

much more severely than I have remarked even in this letter upon the proceedings of Bishop Charbonnel. I remark, *thirdly*, that my discussing the provisions of the law respecting separate schools in but one annual report during ten years, sufficiently shows that there must have been some strong necessity for it at the time; and a reference to that report will furnish ample proof of that necessity, as well as amply justify the observations made. I remark, *fourthly*, that if Bishop Charbonnel found anything officially objectionable in that report, he should have complained of me at the time to the government, and not brought it forward privately at this late period to aid in accomplishing a particular object. I remark, *lastly*, that it argues an obliquity of judgment, not easily conceived, to suppose that I cannot be impartial (even if I had to decide thereon matters between separate and public schools, because I intimated that the latter could not be destroyed by the former (as some advocates for abolishing the separate school clauses of the law had contended) as I believed the latter would, after fair experiment, be preferred by all parties to the former. The very fact, that, with all the anxiety of the Bishop to seize upon every trifling shadow of complaint, he has not ventured to charge me in any instance with administrative partiality, shows the utter injustice of his imputations. I have expressed my belief, and that frequently and with great earnestness, that free schools are more economical and advantageous for all classes than rate-bill schools; yet the majority of the schools of the country are still of the latter class; but how perverted must be the mind that would on that score assail me as partial in administering the law in regard to rate-bill and free schools.

I may also observe that the objection is equally absurd that I must, in the discharge of my official duties, be hostile to the Church of Rome because of my replies to the attacks, and my remarks upon the statements and proceedings of Bishop Charbonnel; I have found it necessary in justification of the school system and of myself, to reply to Protestant ecclesiastics as distinguished, and of much longer standing in the country than Bishop Charbonnel; but who would on that account think of charging me with hostility to the churches of which they are ministers? Nay, on more than one subsequent occasion, I have expressed the sentiments as well as advocated the interests of the great majority of the members of the churches referred to. To no class of persons, more than to Roman Catholic statesmen, was the former correspondence with Bishop Charbonnel with me painful and mortifying; and none more than they will feel scandalized at the fabulousness of his recent statements, and the unconstitutional character and unheard-of provisions of his draft of bill.

I think I have now shown that Bishop Charbonnel's complaints against the school law of Upper Canada, in comparison with that of Lower Canada in regard to separate schools, are without foundation; that the comparison of exemptions and powers is in favor of the separate schools of Upper Canada; that if separate schools in Upper Canada are not multiplied and if those established languish or are soon abandoned, it is not in the law that the cause is to be found, but in the acknowledged greater efficiency and more popular character of the public schools in Upper than of those in Lower Canada—in the greater freedom of our school and municipal systems, and the unwillingness of the great body of the Roman Catholic population to isolate