

Church, either nominating, or in globo. To assert, therefore, that because Hume's and Gibbon's histories are not in the Index Expurgatorius, they ought not to be objected to by me, betrays an ignorance, which was not to be expected from one who has obtained the pre-eminence of Doctor. Had he opened his eyes to the light of common sense, he would have understood that the Church is unable to place on the Index, even the hundredth thousandth part of evil books, which are daily issuing forth from an infidel press. As well might Dr. Ryerson say, that the obscene and filthy pamphlets which are hourly handed about on the streets, and steamboats, should all be placed on the Index. By the same rule it would follow that the *Globe* must be a very correct vehicle of truth, and contains nothing but what is proper, and fit to be read by a decent female, since this wretched sheet is not in the Index Expurgatorius. I avail myself of this opportunity to inform his reverence that he is mistaken in regard to Hume and Gibbon. One of them is in the Index. That both are in his catalogue, I presume, the Doctor can have no doubt now. Shame on the corruptor of youth, who places in their hands the poison of infidelity and skepticism!

5. In order to enable the public to judge of the character of Rev. Dr. Ryerson's Libraries, I will add that bad as the catalogue is which contains not over twenty Catholic works, these Public Libraries, got up under the superintendence of a Methodist Minister, particularly those out in the country, are still worse. Since the beginning of this controversy, friends of mine in the country, have called at some of these Public Libraries, asking for Catholic books mentioned in the catalogue. Those books were not there. Whether they were not on the shelves of the Libraries, which is more probable, the fact is, they could not be had. As a general rule, there are none but Protestant works in the Libraries of Dr. Ryerson.

In connection with the above statement, I beg leave to add the following remarks. Of the scheme of Public Libraries got up by the Chief Superintendent of Education, we may say what is daily repeated about Common Schools. They do not suit our community; they are not adapted to its instincts and wants. We are living in a community composed of a thousand shades and shapes. Books to the liking and taste of Protestants will not be relished by Catholics, and vice versa, Catholics will not, as a general rule, look into Protestant shelves for mental food. They know from experience that these productions of Protestant writers, what they hold most sacred is misrepresented and ridiculed. Nor will Protestants, as a general rule, go to Catholic Libraries when they seek for reading matter. Dr. Ryerson should know that Catholics have no more faith in Protestant Libraries, made up of Protestant books, under Protestant agency, than Protestants have in our own Libraries. I repeat again, in the divided state of Christendom, particularly in Upper Canada, Common Libraries for both Protestants and Catholics are an impossibility. There is, therefore, but one alternative. Let every denomination get up their own Libraries, and purchase books adapted to their own choice and taste. Catholics will never ask, for their own private use a cent out of the funds destined for general purposes. They would consider it the greatest injustice to divert to their own exclusive use what the unanimous voice of the nation has declared to be the common stock, the property alike of Protestants and Catholics. Let me ask of the Chief Superintendent of Education to condescend to take from a Catholic Priest lessons of justice and equity. Let him listen to the voice of an obscure member of the Church of Rome, reminding him of the golden rule once imprinted on his mind by the finger of his Creator, but which has been obliterated by religious prejudices and hatred of his fellow Christians. "Do unto others as you would wish to be done by." Such is our rule, such are the principles which should guide and direct every Christian, whose mind is not poisoned by Ryersonian doctrine. I will add, the scheme of Public Libraries, like that of Common Schools, having been weighed in the scale, has been found wanting. The tree has borne its fruit; they have proved most bitter to the taste. I am informed on good authority, that lately in several localities, Protestants, in a spirit of conciliation towards Catholics, their fellow Christians, have already sold out their Public Libraries, judging wisely that these Ryersonian contrivances do not meet the present wants and taste of our community. This has a great source of discord been taken from their midst. It is to be hoped that before long all Upper Canada, animated by similar feelings, will come to the same conclusion, and scatter to the wind the great humbug of Dr. Ryerson, viz: his Public Libraries, and substitute in their place Private Libraries, better adapted to the liking of each denomination.

6. I come to the fourth charge preferred against me by the Chief Superintendent of Education. I am accused by him of having stated "that in the Common School system, Christianity was not recognized—that the schools were Godless and infidel, and that he (Dr. Ryerson) was employing every means in his power to injure and destroy the Roman Catholic Church." Before I answer the charge, I beg to state that the infidel character of Dr. Ryerson's schools, is not the only objection we have to them. We object to them likewise, on the ground that the books used in them. Schools are not fit to be placed in the hand of a Catholic child, nor of anybody else. Indeed, there is not a single text-book, even on natural sciences, arts, civil polity, political economy, or any branch of natural history and human industry, there is not a single Protestant production of taste, literature and imagination, that contains more or less that is offensive to Catholics. In proof of what I advance, I will make a few extracts from some of the text books taught in Dr. Ryerson's schools. White's Universal History, one I believe, of his standard works in the Grammar Schools, stands prominent among objectionable text books. Almost every page of his modern history, especially when it relates to Catholic nations or the Catholic Church, exhibits instances of bigotry and scandalous perversion of truth. For instance, under the head "The Church," the student in history will read, "Many circumstances seem to have contributed to the great ecclesiastical revolution which distinguished this century. The introduction of inane worship had been strenuously resisted." The above, besides being a falsehood, is a direct insult offered to Catholics as rational beings. Again, in a chapter headed "Luther," "The immediate cause of the Reformation was the gross abuse of indulgences. In 1517, a sale of indulgences was proclaimed as the most effectual means of replenishing his (Leo XII.) treasury. By these, absolution was given for future sins, as well as for past; and they were converted into licenses for violating the most sacred obligations." On the subject of the Council of Trent, the following, among other passages, occurs. "Among the articles decreed by this Council to be implicitly believed are:—The efficacy of the clergy, confession and absolution, the worship of images and relics; the intercession of saints, the adoration and immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary." Be hold, reader, how history is taught in Dr. Ryerson's schools. In a book styled "Lectures on Botany," in Lecture 39, under the title "Superstitions with regard to the blossoming of plants," the reader will meet with the following passage: "In the Romish Church, many superstitions exist with regard to certain plants which happen to blossom about the time of some saint's days. In Italy and other countries in the South of Europe, where these superstitions first originated, the dead nettle being in blossom about the time of St. Vincent's day, a martyr who suffered for Christianity under the Emperor Diocletian, in the year 304, the flower is consecrated to him. The Winter Heliolebe is usually in blossom about the time of the Conversion of St. Paul, supposed to be in commemoration of that event." Again, "The Crown Imperial blossoms in England about the 8th of March, the day of St. Edward,

King of the West-Saxons; nature thus as was imagined, honoring the day with a royal flower. It was during the middle ages, when the minds of men were influenced by the blindest superstition; that they thus imagined every operation of nature to be emblematical of some thing connected with their religious faith." I omit several other passages, reflecting particularly upon superstitious monks and nuns who were, says the lecturer, the authors of these conceits. Thus when Catholic children will expect to read a lecture on Botany and Flowers, they will be treated to a lecture on superstitious monks and nuns. The text book which contains these extracts is fresh from Dr. Ryerson's libraries. I open another standard work lately from the shelves of the Normal School, it is called: "Recreations in Science and Natural Philosophy." Now, who would expect bigotry and prejudices in Natural Philosophy? Such is, however, the case. In a section of the work, headed "Amusing Problems," the following is found:—"A certain convent consisted of nine cells, one of which, in the middle, was occupied by a blind Abbess, and the rest by her nuns. The good Abbess to assure herself that the nuns did not violate their vows, visited all the cells, and finding three nuns in each, which made nine in every row, retired to rest. Four nuns, however, went out, and the Abbess returning at midnight to count them, still found nine in each row, and therefore retired as before. The four nuns then came back, each with a gallant, and the Abbess, on paying them another visit, having again counted nine persons in each row, entertained no suspicion of what had taken place. But four more men were introduced, and the Abbess again counting nine persons in each row, retired in the full persuasion that no one had either gone out or come in. How was all this possible?" I leave the solution of the above problem to Dr. Ryerson and his pupils. If there is any impropriety in publishing such scandalous trash, let the blame be fastened on the brow of those who thus attempt to pervert the mind and corrupt the hearts of unsuspecting youth. Such are the Christian principles and feelings, in the highest and largest sense, which according to Dr. Ryerson, pervade the text books used in his schools.

I return now to the charge preferred against me by the Chief Superintendent of Education, viz: my stating that in the Common School System Christianity was not recognized, that the schools were Godless and infidel, and that Dr. Ryerson was employing every means to injure and destroy the Roman Catholic Church. In answer to the above, I will say that I plead guilty to every one of these charges. With the presumed permission of His Reverence I repeat again what I have already stated on a former occasion, on the same subject. The Common School System, built with Catholic as well as Protestant money, are houses of education from which Religion is banished, where the elements of Christianity cannot be inculcated to the rising youth, where the child of Christian parents must be taught practically that all religious systems are equally pleasing, or rather equally indifferent, in the sight of God, he a believer in the immutable decrees of eternal reprobation, or a follower of the impostor Joe Smith. Our Common School System is but an importation from Yankee Land, where it has already brought forth its bitter fruits, Deism, irreligion, infidelity, Know-Nothingism. Now, what do our Republican neighbors think of their once boasted Common School System? In looking over various statistics and reports of Prison inspectors on the other side of the line, we are struck at the unanimous opinion we meet with, that godless education, that is, mental training, apart from moral and religious instruction, and an increase of crime are co-existing facts. In New York City, where Common School education, next to Massachusetts, has obtained its greatest perfection, Justice Conolly, who last year sat upon the Maine Criminal Bench, reported that for the nine months preceding October 1st, he had himself disposed of nine thousand three hundred and forty two cases, or an average of forty cases daily; excepting Sundays. The Prison inspectors of New Jersey made last January, 1856, the following Report to the State Legislature: "We regret to have to say that we are of opinion that the violation of law by the commission of crime is largely on the increase in our State, and as a natural consequence our penitentiary is full to overflowing." It must be remembered that no State in the Union has made greater efforts for the diffusion of Common School education than New Jersey.

In a meeting held last year in the city of New York, and composed of Professors of colleges, Professor Greenleaf said he knew of thirteen young men who came from one school, and every one of them had rushed headlong into destruction. The same speaker said that one of the teachers had made to him the following declaration: "I think I must change my system of teaching; I think I ought to give a little more moral instruction, for already two of my scholars have been hung for murder." Education has been made a matter of State policy in Prussia, and every child is, by the compulsion of the Government, sent to school, and yet we are told that crime is increasing there at a frightful rate. The criminal returns of Great Britain and Ireland, for the last twenty years, demonstrate that the educated criminals are to the uneducated as two to one. In Scotland the educated criminals are about four times the uneducated. Nay, what is still more remarkable, while the number of uneducated criminals, especially in Scotland, is yearly diminishing, that of educated ones is yearly increasing. I gather the above facts from a little pamphlet published by a Protestant Clergyman, styled, "Does the Common School system of the United States prevent Crime?" I regret that the length of this letter prevents me from laying before the public more than the following extract:—"While the intellect is so sharpened and informed, (in the Common Schools) the moral powers are suffered to stumber and dwarf. The multitudes who have left school, so ready in figures, so skilful with the pen, so well instructed in the anatomy of their own bodies and the mechanism of a steam engine, go forth into the world ignorant even of the ten commandments and the Lord's Prayer, with an unimpaired and slumbering conscience, with impure and enlarged, but unguided desires."

It will not, as Dr. Ryerson does, to assert that on the State or School System devolves the duty of forming the child's mind, reserving to the parent and pastor the supreme control as to its religious instruction. In answer to this frivolous and specious objection, my authority goes on saying, "If we could but be assured that the multitudes of the young were receiving a moral training, any where outside of the school room, at home, or at Church, it would somewhat extenuate the enormity which is now perpetrated. But the lamentable fact is, that five-sixths of the homes of the land are irreligious, five-sixths of the parents of America do not even attend any place of public worship, and are therefore, of course unqualified to give a moral and religious instruction to their offspring." "Ought not," adds the same authority, "this charming host, who are so unprovided for, both at home, and at church, in their daily school instruction be made to receive some adequate moral and religious training? But the popular Common School system provides only for the communication of secular knowledge. Now is it to be believed that such a system tends to the glory of God, to the security of human life and property, or to the prevention of crime in general?" From the above fearful facts and many others which I am compelled to omit, the Protestant writer of the pamphlet above named concludes by saying: "Yet let us not be misunderstood. We have not affirmed that education causes crime. We merely affirm that the two are co-existing facts; and that the system of Common School education is attended with an increase of crime, because it is the education of only one side of human nature, and that not the controlling side. Man's moral and religious nature constitutes this other and better, but undeveloped half." Such is the ground on which we also object to the Common School System. Dr. Ryerson's Schools are identical with the godless Schools,

on the other side of the line, where they have produced the most lamentable results. The Chief Superintendent himself has confessed that they were formed on the plan of the celebrated Massachusetts Schools.

Let us see what title they have to our gratitude in Toronto; what they have accomplished; their present condition and future prospect. What are our Common Schools doing in this city? I beg to lay before the public the following extract from a Protestant Correspondent of the *Catholic Citizen* in a series of letters addressed by him to the Hon. John A. Macdonald. The last letter shows that the number of children of school age, in the city, (Toronto) is 8,884. And by Mr. Barber's Report for 1855, the average attendance in all the city free schools, was 1,570. The fact is officially recorded that in a population of 8,884 children of school age, only 1,570 is the average daily attendance. Let us turn to the cost of supporting schools for the daily instruction of 1,570 children. The whole cost for the year 1855, including teachers' salaries, maps, and apparatus, rents and repairs of school-houses, school-books, stationery, fuel and other expenses, including also the interest at 6 per cent., is put down at £7,093 12s. 10d. The cost, then, says the correspondent, of a daily attendance of 1,570 children in the Free Common Schools of Toronto is, £4 10s. 4d. per head, for the year 1855. Thus, for the education of Dr. Ryerson's pupils (who seldom fail to insult a priest, when they have an opportunity) the city of Toronto has to pay "four pounds ten shillings and four pence" per head. I have said enough, I trust, to convince every sensible man that the whole machinery of the Chief Superintendent of Education, Common Schools and Public Libraries, are a humbug or grand imposition.

1. If with this enormous amount of money expended in supporting what I will not hesitate to call a gigantic imposition, profitable only to those immediately engaged in its management, some desirable result could be obtained, our citizens might, perhaps, submit in silence to this obnoxious burden. But, let me ask, what are the fruits of our boasted School machinery? Has education, after the Ryerson fashion, prevented crime? The statistics recently published show that in a city numbering, according to the last census, 42,000 souls, the number of arrests made by the police during the past year, amount to 5,250, against 3,295 in 1855. His Honor Judge Hargry, in his late charge to the Grand Jury at the opening of the Toronto City Assizes, was struck at the alarming number of juvenile offenders, and remarked: "We may naturally ask how such a crop of young criminals can arise in this land, boasting as it does of an extended system of Free Schools, supported by munificent assessments on the whole property of the country. I fear the educational statistics of this city can too readily afford an answer." Again let me ask, does not this unpleasant and unwholesome state of society, convince every sensible man, that here, as in the neighbouring Republic, modern education, divorced from religion, and an increase of crime, are co-existing facts?

In presence of the above alarming facts, it becomes the duty of every man, every Christian and citizen, to examine where the evil lies. The able editor of the *Toronto Times*, has on this subject the following sensible remarks:—"If the present school system has been tried and found wanting, let us not waste time, that is most precious, in trying it again. Let us not be frightened by the cry of secularism from doing our duty to the rising generation. That something should be done for them without delay, cannot be doubted by any one who knows anything of the youth of this most moral and well educated city." Next follows a gloomy picture drawn by this earnest and honest citizen, of the alarming condition of the youth in the city of Toronto. That something should be done for the rising generation is no longer doubted; that the present school system cannot, will not rescue it from the frightful abyss it is rushing into, cannot be questioned, except by those whose pecuniary interest is closely connected with the grand imposture. What then should be done for that interesting portion of our community? What should all true Christians do for the noble cause of education? If I may be permitted to express my humble opinion, I will attempt to give a solution to this perplexing problem. Let us return to the course pointed out by venerable antiquity, and the experience of all ages. Let us listen to the voice of wisdom and patriotism. Washington's dying injunction was, "Never allow education to be divorced from religion." The separation of religion from secular instruction, says the author of the pamphlet already cited, is altogether a novel proceeding. "This divorcement of religion from education was unknown to our fathers."

Since both reason and experience teach that religion and secular education ought always to go hand in hand, the question arises, how shall this be accomplished? We are living in a community divided into various and large religious bodies. Catholics, members of the Church of England, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Christians of every name. When children of those numerous Christian denominations are assembled together to receive instruction, shall a Catholic priest present himself to teach his catechism? Shall a minister of the Church of England undertake the task? Shall a Methodist preacher offer his services? Or shall a Presbyterian Minister be preferred? All these various religious denominations have their conscientious convictions which cannot be trifled with: they have their creed which must be respected. What shall we do? Let us all adopt the scheme which I have proposed for Public Libraries. Let every religious denomination have its own school. Let religious instruction along with secular knowledge be daily given to the anxious youth. Let the Government extend to all denominations its parental patronage, and bestow on all an allowance proportionate to the daily attendance. Then, and then only shall peace and harmony reign again in our community; then only shall we have a moral youth, a promising generation. I hope Dr. Ryerson will now understand why I object to his Common School System.

In spite of the most convincing evidence, Dr. Ryerson seems to be determined never to retract a wrong step once taken, or retract an untruth however palpable. I presume, His Reverence acts up to the doctrine ascribed by him to *The Leader*, but put in practice by himself. "A lie once told should be stuck to." Without a blush, I fear, he repeats again that Bishops Power and Macdonnell did not entertain the same views on the subject of the Separate versus the Common Schools. I laid before him a letter from the Honorable John Elmsley of Toronto, in which that gentleman stated most distinctly that his Lordship Bishop Power did "him the honor to confide in his charge a large share in the working of the Catholic Separate Schools; and that he was an energetic advocate and supporter of Catholic Separate Schools, and most resolutely opposed to mixed." To this what does Dr. Ryerson answer? Not one word. Of course it is easier to attest than to prove, more convenient to abuse than to refute a man. I am mistaken: excuse me, reader. Behold Dr. Ryerson's answer. "After his decease, Bishop Power was outlived by me, (Dr. Ryerson) in a public and published address." A conclusive logic this, very much so.

8. The Chief Superintendent of Education has asserted in his first communication that the Roman Catholic children who have been taught in the mixed schools, are as good Roman Catholics, as those who had been or are taught in the Separate Schools. Against his assertion I protested most emphatically, and informed him at once, that we could easily afford to give them up to him, since they are, as a general rule, as Catholic and as Protestant as himself. Whereupon, taking me up to my word, the good Doctor exclaimed in an ecstasy of joy: "I will cheerfully accept the charge, and treat this large class of my fellow-citizens with the same consideration and solicitude that I have always shown for their welfare as well as for their rights." I repeat again to Dr. Ryerson: he is welcome to them, he may hug them to his bosom till doomsday. But I cannot allow the following bold assertion connected with the same subject to pass unnoticed. "Now," says His Reverence, "as the

Separate Schools are only recent and few and far between in Upper Canada, it follows that nineteen-twentieths, if not ninety hundredths, of the Roman Catholics who have received any education in Upper Canada, have received it in the mixed schools." Allow me to say, dear Doctor, with all due respect to your character, his satanic majesty would blush at such palpable falsehood. If the Separate Schools in their present form are only recent, they have always existed *de facto*, whenever a Catholic settlement warranted the establishment of one. The Separate Schools in those days were only few and far between in Upper Canada, because Catholics themselves were few and far between. Does not Dr. Ryerson himself know that in the very days of Bishop Macdonnell whom he represents as being in favor of Common School Education, this saintly Prelate went all the way to England purposely to get Catholic Teachers, and brought over four of them, and placed them where there was sufficient population to require their services? Does he not know that St. Raphael, in Glangarry, Alexander also in Glangarry, St. Andrew in the County of Stormont, and Perth in the County of Lanark, had Catholic teachers, Catholic Separate Schools *de facto*, long before the present Separate School Act was thought of. Is he not aware that a Catholic College for the higher branches of education, was established at St. Raphaels, by the same venerable bishop, Dr. Macdonnell, so favorable to common education, if we are to give credit to the Chief Superintendent of Common Schools in Upper Canada? Nineteen hundredths of the Roman Catholics, says Ryerson, who have received any education in Upper Canada, have received it in the mixed schools. An angel would shed tears at such a shameful perversion of truth, and utter absence of candor. Let me, in turn, ask Dr. Ryerson, how long it is since the present Common School System has existed. How could Catholics be educated in schools which had no existence at the time? There were indeed, in those early days, Public Schools to which the youth of the vicinity resorted; but infidel Ryerson schools they were not. When will the light of common sense shine upon the Doctor's obtuse mind and give him to understand that I am speaking of his own common school system, his own godless and infidel schools, where Christianity is practically ignored; in a word, his State Schools, but a few years since imported into our midst from Yankee land, the land of Know-Nothingism? I hope, if the Doctor is not too far advanced in years, he will set himself to work and study the history of his own native land, and dwell particularly on dates and facts connected with education. I feel great delicacy, myself an infusion of a new foreign element, in being obliged to teach Canadian History to the great native of Canada, Dr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education.

9. With the theory of Dr. Ryerson, viz: that to the State and not to the parent the child belongs, I have nothing to do: nor, I believe, any sensible man in Canada. The question having long been settled by the greatest geniuses, the most profound philosophers and statesmen of Europe, particularly of France it has become a village doctor, but yesterday a shouting Methodist preacher, to set up his theory in opposition to the wisdom and learning of the rest of the world. I will merely remind him again that we are living in a Christian country not among the pagan Spartans from whom he has borrowed his senseless scheme fit only for the inhabitants of the moon. We poor benighted Catholics have been taught that on our parents devolves the duty of educating, as well as feeding, and clothing the child. The State will have sufficiently done its part, by enabling the parent to procure for his child such an education as he deems proper.

Before I conclude this already too long letter, I beg to submit to the public whether the course pursued by Dr. Ryerson towards Bishop De Charbonnell, now absent from this country, and myself personally, is calculated to give him much credit. I have raised my voice in the name of the whole Catholic body to protest against the injustice perpetrated by the Chief Superintendent of Education in demanding the application of the Clergy Reserve Funds, solely for the use of his own Schools and Libraries, from which a large portion of this community can derive no advantage at all. Instead of answering me in a fair and impartial discussion, or what would have been more prudent for him, instead of remaining silent, he chooses to brand me with the opprobrious appellation time repeated, of an *infusion of a new foreign element*. Had Dr. Ryerson kept silence, we would have proceeded with our own Separate Schools, hampered as they are with odious restrictions and illiberal provisions. When I remonstrate against his reverence, at the time that he is attempting to destroy them by giving to his Schools an overwhelming superiority over our own Separate Schools, I am met with a long discussion on the right of the State to educate the child followed with the usual amount of ribaldry about *conscientious convictions manufactured to order*. When I give my reasons why we cannot allow our children to go to Dr. Ryerson's Schools, I am treated to a lecture on the "Jeharthy and enslavement of the human mind during the 'Dark Ages'." When I prove to him that almost every book in his libraries contains doctrines or facts hostile to Catholics who consequently cannot derive any benefit from them, the Chief Superintendent of Education accuses me of *aiming at, controlling or destroying every man and every institution in the land*. When I expatiate in the name of 1,500,000 Catholics on the injustice of laying his rapacious hand on the Clergy Reserve Fund, and thus depriving them of their just share of the common property, I am abruptly told by His Reverence; *hush! you are a foreigner*. I appeal to a just and impartial public, are Catholics bound to suffer themselves to be robbed by Dr. Ryerson, without the power of uttering a word of complaint, or expressing their grievance? Is it just; is it fair to place into the hands of a Methodist preacher the immense resources wrested from the Church of England by an act of the Provincial Parliament? Will the French Canadians, also a *new foreign element in this country*, thank Dr. Ryerson for the opprobrious epithets so recklessly flung in their face? Will they sympathize with him when he pours his vial of ridicule upon their Chief Pastors and Priests? What will the Government say when they see their Official and servant, extend the right hand of friendship to the Organ of the Clergy Grits, the perpetual reviler of the present Administration? On the other hand, what estimate must the Clergy Grits form of the Chief Superintendent, a man to day a Tory, to-morrow a Reformer, but ever ready to sell himself to whomsoever is willing to pay him well?

In conclusion I will say: were I as sensitive as my antagonist, I might complain of the unfair treatment I meet with at the hands of a certain portion of the press, which comments upon my letters without publishing them; or publishes Dr. Ryerson's personal diatribes, without allowing the public to see the other side of the question.

Hoping that the public will bear with me, and judge between the perpetual assailant of Catholics and myself, I submit the above rejoinder to their sense of justice and fair-play subscribing myself,

Their most obedient servant,

of the Chief of Police, and from which all mention of religious credence has been advisedly excluded, he hazards the impudent and lying statement, that "to them (the R. Catholics) is attributable a very large proportion of the disorder and crime which disgrace our city." If the Report had made any mention of the creed of the persons arrested, or if there were any means of ascertaining the fact, the assertion might carry some weight with it. But so far from this being the case, I may state, on the authority of Mr. Sherwood himself, that no offender is ever asked what Church he goes to, or what religion he professes to believe. And in order that such a malicious libel on the most law-preserving order of our citizens may not go unrebuked, Mr. Sherwood, who is himself a High Church Protestant, has authorized me to remark, that of the 4,897 arrests for the past year, as far as he has been able to judge, the Catholic body have not borne more than a fair proportion. I feel confident that the lover of truth, of whatever denomination, will accept this testimony of the Chief of Police, as conclusive when compared with that of the irresponsible penny-a-liner referred to.

"Asterisk"—for by that name I must call him, since he has refused to affix a more definite signature to his productions—has made a false representation, when he says that the great mass of those criminals he designates Protestants, "never were in any communion with any Protestant church." They are just as zealous upholders of "broad Protestant principles" as himself; and have just as much right to be considered Protestants as their fellows in crime have to be considered Catholics; perhaps more so, since the latter will very seldom bear the test of the Council of Trent: while the former labor under no similar disadvantage. But it is in his figures that "Asterisk" displays the full extent of his ignorance of the matter he has undertaken to treat.

He puts down, from want of information, the number of persons committed, as 4,897; while, as may be found on reference to the Statistical Report which I have now before me, this is merely the number *summed, or brought up, before the Police Magistrate!* There were but 805 persons committed to jail during the past year; 727 of whom come under the list of "Remanded, or Postponed" leaving 3,365—considerably more than the quota he has generously appropriated to the Irish column—who were dismissed with a reprimand, a slight fine, or who were acquitted of the charges brought against them. The criminal statistics proper, therefore, of the City of Toronto, show 805, and not 4,897, persons punished by imprisonment in the common jail: yet this injudicious and careless scribbler places the list of offenders from the "lower orders of the Irish Roman Catholics," at 3,000!

The assertion that the vast bulk of the lower orders of the Irish in Toronto are "Roman Catholics" is false. The assertion that 3,000 out of the 3,535 natives of Ireland are "Roman Catholics," is equally false. The assertion that "Roman Catholic criminals" are twice as many in proportion to the population, as Protestant ones, is also false. There is not a particle of truth in either of these assertions. They are made at random, and without the least regard to their correctness. As no religious statistics are kept by the Chief of Police, they could not be otherwise.

If any man wishes to prove the fallacy of the first assertion, he has only to visit the buildings, the cart and cab stands, and the taverns of this city. In the former of these he will see the Irish Protestant element predominate, in the shape of laborers, bricklayers, carpenters, and masons, who, wherever they are Irishmen, are in a majority of instances, Irish Orangemen, or Irish Presbyterians. And as to the taverns, five-sixths of which are kept by Protestants, about one-half of them are the regular meeting-rooms of Orange Lodges. The man who could make such an assertion as this has surely forgotten the Orange-rowdy population of St. John's Ward, St. Patrick's Ward, and the Irish Orange rioters who broke up the polling in St. David's Ward on a recent occasion—as also the whiskey battalions of St. James' Ward, who, every Municipal Election, in common with the Irish Orangemen of the other Wards, prevent every peaceable and respectable man from taking part in the election. The fact is, one-half the fighting and rioting of Toronto is done by the Orangemen, who have received of late a strong admixture of the Scotch element, but do not seem to grow a whit more orderly for that. The Irish Protestant population of Toronto are much more numerous than the Irish Catholics; and if "Asterisk" wishes to get at the religious credence of the city offenders through the medium of their nationality, he must take this as a criterion by which to compile his table. Pursuing this, which is the only possible basis consistent with common sense, we have 1,535 Irish Catholic arrests, and the balance, 2,000 Irish Protestants. Building further upon this superstructure, and pursuing "Asterisk's" own principle of appropriating England, and Scotland, and Canada, to Protestantism, (in which in this point he is not far wrong), we have—not committed to the Toronto Jail during 1856—

Nominal Catholics, 1535
Protestants—i.e., individuals "appro-

testing" against Catholicism, 2300
And this proportion, considering that Catholics are about one-third the population of Toronto, and that they are in numerous instances recent settlers, is not surely "a very large contribution to the disorder and crime of our city." This, however, does not cover the real matter in dispute, concerning the *criminality* of the Irish Catholics. The statistics are merely arrests or accusations—the convictions are the test of immorality. Of these, notwithstanding the Protestant Courts and Police force, and the almost universal exclusion of Catholics from juries, the Protestant creed has the vast majority. During the past year, we have had nine trials for murder, at only one of which the accused was a Catholic, and he was acquitted: the rest were Protestants. Amongst the arrests for horse stealing, there is not a single Irish Catholic name; and, with but slight modification, the same may be said of robbery, larceny, and thieving of every description—the only cases in which the Irish Catholic names rise to a fair quota, being those of threatening or assault. In all those offences which are recognised by the laws of the land, and by the common sense of mankind, as detestable and felonious crimes, the criminals are Protestants, with a few remarkable exceptions, produced by unfortunate family broils, and an occasional railroad riot.

"Asterisk's" fling at the Irish nationality, is utterly contemptible. The Irish population of Toronto outnumber the English and Scotch about 5 to 1. Nay more, they are eight one-third of the whole people.—Yet the Irish offenders are 25 per cent. of the Irish population; while the English offenders are 333—the Scotch being somewhere about 20.

So much for a statistician, who would make every Irish Orange criminal a Catholic, and who would make every man who happened to get into the Station-house over night, a rascal of the deepest dye.

P.

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY'S
COURSE OF LECTURES.

MR. EDWARD MURPHY
WILL DELIVER the Fourth LECTURE of the Course in ST. PATRICK'S HALL, on
MONDAY, THE 16th INSTANT.

SUBJECT:
"THE MICROSCOPE & ITS REVELATIONS."
This Lecture will be illustrated by an extensive Collection of curious and interesting objects from Natural History, by means of a powerful Lucerna Microscope; and will be closed with an exhibition of DISSOLVING VIEWS.

Toronto, January 27th 1857.
MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE MONTREAL
WITNESS TORONTO CORRESPONDENT.
To the Editor of the True Witness.
Toronto, Jan. 30, 1857.

Sir—Though feeling a considerable degree of delicacy, arising from self-respect, and noticing anything from the pen of an authority so questionable as a correspondent of the *Montreal Witness*, I cannot nevertheless, let a tissue of his misrepresentations contained in the last number, pass without an emphatic contradiction. I really never met a penny-a-liner who exhibits such a talent for constructing a gigantic fabric of injurious deductions upon such a slight basis of fact. Without the slightest evidence, other than what is contained in a superficial report