

REMITTANCES

TO

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND & WALES.

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

The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 1856.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Niagara from Liverpool, the 16th inst., gives us little of interest, in the political world. The weather was favorable, and the harvest prospects excellent; in spite of which however there had been a slight rise in breadstuffs. The crops in France had been harvested. The yield was of excellent quality, if slightly deficient in quantity.

Spain was quiet. Italy is still in a disturbed state; and a revolutionary outbreak at Naples was daily looked for. The misunderstanding arising out of the occupation of the "Isle of Serpents" by the Russians, seems in a fair way of adjustment. Marshal Pelissier had been created Duke with the title of Malakoff, and a pension of 200,000 francs a year.

"The proof of the pudding is in the eating," not in the making thereof. So with laws: they must be tested, not by the wording, but by the working thereof.

Applying then this simple test to the School Laws of Upper and Lower Canada, respectively, we may be enabled to estimate the truth of the assertion of the *Journal de Quebec*, that the Catholic minority of the Upper Province are better treated than are the Protestant minority of the Lower. For, if "better treated," then assuredly Catholic Separate Schools in Upper Canada would be more numerous, and more flourishing—in proportion to the Catholic population of that section of the Province—than are the Protestant Separate Schools in Lower Canada. Such would at least be the case, if the Catholic minority in one section of the Province were as anxious for separate schools, as were the Protestant minority in the other.

That the Catholic minority of Upper Canada attach at least as much value to the separate school system, as do the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, is apparent from the incessant agitation which, for many years past, the former have kept up upon the subject; for men do not usually give themselves the trouble of keeping up a constant agitation upon a subject to which they are indifferent. From the reiterated complaints then of the Catholics of Upper Canada, we may safely conclude that, if their separate schools are not as numerous, nor as flourishing, as the separate schools of their Protestant fellow-citizens in Lower Canada, we must look for the cause of that difference elsewhere than in the apathy, or indifference, of the aforesaid Catholic minority.

Now, what are the simple facts of the case? Are Catholic separate schools in Upper, as numerous, or as flourishing, as Protestant separate schools in Lower, Canada? It is by this simple test that we can best appreciate the value of the bold assertion of the *Journal de Quebec* in its issue of the 9th inst.,—"That the Catholics of Upper Canada are better treated by the law, than are the Protestants of Lower Canada."

At page 11, of the *Report of the Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada*, we find the following; which, to the mind of any unprejudiced person, must be conclusive on this point:

"I will not undertake," says the Superintendent, "to argue the question of separate schools. The legislation of Lower Canada was the first to sanction the principle; and if they be still a subject of discussion to the Protestants of Upper Canada, the same thing cannot be said of this section of the Province—for there are here 42 Boards of dissentient trustees (of which 4 only are Catholic) having 73 schools under their control. I should also add that the demands of the Protestant inhabitants for Separate Schools, are every year becoming more and more numerous. In Upper Canada there are 42 Separate Schools for a population of 167,696 souls. The Non-Catholic population of Lower Canada amounts to 143,355 souls."

These figures are decisive. The Protestant minority of Lower Canada have nearly twice as many separate schools as have the Catholic minority of Upper Canada; whilst, at the same time, there is a far larger Catholic population in the latter, than there is in the first named section of the Province. And as we have already shown, the causes of this striking difference must be looked for elsewhere, than in the apathy, or indifference to the advantages of separate schools, of the Catholic minority of Upper Canada.

What then are the causes of this striking difference in the working of the Upper and Lower Canada school laws? They are twofold: legal and social; they proceed, partly from the oppressive and vexatious details of the Upper Canada school laws—details therefore which it is the duty of the Legislature to amend; and partly from the illiberality of the Protestant majority of Upper Canada towards the Catholic minority—an illiberality to which there is no counterpart in Lower

Canada—and which therefore it should be the duty of the Legislature to counteract.

In Lower Canada, as the Superintendent tells us in his *Report*, there is no discussion on the subject of Protestant separate schools: no opposition to them on the part of the Catholic majority. As the Legislature of Catholic Lower Canada "was first to sanction the principle" of such schools for a dissentient minority, so the people of this section of the Province have always set an example of liberality which it would have been well if the Protestant majority of U. Canada had imitated. No Catholic of Lower Canada, either in or out of Parliament, has ever been known to raise his voice against Protestant separate schools, or to express the slightest desire even, to deprive his Non-Catholic fellow-citizens of the rights which the law has secured to them in the matter of education. In Lower Canada, the right of the Protestant minority to separate schools, is universally looked upon as sacred; and so far from seeking to throw impediments in the way of its exercise, we do but speak the sentiments of our co-religionists when we say that they desire to give it every extension possible.

In Upper Canada, on the contrary, separate schools for the Catholic minority are looked upon by the Protestant majority, not as a right to be extended, but as a nuisance to be abated; whilst in and out of Parliament, from the drunken rowdy at the hustings—the Protestant minister on his tab—and the eloquent member in the House—still the cry is heard—"No separate schools for Papists!" Nay! even the officials to whom is entrusted the execution of the law, openly avow their hostility to Catholics; and a Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, in his Annual Report, hesitates not to discuss the "most effectual method of causing the ultimate discontinuance and abandonment of separate schools."—See *Dr. Ryerson's Report for 1852*—p. 21.

Such then being the difference betwixt Catholic and Protestant liberality—and betwixt the social condition of a Catholic minority in Upper Canada, and a Protestant minority in Lower Canada—it is evidently the duty of the upright statesman to take cognizance of these differences, and to legislate accordingly. It is evident, we say, that where such differences exist, the self same laws, though in their workings precisely similar, would in their respective workings, be widely different; and that, though in one instance, they might be generally acceptable to all classes of the community, in the other they would be productive only of discontent, because made the instrument of a grievous oppression. The proof of a law is, as we said in the beginning, in the working, not in the wording, thereof. Now it is a fact, proved by figures, that the working of the present school laws of Upper Canada is not so favorable to the growth and development of separate schools for the Catholic minority, as is the working of the Lower Canada school laws, to the growth and development of separate schools for the Protestant minority in the Lower section of the Province. Therefore we conclude, that it is not true, as stated by the *Journal de Quebec*, that "the Catholics of Upper Canada are better treated by the law than the Protestants of Lower Canada." But let us see in what, after all, this "better treatment" consists.

In Lower Canada, the Protestant majority have always, up to the 1st of last month, received for the support of their separate schools, their share, not of the legislative school grant, only, but of all local school taxes as well; and that in proportion to the number—not of children attending said separate schools only—but of resident children of school age belonging to dissentient parents resident in the school district where-in such separate school was established. In Upper Canada on the contrary—the separate schools of the Catholic minority have always been refused any share in the proceeds of the local school taxation; and have been allowed to receive a share of the legislative school grant only, and that only in proportion to the average number of children actually attending such separate schools. Here, at once, without looking farther, we may see a sufficient reason for the prosperous condition of the Protestant separate schools of Lower Canada, when compared with the Catholic separate schools of the Upper Province.

The reasons assigned by the *Journal de Quebec* for this striking difference betwixt the school laws of the two sections of the Province, are, that, in Lower Canada, Catholic marriages are generally more fruitful than are the unions of Protestant parents—that Catholic children are more numerous in their attendance at school than Protestant children—and that in Lower Canada, Catholics and Protestants are about on a par with respect to the gifts of fortune. Therefore, our cotemporary concludes, it was just that the Protestant minority should receive for the support of their separate schools a share in the local school assessment as well as in the Government school grant.

But, he continues, in Upper Canada, the unions of Catholic parents are also more fruitful in children, than are those of their Protestant neighbors—Catholic children are also more numerous in their

school-attendance than are Protestant children—whilst, generally, Catholic parents are not so rich as are their Non-Catholic fellow-citizens. Therefore he concludes, a distribution of the school funds which the Protestant minority of Lower Canada had a right to claim, would have been unjust towards the Protestant majority of Upper Canada, if accorded to the Catholic minority of that part of the country. In other words, the *Journal de Quebec* asserts, but does not prove, that in proportion to the number of children deriving benefit from the schools supported by public monies, the Protestant population of U. Canada, because richer, and because its matrimonial unions are less prolific than those of Papists, contributes a larger sum towards the support of said schools, than does the poorer, and more prolific Catholic population; and is therefore entitled to a larger share of the proceeds. This argument, and the statistics upon which it is based, we shall examine in our next.

THE MIRROR ON ORANGEMISM.

We are sorry to see that our esteemed Toronto cotemporary feels a little sore at some remarks we published in our issue of the 15th inst., from "*An Irish Catholic*;" and wherein the writer alluded to the *Mirror's* silence upon the gross insult offered to the Catholics of Canada, by the Governor General on the 12th ult. We seize cheerfully however this occasion to assure our cotemporary that no offence was intended; and that we much regret that offence has been taken where none was meant.

The *Mirror* in justification of his silence says—"if we were to refuse our cotemporary any aid in his agitation for the recall of the Governor General, we would be repeating his own course in our regard on the occasion" of the *Mirror's* agitation for the recall of Smith O'Brien. Our friend seems to forget, however, that by the terms of its prospectus, the TRUE WITNESS could not take so prominent a part in the discussion of that question as did the *Mirror*; because the recall of Smith O'Brien, though an event in which we rejoice, and towards which we should have been delighted to contribute—was not in any way connected with the interests of the Catholic Church, or one upon which any amount of discussion or agitation in Canada could have any, the slightest effect. Pledged therefore, as we were, to abstain from interfering in purely secular questions, we could not, in the columns of the TRUE WITNESS, do more than express, our hearty sympathy with the unfortunate but gallant gentleman; and our sincere desire that the efforts of his friends to procure his recall to his native land might prove successful.

The *Mirror* is more happy when he excuses himself for not having advised the Irish Catholics of Upper Canada "to hold public meetings to denounce the Orangemen and our Orange Governor." Such meetings would certainly have been useless, and might possibly have been mischievous; and for these reasons they were not advised in Montreal; where on the contrary—as the *Mirror* will see, if he will do us the honor of turning to our issue of the 25th ult., the project of "holding a public meeting to denounce the Orangemen and our Orange Governor," was formally repudiated. The objects of the Irish Catholics of Montreal were fully accomplished without "holding any such public meeting."

The *Mirror* also is no doubt quite correct in his statement that, for the Catholics of Upper Canada to have held such meetings, would have been to rush upon destruction—"that they would have been caught between two fires; massacred by the bayonets of the Orange authorities on the one hand, and the pistols and clubs of a ruthless mob on the other." The *Mirror* thus fully confirms the opinion expressed by us in our issue of the 5th inst., to the effect that, "Orangemism rules in Canada with more intolerance than at home;" and that the Catholics of U. Canada are more thoroughly cowed and subdued by its baneful influences, than are their brethren in Ireland.

We need not again reply to our cotemporary's objections to the proceedings of the Irish Catholics of Montreal, based upon the fiction of a Canadian "Ministerial responsibility." When our cotemporary shall have shown us that there exists in Canada, or in the Canadian Legislative Assembly, any power such as exists in Great Britain, and in the British House of Commons, of enforcing by impeachment, that responsibility, we shall be prepared to acknowledge it to be something more than a sham or fiction. As it is, the Governor General, and the Governor General alone, is responsible for every act of his official career: for he only can be held to answer for his conduct before a competent tribunal, by the process of impeachment. The *Mirror* admits however, that the "petitions will be productive of much good;" and as he does not condescend to indicate how any other course of procedure would have been "productive of any good at all," we see not why he should not heartily concur and co-operate with his Irish Catholic friends in Montreal; the object of whose petition is—not the recall of the Governor—but simply to give publicity in Great Britain to his unprecedented and very disgraceful conduct.

Besides, the *Mirror* should remember that Sir

E. Head's conduct on the occasion alluded to, was more than a mere political act. Like his uncourteous remarks upon the "Inferior Race" of Lower Canada, it indicated a sad want of gentlemanly feeling on his part; because no one with the feelings of a gentleman would take advantage of his official position to insult and wound the feelings of others, many of them his equals, perhaps his superiors, in social position. His behaviour, on more than one occasion, has been grossly offensive; and it is therefore not only of the Governor General that we complain, but of the man who, by his coarse and boorish behaviour, has given unpardonable, personal offence to a large portion of Her Majesty's loyal subjects.

Our cotemporary complains in the last place, of the unfortunate position in which the Catholics of Upper Canada now find themselves; and which he attributes to their "sound views on the School Question." Here again the *Mirror* must pardon us if we differ from him; and if we look for the causes of that position—first, in the simplicity of Irish Catholics themselves, and in their ill-placed confidence in the promises of Protestant Reformers, or Liberals, as they are sometimes called; secondly, in the unaccountable infatuation—to use the mildest term—under the influence of which some—not all, but too many—of our Catholic friends, were induced to assist the said Liberals in their scheme of secularising the Clergy Reserves. When this measure was under discussion in the Legislature, some two years ago, we clearly saw, and repeatedly foretold, what would be the inevitable and immediate result of its settlement—viz., that the Reformers, or Liberals, having got all they wanted out of their Catholic dupes, would turn their backs upon them, and contract a firm, anti-Catholic alliance with the Orangemen of Canada, from whom they had only been kept apart by the said "Reserves" question. The Orange ascendancy, of which the *Mirror* complains, is therefore but the penalty which the Catholics of Canada have to pay, and will yet have to pay for many a long day, for their misplaced confidence in "Protestant Reformers," and their own inconsistent, anti-Catholic, and most suicidal policy on the "Clergy Reserves" question.

But it is useless mourning over the past. The error has been committed, and we must accept the penalty. In the meantime, we have the greatest pleasure in accepting our cotemporary's offer to co-operate with the TRUE WITNESS in its efforts to—"damage our ministerial betrayers, by fixing the Irish mind in Upper and Lower Canada upon their bigoted character." With him, we look upon the continuance in office of the said "ministerial betrayers," as an "intolerable political nuisance," and a grievous calamity to our Church, whose interests they have betrayed, not upon the "School Question" only, but on many other occasions; and we shall be most happy to co-operate with him for their speedy overthrow.

DR. RYERSON AND THE ORANGEMEN.

It will be remembered by our readers that Dr. Ryerson very properly dismissed from his situation, a clerk in the Public Education department, of the name of Wm. Howe, for walking in the same Orange procession of the 12th ult., which subsequently waited upon, and was most graciously received by, our highly respected and beloved Governor General, Sir Edmund Head.—This legitimate, and highly praiseworthy exercise of authority, by the Chief Superintendent of Education for Canada West, has greatly incensed Brothers Stiggins, Snawley & Co. of the "Toronto, Loyal, Orange, District, Lodge;" who have thereupon proceeded, to memorialise His Excellency upon the subject, and to read Dr. Ryerson a severe lesson, upon what they deem his arbitrary, and anti-Protestant conduct.

It remains to be seen what notice the Governor will take of the memorial of Brothers Stiggins and Snawley aforesaid: whether their remonstrances will have the effect of driving Dr. Ryerson from office; or whether they and their "Resolutions" will be treated with the contempt that they deserve. The question at issue, in short, is—Are the Orange *canaille* of Upper Canada to control the entire school system of that section of the Province?

Upon Dr. Ryerson's public acts as Chief Superintendent of Education, we have often commented freely; but in this instance we do him no more than justice when we say, that he has acted impartially and fearlessly. Of the propriety of his conduct, there can be no two opinions; unless it be contended that it be fit and proper for public servants to insult and wound the feelings of a large portion of that public whose servants they are, and out of whose pockets their wages are drawn. The rule enforced by Dr. Ryerson, in the case of the man Howe, is one that we believe is in force in all branches of the public service; and is certainly one which ought to be applied impartially to Protestants and Catholics, to Ribbonmen and Orangemen. It is a rule which recommends itself to every honest man, of every creed, of every shade of political opinion; and for the sake of the respectability of our public offices, and the peace of the community, we sincerely hope that it may not be tampered with, either for the sake of conciliating a handful of contemptible

fanatics, or of averting the catastrophe with which the school system is menaced—if the rule be enforced.

For the fifth "Resolution," of Brothers Stiggins and Snawley, informs us that—"any attempt to deprive the Hundreds of Teachers which are everywhere scattered through the land, particularly in the Protestant towns and settlements of the Province, would be practically to break up the school system; as we are well assured our Protestant brethren, as well parents and guardians of children, as Trustees and Electors of school sections, will never consent to deprive the Teachers and others of the privilege they so proudly enjoy themselves of displaying their colors on the glorious and immortal Twelfth of July."

In other words—the Common School system of Upper Canada is so essentially Protestant, so thoroughly anti-Irish and anti-Catholic, that the right to insult annually by Orange processions Her Majesty's Irish and Catholic subjects is to be considered as an integral part of that system; and indeed so vital a part thereof, that any attempt on the part of Government to prevent its public officials from taking a prominent part in those insulting displays, would inevitably lead to a "break up" of the Upper Canada School system altogether! Are the Protestants of Canada, generally, prepared to adopt this "Resolution" of the Toronto Orangemen!—and if so, how can Catholics be blamed for compassing the overthrow of a system which can exist only upon the condition that government officials be allowed to walk in insulting party processions—processions which till a few years ago were, in Canada, as in Ireland, very justly prohibited by law? Is it possible that Catholics can have any confidence, any respect for such a system—a system which can exist only upon such conditions?

Another "Resolution," the 4th, is based if possible upon still more extraordinary grounds. "In this country" it complains "where the numerous *fete days* laid down in the Roman Catholic calendar have been established by law, and the employees in the public service freely permitted to take advantage of them, it is more peculiarly gallant and offensive that, on the ONE GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVAL, the employees of the Government should be deprived of the rights freely extended to their fellow-employees on Roman Catholic Festival days." Upon this "Resolution" we will offer a few comments.

Firstly—As a Protestant clergyman—the Rev. Dr. Lett—assisted at this meeting, took part in its deliberations, and assented to its Resolutions—and as in these Resolutions, we find the religious Festivals of the Catholic Church contrasted with the ONE GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVAL of the 12th of July—we may logically conclude that the GREAT EVENT, commemorated by the Protestant religion is—not the "Nativity of Our Lord"—for that is a Catholic *fete*—not "His Resurrection or Ascension"—not the "Coming of the Holy Ghost"—for all these are Catholic *fetes*—but the "Coming of the Prince of Orange into Ireland," and the conquest of that country by the foreign mercenaries, by whom—(instead of the angels who sang round Our Lord's cradle at Bethlehem "on earth peace")—he—the Prince of Orange, not Our Lord—was accompanied.—This then is the object of the ONE GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVAL; a festival, we must admit, celebrated in a manner, and with orgies worthy of the cold blooded author of the treacherous massacre of Glencoe. From this also, the ONE GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVAL, we may form some pretty fair notion of the Protestant religion itself; just as from the accounts of the ancient Pagan Festivals, we can form some tolerably accurate notion of the genius of ancient Paganism, and the morality of its professors.

In the second place, it is worthy of notice, that, with Protestants, "equal rights" mean their right to insult and persecute their fellow citizens, professors of a different faith from themselves, and who do not keep the ONE GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVAL, or who do not invoke the name of Dutch William. The Toronto Orangemen do not complain that their brother Mr. Howe did not get leave to absent himself from his office on their ONE GREAT RELIGIOUS FESTIVAL. They do not pretend either, that on the Festivals of the Catholic Church any other privilege than that of absenting themselves from their desks for the day—(a privilege also accorded to Mr. Howe on the Festival of St. William the Butcher of Glencoe)—is ever granted to Catholic employees. But their grievance is this, that a rule of our public departments in Canada, which prohibits government employees, whether Catholics or Protestants, from taking parts in either Ribbon or Orange processions, was not especially relaxed in favour of the said Mr. Howe; in order that he being an Orangeman and a Protestant, might have an opportunity given him of insulting the Irish and Catholics of Toronto by whom a portion of his salary is paid. Because this was denied to Mr. Howe—as most certainly to walk in a Ribbon procession would have been prohibited to the Irishman and Catholic employe—his friends resolve that they have been "deprived of" rights" freely extended to Catholic employees!

The last "Resolution" was moved by the above mentioned Protestant minister, the Rev. Dr.