

talked incessantly about toleration, and had even the effrontery to tell the Pope, that he would do more for the Catholics were he the king of England than his father-in-law could do. But his peremptory refusal to acquiesce in any parliamentary measure of relief was ostentiously promulgated; and the Dissenters were too glad to forget the means of their liberation and the insecurity of their new tenure of freedom, in their joy at the plenitude in which it was accorded them.

Each emancipated sect tendered in turn the tribute of its gratitude to James. The Presbyterians begged him "to believe the thankfulness of their hearts beyond any expression of their lips or pens, for his gracious declaration for liberty in the worship of God; and forasmuch as it had pleased his Majesty to give this safe port to his poor subjects so long tossed with tempests, and justly to believe that loyalty is not entailed to a party, so they should not cease to bow their knees to the God whom they served and by whom kings reign, beseeching Him to recompense this favour to his Majesty with uninterrupted health, success in his councils and affairs—crying as with one voice, "Let the King live for ever." (4) Were there no direct proof of the fact, it is surely impossible to believe that these men could join in dethroning him.

The Quakers deputed William Penn to thank the King for them. They told him in their address that he had well fulfilled the divine precept of rendering to Cæsar, the things of Cæsar, and to God the things of God: "for while he was himself a subject he gave Cæsar his tribute, and now that he had become a Cæsar, gave God his due, viz., the sovereignty over consciences." (5)—*McCullagh on the Revolution of 1688—North of England Magazine for October.*

TEE-TOTALISM:

We have great pleasure [says the Toronto Patriot] in copying the following admirable remarks of one of the ornaments of our Church, the Lord Bishop of Norwich, on the subject of Teetotalism. They exactly square with the humble views which on more than one occasion we have expressed on this subject.

The two most reprehensible features in the Teetotal movements are—1st. The almost blasphemous denunciation of the use of Wine as one of the elements of the Holy Sacrament, and 2nd. The disgusting exhibition of respectable maidens and innocent children publicly paraded through the Streets of a City as members of a Society of persons bound by a pledge to avoid making beasts of themselves by wallowing in the mire of intoxication.

With perfectly equal propriety and reason they might enrol themselves members of an anti-Grand-Larceny-Society, or an anti-Burglary-Association.

It is a poor veil this Teetotalism, under which a man may be intemperate in all the various relations of life, cruel—avaricious—gluttonous—unfaithful—let him only become a Teetotaler, and the pewter or silver pledge will serve as the broad screen for all his other peccadillos. But listen to His Lordship of Norwich:—

"The Teetotalers.—What I object to is their violence, they will not allow pro-

ple to be sober their own way, so that if they will not follow without deviation, their rules and regulations, they are denounced as traitors to the cause of Temperance; nay, I have heard the whole body of the British and Foreign Temperance Society denounced as worse than drunkards. It is really a sort of paradox, for I am sure that you, my Lord, and every person in this room, has the greatest possible dislike to intemperance in any shape; and it is therefore denounced, and I only regret that we are not in Exeter Hall with teetotalers around us; I should think myself justified in using such arguments as I thought fit against their exclusive system. They are temperate certainly but it is a physical kind of temperance; "temperance does not consist in mere abstinence from wine or from spirits, but in abstinence also from anything that conduces to unhinge the human mind, and to unfit it for the society in which it moves." This is too much to be seen in teetotalists; they are characterized by a sort of moral intoxication, if we may so call it; when once their passions are excited they know no bounds; they irritate, oppose and denounce, which is all foreign to the precepts and principles of the gospel. Again, there are certain fallacies in these arguments which ought to be exposed. They object to anything containing alcohol. Then why don't they object to sugar! Their common sense is at fault as well as their chymistry. In order to explain the mention of wine in Scriptures, they try to make it out that it is unfermented wine, instead of perceiving that the great principle of Scripture is [as might be illustrated by passages innumerable] that it is the abuse, not the use of the thing in which sin lies. I think teetotalers are in some sort morally intoxicated upon this point; "and judging from their conduct upon too many occasions, I might almost say they were laboring under a species of delirium tremens."—*Times, Oct. 21.*

From the Montreal Commercial Messenger.

Many people hereabouts will persist in being in a rage about the recent introduction into the Cabinet of Messrs. Lafontaine and Morin. There are many reasons why this should not be. Let us enumerate:

1. Responsible Government has placed Messieurs Lafontaine and Morin in power, and Responsible Government, it is likely, will keep them there. To exhibit rage then, is not what we call wisdom, for those who do exhibit it are quite certain of being laughed at by the very persons they are in a rage with, and affect to despise.

2. It was not bad policy to give place and power to Messieurs Lafontaine and Morin. A phalanx of thirty votes in an assembly of eighty-four was, and is, and always will be a political paunch in that assembly. The French Paunch in the House at Kingston was admirably worked. Its shells told. Thirty votes acting as one vote were truly formidable. Managed with skill, they could almost to a certainty have prevented good government.—How much better was it then to have the gun with us than against us, which we did simply by admitting the bondholders to a share in the responsibility of managing the ship.

3. Mr. Lafontaine is said to be a reformer in earnest. He is said to desire the amelioration of the country, and to care little for "nos loix" when "nos loix" come into collision with measures calculated to benefit the colony. If this be so we have not lost by the recent change, because Mr. Lafontaine is powerful among his countrymen, and if he goes into the amelioration plans in a true spirit, we may expect results highly favourable to the country and the people.

4. The recent change could not be avoided. It was imperative upon Sir Charles Bagot.—It is unjust, then, to assail him with vituperation and abuse.

It should be remembered that he represents the Queen, and that his doings are approved of by Her Majesty, who thereby, through her Ministers, assumes the responsibility of his doings.

From the Quebec Mercury.

We have great pleasure in recording a simple and touching occurrence which, of itself, will speak volumes in illustration of the deep rooted gratitude, and personal esteem, the policy of Sir Charles Bagot has awakened for himself with the Lower Canadian population. On Wednesday last the inhabitants of the village of St. Nicholas, a few miles distant from Quebec, celebrated high mass, with all its solemnities, for the restoration of the declining health of the Governor General, and the prolongation, for yet many years to come, of his life.

When known to his Excellency, this fact cannot but have the most marked effect in soothing the mental irritation which, in his precarious and delicate state of health, the unsparing vituperations he has experienced at the hands of a portion of the people he came to rule, cannot but have created, and will more than recompense him for all the newspaper calumny heretofore heaped upon his head. If this display of feeling has been elicited in a spot where politics have as yet excited but little or no active interest, what may we not fairly presume to be that existing in the districts where they have formed a portion of the every day thoughts of their residents? This is a gratifying proof that the generous and just intentions of His Excellency, towards them, have strongly wound themselves around the hearts of the French Canadians, when they thus incorporate his memory with their acts of devotion, and voluntarily offer up their humble aspirations to the Throne of Grace that He, in his Divine Mercy, may vouchsafe to raise him from the couch of sickness, and preserve him from the hands of the smiter.

Apart from the consideration of this incident as acceptable to the Governor General, individually, we may fairly assume it to be an epoch whence to date the commencement of a high moral change with our fellow subjects of French origin. It may fairly put to the blush of shame any who can step forward and say those people do not evince a deeply imbued respect for the representative of the Queen, and attachment, through him, to the parent state, and the wisely and impartially administered constitution she has accorded them. That they have erred, sadly and fatally erred, the better-thinking among them fully admit; but the contrition which is now following, the conviction now daily impressing itself upon them that they shall no longer be a distinct race, but considered in common with those of English descent—justice dealt out to all alike—the desire they evince for peace, and one common coalition of all to the general weal, all these cannot but work the happiest prospective results.

Shall it be said, then, that Englishmen were those who refused the extended hand of amity and of peace—that they declined to rivet the proffered bond of Union and hesitated to receive to their bosoms an erring but now penitent brother—can it,

we repeat, be said that Englishmen, whose generosity and forbearance are, by words and proverbs, denied all these? The memory of our forefathers, the records of our noble and glorious father-land, common Charity all, all forbid it.

From the same.

As one of the oldest papers in the French language extant in this province, and as read and supported by a class of the French Canadians whose opinions are entitled to consideration, (as being calculated to influence a large proportion of their fellow-countrymen,) the principles enunciated in the *Canadien* must be accounted of weight, and should be considered as these truly actuating the intelligent portion of the true Canadian community. With this impression we translate the following extracts from that journal, forming a portion of his remarks upon the opinions of the French press on the affairs of Canada.

"The French journals have their conviction of the affairs of this province wholly on those advanced by the English press, who in turn are swayed by the writings of English portion of the Canadian press, in misrepresenting the passing political events of the day. The French Canadians do not think, even, of that "entire independence," that "emancipation," of which the Constitutional, &c., speaks. They refused it, when the United States, backed by France, offered it; and it might again be tendered them, and they would once more reject it, and that with wisdom, so long as Great Britain shall render them even handed justice. They ask not, nor have they ever sought, more than a permission to enjoy in peace, and on footing of equality with their fellow subjects of another origin, those rights accorded them as members of the great and glorious British Empire, and secured to them by acts and treaties of the most solemn and binding nature.

Those of their friends, in France, and elsewhere, who impute to them any desire for "emancipation" or "independence," fall into the snare spread by their enemies.

The French Canadians have always cherished an affectionate remembrance of France, as the land of their origin, but they entertain no sympathy for its government; and if at any day they did "emancipate" themselves, it would not be to place themselves under its tutelage. Nor would such a step be taken with a view to their "independence," for that they well knew could not be maintained for a few months even, apart from England; even could it be secured, the country, with its medley population, would speedily become the prey of anarchy, and of faction, until in the end the British would attain the supremacy, and then—farewell nationality!

They are attached to their "institutions," to their laws which they inherited from France, and under which they have so long happily lived, and to "their language," which is dear to them, as is that of any to its people; but the moment they see all these cherished inheritance at once swept away would be to free themselves, and to shake off their allegiance to England.

England claims no subjects more loyal, or more devoted, than the French inhabitants of the Channel Islands, and yet these people are as strongly attached to their laws, their institutions, and their language, (also French) as are the Canadians; and of this they have furnished a recent proof.

Without the French Canadians, Great Britain would not possess an inch of American territory; their fidelity, and their devotion, have already twice saved the country, and may again once more be brought into the field for the same purpose."

(4) Somers Tracts:—ix. 35.

(5) Idem:—ix. 31.