

gentlemen be the officers and committee, with power to add to their number—Win. Lunn, Esq., Chairman; James Ferrier, Jr., Esq., Treasurer; Secretaries: Revd. Messrs. Irving and McVicar. Committee: Revd. Drs. Wilkes, Taylor, Bancroft, Hamilton, Kempt, Bonner, Cordner, Elliot, Douglass, Alexander and Brand; and Messrs. C. Alexander, E. Atwater, T. M. Bryson, J. Becket, J. Court, W. H. A. Davies, George Frothingham, John Greenshields, W. King, B. Lyman, H. Lyman, G. Moffatt, Jr., Wm. Murray, George B. Muir, James Milne, T. M. Taylor, Hugh Taylor, John Torrance, Jr., Joseph Watson, Revd. L. C. Wurtele, Acton Vale; Revd. W. Merrick, Acton Vale; E. S. Humming, Esq., Drummondville; D. Bain, Belle-Rivière; W. Morrison, Esq., St. Eustache; Dr. Cattinach, Alexandria; Principal Graham, Richmond; N. Bothwell, Esq., Wickham; Jeffrey Hale, Esq., Quebec; C. L. Burroughs, Esq. Lachute."

Proceedings were terminated with prayer by Revd. Dr. Snodgrass, who also addressed the meeting, "commeting upon the backwardness hitherto of Protestants, imputing to themselves alone all the blame for the unfavorable position of their schools and educational system; and making an eloquent appeal on behalf of the two Protestant model schools of Montreal, urging Protestants to greater zeal and liberality in support of their educational institutions."

We have, as a strict rule, abstained in this paper from anything which could savour of polemics, and have allowed all attacks on the Educational Department, and on the paper itself, to pass unnoticed. We believe, however, that we would be wanting in our duties to ourselves and the public did we not offer a few remarks on the proceedings at the recent meeting and on the assertions contained in the Report.

We will first call the attention of our readers to the nature of the enquiries made by the Committee. Their correspondents were not asked to inform them *how the school laws operated*, but "to furnish the Committee with facts to show that the carrying out of the Educational Laws is prejudicial to Protestant interests." All the facts thus advertised for, and reported accordingly, were not indiscriminately published; but, after a *careful review*, what had been deemed the material part of the information was embodied in the Report. It would be but natural to suppose that these facts, thus carefully selected, are those which have been judged the most likely to support the proposition *quod erat demonstrandum, id est*, "that the working of the school laws is prejudicial to Protestant interests."

It is also to be remarked that no enquiry was ever made by the Committee at the Education Office to test the correctness of the several allegations contained in the Report before submitting it to the meeting, which, also, without further enquiry, immediately upon its being read, ordered it to be printed and extensively circulated, thus accepting as well founded all the assertions put forth.

We will also observed that in the Report, and in most of the speeches made on the occasion, it was implicitly assumed that the law relating to dissentient schools affects Protestants alone, the fact