

laity of the church find it quite task enough at present to furnish half, or less than half of the stipends of their ministers, while the other portion is obtained from the reserve fund, or the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. How then, in the name of common sense, will they like to be forced to provide the *whole* stipend? The *whole*—yes—there is the alternative that will be placed before you—the *whole* of your clergyman's salary—or *no* clergyman,—no church—no religious ministrations—your church shut up—your holy ordinances discontinued.

What churchman is there so insane as not to see the double hardship involved,—and that, in surrendering the reserve funds, he is virtually doubling the demands upon his own resources.

A few wealthy men, indeed, may say —“We would rather double our present payments than have this constantly-renewed, harassing, and disturbing question kept up.” It may do for a *few* to say so ; but it will not be said by the majority of churchmen—by the farmers, mechanics, and labourers, who form the numerical body of the church. It may do for some who have ulterior objects in view, to wish to set aside, at any sacrifice, a question which seems to stand in the way of favorite plans, or of their own political ascendancy : but it will not do for the majority of churchmen to reason in this way : and I would think scorn of that man, whatever his position, who would surrender a principle like this, and the possessions and interests of his church, to please a constituency, or to perpetuate his own popularity.

If the Reserves, or a certain portion of the reserve funds, belong to our church by every security that law can give, it is a crime to take them away, or to yield them up. If they are not ours, let them go—if they *are* ours, let us be resolved to keep them.

Some may think that policy and expediency would justify the surrender. But “*expediency*” is often used as a miserable fallacy, and an excuse for doing just what suits one-self : permit me to recall its proper meaning. Where there is a choice of several courses, all equally lawful, one may through circumstances, be more expedient than the others ; but—when the choice lies between right and wrong—the *wrong* can *never* be expedient.

I would recall to your recollection—I would urge you as churchmen not to forget—the features of gross *injustice* which have marked every step of this attack upon the pro-