

## REMITTANCES

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

## The True Witness.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1857.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The annual Spooner Motion on the Maynooth Grant excited this Session but little interest. The respectable old woman who brought it forward was, if possible, more violent against Popery, more mendacious, and more prosy than ever; Mr. Roebuck gave the poor old lady a moderate chastisement; and after a few remarks from some of the other members, the motion was negatived upon a division.

The Continental news is of little interest. It would seem, however, that Russian influence is all powerful with the Persian Government; and that the war in Asia may yet result in a European embroilment.

Little has been done in our Provincial Parliament during the past week; the "Seat of Government" question has however been brought prominently forward, and the *nomad* system is to be abandoned, though it is as yet all uncertain where our long wandering Legislature will permanently pitch its tent. The Ministry, by way of shirking the responsibility of a choice, are to move that Her Majesty be requested to select the site of the Seat of Government; a policy which by some is condemned as inviting Imperial interference with our peculiar Canadian interests; but which, at all events, relieves our Office-holders of a heavy load. The Quebec papers, in view of the vote last Session, seem to think that their City has been unjustly dealt with. From despatches laid before the House, it would seem that Her Majesty has been advised to withhold her consent to the Bill authorising the Anglican clergy in Canada to meet in Synod, for the management of their ecclesiastical affairs.

## STATE-SCHOOLISM IN UPPER CANADA.

From all parts of Canada West, and from persons in every condition of life, we are in receipt of loud complaints against the iniquitous restrictions of the existing School Laws; and their, if possible, still more iniquitous administration by the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada. Imperfect as are the provisions of the Separate School Act—18th Vic., c. 131—they are, by the cunning artifices of the Methodist minister, to whom their execution is confided, rendered altogether useless to the great mass of our Catholic brethren in the Upper Province. And it is this ruinous state of things that we are exhorted to leave unaltered, for fear of disturbing the pleasant slumbers of the occupants of the Ministerial benches, and lest we should frustrate their benevolent design of forwarding the material interests of a particular section of the country. The souls of our little ones are to be sacrificed for the sake of, perhaps, a canal, a railroad, or some similar "job," which, if perpetrated, promises to put a few dollars into the pockets of the proprietors of land in the neighborhood. And, oh shame! this sordid policy is advocated by men who call themselves Catholics.

As a specimen of the manner in which, by his arbitrary interpretation of the existing School Laws, the Rev. Mr. Ryerson manages to frustrate the intentions of its framers, and to defraud the Catholic supporters of Separate Schools of the miserable pittance which the law awards them, the annexed communication from an esteemed correspondent in Upper Canada, affords an excellent illustration:—

"Sir—On the 17th November, 1856, conformably to the Separate School Act, 18th Vic., cap. 131, a Catholic Separate School was established at Clifton Town Suspension Bridge, Welland County, Canada West, and has always been kept open since.

"On the 1st of January, 1857, at the time of the apportionment of the Legislative School grant, the said school had been in existence for six weeks.

"The aggregate number of attendances during those six weeks had been 1017; which being divided by 28, the number of school days included in those six weeks, gives an average attendance of 36.9-28; that is, a fraction more than 36.

"Now, the facts being thus, the supporters of the said separate school lay their claim to a share in the Government grant, on the strength of the 13th section of the above cited Act, which reads thus:—  
"Every Separate School established under this Act shall be entitled to a share in the fund annually granted by the Legislature of this Province for the support of Common Schools, according to the average number of pupils attending such school during the twelve next preceding months, or during the number of months which may have elapsed from the establishment of a new Separate School, as compared with the whole average number of pupils attending the Common Schools in the same city, town, village, or township: Provided always, that no Separate School shall be entitled to a share in any such fund, unless the average number of pupils so attending the same be fifteen or more (periods of epidemic or contagious diseases excepted)."

"The average attendance of our school since the time that it was opened, up to the 1st of January, 1857, being 36, instead of 15—the minimum required by the law just quoted—it is evident that we had a right to a certain apportionment of the Legislative School Grant; the amount of which we cannot precisely determine, because we have not all the data required by the law—the Education Office has them.

"But the paragraphs 3rd and 4th of the regulations appended to the back of the Half-Yearly Report of the Trustees to the Chief Superintendent, impose the number 125—(the number of school days during the second half of the year)—as the necessary uniform divisor to find the average attendance of a school kept open for less than six months. This arbitrary and unaccountable substitution of the invariable divisor 125, for the case of any school kept open for less than six months, making the above cited law altogether void in our own case, we objected to such divisor in a first letter to the Chief Superintendent.

"The answer of the Chief Superintendent being nothing else than a re-assertion of the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the above cited regulations—namely, that 'the common divisor employed in regard to every school in the township, or town, must be employed in regard to our Separate School, that is, 125'—we insisted in a second letter, and met only a re-assertion of the original injustice.

"The second answer of the Chief Superintendent, giving no more satisfactory explanation than did the first, but stating merely that 'he had sufficiently explained'—we resolved to have recourse to your excellent journal to expose before the public the unfairness, injustice, and impudence of the chief adversary of 'Freedom of Education' in Upper Canada.

"We subjoin our two letters to Dr. Ryerson, together with the two answers of the Doctor thereunto. Should any one think the following investigation long or tedious, let him remember that it is sometimes difficult to find out the serpent's head through the many foldings under which it lies concealed; but that when our life is at stake, we must watch the venomous reptile until we find its head, and are able to crush it. 'Ipsa coarctat caput tuum.'

The following is the correspondence alluded to in the above communication:—

FIRST LETTER TO DR. RYERSON.

Clifton Town, Co. Welland, C.W.,

9th Jan., 1857.

"Dr. RYERSON—Rev. Sir—Herewith you will receive a return of the Roman Catholic school in this town. It is made up agreeably to the general instructions at the back of the same. I think in this instance, the paragraphs 3rd and 4th are not applicable; in as much as they clash with the 13th section of the Act 18th Vic., cap. 131, which states 'that if any Separate School shall not have been in operation for a whole year at the time of the apportionment, it shall not receive the sum to which it would have been entitled for a whole year, but only an amount proportional to the time during which it has been kept open.'

"Now, you will perceive from the return that the school has only been in operation about six weeks; and that the number of school days during such period, is only 28. Hence this number will in equity be the divisor in this case, and the result will stand thus: aggregate attendance during six weeks 1017, which divided by 28, will give an average of 36.9-28, and which will entitle us to a portion of the Government grant.

"The return ought to have been made some days ago; but this delay has been occasioned in consequence of the town being newly incorporated, and all things connected therewith requiring knowledge, of which we were previously unacquainted.

"Your early reply to the foregoing will oblige.

Your obedient servant,

TIMOTHY KAVANAGH.

To this first application for a share in the Legislative School Grant, proportional to the time during which their school had been kept open, the Catholics of Clifton received a reply from the Chief Superintendent, couched in the following terms:—

Toronto, 21st Jan., 1857.

"The common divisor employed in regard to every school in the township, or town, must be employed in regard to the separate school; that is, 125—the number of teaching days in the second half of the year. Dividing the aggregate number of days that pupils have attended the school, by the number of days that such school has been kept open, will give the average attendance for the time that it has been kept open; but not the average attendance for the half year as compared with the average attendance for the half year at the other schools in the same township—the basis of distributing the half year's grant to all the schools of such township.

"But these results will be ascertained by me, after having received the proper data duly attested. Let the return you have transmitted—and which accompanies this—be attested according to law, and forwarded to me with the requisite certificate that your school has been duly established. I will then readily make the apportionment to your school authorized by law."

This answer, explaining nothing, the Trustees of the Clifton Catholic school wrote a second time to the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, as follows:—

Clifton Town, Co. Welland, C.W.,

26th Jan., 1857.

"Dr. RYERSON—Sir—In reply to yours of the 21st instant, allow me to state in reference to the common school divisor of 125, used by you, that whilst it is applicable to schools which have been in operation for six months, it does not meet our case. The separate school at Clifton was opened on the 17th of November, and the equitable number for a divisor would be the number of fixed school days from such date to the 31st of December; and which will be somewhere about 28. Now, assuming this number to be correct, and using the same as a divisor, an average attendance will be gained to form a basis on which the attendance for the six months may be ascertained, and the apportionment made. In our case, I do not see how a correct result can be arrived at by using your divisor. If however I am wrong, you will perhaps have the kindness to explain further, as I feel anxious to understand the principle thoroughly.

"I send herewith the papers required by you, although not in accordance with my notions.

"Your early reply will oblige.

Yours respectfully,

TIMOTHY KAVANAGH.

To this Dr. Ryerson replied:—

Education Office, Toronto,

31st Jan., 1857.

"Sir—I have the honor to state in reply to your letter of the 26th inst., that I have sufficiently explained how, according to what you propose as the method of ascertaining the amount payable to your separate school, a school kept open one week with an average attendance of 20 pupils would receive precisely the same sum as another school kept open six months, with an average attendance of 20 also, which of course is contrary to law and justice.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. RYERSON.

The result of all this interchange of documents is simply this—that the Catholics of Clifton, having established a separate school conformably to the provisions of the law, all whose requirements they have strictly fulfilled, now find themselves deprived of all share in the Legislative School Grant, because their school has not been kept open for six months; a condition which was not contemplated by the framers of the law, but has been arbitrarily imposed by the Rev. Mr. Ryerson himself.

It is evident that no such condition was contemplated by the framers of the law; for the concluding sentence of the thirteenth section of 18th Vic., c. 131, makes express provision for the case of a school kept open for any period less than a year; but during which it had been attended by an average attendance of 15 pupils:—

"If any separate school shall not have been in operation for a whole year at the time of the apportionment, it shall not receive the sum to which it would have been entitled for a whole year, but only an amount proportional to the time during which it has been kept open."—18th Vic., c. 131, Sect. XIII.

Thus the law clearly contemplates the case of a school kept open for any period less than a year; and exacts only an average attendance of 15 pupils, as the condition of sharing in the Legislative School grant. To ascertain the amount to which any separate school, kept open for any portion of a year—but whose average attendance of pupils has reached the required number—is entitled, we must divide the aggregate number of attendances by the number of days during which it has been kept open; and this will give the average attendance of pupils during that period. Then, knowing the sum to which that average attendance would have entitled the school, had it been kept open during the whole scholar half year immediately preceding, it is easy to calculate the sum to which it is entitled if it has been kept open for only a half, a third, or any fraction, of that period. Thus a school kept open for three months, or six weeks, with an average attendance of 36 pupils, would be entitled to receive, one-half, or one-fourth—respectively—of the sum to which it would have been entitled, if, with the same average attendance, it had been kept open during the whole scholar half year immediately preceding the apportionment of the Legislative School grant.

But the one object of the Rev. Mr. Ryerson is, not to make an equitable distribution of the funds over which he has control; but to defraud *Romish* schools of the miserable pittance which is their legal due. For this purpose, he arbitrarily imposes one uniform divisor, representing the whole number of school days in the scholar half-year as the divisor by which the aggregate number of attendances, must be divided, in order to ascertain the average attendance of pupils; which must be 15 at least to entitle the school to any share whatever in the Legislative School Grant. By this iniquitous process, a Catholic school which had been kept open for 124 days during the scholar half-year of 125 days—and with a regular attendance every day of the required number of 15 pupils—would be excluded from all share in the aforesaid grant; because 124 multiplied by 15, gives only 1860, as the aggregate attendance of pupils; and that aggregate, divided by Mr. Ryerson's common divisor 125, does not reach the required number of 15; without which average attendance, the *Romish* separate school is excluded from all share in the Legislative School Grant. Practically, therefore, Dr. Ryerson's arbitrary enforcement of one common divisor representing the whole number of school days in the scholar half-year, imposes a new obligation upon Catholic supporters of separate schools, and one not contemplated by the framers of the present School Law; and whilst that law only exacts an average attendance of 15 pupils for any period less than a year during which a Catholic separate school has been in operation, Dr. Ryerson steps in, and exacts in addition, that the school shall have been in operation for six months. In the case immediately alluded to above, the sum in dispute is trifling no doubt, but the principle at stake is most important; and in fact involves the question—"Shall a bigoted Methodist Minister be allowed to set the law of the land aside by his arbitrary glosses thereupon?" However, if the "do nothing" policy of the *Ottawa Tribune* be followed, to this also, as to many other acts of insult and injustice, must we make up our minds quietly to submit.

"May we"—asks the *Ottawa Tribune*—"insinuate that we have a right to express our honest opinions freely as to the course we deem best to be pursued to obtain the needed amendment to the School Law?" We reply to our cotemporary—"Of course you may."

Not only has he the right to express his opinions freely, as to the policy he deems best to be pursued to obtain the "needed amendment" to the School Law; but, as a professed Catholic journalist, and as admitting that an amendment is "needed" it is his duty to do so. Now, the burden of our complaint against him is this—not only that he has indicated no line of action whatever, as best to be pursued, in order to obtain that "needed amendment;" but that he advises his readers to adopt no course at all—to sit still in fact, and do nothing. But as nothing can ever come from doing nothing—so, if the advice of the *Ottawa Tribune* be followed, nothing will be the result; and the "needed amendment" will not be obtained.

But time presses; the dangers to which our Separate School system is exposed, are imminent; every session our chances of ultimate success diminish; and the longer we postpone the settlement of the question, the more difficult will it become to obtain a settlement satisfactory to

Catholics. Indeed, so precarious is our position, that our worst enemies could not desire us to adopt a policy better calculated to secure their ends—the entire overthrow of the Separate School system—than that which the *Ottawa Tribune* recommends; and which policy it is no doubt the intention of our Ministers to pursue, if permitted to do so by the apathy, folly or venality of the Catholic laity, and Catholic press.

Will the *Ottawa Tribune* endeavor to realise our actual position? Last year, as we learn from the Governor's speech at the opening of the present session of Parliament, there was paid over to the different Municipalities a sum accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves, exceeding Three Hundred Thousand Pounds; every penny of which is applicable, if the said Municipalities please, to "Common or Mixed School" purposes; but not one farthing of which can be applied, as the law now stands, to Catholic Separate School purposes. Next year, another sum of equal, if not greater, amount, and with the same iniquitous, and—to Catholics—ruinous limitations, will be handed over to the same bodies; and thus, every year, whilst the unjust law remains unaltered, will a large portion of the public funds, be made applicable to the support of the system of "common or mixed schools"—which the Catholic Church of Canada, speaking by the mouths of her Chief Pastors in Council assembled, has formally condemned; whilst, at the same time, not one penny thereof can be applied to that system of education of which alone the Church approves; and which therefore, neglecting every other consideration it is our most sacred duty as Catholics to support, no matter at what cost, or at what sacrifice of our material prospects.

By the law therefore, as it stands at present, without any effort on the part of our enemies, the fate of our Catholic Separate Schools is sealed, and their ultimate destruction secured. To save them, if possible, from that impending fate, Catholics must at once, and everywhere, vigorously bestir themselves; and thus even now at the eleventh hour, may we, if united, honest, and disinterested, and with no object at heart save the greater glory of God, and the salvation of souls, rescue ourselves and our descendants from the accursed thralldom of "State-Schoolism" which menaces us; and which will inevitably be our lot, and their lot, if we lose one moment in extorting from a dishonest Ministry, and a reluctant Legislature, that justice which as citizens we have the right, and which as Catholics it is our duty, to insist upon.

But delay is fatal. Already, by the dishonesty of our Catholic legislators, who last session adopted the "do-nothing" policy, advocated by the *Ottawa Tribune*, an irreparable injury has been inflicted upon us; already—as the Rev. M. Bruyere in his unanswerable correspondence with the Rev. M. Ryerson has clearly shown—by the appropriation of the vast funds annually accruing from the secularised Clergy Reserves, to "common or mixed schools" purposes, exclusively, has an injustice, the consequences of which can scarce be exaggerated, been perpetrated upon the Catholics of Upper Canada. If in the interval the law be not amended, a similar injustice will be perpetrated upon us next year. Thousands, and hundreds of thousands of pounds, the common property of the community will be made applicable to "common or mixed school" purposes exclusively; and as everything which tends to strengthen the "common or mixed school" system tends, in exactly the same degree, to weaken the Separate or Denominational system, it is evident even to the most stolid intellect, that—unless we can obtain an immediate alteration of the laws now regulating the application of the funds accruing from the Clergy Reserves—unless, ere any further sums accruing from that source are appropriated to the exclusive use of the "common or mixed schools," we can obtain from the Legislature a formal recognition of the right of our separate schools to share equally with the other schools in all monies accruing from the Clergy Reserves, and by the Municipalities appropriated, directly or indirectly, to educational purposes—all hopes of obtaining redress of our grievances are at an end; and that we must make up our minds to submit to the fate which our folly and treachery will have entailed upon us.

We may be told, that it is vain to expect that those alterations in the Statute Book which justice requires will be accorded to us: and that therefore it is in vain to agitate the question. We answer that—no matter what the result, we cannot be in a worse situation than we are in at present—that, if we allow things to remain as they are, our separate school system must, under the operation of the iniquitous clauses of the Clergy Reserves Bill, speedily fall to the ground; and that, therefore, by agitating the question we have nothing to lose, and everything to gain. Thus even from the very hopelessness of our situation should we take courage—"Una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem."

Finally, the policy that we advocate is that which the Bishops of Upper Canada, and His Lordship of Toronto particularly, recommended to the Catholics of the Province during the Session of 1856. It is the policy to which the Catholic Institute of Toronto has formally pledged

itself—viz., opposition to every Ministry that will not immediately concede all our demands on the School Question. It is the policy which, till within few weeks, was strongly and ably advocated by the *Ottawa Tribune* himself. If he has changed, if he has abandoned his old principles, so cannot the *True Witness*.

"When," however, says the *Tribune*, "the majority of the clergy and laity of Western Canada show a disposition to adopt a course contrary to our advice, we will be found with them." But, we ask him—what reason has he to believe that the ecclesiastical authorities of Western Canada approve, in 1857, of that system of tactics, of which we know positively that they disapproved in 1856? This at least we may say—that, last year, in urging upon the Legislature the immediate consideration of the School Question with a view to its final settlement, the *True Witness* was acting in concert with the highest ecclesiastical authorities of Upper Canada; and that we have no reason to suspect even, that their opinions have in aught altered since the formal condemnation pronounced last year by the Bishop of Toronto upon the conduct of those Catholic members of the Ministry who, to suit their own ends, treacherously stifled the cry of the Bishops, Clergy, and Catholic laity of Upper Canada for "Freedom of Education." Besides, if the Bishops, if the Clergy of Upper Canada were of opinion, with the *Ottawa Tribune*, that our best policy is to sit patiently with arms folded; whilst the inevitable course of events brings about the ruin of our separate school system—why would His Lordship the Bishop of London—why would the Rev. M. Bruyere—persist in stirring the public mind through the columns of the press, with their eloquent denunciations of the present School Laws. From these data therefore, we conclude, that the opinion of the ecclesiastical authorities on the School Question, is now, in 1857, exactly what it was in 1856; that the course of action which they strongly recommended then, they approve now; and that, consequently, the "do nothing" policy advocated by the *Ottawa Tribune*, and the waiters upon Providence, is not a policy which a Catholic laity, desirous of carrying out the views of their ecclesiastical superiors, would be justified in following. Why, if it were only for the sake of knowing who are, and who are not, our friends, in order that at the next General Election we may know how to deal with them, we should force the members of the present Legislature to declare themselves openly from their seats in Parliament, during the present Session, as to their opinions on the School Question; and we should treat every man, who votes against, or who does not vote for, all our demands, as an enemy; for whom no Catholic should ever again cast a vote. Now, it is this profession of faith that our Ministers, that our Representatives, are most anxious to avoid being called upon to make; but this profession of faith we would, if we were prudent and honest, extort from them before the close of the present Session.

We subjoin a portion of the eloquent and universally admired address delivered by the Right Rev. Dr. Fulford, Anglican Bishop of Montreal, upon the occasion of the opening of the Normal School, for this section of the Province; for as coming from one holding such a position amongst our separated brethren, and speaking as bishop, and in the name, certainly, of the most important section of the Protestant community, it is well worthy of a serious perusal.

It will be seen that His Lordship unequivocally condemns the modern system of a merely "secular" education, as, in a moral point of view utterly worthless. By implication therefore—for from a "common or mixed" school system amongst a people of not only different but contradictory religions, the religious element must be eliminated—His Lordship, speaking in the name of the large and influential body whom he represents, condemns the aforesaid "common or mixed" school system. Therefore it follows that he, and they whom he so worthily represents, approve of the Separate or Denominational system, for which the Catholics of this Province have so incessantly labored. May we not then hope, that our fellow citizens of the Anglican communion will unite with us to accomplish the end which, professedly both have at heart, viz., the overthrow of "State-Schoolism," and the establishment on a firm basis of the Separate or Denominational system.

For what we claim as a right for ourselves, we recognise the right of all other denominations to ask for themselves. Do Anglicans want Separate Schools? Then by all means should Catholics vote in favor of such schools; and honestly endeavor to secure for their fellow citizens of a different persuasion, the blessings which they demand for themselves. Such also should be their conduct with regard to Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and with every other denomination of which our community is composed. They have all equally with us, a right to Separate Schools; and for the simple reason—that it is as gross an outrage upon "Religious Liberty"—and as violent an interference with the "rights of conscience"—to compel any man to pay for the support of a School, or educational system to