

Church of England to enjoy the whole of the Clergy Reserves, and in opposition to that of the Church of Scotland to a portion thereof, must be of opinion that the clergy and members of the Church of Scotland in the Provinces of Canada are unworthy of the christian name, and have forfeited all right to be regarded as possessing either honest or honorable principles, else it would be wrong in you to say that we are "anxious for the destruction of your church," and attempt to "rob and plunder" her, that we are "deplorably hypocritical," and under the influence of many other evil motives and passions, which you have pourtrayed in no very measured terms. If I, or those who think with me on these conflicting claims, are indeed as "foolish," "absurd," and "wicked" as you have described us to be, we need not complain that you have not exercised christian charity in making up your judgment on our proceedings; for besides being very "senseless," you say that we urge apprehensions without foundation, "and which we do not believe to be true." It may create surprise that the assertion of a claim to a national right, which you denounce as absurd, senseless, and wicked, should, from the very first moment that it was preferred, find so many eminent members of the English Church to give it countenance and support,—eminent not only on account of their exalted character and rank in society, but some of them from their extensive legal acquirements, and Parliamentary experience. Can they with propriety be charged with lukewarm or other unbecoming feelings towards the venerable establishment to which they belong? or is it at all likely that their respect for the Church of Scotland, and their sense of justice, could so bewilder their judgment that they would violate the most sacred obligations as christians and men of honor, and join in a deliberate act of "robbery" and "plunder"? where the very possibility of private interest or local feeling is out of the question!

Need I refer to the opinion of the three legal advisers of the Crown in the year 1819?—to Lord Grenville, who was a member of the House of Commons when our Constitutional Act passed, and who actually framed the bill?—to the Earl of Haddington? — to the Earl of Harrowby's speech in the House of Lords on the 26th June, 1828, when the petition of the Presbyterians of Lower Canada was laid on the table?; on which occasion His Lordship remarked that he "would not have said a word upon "the subject of the petition presented by the noble lord (Had-