gives details limiting the power of the inspector as to entering on land sown with grain, and also makes the inspector liable to a fine for neglect in discharging his duties.

The committee rose and reported the bill with amendments.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. McCraney in the chair, passed the following items:—Lieut.-Governor's office, $3,980, no increase; Executive Council and Attorney-General's Department, salaries and expenses, $14,688 34, increase of $608 34; Education Department, $20,679, increase $1,583 74; Crown Lands Department, $46,360, increase $1,460; Public Works, $17,880, increase $200; Treasury Department, $17,610, increase $150; Department of Agriculture, $1,400, no increase; Secretary and Registrar's Department, $14,100, increase $400; Registrar-General's Department, $8,725, increase 400; license and administration of justice, $5,200, increase $150; immigration, $1,600, no increase; public institutions, $8,225, increase $25; miscellaneous, $16,700, decrease $1,200.

The Committee reported progress, and the House adjourned at 12:10.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES.

Amendments to the Synod and Rectory Sales Act.

THE BILL REPORTED.

The Private Bills Committee met yesterday, Mr. J. M. Gibson presiding. The first bill taken up was the Bill to amend the Synod and Rectory Sales Act, affecting the Diocese of Toronto. There were present to promote the bill, His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, Ven. Archdeacon Boddy, Revs. A. J. Broughall, John Langtry, and A. Williams, with Mr. James Maclennan, Q.C., and Charles Moss, Q.C., solicitors. Messrs. J. K. Kerr, Q.C., B. B. Osler, Q.C., and H. D. Gamble opposed the bill on behalf of the rectory and churchwardens of St. James' Cathedral. The preamble of the bill sets out that in order to enable the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto to effectually execute the rights, powers, duties, and trusts conferred and reposed in them by an Act entitled, "An Act to Amend the Synod and Rectory Sales' Acts affecting the Diocese of Toronto," and other Acts, it was desirable and necessary that the lands dealt with in these Acts be vested in that incorporated Synod. Under the first clause of the bill the lands over which the Synod had powers of sale were vested in the Synod, and the second clause provided that the rents of unsold rectories vacant since March 7, 1878, should be paid to the Synod. A number of petitions were read from the churchwardens of St. James' Cathedral, and the Earl of Onslow and H. E. Bennet, both of England, objecting to the passage of the bill, the former on the grounds that vested rights would be interfered with, and the latter because they held some $65,000 in debentures of the rectory of St. James.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that it would be better to bring about an amicable settlement of the dispute between the parties if possible, before the Committee took action on the bill. The judgment was only a judgment in the first instance, and he understood that it was the intention of the defendants to appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. MORRIS agreed with the suggestion of the chairman. He was in favour of allowing the Bill to stand till Monday next till the promoters and opponents of the bill could come to an amicable settlement.

Mr. OSLER stated that the Cathedral authorities had always been willing to arrive at a fair settlement. (Laughter). He said the reverend claimants might laugh, but it was a hungry laugh. They had offered to refer the matter to an arbitration and named the Chief Justice of the Province of Ontario, but that offer had been refused. The claimants had determined to get all the law would give them. The defendants believed that the judgment would be reversed by the Privy Council. It was a serious matter with the people of St. James' Cathedral to deprive them of these receipts at once, as they had gone into debt to build the spire to the extent of some $70,000, which would not have been undertaken without this endowment. They were prepared to recommend a settlement as follows:—The rector was given $5,000 a year by law, and they were perfectly content with a proper division of the funds, which were left among the existing churches and the Cathedral.

Mr. Maclennan did not agree to any such proposition. They came before the Railway Committee simply to get their rights. He did not see any use of an adjournment for the purpose of attempting to come to a solution of the difficulty. He cited the history of the case from 1866, when the question was first discussed. In 1878 legislation had been passed giving the late Dean $5,000 per annum and declaring that the surplus should be divided. Every person thought that this was a settlement of the matter until the death of Dean Grasett and until Canon Dumoulin was put in his place.

Considerable discussion followed as to what effect the legislation asked would have with the case lately decided, and which was proposed to be sent to the Privy Council, and a clause was inserted in the bill, to which both parties agreed, that nothing in the Act should "affect the litigation in the action of Langtry v. Du-