

endeavouring to ward off every, even indirect, attack, that may be made upon their religious liberties. They say, and justly, we want not any further guarantee, we want not any act of parliament, to confirm what is ours *inalienably and of right*, and which the boasted omnipotence of the Imperial parliament, can not take from us. Every act, or every section of an act, in which any mention is made of either confirming, or innovating upon, the Roman Catholic religion in Canada, as recognised and exercised agreeably to the capitulation, to the treaty of cession, and to the Quebec act, is utterly void; we can not, we dare not, recognize it, as either strengthening our right, or binding us by its power. But although they properly deny the right, or the power, of the Imperial Parliament to effect any alteration in their religious constitution, or privileges, they know that *by their own consent* every such alteration may be made, and even the whole hierarchy of their church overthrown; their constitution expressly admits it; now, should they have a house of assembly, the majority of which (representing a comparatively most insignificant minority of the united population of the two Canadas,) were protestants, and some of them bigoted, methodistical, enthusiasts, (as would no doubt be the case,) it would be in the power and competency of such a majority, to make all the alterations, and innovations they chose, and in that way they would apparently, but most fallaciously, *by their own consent*, be wholly deprived of the free exercise of their religion. Even were this, only a possible case, instead of being, as it is, a very probable one, it would be their duty to withstand the adoption of any measure which would lead to that contingency. It will be here objected, that the clause of the union-bill which says, that no future act of such united legislature, shall, in any wise, affect the free exercise of the religion of the church of Rome, would prevent this; but to this I answer, let but the united legislature of the Canadas, their legislative councils, their governors, and the Imperial parliament of Britain, with the Royal sanction to boot, be but joined in the enactment of any law whatsoever, were it even one of absolute abrogation; where is the remedy? where is the guarantee? I want no answer. Every one must feel what the answer must be. A great part of the same reasoning will apply to the subject of the French laws, which, in civil cases, prevail in Lower Canada. They are secured to the Canadians in the same manner, as their religion, and may in the same manner, be subverted and abrogated, should a united legislature think fit, and which would then be said to be *by their own consent*; nay, that the alteration of those laws, and the substitution of the English common and statute law, is a main purpose of the Unionists, is either openly avowed, or very thinly veiled. The respective