

equally with other
provided by law in
Upper Canada;
ls.

only one board

da are constituted
ve certificates of
y other board of

a proportionate to

real and Quebec.
ch is confined to
wer Canada, tells
re not allowed to
y, but according to
lth, and therefore
f.

ion from taxation
ngs."

Canada, are not
e schools in Upper
for the salaries of
cept such as were
are the supporters
ment of any school
levied before they
in Upper Canada
e establishment of

esponding with the
beral constructions
enforcement of the
pirit."

to the trustees of
n any one instance.
g should furnish a
ey complain, and
a disregard of this
ool trustees in the

city of Toronto,* although I did not even delay on that account to receive and answer their communication. The publication of my correspondence with these parties—and which has been withheld in the bishop's newspaper organs that have perpetually assailed me—would furnish a complete refutation of this unjust and groundless insinuation. It has also been shown above that the "dissentient minority" in Lower Canada, must previously "correspond," not "with the superintendent alone," and not at all with him, but with the Catholic school commissioners of the municipality as to the establishment of a "dissentient" school, and must make a protest against, or avow their dissent from, the school regulations made by such commissioners, in order to establish a separate school; and afterwards make another written protest in order to be exempted from the payment of school rates levied by such commissioners—regulations which said commissioners are not required to communicate to dissentients at all. Should the Roman Catholic school commissioners make no "regulations" to which the Protestants could object, "on the ground of religious difference," they could not establish a "dissentient" school—as every step they take towards the establishment of such school, must be subsequent to the making of school regulations by the commissioners; must be effected by corresponding with such commissioners, and not with the Chief Superintendent; and must contain a protest against, or avowed dissent from, the regulations made by such commissioners. Besides this, each semi-annual return to the Chief Superintendent of the actual attendance of children at the "dissentient school" must be made on the oath of at least two of the trustees—a requirement which is not imposed upon the Catholic commissioners in making their semi-annual returns. Now, were the trustees of separate schools in Toronto placed in such a relation to the trustees of the public schools, and compelled to make every return on oath, without such oath being required of the other trustees, we should then have much more serious and better founded complaints from your Lordship. Nor is it unworthy of remark, that no religious denomination in Lower Canada can have separate schools such as are granted to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada. In Lower Canada the schools of the majority are denominational, while the schools of the minority are non-denominational—it having been officially and judiciously decided there that the schools of the "dissentients" are for Protestants generally in contradistinction to Roman Catholics, but not for any one denomination of Protestants in distinction from others. Therefore the schools of the minority in Lower Canada cannot be used for denominational purposes, while the schools of the majority are so used universally.

13. Bishop Charbonnel. "It is again enacted that no corporation shall alienate any portion of property held by it without the sanction of the Chief Superintendent, and no such corporation shall cease by reason of the want of school commissioners in any municipality at any time."

Answer. Nor can any corporation cease to exist in Upper Canada for want of a school, or even for want of members; nor can school property be alienated or applied to other than school purposes, even with the sanction of the Chief

* See letter to the trustees of Roman Catholic Schools, Toronto, dated 11th May, 1854.