

12th Statement.—"In Lower Canada, separate school trustees may receive their shares in all school funds on easy reports and certificates."

Correction.—Though separate school trustees in Upper Canada share in the legislative school grant, on making the same returns, at the same times and in the same ratio as trustees of common schools, yet it is not so in Lower Canada; for there the semi-annual returns of the dissentient trustees, must be made on the *oath* of at least two of them; *which is not required of the school commissioners* in making their returns; nor can the trustees of dissentient schools share in the school fund until after having had a school in operation eight months, and an attendance of at least fifteen pupils—three conditions, these, not required of the trustees of separate schools in Upper Canada.

13th Statement.—"In Upper Canada, separate schools are visited by clergymen of a different faith; in Lower Canada, separate schools cannot be visited by clergymen of Rome."

Correction.—Roman Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada, cannot be visited by Protestant clergymen, who are by law visitors of "the public schools," not of the "separate schools."

14th Statement.—"In Upper Canada, from these penalties general dissatisfaction of dissenters, who cannot have either separate schools or the money due them; witness Toronto, Hamilton, London, St. Catharines, &c. &c.; in Lower Canada, from these liberal clauses working liberally full satisfaction of Protestants."

Correction.—I know not of a Protestant newspaper in Lower Canada satisfied with the school system there; nor have I met with a Protestant who did not express his belief that it is unjust to Protestants. I find, also, that in 1851, there were but 43 dissentient schools in all Lower Canada, and in 1850 there were 44.* But there was no dissatisfaction with the school system among Roman Catholics in Upper Canada, until Bishop Charbonnel excited them to it; nor has there ever been, to this day, a complaint from St. Catharines, or Hamilton, or London; nor am I aware of the existence of a separate school, or a desire for one, in either of those places. Bishop Charbonnel has not been as successful in those places, as he has been in Toronto.

I have thus examined, one by one, the contents of Bishop Charbonnel's "Comparative table of the legislation on separate schools;" and the feeling produced by it cannot fail to be that of surprise at the trivial character of his complaints, and the baselessness of his statements. It must be obvious that so much noise is not made about such trifles, but that these statements and complaints have been put forth as mere pretexts, with a view of accomplishing more important objects; and these objects will be apparent on examining the draft of bill prepared by the Bishop, nothing short of the provisions of which, we are told, "will satisfy the conscientious convictions of the Catholics of this Province." I proceed, therefore, to examine the provisions of this draft of bill, which will form the second part of this letter.

* The Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada has not reported the number of dissentient schools since 1851.