

ministrations of the Church of England; and we know that this desire is not confined to the actual members of her communion, but is shared in by many who have not been reared in her tenets. They feel that this would be a public good—on general grounds a high moral boon—an accession to religious privilege. We know, too, that the great majority of places where this desire is so strongly felt and expressed, are not of themselves able to supply the maintenance of a Clergyman, even on the moderate scale which is now, as a general rule, demanded. Take away the means of supplying this deficiency—of eking out the stipend which must be furnished before a clergyman can be secured—and then we should have a grievance in reality; a grievance which, I believe, well nigh a majority of the people would be loud in denouncing.

The advocates of the contemplated spoliation will surely not affirm that there is danger of internal corruption—of a depravation of the faith and morals of the Clergy—from the provision allotted to the Church of England. The intelligent Inspector General of the Province could enlighten them upon this point, and satisfactorily prove that, with the best possible husbandry, there will not even be enough to afford £100 per annum to a Clergyman in each township of this Province from the Church of England's share of the Reserves. And what is that annual ecclesiastical revenue to a township, when at the present moment several townships require two clergymen and even more? The township in which I myself reside would very actively employ three.

We have no ground, then, for apprehending corruption, from any prospect of the exorbitant wealth of the Clergy derivable from this source. Nor need any fear be entertained by the most cautious calculators upon this subject, that the Clergy even on this small