fined
of Jusbeause
n that
of five
Bibles
ad secguilty,
ct, be-

were

iip, as

ted till

moved record torney g only, he snit rwise, m was "that harter," King's bailed

tate.—
d still
yranny
coun-

n Eng-

ster of

ere d**e**sorders for the overnon had The bolishd been It was d been sentatituted depricerted obediwould rishes, ce dechiefly nisters nd no jected. pected or the

our in

intru-

r such

o care,

by the regularity of their manners, to soften the prejudices entertained against them."

The fute of Scotland has been the recent fate of Upper Canada. The people have ever been averse to the establishment of a dominant church with any peculiar privileges or endowments from the Government. They have earnestly and repeatedly prayed against it by petitions to the King, numerously signed, for many years past; and this direct expression of their almost unanimous desire, has been seconded by their representatives in this House, in successive Parliaments. Yet recently the united wishes of the people have been painfully and ularmingly violated by forcibly establishing amongst them, in Scotch fashion, the very Episcopal ascendancy they have deprecated. Fifty-seven rectaries have in open defiance of universal sentiment, been erected within our borders, richly endowed, and armed with exclusive ecclesiastical and spiritual rights and privileges; while with similar defiance, clergy reserves are sold under an English act of Parliament passed without our knowledge and consent, to the amount of £70,000, and that amount abstracted from our impoverished land, and paid into the military chest. This is despotism as undeserved by Canada as it is unworthy the parent state. We have not the physical strength, if we had the moral courage of the Scotch, to resist the evil; and therefore necessity may doom us to bow to wrongs, which, because of our weakness, it was ungenerous to inflict. How keenly are we at this hour feeling the scourge which has thus been visited upon us by the ascendancy of the church which in England maintains her adulterous union with the State. Perhaps Providence may have in reserve for us some unseen way of escape from impending corcuption of religion, and wound of the dearest privileges of an outraged dependency.

The proposition of the learned member for Toroute to divide these Clergy Reserves among a select number of churches is equally, if not more, objectionable than the devotion of them to one. Upon what principle is this curious selection to be made? Is it to be upon the principle of numerical strength? You might as well measure a man's conscience by his corporal dimensions! Is it to be upon the principle of orthodoxy? Then the learned gentleman must be the Prometheus of the House to draw fire from Heaven to subject the various creeds to its more than human test in the crucible of truth. Or will be assume to be our Inquisitor-General, and with the aid of a Solect Committee summon the Christian community to answer his searching investigation? It would be a singular scene: only imagine it :-Inquisitor.—Do you believe in the Trinity? Witness .- That word is not in the Bible, pray what do you mean by it? Inquisitor.—I am not expounding my faith; I am enquiring after yours. Witness .- My faith is between I and my Maker. Inquisitor.—Report this contumacious fellow to the Hon. House that he may be committed to the terrible custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. So that we might at last arrive at that very physical

force, thought too gross for the modern refinement of those who direct their keoner operations ngainst the spiritual part of man. Why should any be selected? Why should any be excluded It is proposed, I understand, to limit the distribution to the four principle churches, viz.:—the Established Church of England, the Roman Catholies, the Scotch Kirk, and the Wesleyan Methodists. If it is just no longer to exclude the three last, it must be unjust to continue the exclusion of others. Enumerate as many reasons as you please for the future admission of any three churches, and each of those reasons will afford an appeal equally forcible in behalf of the neglected ones. The four churches above mentioned are called the principal or leading ones; and it seems, they are on that account, intitled to consideration. But if they have arrived at their present importance without your aid, it is evidence, the best evidence too, of their ability to maintain it. The great difficulties have been already overcome. Under Providence these Churches have become organized, effective and evangelieally influential. They have been built, certainly not upon acts of Parliament, or Clergy Reserves. The admission of them is not pretended to be upon the ground of their poverty or weakness, or from the fear they cannot prosper for the next, as they have done for the past, 40 years. Can a christian, then, put his hand on his heart and say, that the proposed extension of the ecclesiastical wealth, is either necessary or intended for the benefit of churches which have heretofore been planted, watered, and matured into temporal independence and spiritual prosperity, with the all sufficient aid of the divine blessing? When christianity was so diffused through all countries, as to be said "to fill the world;" when christians were "innumerable even in distant provinces;" when, says Arnobius, " men of the greatest genius, orators, grammarians, rhetoricians, lawyers and physicians," became converts, in the face of pagan threats, executions and tortures; when mankind was so universally christianized, that there remained of the world only a remnant for easy conquest: when the force of truth under the spirit and providence of Heaven had gained this ascendancy; then Constantine offered his alliance and imperial favor. So, you are the Constantines of the day. Seeing that certain churches have tirmly taken root and grown into general christian consideration and respect, you obtrude upon them your Clergy Reserves and Parliamentary alliance. As the church under Constantine was corrupted and impaired, so will our religion droop under the patronage with which you may overshadow it.

You ill bestow your parliamentary charity. It is usual to give to the needy: but on this occasion it is proposed to enrich those who have already enough. The course pursued would appear more plausible, were aid proposed for the smallest churches whose age and resources might be considered as presenting claims for support. But it is unaccountable conduct to pass over those who least to those who most want! If in-