

In speaking to the motion Dr Hamilton said that there had been an encroachment upon the liberties of the people. If it were successful we would be ruled by Quebec, which practically meant the Roman church. On account of the agitation of past years no bibles were now used in the schools. The speaker proceeded to give the history of the controversy, which has been repeated so often in the papers that it is not necessary to give it here. The important thing for the Synod to do was to express its sympathy with the legislature of Manitoba. If the resolution of the Dominion were passed, trouble would surely ensue: what the end of it would be no one knew. An important election was to be held in Haldimand, and if the Synod declared itself with no uncertain sound the action might be a guide to the electors in voting. They had a great evil to fight and it was necessary to do it manfully. He moved the resolution.

Rev. J. L. Turnbull: "Moderator, as a member of the court of Haldimand I second the resolution with all my heart."

Dr. Laing expressed himself in thorough accord with the principles of the motion, but the form of it was not entirely satisfactory to him. It was certainly called out by a political juncture. While the political barometer went up and down the Presbyterian Church should stand fast to its principles. The motion should embody the Synod's principles of education, and set forth how these had been violated. It was not a question of party. This matter required a great deal of consideration; so a resolution that they would look back to in the future could be framed. In 1846 the impossibility of establishing an educational system which contained no Christian teachings, into which the Presbyterians could enter heartily, was demonstrated. It may be possible that a majority in Manitoba are in favor of purely secular schools. This was a great evil. He would have sectarian education. The other was tried in the balance in Australia and found wanting. It was the desire in mixed communities to have a system that would in no way offend the conscientious scruples of the school supporters. We can have a system that Roman Catholics cannot honestly object to. The separate school cry was raised in 1860 and separate schools were thrust upon us by Quebec. Now that they have our hands tied, they wish to tie Manitoba's, the North West's and ultimately British Columbia's hands. Are we going to stand idly by and see this go on? Nevertheless the motion should be stripped of its political significance.

Dr. Mackay approved of the aim of the resolution, but also thought that the form might be changed slightly. Religion seemed, however, to be getting more and more mixed up in politics. "It makes my blood tingle in my veins to read of what Manitoba is getting thrust upon her while we are sleeping. What do they intend to give Manitoba? Separate schools, certainly, but what kind? Not Ontario's separate schools, but a system that is not a system, an education that does not educate. By that system that was in vogue before 1890 the priests were paid large sums of money, for which no accounts were ever given. They were used to educate the children as was evidenced by the large number of men who, when they grew up, were not able to sign their own names. This money was not used to educate the children for proper citizenship. It was not a separate school system, but a system that was a disgrace to civilization. Draw the resolution up carefully, so it will be a proper expression of our opinion." (Applause.)

Dr. McMillen was in sympathy with the line of thought of Dr. Laing. If Home Rule was sound for Ireland it was sound for Manitoba. He hoped Ireland would never get it, but wished to show the inconsistency of those who were endeavouring to get Home Rule for Ireland and were robbing Manitoba of her rights. He did not wish to mix politics with religion, and hoped the Synod would avoid that also. He protested against the Roman Catholic Church having done for

her what no other Church had. This was a good matter for judicious consideration, and he hoped that the deliverance would be worthy of the Synod. But after all the objections were removed, and all care exercised, there would be political use made of it.

Dr. Lyle, of Hamilton, took a different stand from that of the previous speakers. The Catholics, he said, had rights, and should get them. He claimed nothing himself that he was not ready to give them. However, he saw the impossibility of an educational system with which the Catholics would agree. If they were left to make one of their own, they would quarrel with it in a short time. The State was not able to teach religion to the children.

It was moved by Rev. E. Cockburn, and seconded by Rev. W. J. Day that the resolution be remitted to a committee to prepare a deliverance. Both these gentlemen made short speeches on the motion.

DR. ROBERTSON.

Dr. Robertson made an excellent speech on the all-important question, and as his home is in the West, additional interest was manifested. The doctor said he asked for the moral support of a large and influential Synod in this matter. It was not a question affecting Manitoba, but every province in the Dominion. If the Prairie Province is crushed, the conquest would soon spread to other places. The Privy Council said that the Act of 1890 was *ultra vires* that the Manitoba Government had power to pass it. The Privy Council again said that the Act did not affect the rights of the Catholics. After 1890 the Catholics, when called upon to pay taxes for the public schools complained that they had not enough left to support their schools. The Privy Council then said that if they had grievances they could air them at Ottawa. This was done and the Cabinet sat, not as judges, but as statesmen. The government at Ottawa said to the west, restore the law you had prior to 1890. That is what they said, that is the remedial order. What was the state of affairs then? There was one educational board divided into two sections, the Protestant and the Catholic, and each looked after the training of their own children. The Catholics appointed their own teachers, books and inspectors. Evidence showed that many of their schools were opened but one, two or three days a week. The inefficiency of their system was shown when a petition from an old Catholic parish was presented with nine-tenths of the signatures signed by a cross as the men were unable to write their own names. These two sections divided Manitoba into two districts. Each district contained so many children. No matter how big the district, or if it was impossible for some to attend owing to the great distances, the name of every Catholic child of school age, and some under it, was entered on the lists. The Protestants entered up only those who attended. The Government divided up its money for schools upon the basis of attendance, so for \$197 received by the Protestants the Catholics got \$347 for their poorer schools with poorer attendance. The Roman Catholics did not tax themselves to pay teachers but only to erect school buildings. The Government paid them \$13,000 more than they paid for teachers. When a demand was made to have this money refunded it was met with a refusal but was finally paid. This is the system the Catholics want restored. It is undoubtedly preferable for them but no good citizen should support it. For years past the people saw that we could not get along with the law as it then existed. There was no educational guarantee to the rising generation. Manitoba was too poor a country to support two large systems. The speaker had seen two schools not half a mile apart, two buildings, two teachers and only 20 children in both. The great number of schools makes it necessary that the grants should be lessened, and the result is that each school receives hardly enough to keep it going for the year. Out west there are people of every nationality. The only way to unite them into one people was by one school system, have every child taught the English language, the chil-

dren grow up together. With the other system one people would not have grown from the many classes now in the west. The speaker simply asked that the matter be left to Manitoba to deal with. It was a matter for the province and involved provincial rights. The Western people do not want others to legislate for them. They will resent such action and it is difficult to guess what the end of the trouble would be. The west asked to be allowed to quietly and calmly settle the matter itself, but any outside pressure brought to bear would be resented. No interference with the peace is important to the settlement of the country. Manitoba asked for provincial rights. Let her settle the difficulty herself. "It will strengthen us and stiffen the backbone of the east," said the doctor, concluding his very able and intensely interesting speech.

The following committee reported the finding here subjoined which was adopted: Dr. Hamilton, convener; Dr. Laing, Dr. McMillen, Dr. Mackay, Dr. Lyle, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. D. H. Hunter and Mr. D. Turnbull.

Your committee having considered the matter report as follows: The religious element in education we deem to be of vital importance. We hold strongly that a non-Christian and purely secular system is unsafe for the State and cannot produce or foster the spirit of good citizenship.

The truths and moral duties of Christ, held in common by all, are amply sufficient to supply what we desiderate in a public system of education, and teaching of the distinctive tenets of any one branch of the Christian church should not be undertaken by the State.

On these grounds we are opposed to the granting of public moneys for the support of the denominational schools.

The system of education established in Manitoba being, according to our understanding of it, Christian, but not sectarian or denominational, and admirably adapted to her mixed and sparse population, has the approval of this Synod.

Therefore we deprecate any outside interference with the view of forcing on Manitoba a system of separate schools.

Dr. Lyle presented an excellent report on Sabbath Observance. Its recommendations as follows were adopted: (1) Your Synod would urge the ministers under its care to preach on "The Sabbath" at least once during the coming year. (2) That the heads of families be enjoined to see that the young are taught to keep the Sabbath day as God commands it to be kept. A motion of confidence in the Lord's Day Alliance of this province was carried.

The committee reported concerning the communication received from the diocese of Niagara re parochial schools. A great many delegates did not think the reply was strong enough and considerable discussion ensued. It was finally adopted as follows:

"The Synod respectfully acknowledges receipt of the communication from the chairman of the committee on education of the Synod of the diocese of Niagara, and thanks the committee for their courtesy in informing this Synod of their purpose in regard to religious education in the public schools of Ontario.

"The Synod recalls the satisfactory results of the former united action of the churches in the matter and would hail with pleasure any opportunity of further improvement in this direction. At the same time the Synod believes that it would not be justified in taking any step calculated to interfere with the non-denominational system now established for the introduction of doctrinal teaching to which many of our fellow-citizens would be conscientiously opposed, and therefore respectfully decline to co-operate with the Synod as requested in anything looking in the direction of the establishment of parochial schools."

The report of the committee in reference to the late Dr. King was read and adopted.

Delegates were appointed to attend the meeting of the Dominion Alliance, and votes of thanks were tendered the local church authorities and the press for the kindness extended the delegates.

The Synod then adjourned to meet in St. Andrew's church, Chatham, next year.