

Superintendent; and separate school corporations in Upper Canada are responsible to their supporters alone, in regard to all school property, and not to the Chief Superintendent.

14. Such are the points on which your Lordship has undertaken to compare the school laws of Upper and Lower Canada in regard to separate schools, in order to prove that I have asserted "falsehoods," and that I have got laws passed which are unjust and oppressive towards the Roman Catholics; and by means of such statements and representations, your Lordship has endeavoured to impress public men in Lower Canada with the idea that you are cruelly oppressed and persecuted by the school law and its administration in Upper Canada, and thus to sow the seeds of distrust and dissension between the two sections of United Canada, and invoke the interference of Lower Canada in matters appertaining exclusively to Upper Canada. The intelligent statesmen of Lower Canada will, no doubt, be surprised to find how utterly apocryphal are your Lordship's representations on this subject, and how grossly you have wronged the people and public men of Upper Canada by your statements and appeals.

15. Your Lordship has represented me as having "been compelled to change my decision" on a matter respecting which I gave but one decision, and that willingly and promptly; and you have assailed me with opprobrious epithets and allusions, when, if the correspondence which has taken place between this department and persons acting under your Lordship's direction, were published, it would be seen who has endeavoured to give the most liberal construction and application of the law, and who has sought to evade its provisions, to embarrass its operations, and to create and multiply causes of dispute; that if money has not been paid when the law provided for its payment, to whom the delay is justly attributed:—that if (according to the reported proceedings of the board of school trustees for the city of Toronto, this very week) the legislative school grant is promptly and fairly apportioned between the public and separate schools in 1854, it is not because the law is different from what it was in 1853, but because the provisions of the law have been complied with by parties who did not observe those provisions last year. Nor can the fact fail to be noticed, nor its legitimate inference be overlooked, that these disputes between separate and other school trustees, are, as far as I know, confined to the city of Toronto, and as the noise about the school law has been commenced and perpetuated by an ecclesiastico-political institute, of which your Lordship is the animating spirit, there must be some other cause than anything unjust and oppressive in the provisions of the law in regard to any party.

A key to explain much of the zeal evinced by your Lordship is furnished in a remark of Mr. Cauchon's, whose address to your Lordship seems to have afforded you so much gratification. Mr. Cauchon says: "Who is ignorant of the fact, that Protestantism is intolerant in its very nature. It will cry out to you, be freemen, if you think as we do; if not, be slaves. Liberty is for Protestants." This, it appears, is the feeling your Lordship seeks to inculcate in Lower Canada, in regard

• See letter to certain Roman Catholic inhabitants of St. David's Ward, Toronto, dated 30th August, 1853.