

by a pension or salary, quietly to relinquish it for alleged reasons of State to the Crown, could it have been more judiciously exercised by the Government, and so satisfactorily to those immediately concerned, as it has been uniformly since the conquest to this day, in the hands of their own pastors? Emphatically it may be answered, No. There can scarcely be a doubt that the Church patronage in the hands of the Government would be made subservient to politics; in a word, prostituted. The most supple and subservient of the priesthood, to the Executive, those mixing themselves up with the passions of the multitude, and openly in disregard of the sacred obligations of duty, taking, for instance, a part in elections to secure the return of Executive creatures, or those most assiduous in paying court and doing homage to men in power, would, in all probability, be the most likely to fare best in the church livings; while men of genuine merit, above prostituting the influence of their sacred station to politics, would be passed over, and might live and die unnoticed. At any rate, discontent and disorder, had the Government, either forcibly or through corruption, assumed the appointments to the Roman Catholic *cures*, would, most probably, have resulted, and it wisely refrained from the experiment. The subject has since remained at rest, and it is to be hoped will so remain. The Parliament of Canada having recently, in a very emphatic manner declared it "*desirable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State,*" it is not indeed likely that it will ever be revived. The Roman Catholic population maintain, at their own expense, under an Act of the British Parliament, their Clergy, and so long as they themselves are satisfied with the management of the Church affairs by their own pastors, any attempt to wrest it from them for reasons of State, would, to say the least of it, be exceedingly bad policy. As, therefore, the