

The notice of a motion of Mr. Lyon was called for the appointment of a committee to enquire into the petition of Jas. Walkley, of Bytown, complaining of Christopher Armstrong, Judge, or for an address to His Excellency, praying that he instruct the Crown officer at the approaching assizes at Bytown, to prosecute the said Christopher Armstrong for perjury, or the said James Walkley, for libel.

Mr. Lyon was absent; and the notice was dropped amidst a general expression of reprobation against Mr. Lyon for putting such a motion on the printed list and leaving it there.

The notice was stated to be of a libelous nature, and it was contended that if there were any complaints against Judge Armstrong, he ought to be proceeded against in the ordinary way before the Court.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for the appointment of a committee to report to the House a bill for the universal introduction of the principle of vote by ballot into the city, town and county elections of members to the Assembly in Upper Canada and Lower Canada. The bill to take effect when over the elective franchise shall be given to classes other than freeholders, and be applicable to the election of Legislative Councillors when they shall be chosen by the popular vote. Motion lost.

EXTRA.—In the business of the Church Society's Meeting inserted in our last issue, the following mistakes occurred in the notice of motion by H. C. Baker, Esq.:

For "expunge the 27th to the 35th line," read "expunge the 27th to the 30th line;" and the last word, for "therein" read "within."

WEEKLY CALENDAR.

Date.	1st Lesson.	2d Lesson.
May 22, TRINITY SUNDAY.	M. Gen. 1. 18.	Mat. 3. 1.
" 23,	M. Ezra 4. 5.	Mat. 21. 1.
" 24,	M. " 5. 1.	1 Cor. 6. 1.
" 25,	M. " 6. 1.	1 Cor. 7. 1.
" 26,	M. " 7. 1.	1 Cor. 8. 1.
" 27,	M. " 8. 1.	1 Cor. 9. 1.
" 28,	M. " 9. 1.	1 Cor. 10. 1.
" 29,	M. " 10. 1.	1 Cor. 11. 1.
" 30,	M. " 11. 1.	1 Cor. 12. 1.
" 31, SUN. APT. TRIN.	M. Jos. 23. 1.	Mat. 27. 1.

* Creed of St. Athanasius. † Pro Ps. M. 8, 15, 21; E. 47, 108.

Canadian Churchman.

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1853.

THE CLERGY RESERVES.

It appears that, in common with several of our contemporaries, we were misinformed as to the amendment in the Clergy Reserves Bill, to confer power upon the Canadian Parliament to legislate upon all religious endowments in the Province, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant. The general feeling amongst the Peers, seemed to be, that no such declaratory clause was necessary, inasmuch as the principle was undoubted that all Colonial endowments, could be legislated upon, and secularized, as well as the Clergy Reserves, which had hitherto been deemed the exception.

We had contemplated giving an abstract of the debates in Committee, and at the discussion upon the third reading of the Bill. As even an abstract, however, would engross too much of our present space, we have altered our intention, more especially as our readers are already familiar with the prominent arguments and points which were advanced.

That truly Christian statesman the Earl of Derby, advocated, but unsuccessfully, an amendment, the effect of which would have been to ensure to the Anglican Church and other Protestant bodies in Canada, the lands already allotted to them. In the following eloquent and most impressive manner did he sum up his admirable remarks:

"My lords, the principle of my case is this: if property has been assigned by competent authority to trustees or existing bodies—if, under the authority of acts of parliament, that investment has been made in British and colonial lands—if, on the faith of that investment, new churches have been built, new parishes formed—if Christianity has spread and extended over the face of the country, have you a right by the mere exercise of the authority of parliament—on your conscience do you believe you have the right to look to the pecuniary interests of the matter only?

Is there a member in your lordship's house—particularly, I would ask, is there a member sitting on the right reverend bench, who would say, as to the alienation of church property, "So long as my interests in my see are preserved I care not (cheers). So long as the interests of the incumbent are safe, I care not (hear). No matter what becomes of the parishioners (hear, hear). It is a settlement which the state may withdraw. We are only the salaried servants of the state. The prescription of 400 years may be done away with. We will fling all these claims to the winds; you are at liberty to deal with the incomes of our sees, and with the incomes of the clergy under our guardianship. We are prepared to deal with the pecuniary interests of the Church (hear, hear) of which we are the representatives in this house. We leave all to depend on the caprice of the representative assembly or of a popular House of Commons" (cheers). My lords, I do not think such a language would be held by any one of your lordships (hear, hear). But the noble earl has said that the security of the Church of England rests on the deep attachment of England (hear, hear). I do not doubt the attachment of a large portion of the people of this country to the Church; but if that security rests on attachment to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England of a large portion of those who now are or who may hereafter be the representatives of the people in parliament, I say that the possessions and the temporalities of the Church rest on a much more narrow and dangerous basis than is supposed (hear, hear). I believe, my lords, the church possesses the confidence of the people and the affections of a large portion of them. But whether she is viewed with affection or not, I believe there are many who would hesitate before they confiscated that Church's property, because they venerate the established rights of property (cheers), and because they would resist the beginning of a system of confiscation of which none could see the end (cheers). If, then, you think it unconstitutional to deal with grants from the Crown, sanctioned by the legislature, and involving the rights of property, do nothing by which you can cast doubt upon the sincerity of your conviction—do not, under any plea of temporary expediency, apply to the colony of Canada and the Church of Canada, that doctrine which you hold to be in principle indefensible as applied to England (hear, hear). My lords, I entreat you to pause before you pass this most dangerous measure. Grant, if you will, to the colonists, full control for the future. Let them increase these emoluments and endowments in proportion to the growing wealth and population of the province, but maintain the rights of settled and vested property (hear, hear). Do not attempt to confer a right on them which you do not possess yourselves; maintain there the same principles you desire to maintain in England; and if the feelings and opinions of the great bulk of the Canadian people—the good and loyal people of Canada, are to weigh with you, enable them to say parliament has given us that control which it is theirs to give, and it has refused nothing but what honestly and conscientiously it would refuse to itself, because it would violate the rights of property (cheers).

In the following portion of the debate, the Bishop of Exeter spoke some home and searching truths, which must have told with startling effect upon such of the wavering Peers as had not been rendered utterly callous, by the petrifying effects of principle-repudiating expediency. The true hearted Prelate observed:

"Certainly, office worked strange transformations (hear, hear, and a laugh); and no one could have predicted a few months ago the extent to which the government of the noble earl would carry 'Conservative progress' (hear, hear). It was plain that in the sense which some of the noble earl's colleagues attached to the term it was much the same as Radicalism (hear, hear). 'Conservative progress' had reached a perilous point which it had extended to the destruction of religion in the colonies.

"The Earl of Aberdeen (angrily).—Hear, hear. "The Bishop of Exeter.—The noble earl cheers me. I repeat, my lords, we have reached this point, if the measure of the noble earl and his colleagues is to pass. We have reached this point, that of destroying the provision made for the endowment of religion in the Canadian colonies (cheers).

"The Earl of Aberdeen.—Endowment is very different from religion.

"The Bishop of Exeter.—The noble earl says endowment is different from religion. I agree with him. But though they are different, they are necessarily connected—the one is practically requisite for the other (hear).

"The Earl of Aberdeen.—No.

"The Bishop of Exeter.—The noble earl says 'No,' but an authority to which even the noble earl will not demur says 'Yea.' For in Holy Scripture it is said emphatically, that 'Kings shall be as nursing fathers to that Church, and Queens as nursing mothers' (hear, hear). It is then a duty, clearly pointed out to every Christian state to sustain religion by temporal provision and endowment (hear, hear). Practically, nothing human can be sustained without human support, and the Church must have a reasonable provision (hear).

"The Earl of Aberdeen.—(Hear, hear).

"The Bishop of Exeter.—The noble earl assents to that, and in doing so he only assents to a principle of the British constitution. It is a fundamental principle of the British constitution that there shall be an endowed Church in this country. It is in the compact between the Sovereign and the nation, and is embodied in the coronation oath, by which the Sovereign swears to support the Established Church, not only in Great Britain but in all the territories appertaining to the Crown (hear). Was this a light matter? And were they to be told that religion and endowment were different? (hear, hear). He did not, of course, mean that there could be no religion without endowment, but that, practically, in the ordinary dispensations of Providence, religion could not be effectually maintained in any country without a due and proper provision (hear).

The Standard thus nervously comments upon the fate of Lord Derby's amendment:

"The House of Lords last night rejected, by a majority of 39, the amendment of the Earl of Derby upon the Canada Reserves Bill; the sole effect of that amendment being to secure to the Protestant Churches of Canada the lands already allocated to their use, leaving the residue of the reserves at the mercy of the Canadian Parliament. If the rejection of this moderate amendment be not an acquiescence beforehand in robbery, words have no meaning. Of the allocated lands it cannot be said as of those unappropriated that, having no defined owner, they are 'communis juris.' They have owners in the several Churches to which they have been allocated, and the consent to their spoliation is just analogous to the suspension of the laws against robbery in the case of any particular class of individuals. It is not for us to assign motives to the majority who rejected Lord Derby's amendment, but if the fear of a revolt of Canada in favour of the Infidel and Romanist faction was among those motives, we may say that no fear was ever less founded in reason. The loyal men of the Provinces outnumber the disaffected two to one, and in military efficiency surpass them ten to one. Let the metropolitan state but say firmly the Provinces shall be forever Christian and Protestant, and the Infidels, Rolf, and Papineau faction, should they dare oppose, would soon find their way to the bottom of the St. Lawrence. It is by truckling to them, and only by truckling to them, that such 'tongue-valiant' demagogues are made formidable."

The battle of the Clergy Reserves is once more to be fought in poor faction-vexed Canada. May God defend the right, and send His Church a good deliverance!

THE TERM "PROTESTANT."

Most entirely do we concur in the sentiments expressed by our friend H. C. C., whose communication appears in another column. When we inserted the extract upon which he comments, it was with the full intention of entering a caveat editorially, against some of the false positions assumed by the writer, and the objectionable expressions which he had been led to use. Our correspondent, however, has fully anticipated our purpose, and we refer to his letter as containing, in the main, a statement of our own views of the matter.

There can be no question that the word "Protestant" is frequently employed in a very loose manner, but in denouncing a palpable evil, the author of the article reclaimed against, has unquestionably laid himself open to severe animadversion.

The Anglican Church is undeniably Protestant, though assuredly not in the loose and illegitimate sense in which dissenters too frequently employ the term.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AS A WRITER.

From an exceedingly interesting article in the April number of the *Quarterly Review* we derive the following remarks upon the style of writing which characterized "Britain's greatest Duke." They are deserving of an attentive perusal, especially in an age like ours, in which, to use the words of the present Lord Advocate of Scotland: "men seem to scorn to say what they have to say in simple words, and to think that their thoughts will not get justice, unless dressed out in a peculiar, and generally a fantastic livery of their own."

"We may be permitted also to dwell once more for a moment on the nervous, perspicuous, idiomatic style of these despatches, drawn from deep wells of pure Anglo-Saxon undefiled. Truly English in word and thought, they tell a plain unvarnished tale with the real unadorned eloquence of practical patriotism. The iron energy of his sword entered like Caesar's into his pen, and he used either instrument with equal facility to turn his antagonists to flight or shame. His two golden rules of composition, and which we recommend to the rising generation of type, were, firstly, never to dip the pen in the inkstand without previously understanding the subject;—secondly, to avoid synonyms, and especially when giving instructions. Perhaps almost everything that small critics frown at as clumsy, inartificial tautology in the Duke's composition was designed and deliberate—he saw how often differences spring from the interpretation of synonyms, on which men seldom agree exactly; and that mis-

takes were less likely to happen when one and the simplest word was chosen, kept to, and impressed by repetition; and how many lawsuits, and what costs would be avoided, if the drawers of our acts of Parliament—barristers of three years' standing—would condescend to repeat the same terms, instead of showing off style by variations! The Duke scouted all bullying bulletin balderdash—all talk of 'driving leopards into the sea,' 'finishing campaigns with thunderbolts,' 'crumpling Czars like sheets of paper'—and similar feats, sooner said than done. And as he wrote he spoke. Hyperbolic only in the defence of comrades, he knew how cheering the note of praise is to the distant soldier fighting for his King, and how depressing the cold blast of a furious Opposition. He was no Athenian sophist skilled in logomachies—no practised debater, no intellectual gladiator; he just said the right thing at the right time, constantly expressing the most in the fewest words—and his character carried conviction. All understood his blunt soldier-like discourse, as if giving the word of command, and few took offence at his honest home thrusts, or could resist his sledge-hammer blows on the nail's head. He used his words to explain, not conceal his thoughts; not a few terse phrases have passed into proverbs already—but a quiver might be filled with the finely pointed shafts shot from his mind, that arsenal of common sense, sound judgment, and wide experience."

The reviewer adds a little anecdote worthy of preservation, bearing upon the subject under notice. He obtained it from the private diary of a friend "who happened to dine quite *en famille* with the late Sir Robert Peel," at the time when Col. Gurwood's collection of "the Duke's" Despatches, were in course of publication:—

"After dinner a chief subject of conversation, the Despatches, of which another volume has just come out. I was struck with one remark of Peel's. 'In my opinion,' said he, 'when a studious man, say an American, a hundred or two hundred years hence, wishes to get at a distinct notion of what was in this age the actual style and tone of conversation in good English society, he will have to rely very much on Gurwood. We have had no dramatist at all—we have had only two good novelists, and neither of them is at home in English. As yet I see nothing that will be so valuable, even in this way, as the Duke's Letters.'"

CREDULITY OF UNBELIEF.

We extract the subjoined paragraph from one of our contemporaries:

"CONVERSION BY THE RAPPERS.—The celebrated Robert Owen of Lanark, who believed there was no personal or conscious existence after death, has been led to a belief in a future spiritual life, by communication with the American lady 'medium,' in London. He says that a great moral revolution is about to be effected for the human race, by an apparent miracle. Communications of the most important character have been made him by the departed spirits of Jefferson, Franklin, the Duke of Kent, Grace Fletcher and several others."

What a striking illustration is thus furnished of Coleridge's remark, that "nothing is so credulous as infidelity!" Here we have a case-hardened, grey haired infidel, who during a protracted lifetime has remained impervious to the irrefragable evidences of Christianity, becoming the dupe of an artful juggler!

The picture is a very sad and a very humbling one! It demonstrates what a wretched and unphilosophical thing human intellect may become, when devoid of the light giving Spirit of God! How vividly does the case of this poor, old, doating sceptic remind us of the terrible words of St. Paul: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was hardened; Professing themselves to be wise they became fools!"

THE VOX POPULI.

During a recent debate in the House of Assembly, Mr. Drummond declared, that he "seldom looked into the newspapers to see what was said!"

Is not this rather a strange avowal, to fall from the lips of a member of a professedly liberal Administration?

According to the creed of Democracy *Vox Populi* and *Vox Dei* are synonymous and convertible expressions.

How inconsistent, then, for Mr. Drummond to disregard the channels through which so much of popular opinion is transmitted!

The truth is that *Radicalism in office* has no warm liking for the press. Mr. Drummond seldom condescends to glance at a public journal, and that mob-created monarch, Louis Napoleon, is the sternest despot under whom the "fourth estate" of France has ever groaned!