

the proceedings provisions of the
 g ten years, suf-
 or it at the time;
 ernessy, as well as
 shop Charbonnel
 e complained of
 ately at this late
 ly, that it argues
 at I cannot be-
 rate and public
 y the former (as
 had contended)
 all parties to the
 eize upon every
 ny instance with
 I have expres-
 free schools are
 schools; yet the
 t how perverted
 a administering

I must, in the
 because of my
 proceedings of
 e school system
 d, and of much
 would on that
 which they are
 the sentiments
 members of the
 Catholic states-
 me painful and
 ulousness of his
 of provisions of

nts against the
 anada in regard
 exemptions and
 separate schools
 sh or are soon
 acknowledged
 in Upper than
 nicipal systems,
 ation to isolate

themselves and their children from these free institutions and their fellow citizens, and to erect and sustain separate establishments for themselves—and also in the greater mental culture and wealth of the Protestant minority as compared with the Roman Catholic majority in Lower Canada than that of the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada as compared with the Protestant majority.* I think I have also shown, that Bishop Charbonnel and his colleagues claim upon the ground of “conscientious convictions” a legislative enactment to deprive the Roman Catholics of the individual right of choice in school matters,—severing them from the rest of the population by law, and not by individual option—that the three Bishops claim Protestant taxes as well as Protestant school property in support of Roman Catholic schools, and the discretionary subjection to them of the school fund and all the municipalities of Upper Canada.

Under these circumstances there are obviously three courses before the legislature—to maintain the separate school provisions as they are, and leave separate schools to work out the experiment of their own destiny; to concede to the claims of Bishop Charbonnel and his colleagues, and thus bring on a war with the municipalities and people of Upper Canada such as has never been witnessed; or to abolish the separate school provisions of the law altogether, allowing exclusive privileges to none, but equal rights and protection to all.

I have the honor &c.

(Signed)

E. RYERSON.

The Hon. JOHN A. MACDONALD, M.P.P.,
 Attorney General for Upper Canada,
 Quebec.

* But notwithstanding these facts, there are fewer separate schools in Lower than in Upper Canada, the number in the former (L. C.) being 43, in the latter (U. C.) 53: this shows that the school law must be more favorable to separate schools in Upper Canada than Lower Canada.