

Disagreements between Trustees and Superintendent; how settled.

23. In the event of any disagreement between trustees of Roman Catholic Separate Schools, and Local Superintendents of common schools, or other municipal authorities, the case in dispute shall be referred to the equitable arbitrament of the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada; subject nevertheless to appeal to the Council of Public Instruction, whose award shall be final in all cases.

Disagreements between Trustees and Superintendent; how settled.

[29] 28. In the event of any disagreement between trustees of Roman Catholic Separate Schools, and Local Superintendents of Common Schools, or other municipal authorities, the case in dispute shall be referred to the equitable arbitrament of the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada; subject nevertheless to appeal to the Council of Public Instruction, whose award shall be final in all cases.

*When this Act shall come into force.
(A new section.)*

[31] 29. This Act shall come into force, and take effect, from and after the thirty-first day of December next.

*Inspection and government of Separate Schools.
(A new section.)*

[27] 25. The Roman Catholic Separate Schools (with their registers) shall be subject to such inspection as may be directed from time to time by the Chief Superintendent of Education, and shall be subject also to such regulations as may be imposed from time to time by the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada.

Disagreements between Trustees and Superintendent; how settled.

[28] 26. In the event of any disagreement between trustees of Roman Catholic Separate Schools, and Local Superintendents of Common Schools, or other municipal authorities, the case in dispute shall be referred to the equitable arbitrament of the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada; subject nevertheless to appeal to [the Governor in Council,] whose award shall be final in all cases.

When this Act shall come into force.

[29] 27. This Act shall come in force, and take effect, from and after the thirty-first day of December next. [But all contracts and engagements made, and rates imposed, and all corporations formed under the Separate School Law, hereby repealed, shall remain in force as if made under the authority of this Act.]

No. 4.—AMENDMENTS TO BE PROPOSED BY THE HON. MR. HILLYARD CAMERON, TO MR. SCOTT'S BILL (NO. 2) IN RELATION TO SEPERATE SCHOOLS IN UPPER CANADA.

1. Add to clause 12 the word "only."
2. Strike out clause 13, and insert instead thereof: "It shall be the duty of the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, from time to time to name such persons as they may think fit, in the respective cities and counties in Upper Canada, to grant certificates of qualification to Teachers of Separate Schools; and no one shall be employed as a Teacher of a Separate School unless and until he has obtained such certificate."
3. Strike out, in clause 14, the word "contiguous," and insert "adjoining;" and also after the word "thereto," in sixth line of the said clause, insert "and is resident within three miles of the school house of the Separate School of which he is a supporter."
4. Strike out, in clause 18, "for the support of Separate Schools, or Separate School Libraries, or."
5. Insert in clause 19, "of the school house."
6. Strike out, in clause 20, from the word "authorities," and insert: "Provided always, that the amount of the Legislative grant to any Separate School, in any one year, shall not exceed the aggregate amount contributed by rates, fees, or otherwise, by the supporters of such Separate School in the said year."
7. Strike out, in clause 26, the word "exceed," and insert "be less than."
8. Add the following clauses to the Bill:—
"This Act shall be extended to the Separate Schools of any denomination of Protestants, who shall desire within cities and towns to have Separate Schools, and shall have erected, or shall erect, school houses within such cities and towns, at the expense of any such denomination; which school houses shall be accepted by the Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada as sufficient for school purposes for such denomination."
"With regard to Separate Schools of any Protestant denomination, the several clauses and provisions in this Act shall be read and construed as to such Protestant Schools, as if the word 'Protestant' were used in such clause and provision of the Act, wherever the words 'Roman Catholic' occur."

1. COMPULSORY EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

I hold that the state has a right to compel parents to take advantage of the means of educating their children. If it can punish them for crime, it should have the power of preventing them from committing it, by giving them the habits and the education that are the surest safeguards.—Hon. Josiah Quincy.

2. THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMON SCHOOL ACT.

The following is the bill just passed in Massachusetts in reference to the reading of the Bible in Common Schools;

A Bill concerning Religious Services in Public Schools.

Be it enacted, &c. :—

Sect. 1. The school committee shall require the daily reading of some portion of the Bible without written note or oral comment, in the public schools, but they shall require no scholar to read from any particular version, whose parent or guardian shall declare that he has conscientious scruples against allowing him to read therefrom, nor shall they ever direct any school books calculated to favour the tenets of any particular sect of Christians, to be purchased or used in any of the public schools.

3. TRUANCY IN THE BOSTON SCHOOLS.

Truancy has long been one of the most serious impediments with which educators have had to contend. Much has been said and written on the subject, but no successful plan for preventing it has ever been devised. The City of Boston, always in the lead in educational reforms, has recently taken the matter in hand with a determination to trace the evil to its true source, and then adopt effectual means for its removal. She has bearded the lion in his den, and is beginning to handle the juvenile offenders without gloves. Heretofore school officers and teachers have contented themselves with throwing a few tufts of grass; but finding that this "only made the young sauce-box laugh," the people of Boston have resolved to try what virtue there is in more cogent appliances. In nearly all of the attempts heretofore made to correct this evil, the artful scholar, through misrepresentations and the false sympathies of parents, has triumphed.

Truancy when properly considered is a very grave offence, and is productive of more harm than is generally supposed. It works a serious injury to all parties—the parent, the child, the tax-payer, and the public. Yet, strange as it may seem, if coercive measures become necessary for its suppression, the parent will palliate it, and resist the proper authorities in any effort to correct it. A case recently occurred in our own State, in which the teacher, after remonstrating with both scholar and parent, and counselling with the school director, applied the rod; upon which the parent sued her, and, stranger still, the wooden-headed justice ruled against her, and fined her *one dollar*, on the ground that he found no clause in the school law authorising a teacher to whip a pupil!

The State provides schools for the children, in order that they may become intelligent and useful citizens. Hence arises the question—if the State has the right to tax the people for the education of the children, have not the people the right to demand that the children avail themselves of the means of instruction provided for them? As a nation we boast much of our intelligence, but on this point we are rather below the standard. While other