

Attorney General

ools, and draft of a new

nd April, 1855.

en confided the care
Canada, I desire to
s hereto appended),
Bishop of Toronto
Catholic Bishops of
of the Legislature
at as the ultimatum
per consists of two
Upper and Lower
the signers state,
of the Catholics of

ic Bishops. This is
en enclosed to some
believe the greater
a pamphlet against
en ware and toy
e Christian religion
religious enough, in
the board of school
port free schools—
nge the pages of his
hop Charbonnel is
zen the only news-
r of this sorrowful
his attack upon our
fictions, so far as
myself personally,
I have not thought
arbonnel, and intro-
ated amongst the
s the motto of the
e Honorable Chief
uildings for Upper
ke the Chief Justice

express a sentiment unfavorable to our public school system. Sir John Beverley Robinson has evinced himself a cordial friend of our school system, as testified by his addresses on various occasion; the distinguished Baronet is a man of too high a sense of honor and propriety to have consented to deliver the address on the auspicious occasion referred to, had he not approved the system of public instruction of which the normal and model schools are the types and auxiliaries: and such was the whole character of the beautiful discourse which he read and which was published entire in the *Journal of Education* for December 1852, and in my annual report for the same year. But, as late as the 8th of last January, Chief Justice Robinson, in his annual address before the Canadian Institute, took occasion to allude to our common school system in the following significant terms:

"If the system of common school education which pervades all parts of Upper Canada shall continue to be maintained in full efficiency, which there is no reason to doubt, the number of those who can enter with pleasure and profit into discussions upon subjects of science will be immensely increased; and those whose generous aim it may be to enlighten and improve others by communicating freely the results of their own researches and experiments, will find abundance of hearers and readers able to understand and reason upon their theories. There is good ground, too, for expectation that, with the advantage of public libraries, selected as they are with care and judgment, which are being formed within the several counties, and even within each school section, a spirit of inquiry will be fostered, and an ambition excited to be distinguished in scientific pursuits, which we may hope will in time add largely to the number and variety of interesting contributions to the Institute."

Therefore Bishop Charbonnel and Mr. Dallas (the one in his personal intercourse and the other in his pamphlet) are wholly unjustified in using the name of Chief Justice Robinson as authority for their attacks upon our school system.

I will now address myself to the paper referred to; and in doing so, I will notice first, The statements which Bishop Charbonnel has made in his comparative view of the school laws of Upper and Lower Canada; secondly, The nature of the demands made in Bishop Charbonnel's draft of Bill; and thirdly, The course of proceeding which I have pursued, and which Bishop Charbonnel has adopted towards me, in respect to separate schools.

I.—Bishop Charbonnel's statements respecting the school laws of Upper and Lower Canada in regard to separate schools.

The statements contained in this "Comparative table of the legislation on separate schools," are the same as those which were delivered by Bishop Charbonnel at the "Catholic Institute" in Toronto, and published in the *Catholic Citizen* in July before the last general elections, and afterwards shown by me to be wholly incorrect in a letter addressed to the Bishop published in the Toronto papers, and dated 26th August, 1854.* The Bishop repeats and republishes these statements just as if they were true, and as if they had never been shown to be otherwise. It will therefore be necessary for me to notice them again in order.

* See letter, No. 4, to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.