

1st June, 1837, Mr. (now Dr.) Cook read to the Presbytery of Quebec, which then included Montreal, the draft of a letter of instruction to Dr. Mathieson, who was proceeding to Scotland as a representative to the Mother Church. The draft was approved and ordered to be transmitted. It is signed by "John Cook, Moderator of the Presbytery of Quebec." The letter throughout takes for granted the real connection that exists between the Church in Canada and the Church of Scotland, but these words seem to place the matter beyond doubt:—

"CLERGY RESERVES.—You will endeavour to keep alive, in the Church of Scotland, the interest already expressed in our just claims to a portion of these reserves, as belonging to an Established Church of the British Empire, co-ordinate with the Church of England."

To plain, simple, honest men, but one meaning can attach to these words. Yet in the face of these, and as I shall shortly show them, other expressions equally strong, Dr. Cook, the writer of these words, and who signed in his official capacity, had the boldness, as a member of the Board which sought to appropriate the Fund belonging to the Church he and other members of the Board had left, to instruct his attorneys to set up the plea to set aside the Writ of Injunction obtained in 1875, that there never had been any real connection with the Church of Scotland on the part of the Church in Canada which, to use his own words, had demanded recognition, as belonging to an Established Church of the British Empire, co-ordinate with the Church of England! The question may very pertinently be asked:—Was there any attempt made to obtain a share of the benefits of the Clergy Reserves, by setting up the false pretence that the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland represented in Canada one of the National Churches so completely that she was entitled to all the advantages bestowed by the Act of Union, equally with the Church of England, or was the statement in 1875, in the legal plea a direct violation of the truth? These, to say the least, singular variations may be allowable to an advocate anxious to gain his case; they can scarcely add to the reputation of a Minister of the Gospel.

The evidence of the Hon. William Morris as to the connection with the Church of Scotland can as little be doubted as that of Dr. Cook. In the same year, 1837, that gentleman was sent to Great Britain in reference to the claims of members of the Church of Scotland living in Canada, that is, members and adherents of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. It is necessary to be very particular on this head. At a meeting held in Cobourg, at which Mr. Morris was appointed, the following, among other resolutions, were passed:

"That under and by virtue of the Act of Union, the adherents to the Church of Scotland, in any British Colony, are entitled to a communication of all civil and religious rights, &c., equally with the adherents of the Church of England.

"That in terms of the Act of Union, the status of the Church of Scotland, is co-ordinate with that of the Church of England, &c.

"That with the view of effectually removing the disabilities under which we labour, we address His Majesty and the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, praying that a declaratory Act of the Imperial Parliament may be passed, to remove all our disabilities and to restore us to that position to which by the Act of Union we are entitled.

"That all members of our Church throughout Canada should resist by every constitutional means all attempts to encroach on our rights, and should rest only when no disability shall remain to be removed, and when the provisions of the Act of Union, in reference to the Church of Scotland, shall be fully complied with."

There were sixteen resolutions in all, but the extracts sufficiently show their nature. It is unnecessary to speak in detail of the steps taken by Mr. Morris to vindicate the claims of the Church which he was sent to represent. He emphatically claimed for it the privileges asked for by the petition which he carried with him, and on his return received the thanks of the Synod and a testimonial to be preserved as an heir-loom in his family. Yet Mr. John L. Morris, his son, a member of the Board which is administering for the benefit of those who have joined another communion the fund belonging solely to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, had the hardihood, in 1875, to set up the plea that there never was any real connection with the Church of Scotland. As one of the attorneys for the Board it may be laudable in him to use any plea, but that can scarcely be a virtue in an advocate which is a sin in an elder. However, he may plead the example of ecclesiastical gentlemen in mitigation of the offence, for we know that

Ev'n ministers they hae been kened
In holy rapture,
A rousing whid at times to vend
And nail't wi' Scripture."

It may be objected that the claims set up by the adherents in Canada of the Church of Scotland were never acknowledged as valid, and that therefore those who had seceded in 1875 must not be condemned as inconsistent in first making the demands and then, finding them untenable, accepting the defeat and conforming their actions to the reality as brought home to them by an adverse decision. I will in answer to this supposed objection show: 1. That the Church of Scotland admitted and supported the claim of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland to be her representative in Canada, and as such entitled to demand and receive all the benefits arising from the fact of her being a National Church; and 2. That the Imperial Parliament recognised and provided for the claims of that Church.

At the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May, 1837, the report of a committee appointed to consider the position of the Church relative to the appropriation of the Clergy Reserves recommended that the most energetic measures should be adopted by the Assembly to procure a portion of that source of revenue for the Church of Scotland in the colonies. That report was approved of.

In May, 1839, at the meeting of Assembly, the report of the Colonial Committee, adopted by the Assembly, states that "the Committee embrace every opportunity for asserting and maintaining the rights of members of the Church of Scotland resident in the British Colonies to all the privileges and emoluments secured by the Treaty of Union to the Established Churches of the United Kingdom." The Assembly itself records its heartfelt acknowledgment for the "satisfactory assurance given to the representatives with reference to the claims of the Church of Scotland on the Clergy Reserves in Canada." In the appendix to the Committee's report is a letter, dated 4th January, 1839, from Sir George Grey, Colonial Secretary, addressed to the chairman of Committee, containing, when viewed in the light of the counter statement of Dr. Cook in

1875, the following remarkable words: "Your letter of the 20th November, on the subject of the memorial of the Rev. Dr. John Cook relative to the grant to the Church of Scotland in Lower Canada out of the Clergy Reserve Fund, was received," &c. On the 5th of March, 1839, the Colonial Committee of the General Assembly, speaking of the Clergy Reserves, "conceive that a memorial should be prepared to be laid before Her Majesty's Government respecting the legal claims of the Church of Scotland; a recognition should be sought from Government as to the rights of the Church of Scotland to be considered as an essential part of the Protestant established religion in Canada, . . . and further agreed to the recommendation of the acting Committee, that a deputation should be sent to London to present the memorial and urge the claims of the Church of Scotland in Canada on the consideration of Her Majesty's Government," (that is, the claims of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland).

So much for the action of the Mother Church. What course did the Government follow? On the 7th August, 1840, an Act was passed (3 and 4 Vic., cap. lxxviii.) recognising the claims thus put forward, and providing, amongst other arrangements respecting the Reserves, that "the net interest, &c., accruing upon the investments of the proceeds of all sales of such Reserves . . . shall be divided into three equal parts, of which two shall be appropriated to the Church of England and one to the Church of Scotland in Canada."

The first secession, which took place in 1844, actually divides the history of the Church into two periods up to 1875, when the second secession took place. I shall in another paper show the subsequent events until the secularization of the Reserves in 1855.

DOUGLAS BRYMNER.

THE "JINGOES."

History has to deal with few things more curious than the way in which odd names come to be associated with national parties or movements. Every political crisis gives rise to certain words, either minted for, or adapted to, the occasion, and the origin of these becomes in time matter of curious speculation. Party spirit is fertile in nicknames and terms of contempt; and while many of them die out and are forgotten, others stick to those to whom they are applied, and in process of time lose the "sting" which was in the original application, and so pass into general use as a mere matter of convenience.

Almost all our party designations were originally applied contemptuously. This we know; but in most cases this is all we know. Historians find, for example, that at a certain period the terms "Tory" and "Whig" were in general use. Now, these are very peculiar terms, and it is natural to enquire, When and under what circumstances did they originate? There is little definite information to be found on this point, and what is to be obtained is unsatisfactory. We are told that Tory meant originally "an Irish robber," and that "the Tories were noted for their ferocity and murders." Turning to "Whig," we find it described as "a term originally applied to the fanatical conventiclers of Scotland; and Halliwell enables us to conjecture why the term was used, since he describes it as a Lincolnshire word for "sour whey,"—and the whey-faced conventicler was sour enough in all conscience. Here, then, we have the words in their original meaning; but that seems to have nothing to do with the political meaning. How came they to be adopted in the designations of the two great parties in the British House of Commons. The question is more easily asked than answered. The historians give all sorts of accounts, pointing to various and different epochs, clearly knowing very little about it. In the main, we may take it that the Jacobites were Tories, and the Hanoverians the Whigs, in the old time, when England was distracted by the squabbles for the supremacy of the rival Houses.

It is certain that for two centuries, or thereabout, the Tories and the Whigs divided public opinion pretty much between them, though not always precisely on the same grounds. Once the terms were defined as meaning—Tories, those who curb the power of the people; Whigs, those who would control the power of the Crown,—which is hardly a sufficiently exact or capacious definition to embrace what the terms now imply.

Somewhere about 1840 the new terms "Conservatives" and "Liberals" came into fashion, and still more recently we have the super-refined title "Liberal-Conservative," the prefix (as we have been reminded in the records of the Police Court within the last week) being added, *teste* Goldwin Smith, as a "deodorizer"; still, we fancy the old "Tory" may be found behind the mask if we only take the trouble to look for him.

Supplementing these parties, we have the "Radicals"; and here for once we are able to see precisely in what manner the term arose. It was first applied as a party name in 1818 to Henry Hunt and his followers, who were fond of talking of a "radical reform" in Parliamentary Representation. Here is plain sailing; but we get into the fog again when we come to some other of the terms now quite familiar to us as indicating parties—political and others—unknown to our forefathers.

It is beyond our limit to do more than mention the "Chartists" and the "Fenians" as representatives of the violent and wicked outgrowth of modern discontent, whose main object seems to have rested in the hope that in a scramble, something in the shape of "portable property" might fall to their share.

The silly and meaningless party titles which have existed at intervals in the United States, and have gone to a merited oblivion, may also be passed by,—we refer to such rubbish as "Loco-focos," the "Barn-burners," the "Know-nothings," the "Hard-shells," &c. &c.; but it is worthy of notice, that the titles "Democrat" and "Republican" seem to have a different meaning from that which is attached to these terms in any other country; so we have here in Canada our "Grits" and "Clear Grits," our "Bleus" and "Rouges," all of which appear to pass current, with some sort of meaning.

Why, again, are the followers of John Wesley called "Methodists"? It is said that the term was suggested by the Latin appellative *Methodistæ*, given to a college of physicians in ancient Rome in consequence of the strict regimen