plunder suddenly frustrated by the timely precautions of the good man into whose house he intended making forcible entry. With just as much show of reason on his side, might the aforesaid burglar demand compensation from his intended victim for the trouble and unnecessary expence to which he had been put, as the Trustees of Protestant schools complain of the inconvenience to which they would be exposed if deprived of their power of taxing their Catholic fellow-citizens for Non-Catholic purposes. The answer however, both to the burglar and the Protestant Trustees, would be—"No right can be founded on a wrong; nor can you claim compensation from us because you have not been allowed to carry your meditated rascality against us into execution." As to the inconvenience and "les incomptes"—to which Protestant Trustees would have been exposed, had Mr. Bowes' Bill passed into law, that might have been easily avoided by the said Trustees. In making their calculations, it would only be necessary for them for the future to take into account the simple fact, that they never had the right to tax Catholics for Non-Catholic purposes; and that no act of theirs, nor of the Legislature, could impose any moral obligation upon Catholics to support Protestant school houses or libraries.

The Catholics of Upper Canada complain also of another impediment thrown in the way of the exercise of their most sacred rights. We give it again in the words of the respected Prelates whom we have already quoted; and who in their published Protest against the present School Law, denounce the injustice of those clauses of the Act, which render "doubtful the right of Catholics to apply their school taxes to the separate school of a neighboring section. "This"—their Lordships continue—"is the most iniquitous clause in the Bill"—(though from the silence of the Journal de Quebec one would suppose that no complaints upon this point had ever been made)—"for by it Catholics about Toronto, Adjala, Guelph, &c., have been taxed twice: once for their own schools, and once for Protestant schools. No such infamy as this is tolerated in regard to the Protestants of Lower Canada."

Many other differences of detail betwixt the Upper and Lower Canada School laws might we notice—and of which the result is invariably to the disadvantage of the Catholic minority of the Upper Province. For instance, in the Lower Province, the Trustees for the Protestant minority are entitled to their share of the government grant in proportion to the number of children of school age belonging to the dissentient inhabitants whom they represent, whether the said children

attend school or not. In the Upper Province, on the contrary by the XIII. section of the Act of 1855, the Trustees of Catholic Separate Schools can share in the government grant in proportion only to the number of children actually attending their schools; and if the average attendance has not been that prescribed by the same clause of the Act, they—the Catholic Trustees aforesaid—cannot receive even one penny of the said government grant. In the same spirit as that which dictated these onerous conditions, is the XIV clause of the Upper Canada School Act concocted. By this clause, semi-annual statements—"which must be verified under oath"—as to the minutest details of the names &c., of the different children attending their schools, are exacted from the Trustees of Catholic schools;—statements of course which it is exceedingly difficult to verify, and any error in which affords a hostile Chief Superintendent the ardent longed for excuse to deprive the Catholic minority of that miserable pittance out of the public purse, which the law nominally awards to them.

We do not pretend to have exhausted the subject; or to have done more than briefly indicate a few of the principal differences betwixt Upper and Lower Canadian legislation upon the School question. We feel that we have but very feebly stated the case of our Catholic brethren in the Upper Province; but we trust that what we have done may afford some explanation of the extraordinary difference between the respective workings of the Upper and Lower School Acts—as exemplified in the statistics quoted by us last week from the "Report of the Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada." By these statistics it was shown that, for a Protestant population of about 143,359 in Lower Canada, there are nearly twice as many separate schools as there are for a Catholic population of 167,696 in the Upper Province. This striking difference we have shown can be easily accounted for, by the difference betwixt the School Laws of the two sections of the Province; and it is of itself, a complete refutation of the Journal de Quebec, and of the miserable sophistries by means of which it seeks to palliate the tergiversation of M. Cauchon and his ministerial colleagues.

THE GLOBE'S LEGIC.—The Globe thus states the case of the claimant of Separate Schools in Upper Canada:—

"Suppose any man, or any body of men, should wait on Col. Tache, and inform him that they conscientiously believed that their house rent ought to be paid out of the public treasury, does anybody believe that that gallant individual would think of hearkening to such demands for an instant? Yet how in principle, is the Separate School system different from this?"—Globe

It is indeed scarcely worth while noticing such twaddle; yet, as it is put forward in the shape of an argument—and as no doubt it is the best argument that Protestants can bring forward against the claim of Catholics for Separate Schools—we will condescend to reply to the question therein propounded. How—asks the Globe—does the demand of the Catholic advocate of the Separate School system differ, in principle, from that of the man who, upon conscientious grounds, should demand to have his house rent paid out of the public treasury? We reply:

If the house rent of the majority of the population were paid out of the public treasury—and if the minority were taxed with the object of paying the said house rent—then most undoubtedly the minority would have the right to insist that their house rent as well, should be paid out of the public purse; and betwixt the assertion of that right, and the demand of the Catholic minority in Upper Canada for Separate Schools, there would be no difference of principle whatever.

The Globe however, in his pretended statement of the case, leaves out of sight the all important fact that the "house rent"—or in other words, that the schooling of the children—of the Protestant majority is paid out of the public treasury, or funds to which the Catholic minority are compelled to contribute, although they can derive no benefit therefrom. They therefore, so long as the "house rent"—or schooling of the children—of the Protestant majority is so paid; though a minority, have the right to demand that their "house rent"—or the schooling of their children,—shall also be paid out of the same funds. Catholics have the right to demand Separate Schools upon these grounds—1st—that the State taxes them for schools—2—that they cannot conscientiously avail themselves of common schools,—and, in the last place—because if the State taxes them for schools at all, it is bound to give to them schools of which they can avail themselves without doing violence to their conscientious convictions—the validity of which convictions again, they alone are the competent judges.

Does the Globe find these conditions hard or exorbitant? Then we say to him, and his friends, grant us the only other alternative—the "Voluntary System," in education as in religion, for the School as for the Church. Under this system, every one will be free to feed, clothe, physic, and educate his own children as he will, without being called upon to feed, clothe, physic, or educate any other man's children; and under it, we can promise him, no Catholic will ask

that his "house rent"—or children's school expenses—be paid out of the public treasury?—

This then is our last word to the Globe, and his brother fanatics. Give us either "Separate Schools," or the "Voluntary System." Either cease altogether to rob us, and cheat us, for the support of your schools of which we do not choose to avail ourselves, and upon which you have no more right to enforce our attendance than you have to compel us to sit under the ministry of that chosen vessel the Reverend Elchanah Goatish—or give us, for the money which you wring from us, money's worth in the shape of schools which we can conscientiously allow our children to attend.

But why, asks the Globe again, should not Anglicans, Mormons, Methodists, and other Protestant sects, be all and each allowed to claim separate schools upon conscientious grounds, as well as Catholics? Why should not the disciples of Wesley, or Joe Smith, demand separate schools for the diffusion of Wesleyanism or Joe Smithism? No reason whatever, we answer, why they should not. On the contrary, if the State taxes them for schools, it is bound to give them such schools, and such schools only as they, the tax payers aforesaid, approve of. If to this the State objects, the only other course left for it to adopt is, to abstain altogether from interfering in the domain of education, as one in which it has no legitimate authority—for, it cannot be too often repeated—neither over education nor religion has the State any legitimate control; and at best, its interference with either is a monstrous usurpation. Perhaps, after all, the course last indicated affords the only possible satisfactory and equitable solution of the "School Question." We do not mean to say that it is the most desirable solution; but still—taking into account the state of parties in the Upper Province, the undisguised efforts made by a brute Protestant majority to tyrannise over a Catholic minority, and the irreconcilable differences betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism—we cannot avoid coming to the conclusion that "Voluntaryism," in education as in religion, is, if not the best system conceivable, the only one practicable, the only one consistent with the principles of strict justice.

The Globe offers however the following as a solution of the difficulty:—

"Let us have one uniform comprehensive secular system of common schools open to all, and fitted for all."

A very pretty solution, but open to this objection that it is impracticable. Schools "fitted" for Protestants, must ipso facto be "unfitted" for Catholics; and the population of Upper Canada is composed, partly of Protestants, and partly of Catholics. Besides, of the question of "fitness," the individual parent of the child, can be the only competent judge. He alone has the right or power to decide what schools are "fitted" for his children; just as to him alone belongs the right of deciding what church is "fitted" for him and his family to attend.

What Mr. G. Brown actually means by a "common school system fitted for all," is, "a system of common schools which, in the opinion of the Protestant majority, shall be "fitted for all";" they, the aforesaid Protestant majority, assuming to themselves the right of setting aside the opinions of the Catholic minority upon this important point. We however do not intend to make this sacrifice of our "right of private judgment." We alone are the competent judges of what is "fitted" for our children; and we do not, and will not, recognise in any body upon earth, except the Church, the existence of any right to tell us what system of education or of religion, is or is not, fitted for us to adopt.

LA BLAGUE—OR THE JOURNAL DE QUEBEC AND "OUR HOLY RELIGION."

We are delighted to find that the independent course adopted by the TRUE WITNESS of Montreal, and the Mirror of Toronto, with respect to our Ministry, has given great offence to the Journal de Quebec. Our Quebec cotemporary, being a servile "gouvernement hack," naturally feels shocked at the plain truths which the above named journals have of late been compelled to address to their Catholic readers; and would rather see the Catholic Church assailed by a hundred sheets such as the Toronto Globe or Montreal Witness, than defended by half a dozen such as the TRUE WITNESS or Toronto Mirror. No doubt of it.

In the eyes of the Journal de Quebec, the proper way of defending the interests of the Church is to sacrifice them to her enemies—to vote, for instance, with the Hon! Mr. Cauchon and his colleagues, in support of such measures as those introduced by Mr. Drummond in his infamous "General Corporations Bill." It is thus that the Journal de Quebec likes to see the interests of Catholicity maintained; because thereby the pecuniary interests of M. Cauchon are secured, and the receipt of his quarterly salary is assured to him.

And now that we are upon the subject, will the Journal de Quebec have the kindness to explain how it is, that it, and the TRUE WITNESS, are at variance upon so many important points, seeing that the last named journal has never, in any one instance, deviated from its original course?