1*st Statement.*—"In Upper Canada, dissenters must, for having separate schools, be twelve heads of families, apply to and be authorised by persons opposed to them; in Lower Canada, dissenters may, in any number whatever, heads of families or not, establish separate schools, without petition to, or authorisation from persons opposed to them."

*Correction*—Both parts of this statement are incorrect, "twelve heads of families," in place of ten freeholders, as provided in previous acts, were inserted in the school act of 1850, in accordance with the wish of the acting Heads of the Roman Catholic Church at Toronto; and I would have as readily proposed five heads of families as twelve had it been desired, nor will any one pretend that a school can be established and sustained by fewer than twelve heads of families. It is not correct to say that there is no reference to numbers in Lower Canada; though heads of families are not mentioned, the offspring of heads of families are specified; for a dissentient school is not allowed except in a school district which contains more than *twenty* children between the ages of five and sixteen years; nor can any dissentient school be continued which is not attended by "at least fifteen children," as certified *on oath*, a condition imposed on the dissentients of Lower Canada alone. See sections 4, 19, 26, 27, Act 9 Vic. ch. 27, and section 18, of the Act 12 Vic. ch. 50. These conditions and the returns they involve, are vastly more restrictive and onerous than a single application signed by twelve heads of families, without reference either to the number of children residing in the school district between the ages of five and sixteen years, or the number in actual attendance at school.

Those parts of the statement which represent the applicants for separate schools as depending suppliants for authorisation before persons opposed to them, while the reverse is the case in Lower Canada, are a mere play upon words. It is true, the dissenters "apply to" and are "authorised by" a municipality to elect their school corporation, and so does a person "apply to" to the Crown Land Office, perhaps to an opponent, for a deed of land, and is "authorised by" such deed to hold the land; but is he thereby a *dependent*? So do common school trustees, in townships, cities and towns, apply to the municipal councils for sums of money to be raised by rates, and are "authorised" to receive and expend such sums. But are the trustees thereby dependents on the councils? No, the latter are *required* to comply with the application of the former, and have been, in more than one instance, compelled to do so by the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench. So is each municipal council *required* to comply with the application of any twelve heads of families in a school section for a separate school, and *must* include in such separate school section all who apply to be included. What more can be reasonably desired? It is also thus through the municipal council that every school section in Upper Canada is constituted, and the first trustee election in it provided for. And the clerk of each council is required to keep a record of all the school sections in the township. Without such a record there can be no means of knowing the limits of school corporations, or how to levy school rates or exempt parties from their payment within any such school divisions. It is of no more consequence whether the municipal council is favorable or opposed to parties applying for a separate school, than it is that a post