

of their own. He begged to move the following amendment:—"That whereas the Chief Superintendent of Education has introduced into a bill to be brought before the Legislature certain clauses which meet the objection which many members of the Church of England have to the Common School system, this Synod thankfully acquiesce in the proposed amendments, and suspend for the present further action in the matter."

Rev. Mr. Hilton seconded Dr. Shortt's amendment. He said there was not as much religious sentiment taught in those schools as could be uttered in one sentence. He, as a country missionary, could positively state that he had never met a child from a public school that could repeat the ten commandments. He was perfectly astonished when he came to Toronto and found the amount of blasphemy that was carried on in the streets in broad daylight, notwithstanding the splendid staff of teachers in the public schools. He did not claim separate schools as a privilege, but as a right.

Mr. J. W. Gamble did not believe that the children were one half so bad as the rev. gentleman had made them appear. (Cheers.) Nor, amid all the eloquence to which he had listened, had he heard one satisfactory argument adduced against the Common School system. It was admitted that the Scriptures were read, and yet it was declared that no religious instruction was given. Now he had been taught, and taught by his lordship, that where the Scriptures were read with devout and prayerful minds, the Spirit of God would bring them home to the hearts of those who read them. (Hear, hear.) He thought if the Church of England clergy were to take up the work of superintendence in their several localities, the best results as to the religious influence exerted on the minds of the children would follow. As to the particular question, however, before the Synod, seeing that large school houses were erected and attached to almost every one of their churches in this city, he did not see why the boon held out by the Chief Superintendent of Education should not be accepted, provided that they coupled their acceptance of it with some such resolution as that of Mr. Hodgins, declaring that they did not desire any extension of the separate school system, or to trench in any way on the system of Common Schools.

Rev. Mr. Palmer thanked Dr. Bovell and Mr. Joseph for the able speeches they had made in favour of the resolutions; he said he would withdraw his claim for separate schools, if the Bible and the ten commandments were taught in the schools, and prayers were daily offered up.

Mr. Green said it was for the clergymen and school teachers to bring those children that had been spoken of, out of those dens of iniquity that had been mentioned.

Mr. Harman said he could not conscientiously see his way clear to support the amendment. He fearlessly exposed the common school system. He desired to have more than one hour in the week devoted to religious instruction in the schools. The Chief Superintendent of Education, he admitted, was a smart man, and surrounded by smart men; but was it right that the members of the Synod of the Church of England should surrender their own privileges to him; and even if they did, had they any assurance that their desires would be carried out? Let them go directly to the legislature, as the Roman Catholics did, and demand their rights. Mr. Hodgins had placed this resolution on the notice paper: "That with a view to provide as far as possible for united action in the diocese, in promoting the greater efficiency of Sunday schools, a committee be appointed for this purpose, whose duty it shall be to present a report annually to this Synod, on the condition and progress of Sunday schools throughout the Diocese, and to make such suggestions for their improvement as they shall judge expedient." By this he admitted that one hour a week was not sufficient for the moral and religious instruction of our children. He sincerely hoped that Dr. Bovell would not withdraw his motion. Let them go to the halls of the legislature in a solid phalanx.

Mr. Grover, of Colborne, said the amendments hitherto proposed were but half measures, and, if in order, he would have liked to propose another. He hoped no one, opposed to separate schools, would vote for Dr. Shortt's amendment. He would rather see the original resolutions carried. But he asked the clergy to pause before they forced on the people a measure which was not required by the laity. He declared that the laity were ten to one against any such measure, and he spoke advisedly when he said so.

The Rev. Dr. Beavan contended that the church ought to receive facilities for the establishment of parochial schools. He did not take this ground, he said, in opposition to common schools. He thought the country was greatly indebted to the legislature which established them. So far as the common school system went, it did a great deal of good. But he did not

think it a perfect system, and he considered it ought to be supplemented by something higher, before they fulfilled their duties as Christian Churchmen.

A good deal of opposition having been manifested to Dr. Shortt's amendment, he obtained leave to withdraw it.

The Rev. Dr. Fuller supported Dr. Bovell's resolution. He asked who had induced the Chief Superintendent to make these great amendments? It was this Synod. Who induced the Board of Public Instruction to admit the Bible into the common schools? It was this Synod! Where else had a voice been raised on this question but in this Synod? Who had introduced religious instruction into these schools? Who, but this Synod! And were they, when, after years of labour, they had raised the stone to the top of the mountain, and almost placed it on the top—were they now to go back? No! they should go on, and attain the end for which they had laboured.

Mr. Holgate, of Milton, would have preferred Dr. Shortt's amendment, but that having been withdrawn, he had to decide between the original resolution and Mr. Hodgins' amendment. The question, he thought, resolved itself into one of principle against expediency, and he should therefore support Dr. Bovell's resolutions.

The Rev. T. W. Allen regretted the withdrawal of Dr. Shortt's compromise measure, but since he had to choose between the resolutions and the amendment, he must prefer the former. At the same time he must say that he was not antagonistic to the present system of education. He admired that system, but thought that it was necessary that it should be supplemented.

The Bishop, before putting the question to the vote, wished to make a few remarks. Last year, on this question, he said they had a right to separate schools, and that they ought not to appear before the legislature as mere supplicants. If 50,000 persons were required to petition the legislature for the rights of the Church, they could be got, and they ought to continue to demand them until they were granted. He could not therefore agree to the amendment, although he admitted that it had been introduced by Mr. Hodgins with great moderation and great talent.

Mr. Hodgins's amendment was then put and negatived. Yeas—Clergy 9; parishes, 12; total, 21. Nays—Clergy, 45; parishes, 29; total, 74.

Yeas—Clergy.—The Rev. Messrs. S. B. Ardagh, R. Arnold, Dr. O'Meara, Dr. Blackman, P. Jacobs, Dr. Shortt, H. J. Grassett, S. J. Boddy, and A. Sanson.—9. Parishes (Lay Representatives)—Brampton, Cavan, Clarke, Georgetown, Stewarton and Norval, Lloydtown, Newmarket and Holland Landing, Reach and Uxbridge, Scarboro, St. James (Toronto), Trinity (Toronto), Whitby and Oshawa, and Woodbridge—12.

Nays—Clergy.—The Rev. Messrs. F. L. Osler, S. Houston, G. A. Bull, Dr. Beaven, H. D. Cooper, T. W. Allen, H. Brent, Dr. Bethune, A. J. Fidler, T. P. Hodge, J. Langtry, W. Logan, C. E. Thomson, H. C. Cooper, W. Ritchie, J. Wilson, Dr. Lundy, A. Palmer, J. G. Geddes, A. Dixon, F. Tremayne, Jr., J. W. R. Beck, G. Viner, W. Grant, C. H. Drinkwater, E. Baldwin, Dr. Fuller, W. S. Darling, R. Sanders, T. S. Kennedy, G. T. Carruthers, A. J. Broughall, S. Givins, A. Williams, E. H. Dewar, J. Curry, G. M. Higginson, D. McLeod, W. A. Johnson, J. Ambery, J. Fletcher, J. Pentland, S. Davidson, G. C. Irving, and J. Hilton—45. Parishes (Lay Representatives)—Ancaster and Dundas, Barrie and Shanty Bay, Barton and Glandford, Berkeley and Chester, Beverley, Cobourg, Cookstown, Credit and Sydenham, Cartwright and Manvers, Douro, Elora, Etobicoke and Mimico, Georgina, Grimsby, Louth, Milton and Hornby, Penetanguishene, Port Hope, St. Catharines, St. George (Toronto), Holy Trinity (Toronto), St. John (Toronto), St. Stephen (Toronto), St. Paul (Yorkville), Thornhill and Vaughan, Thorold and Port Robinson, Watford and Lowville, Willard and Marshville, Weston and Carlton, and West Gwillimbury.—29.

The votes of Arthur, Grafton and Colborne, and Tullamore and Gore of Toronto, were lost, on account of their representatives being divided.

The Rev. Mr. Darling moved the adoption of the report of the Committee presented on Tuesday.

The report, although it had been referred to the Committee for modification, came back without any alteration. The following changes in the report were proposed by Mr. Hodgins:—"That the last paragraph in the report be struck out, and that the fourth paragraph be altered so as to read as follows: Your Committee beg to report, that having been in communication with the Chief Superintendent of Education, they learned that a bill had been prepared by him for supplementing the existing school law, and providing for the education of vagrant children in cities and