

SUMMARY.

SATURDAY, March 20, 1853. CENTRAL ACADEMY. House in Committee on the Bill to continue a certain Act...

MONDAY, March 22, 1853.

ST. DUNSTON'S COLLEGE. Mr. Clark, Chairman of the Committee of the whole House, on Petition of the Rev. Angus McDonald, for an annual sum...

FISHERY RESERVES' BILL. The Fishery Reserves' Bill was committed to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House, and amended, and agreed to therein.

AND WHEREAS no Grants from the Crown of Townships Nos. 8, 12, 20, 25, 44 and 46, appear on record in this Island...

DEAR SIR,— You tell us that "ignorance is the parent of papal devotion;" (second series, page 86.) How is it, then, that ignorance produced so contrary an effect upon you?

I insist, as you perceive, on determining the state of your intellect at the period of your fall from the faith. Your subsequent acquirement of knowledge and education, I have no wish to question or deny.

First, then, we must leave out the Presbyterian education, which you have acquired since you became an infidel, at the age of eighteen. Secondly, we must leave out the education of the Catholic catechism, which you had forgotten.

And now, forsooth, you "Reasons" for leaving the Church! What reasons? The existence of reasons in such a mind, on such a subject, was a metaphysical impossibility.

But you had, you say, "Common sense." I doubt it. "Common sense" is by no means so common as you seem to imagine. If you take the term to signify the general opinion of the age and country you lived in at the time, it is evident that your renouncing Catholicity, and becoming an infidel, was not, and could not be called, an exercise of "common sense."

I think, sir, that you will admit this reasoning to be conclusive. The premises are your own, the conclusions are logically and fairly deduced. And if so, then it follows that, at the time of your pretended conversion, you had not and could not have had any reason for your change of religion.

which would be so becoming in a minister of religion, and especially one who professes so high a respect for "common sense," and so intimate an acquaintance with his "infidel Bible." Does the Bible warrant such statements as the following? You tell us how the priest used to question you in confession, and how you used to answer him, (page 20.) You complain that he did not speak to you in English, but "in Latin," (same page.)

We have already seen that a "perfect blank as to all religious instruction," The reader will be curious to learn when and how you procured the necessary outfit to cover the mental nudity in which you forsook us, and to appear before the public (as you have appeared in your recent Letters) decked off in the secondhand raiment of Catholic Theology.

Under the influence of this benevolent anticipation, they sent you to college. As your mind was a "perfect blank," of all the Bible, might not the former edifice. The foundations were unobstructed and clear, and the new architects had only to proceed with their work and build you up according to the approved rules of Presbyterian "constructiveness."

And yet, there is nothing in the poverty which caused you to fall into such hands, of which it would not be great weakness, on your part, to be in the least ashamed. If circumstances had not placed you in a false position, I think you would feel proud of the poverty which you inherited from your Irish parents; for it is the most illustrious of titles.

First, then, Catholics believe that the Protestant version does not contain the whole canon of Scripture, because it is defective of some of the books which the ancient councils of the Catholic Church have ever considered as divine.

To these decrees the venerable Fathers of the Universal Church implicitly submitted, and taught their humbler brethren the necessity of yielding their unhesitating obedience to the authority of their Church. The Catholics of the present age are not less tenacious of this authority than their forefathers were.

In stating, in the second place, that the Protestant translation is incorrect, we desire it to be distinctly understood that we mean to say nothing that may be construed hurtful to the feelings of our Protestant brethren; but merely to say that Catholics are convinced that the Protestant authorized version of the Scriptures labors still under many of the defects which were noticed by King James the First, and by many celebrated and learned functionaries of the Establishment since.

Correspondence. (FOR THE EXAMINER.) THE BIBLE QUESTION. We have been far from being disinterested observers of the excitement which has for the last twelve months disturbed the peace of our usually quiet community, and have had an "itching palm" for that moment to arrive, when, not to the passions, but to the reason and candor of intelligent persons, we might calmly, on the subsidence of the storm, offer such observations as might lead them to pronounce a righteous verdict in behalf of a large portion of their fellow-citizens.

But previous to entering on the subject, permit us to remark the dignified position of the Catholic body which has, in this trying case, been allotted to it. While the pulpits and the "sanctified press" of associated opposers were teeming with abuse; while public meetings were called; and the platform resounded with declamation, vituperation and falsehood—Catholics remained peaceful and quiet.

How mendacious must that man be, who can admit that the past was a contest between "Bible" and "No Bible?" How lost to truth and probity he who publicly asserts that Catholics desire the suppression of the sacred Scriptures? and how unworthy of the dignity he, who with the words, "I am an Ambassador of Christ," upon his lips, weaves from two propositions a tissue of calumnies and lies that would dishonor an ambassador of the D—!

We will state the case as in truth it stands, and then to the subject suggested by it. There are three versions purporting to be sacred Scriptures; the Catholic, the Protestant and the Jewish, all of which essentially differ from each other. So important are the points of difference in the view of each denomination, that the Jew will not admit the Catholic version to be genuine Scripture, no more than the Catholic admits the Protestant version, or the latter either of the former.

These are not mere assents or dissents to abstract truths: they are points of conscience, on the strength of which each denomination (right or wrong) rests its hopes for eternity. They are points of conscience which the laws of our country recognize and guarantee to protect in all the Queen's subjects,

so long as they do not violate the enactments of the land. Has the Legislature decided that one of these versions shall take precedence of the others in any of our mixed public schools? It has not; it cannot. It views them all with equal eyes. But a large portion of citizens would have the Protestant version used as a class-book; and because another large portion of citizens will not allow the public mixed schools to become sectarian by the introduction therein of the Protestant version, and the consequent opportunity given to presumptuous pedagogues, and ignorant masters and mistresses to "spound" and "splain" the Scripture lessons according to their respective ways of thinking. Many Protestants declare positively that Catholics wish to do away with the Bible altogether. This is the true "finding" that justifies greater severity than is implied in the words mendacity, calumny and falsehood; but we forbear.

It is not intended here to pursue this branch of the subject, it is connected with so much that is foul, that it might be difficult to restrain emotions and expressions that become not a transcriber of public sentiment. We have, it is hoped, chosen a more useful task, which is to show good and abundant reason why Catholics can never accept of the kindness our friends of the Protector intend for them, by insisting that their children shall assist at the reading of the Protestant version of the Scriptures, and listen to all and every explanation given thereto.

Every age has its own peculiar characteristics. The middle of the nineteenth century is likely to be known to posterity as the age of Quackery. Yet it may be doubted whether, in the medical profession, the quacks are not the best allies of the duly qualified practitioner. With us they are at once a stigma on the profession and the pest of the conscientious educator. Writing they teach in 18 lessons, boys are translating from the Greek and Latin classics, as Johnson once said, into no language at all.

Pay a visit to a second-hand book store; you will find the shelves filled with school and college books. These books, however they may differ as to binding and general dilapidation, present a remarkable uniformity in one particular. While the earlier pages or chapters bear unmistakable evidence of having served the turn of more than one student, the later chapters, generally more than half the entire work, remain in a state of pristine purity. No matter whether the book be Caesar or Xenophon, Virgil or Homer, or even Telemachus or Boileau, the same appearances everywhere present themselves, the first part in tatters, the rest unread. How is this? Quackery on the part of Educators, ignorance on the part of the public.

As soon as boys can construe a few simple sentences in Delectus, they are hurried into Caesar. Just as they are beginning to read this author with advantage, and becoming acquainted with his style and phraseology, that is when they have only read the first two or three books corresponding to chapters in an English history, they are taken to Virgil. Children put to read a Latin Epic Poem before they are able to appreciate, certainly before they have read, the Deserted Village or the Pleasures of Hope. But you know the character of the school must be maintained, and this can only be done by having advanced classes. The majority of parents are content, as their children appear to be making rapid progress. Now I have always set my face against this sort of thing. Instead of encouraging parents to put their children to the study of the Greek and Latin, when even the pupils did not manifest decided talent, or that the means of their parents or their views regarding their children's future calling did not justify a reasonable expectation of their remaining at school till the age of 18 or 19, I have always endeavoured to dissuade the parents from allowing them to begin the classics at all, and to take the French instead. This was to advise them against what the world calls my own interest, for my salary rose and fell with the number who might be studying classics. My motives were probably misunderstood, and by interested parties misrepresented. The manner in which Mr. Murray alludes to Caesar, as being "the only classic work read and supporting competition," is artfully designed to give colour to this misrepresentation. Now as to the question of my own competency. It would be almost as unbecoming in any one to dilate on his own abilities as it is in those who know nothing whatever about them to depreciate them. I shall therefore content myself with remarking, that satisfactory testimonials of my classical acquirements had been placed in the hands of the Trustees before they appointed me Second Master; what then will 13 years of unremitted application and constant practise in teaching effect for a person of my habits? I consider myself, to say the least, as competent to take charge of the Academy as any one who has undertaken it before me. Nay more, I imagine there are few parts of the Empire where my talents would not be rewarded with a higher situation.

The reader is now prepared to enter on the examination of Mr. Murray's remarks. He was, he says, perfectly amazed to find from the newspaper that the first Latin class had proceeded no further than Caesar. Before giving way to his amazement, would it not be acting the part of a sensible man to have enquired the ages of the boys composing that class? How does he know but that for boys of their age to be able to read Caesar, is very respectable progress indeed? Moreover, they have read Caesar (de Bello Gallico) quite through. They can give a written translation of any part of it into grammatical, even into elegant and idiomatic, English. No one will ever have to set up the same defence for them that has been for certain gentlemen who have finished their education.

"An ignorant old fogey of the clergy told me in discussion, 'a few days ago, that he considered it the height of presumption in me to think I could criticise the productions of men who were good classical scholars—that they were not to be considered subject to our common rules of grammar, &c. Strange, indeed, if a knowledge of the classics can become a substitute for common sense and correct writing.'"—Letter of a Free Churchman.

The same class has this year entered Virgil. They can appreciate the style, and, to some extent, even relish the beauties of that elegant poet. They have in fact as good a knowledge of the language as many boys who are reading, or endeavouring to read, Livy or Juvenal. They can most of them solve a quadratic equation—are not ignorant of geometry—and some of them have advanced as far as analytical Trigonometry. They are thus in a position to enter on the study of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy with advantage. They are even making acquaintance with the use of instruments. At the present time they are able to compute such a weekly almanac as that published in the Islander, and which must prove of great service in regulating the time in country places. But motives higher than mere utility prompt me to push them forward in this direction. Astronomy, the most sublime as well as the most precise of the physical sciences, requires a rare combination of mechanical, mathematical and optical skill. Accordingly, quackery can find no shelter within its precincts. But there is a misty region beyond, where science ends and speculation begins, where every thing is hazy and indistinct as a vision of the night. Here is a most tempting field for persons with a little learning. They are to be found there in hundreds, most of them spor-

Excuse me, gentlemen, but I said nothing of the kind. What I did say is as follows:—"The rev. gentleman himself seems to have had some misgivings as to the validity of these objections, (namely those against the efficiency of the Academy,) and seeks to entrench himself behind others. 'But, sir,' he continues, 'it is necessary that a college should be established for other reasons, and one of these is—to meet the gigantic schemes which Popery has proposed for the overthrow of Protestantism, and the establishment of its unalloyed principles in this Island!' These gigantic schemes are like other giants, purely imaginary. They have been called into existence to serve a purpose. That purpose it is difficult to divine, unless it be to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights, as recently shadowed forth in the Protector."

Let the reader compare the foregoing with what I am made to say in the former quotation, and then find me, if he can, amid the political controversy, with which our Island press abounds, a more palpable misrepresentation. Attributing to Catholics, or as he himself calls it, Popery, schemes which

gentlemen,—Before proceeding to redeem my promise of reviewing Mr. Murray's speech, allow me to come to an understanding with you on a matter that more nearly concerns yourselves. In the introductory remarks with which you preface my letter you say:—"While we willingly give insertion to the following letter we must take exception to one passage which says: It is difficult to divine the purpose for which Messrs. Lockhead and Murray have spoken against the Academy, unless it be to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights, as recently shadowed forth in the Protector."

Excuse me, gentlemen, but I said nothing of the kind. What I did say is as follows:—"The rev. gentleman himself seems to have had some misgivings as to the validity of these objections, (namely those against the efficiency of the Academy,) and seeks to entrench himself behind others. 'But, sir,' he continues, 'it is necessary that a college should be established for other reasons, and one of these is—to meet the gigantic schemes which Popery has proposed for the overthrow of Protestantism, and the establishment of its unalloyed principles in this Island!' These gigantic schemes are like other giants, purely imaginary. They have been called into existence to serve a purpose. That purpose it is difficult to divine, unless it be to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights, as recently shadowed forth in the Protector."

Let the reader compare the foregoing with what I am made to say in the former quotation, and then find me, if he can, amid the political controversy, with which our Island press abounds, a more palpable misrepresentation. Attributing to Catholics, or as he himself calls it, Popery, schemes which

gentlemen,—Before proceeding to redeem my promise of reviewing Mr. Murray's speech, allow me to come to an understanding with you on a matter that more nearly concerns yourselves. In the introductory remarks with which you preface my letter you say:—"While we willingly give insertion to the following letter we must take exception to one passage which says: It is difficult to divine the purpose for which Messrs. Lockhead and Murray have spoken against the Academy, unless it be to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights, as recently shadowed forth in the Protector."