Canada. He (Mr. Cameron) would once for all repudiate the idea of the term "Socialist" being applied to him, and he held it *to be a poor compliment* to the member for Montmorenci, if really he was sincere in supposing that, because he (Mr. Cameron) held strong views on the subject of ecclesiastical endowments, he (Mr. C.) was therefore a Socialist. The member for Montmorenci ought to know that those who were most conscientiously sincere on this subject, would necessarily be the last to become Socialists. He (Mr. Cameron) held his principles on this subject under higher authority than political partizanship. His views and his principles were based on divine truth, and he would never seek to destroy the rights of others; but, on the contrary, he would do to others as he would wish them do to him. But, if Socialism meant an opposition to exclusive rights and privileges, to protection of trades, legislation for classes, whether clerical, legal or medicinal, or the building up in any way a section of the people from the means of the whole, he (Mr. Cameron) had no objection to the term. If, on the contrary, as he believed, the term was applied to agrarian and immoral principles, to the destruction of the rights of property and the conjugal relation, then he repudiated with scorn the imputation, and denied that any line ever written, any word ever spoken, either in the heat of debate or in private, ever warranted any man in insinuating such a charge; and the twaddle and bunkum attempted to be made on it, had his entire contempt. The question in itself was very simple. At the passing of the 31st Geo. III., it was thought good policy to *reserve*, mark the word, two-sevenths of the public land, one seventh for the future use of a Protestant clergy, and the other ones seventh to be called "Crown Lands,"—to be kept, to be enhanced in value, and then sold for the benefit of Canada. He (Mr. Cameron) would ask the house what difference was in the nature of these Reserves, both a matter of speculation on the part of a wise minister for the future benefit of Canada — the one-seventh called Crown Reserves was kept from 1791 to 1828, when they were sold to the Canada Company; and had the same authority desired, they undoubtedly had the same right to dispose of both. At all events, this point was this: both were reserved by Act of Parliament for a future purpose. Neither were ever appropriated, or given, or granted, as we are here told by the hon member for Toronto, that they were. It is really a great piece of effronitery for a lawyer to get up here and argue with verbose pomposity about the sanctity of vested rights under patent, and to ask if a *grant* from the King of England was not as good as one from the King of France!! Of course, all will answer "certainly," but if he puts his case on this question, he is non-suite', for he can produce no patent, no grant, no title, not even possession! In fact, this argument ought to settle the question: the meaning of the simple word "Reserve," ought to settle this whole affair. If this land be a "reserve," it cannot be a grant, it never was *given away* or patented. He (Mr. Cameron) was no lawyer, but he defied all the lawyers in Canada to contravene his statements.—[A voice cried out "what of the Rectories?"]

Oh! said Mr. Cameron, that is a separate question and was a complete contradiction to this argument; he would speak of them, but thanked the hon. gentleman for the admission that the only *grant* or patent pretended was for the *Rectories*, and that his statement, the land was a mere reserve never appropriated, stands acknowledged as fact.

But notwithstanding all he had done, suffered and was ready to do, he was maligned and pursued with bitter falsehoods, such as he had stated. The member for Kent had, with the most unblushing effrontery and that mere worm air of sincerity that he feigns, read to night from a string of papers editorial articles written during the election contest, and pretended to think that members of this House were bound by what every editor in their favor had uttered. A doctrine so absurd need hardly be contradicted. As no two editors agree in their own views on the question, it would indeed be hard to hold members to follow all of them, but he was willing that mere matter of opinion, given with a view to prejudice the country, should go for what it was worth. What he meant to attack and condemn was his reading, from certain papers what he gave as facts, the opposition of the Reform press, to these resolutions The hon. gentleman quoted from the Paris *Star*, and said it had condemned them.—Now the Paris *Star*, Sept. 8th, ready thus:

"We are very happy to be agreeably disappointed in the stand which the ministry have determined to make upon the Reserves question. From the remarks from various quarters previous to our last issue we were led to form some serious misgivings on this one question;—not that it is by any means the most important question for the consideration of the country; but because it is one which, above all others, has kept the country in a continual turmoil, and will ever do so until it has been disposed of. When we saw, in the report of Mr. Christie's speech, that the ministry were determined to stand or fall on the Clergy Reserve question, we were led to say we will do all we can to keep them up. Mr. Hincks in his explanations boldly declares that he is prepared to take those steps which are necessary in order to press the settlement of this question on her Majesty's Ministers and the Imperial Parliament."

and relating to the hon. gentleman reads thus:

"No man could more slavishly have sold himself to do the biddings of his masters than did the editor of the *Globe*, and now he turns round and rakes up all the private matters that came under his cognizance when he was a friend, and thus proves that there is no enemy half so bitter as an alienated friend. Can this conduct [illegible] this speech is worthy of remark. All the Conservative papers are in ecstacies about it. Even our worthy friend the *Streetsville Review* says:—"George is a clever fellow, and can hardly demonstrate the difference between a raisin and a black beetle." We have no sympathy with the philosophy that contents itself with telling people that they have done wrong; we would much rather help them with all our might to do what is right, and we believe that if the hon. member for Kent would act in this way his talents would be turned to a much greater advantage."

Now, was it not infamous that such attempts should be made to mislead by direct falsehoods this House!

Mr. Brown rose to explain and said it was in a former number.

(Mr. Cameron.) The previous number was on the 1st Sept., before the resolutions went up; that was but another evidence of falsehood. But to select where every statement was false, was useless. The article from the *Examiner* was equally so it was not against the resolutions, nor was the Dundas *Warder* which said:—

(Here the hon. gentleman read from the Dundas *Warder*.)

Well the most of the papers he quoted were in favour of the resolutions, with twenty-four others, except the *Globe*, the *Free Press* and Sarnia *Shield* (owned and printed by a foreman from the *Globe* office) well known to be bitter opponents of the Government. The member for Kent said there were but two or three inconsiderable papers that did not condemn. He had on the desk twenty-four which sustained the Government directly and distinctly in their course, of which are: the *North American*, *Leader*, *Examiner*, Hamilton *Journal*, *Canadian*, Brantford *Herald*, Kingston *Herald*, *Argus* and *Whig*, Barthust *Courier*, Huron *Signal*, &c., &c.—The hon. Gentleman said in his report of the *Globe* that the member for Norfolk spoke evasively, and that the hon. Secretary gave no opinion, and in fact was not prepared to secularize the Reserves. He excuses himself and says he may be mistaken, he does not speak French. Now let the country know that the member for Montmorenci rose in his place and informed the House that he had interpreted for the hon. gentleman, and told him that the Secretary, Mr. Morin, had distinctly said that he was in favor of the secularization of the Reserves.

Mr. Brown rose and said: "Oh! that was only last night."

Very well [said Mr. Cameron], admitting that, then, how came you to repeat the falsehood again in your place this night, as you have done to the country. And, did you not, when you saw the reporter's statement of Dr. Rolph's speech in an Upper Canada paper, in which there were but these words, "the Administration will stand or fall by the settlement of this question;" did you not, feeling the position he was in, the damning effect it must have on your private as well as public character; did you not go to the reporter and endeavor to persuade him that he was wrong, and try to get some letter or admission that might shake public confidence in the statement, and when he reported, confirmed his statement, and to your knowledge, called upon Dr. Rolph, who confirmed and repeated it, you still write to the public through the *Globe*, that it is untrue!! did you not?

Mr. Brown tried again to explain, but stuttered and mumbled inaudibly.

Mr. Cameron said that he would then take one of his minor falsehoods more and leave the hon. gentleman to cogitation.—the *Globe* of the 10th has this paragraph [Mr Cameron then read from the *Globe* of the 10th.]

To-night he says that Dr. Rolph, to deceive the people and gain his election, promised distinctly to legislate a Bill, and that at once.

Mr. Brown jumped up and said: "Oh! I never knew that till last night."

Mr. Cameron—Aye! the hon. gentleman never sees newspapers, and did not read what Dr. Rolph said in election speeches; how came he to find it last night and when he found it, did he contradict all the statements he had made to the contrary? But he [Mr. Cameron] should "nail the lie to the counter" once more.—How could he [Mr. Brown] say he [Mr. Cameron] was drunk at his election when they discussed a bill and the reasons against it at Sarnia, where he [Mr. C.] declared Ministers were agreed on the subject, and put his words in a setting in hopes of convincing him, every word of which he [Mr. B.] denies, and says he [Mr. C.] "was drunk!" Gentlemen could not be had done. The correspondent of the *Globe* on the debate says: [Mr. Cameron read an extract from the correspondence which asserted that Dr. Rolph spoke first.]

Now, even in so small a matter of fact as this, there was not one word of truth.—Every gentleman there [and who better than the member for Kent] knew that the member for Huron spoke *first*, and for the mere sake of an additional fling, he [Mr. B.] deliberately mistook the word and fact. It would be endless to point out the system of falsehood which this desperate man took to defend himself from his insane and *Arnold-like* course, and he would now bring his remarks to a close by alluding again to the remarks of the member for Montmorenci, and the position of the Government with the reasons why, under present circumstances, these resolutions are preferred to a Bill. When the matter was brought up in 1849, he [Mr. C.] considered that a Bill was more likely to succeed to bringing the matter to a close under the then liberal administration than an address. He was of opinion a bill might have been legalized at home and made law, as soon as a new bill could originate at home and we get the power. But in this he was opposed by the member for Kent, as editor of the *Globe*, and at a great public meeting in Toronto. And the address prevailed, and the Home Government favorably responded and are fully pledged to give us the power, to legislate. Now a tory party are in power, the hon. member is in favour of a Bill to be discussed by them and submitted with its details and attenuating clauses to the Bench of Bishops, and has clearly said that if these resolutions carry, he does not *care how soon the opposite party are in power*. So that, of course, if the power comes, *they* instead of us might exercise it.

Mr. Brown again got up to explain: he had said that Mr. Cameron's bill had no suspending clause in it.

Mr. Cameron—How did Mr. Brown know, had he ever seen the bill? He (Mr. Cameron) [illegible] that there never was any such bill; this was another of those ready subterfuges the hon. gentleman assorted. But suppose that there were a *bill* without a suspending clause, *knowing* would it have taken the ministry of the day to *frame* one and try it, and if lost, then he might have been justified. But in 1850 there was a bill with a suspending clause, and he opposed it and said in speaking of it as follows:

The following charge was made by the *North American* against the Ministry—"The neglect to touch the great question of the Clergy Reserves." And the *Globe* answers thus:—"they did touch" them—though not in the way our annexation contemporary desired. It was a very pretty effort to embroil us with the Home Government, that ruse of the Republicans proposing to settle the Reserves by a Bill, without regard to the Imperial statute now in force. There was a way of "touching" the question which the American and those who think with him would no doubt have preferred—but we rather think the constitutional liberals of Upper Canada will hardly see "treason" on the part of Ministers in not favoring their views."..... "As to the Rectories, nothing has yet been done, it is true—but Rome was not built in a day; too much has been done—that's the fault"....." And this the whole alleged ground for complaint against the present Ministry from one of its bitterest assailants! We ask any thinking man, be he constitutional, liberal, or rampant radical, if there is the shadow of an excuse in this for the splitting up of a party?—if there is the slighest apology for pronouncing the leaders of a party traitors on such trashy whimperings? As to the alleged remarks of Mr. Baldwin, we have not referred to the debates to see their precise meaning—but admitting that that gentleman did use language on one or two points to which few Upper Canada liberals could assent, are we therefore to forget all his services to the country and abuse him as a traitor? We hope not."

And yet he [Mr. Brown] said since he became an opponent of the reform party, that Mr. Hincks should have gone for this bill. He was wearied and wearying the House on these endless inconsistencies, and would just allude to an assertion made by the member for Kent, in addition to the fact that Mr. Price's resolutions bind us, that the action of the Home Government burden us. He [Mr. Brown] says a bill presents one simple point in proposing an address, then taking the initiative and acting. He [Mr. Cameron] asserted that fact and argument were quite the reverse. A bill involves legislation at home in details, involves difficult party questions, and would invoke the opposition of a whole government just elected on High Church principles; the address only one *question* the abstract right of the people of Canada to legislate on a local matter, and he [Mr. Cameron] was quite willing to submit the simple statement of the case to the people of Canada.

Mr. Christie of Wentworth said—Although the hon. member for Kent had characterized those who supported the course of the Government on this great question as traitors to the voluntary principle, as being sold to an infamous scheme for deceiving the people of Canada on this question, on which of all others they have the strongest feelings, he did most indignantly rebut the slander. He would yield to no man in Canada in zeal for the voluntary principle, and he did not happen to belong to a church which, according to the hon. member's own showing it is the receipt of Government money, a church which the hon. member knows holds the Establishment principle, has in Canada ejected one of its ministers for holding the voluntary principle, he repeated that he was not as he, the hon. member for Kent was, a member of that Church, and that did not homologate its principles. He was aware that the discussion of the voluntary principle was at present irrevalent, but as other hon. members had given their views, he would shortly state, that he believed the connection between church and state to be unjust in principle and foreign to the nature and design of both institutions. The alliance could not be contracted without a compromise of independence either on the part of the church or of the state. It was foreign to the nature of civil society, because the proper province of the Government was temporal civil, and because any money which might be given to the state by the church was money which was surrendered to the state for state purposes, and therefore was diverted from its legitimate purpose. It was foreign to the nature and design of the church, because its founder declared that his "kingdom is not of this world," in other words it was separate from, and independent of civil government. The established principle involved destruction of the independence of the church. Now the rights of the church are indefeasible, they are not's to retain and exercise, not to give away. In receiving an endowment she must give a *quid pro quo*. The Government would not be justified in giving the public money without receiving an equivalent, and that surrender of the church's independence. The ministers of an established church are a sort of moral police, who must move at the beck of the Government. In proof of this he referred to the established churches of England and Scotland. In both an appeal against spiritual authority may be had to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; the right to decide on such an appeal rests with them. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Badgely) asked what would have been the state of Europe but for church establishments! That hon. gentleman had made a most unfortunate reference. Let him turn to the awful convulsions in Piedmont, Spain, Portugal and France,—the horrors of the Reign of Terror—and see the fruits of an Established Church. Let him recollect that Voltaire, Rousseau and Tom Paine came from a land of Church Establishments. We may be asked why Great Britain, with her Church Establishments, stands unmoved amid the wreck of Empires. Why, the secret is to be found in the Toleration Act, and in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.—Dissent is the safety valve it has saved Great Britain from being convulsed from one end to the other, and it has saved her people from the fearful vortex of infidelity. The hon. member had suggested that he (Mr. C.) might be a prominent person in a struggle against Great Britain, in the event of her refusing to accede to our wishes. He was no fighting man; but if pushed to it, he was ready to say, perish property, but *principle* and *truth never*. The hon. gentleman referred to the state of Europe; yes, the recollection of the atrocities perpetrated by the Church of England in his (Mr. C.'s) native country, in the reign of [illegible] but it over-set them, and when the light and values were consumed with the blood of some of the best men in Europe, who for eight and twenty years successfully resisted the nonsense of ecclesiastical despotism, and with a vivid recollection of those barbarities, he, (Mr. C.) would be false to the cause of Canada, were he not to resist even the semblance of an attempt to introduce such a system there.—In giving his cordial support to the resolutions before the House, he did so deeply impressed with the importance of the question to which they related, and of the urgent necessity which existed for its immediate and satisfactory settlement. In speaking of the desirableness of a settlement of this question, he said advisedly that the present was no settlement, it was a miserable compromise between Lord Sydenham and the famous "bread and butter" Parliament of Sir F. Head, carried by one of those "accidental majorities," to which our eminently distinguished Colonial Secretary refers. Yes, that was an accidental majority, that majority was never obtained again. The *people* of Upper Canada never acquiesced in the present disposition of the Reserves; the Parliament which made that disposition was a Parliament elected under the most corrupt influences, and one which in no sense represented public opinion in Upper Canada. Even Lord Sydenham most clearly admits this in his despatch to Lord John Russell, dated Jany. 1840:—

"I will not conceal, however, from your lordship, that even to this Bill, thus proceeding on the principle of so general a distribution among different religious persuasions, nearly insurmountable objections have been and are entertained in this Province. For many years past, the representatives of the people have uniformly refused to assent to an appropriation of this fund to religious purposes at all, and have steadily maintained its distribution to educational and general state purposes; and it is only with the strong desire which is entertained of coming now to a settlement, which has led many who formerly advocated these opinions now to withdraw their opposition and assent to this measure. But I can safely say so far as this Province is concerned, that assent can never again be looked for. I entertain no doubt that the course taken by many members of the Assembly in their conscientious and most laudable desire to put this question at rest, will occasion great opposition to their return at the next election; and I am satisfied that in a future Assembly, if the matter were again unfortunately brought before it, it would not be possible to obtain any such terms for the Established Church or for religious instruction."

Now he put it to the hon. gentleman opposite who contended that the present was the final settlement, whether such action on the part of a Legislature could be considered as an indication that the people of this colony would be satisfied. Why did Lord Sydenham state that those who voted for that Bill would meet with opposition at the hustings? He (Lord Sydenham) knew that the wishes of the people, as expressed by their Representatives, had on 11 different occasions been thwarted by the Legislative Council in the most shameful manner, and notwithstanding such rebuffs their opinions had never wavered. The hon. member for Toronto called this unprofitable legislation, when he and his friends had by appeals, not to the popular branch but to those who represented prerogative, so often contrived to render it "unprofitable." And those gentlemen ought to recollect that they revived this agitation. (Cries of No.) Hon. gentlemen cry no—he appealed to doings in 1840, and would ask what took place then? Why, being aware that the people would not long be content, they got up a scheme for dividing the lands allotted by 3 & 4 Vic., cap 78, among the different religious societies, in a Parliament in which they could manage the matter. Let it be clearly understood, then, that they (the hon. gentleman opposite) removed this agitation.—This is again denied: what does Lord Cathcart say in a despatch to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, dated 11th April, 1846:—"In the present session of Legislature, many petitions in favor of and adverse to such a division have been presented, the *power being claimed by members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the Kirk from the nature of their constitutions.*" In the face of these facts, let them be silent about re-agitation of a settled question. When they introduced that scheme, they were warned as to consequences, by many members on both sides of the House, but they persevered and were beaten, and he (Mr. Christie) hoped that their final discomfiture was not far distant. Then they were assailed by the cry of "vested right;" say they "if you disturb these endowments, no man's property will be safe." Why the people of Canada claim the right to manage their own property; those lands had always been public property; all right to them being vested in them, there was the "vested right."—Every Church establishment was a public institution erected for the express purpose of giving religious instruction to Her Majesty's subjects. The whole thing was bound up in the bundle of life which an Act of Parliament, and if hon. gentlemen were content that according to their notions the Church should depend upon the State for its existence, they could not be surprised when the fiery ordeal of public opinion should terminate such an ephemeral existence. He (Mr. Christie) maintained that the argument acquired additional strength in this case, where, according to the express terms of the original contract, the right to vary or repeal was distinctly reserved. Now, if those gentlemen could show that the terms of a contract are of no importance, that a conveyance which distinctly specifies that it was not absolute, be absolute, and if they would also shew that there was no difference between public and private rights, then he (Mr. Christie) would admit their argument. Now, for the benefit of those gentlemen who did not understand this question, he would quote a very clear exposition of the whole matter from two distinguished statesmen. Sir J. Macintosh says:—"Bodies (and established churches are among the number) are instruments fabricated by the Legislature for a specific purpose; which ought to be preserved while they are beneficial, amended when they are impaired and rejected when they become [illegible] Hume says, "No one now questions the inviolability of corporate rights, when a clear case of public necessity or expediency demands their sacrifice, demands their sacrifice, and when the first of all duties, the most urgent of all necessities call for an alteration in the application of public property, it would be preposterous to contend that the embryo rights of any number of unappointed or unborn incumbents can legitimately interpose to prevent a just or necessary part of reform."—Leaving this part of the argument, we had repeated admissions on the part of the Imperial Government that we ought to have the right to legislate on this subject. All along this had been recognised. Hon. gentlemen opposite said there was no constitutional involved, Lord Glenelg viewed the matter very differently, even at a time when that question was very imperfectly understood, in his instructions to Sir J. Colbourne, he clared that "Parliamentary legislation on any subject of exclusively internal concern in any British Colony, possessing a representative assembly, is, as a general rule, unconstitutional, and that to withdraw from the Canadian to the Imperial Legislature the question respecting the Clergy Reserves, would be an infringement on the cardinal principle of Colonial Government, which forbids parliamentary interference except in submission to an evident and well established necessity." This principle has been fullyset forth by Earl Grey in his recent despatches on this subject, and it has never been denied by any Colonial Secretary but Sir J. Packington. Why, he wondered if he (Sir J. Packington imagined that we were to be frightened by that puerile, and insolent document which has been sent in reply to our just and constitutional demands. His insolence was apparant from the fact that he puts the petitions sent from this country on an equal footing with the addresses from this House. Now he [Mr. Christie] wished to know if the Colonial Minister was to be guided by the back stairs influence, and to set at defiance the constitutional means of information. If we are to be treated in the railway matter, the sooner we know it the better. No! we fling it back in his teeth, and tell him that although we are loyal to Her Majesty and because we are so, we expect and demand our constitutional rights. That was one of the most extraordinary despatches ever sent to any colony, and however lightly he [Sir J. Packington] might be disposed to treat the matter, that despatch had excited the deepest indignation in this country. But after all, in a moment of impolitic eagerness to protect his beloved church, he had given up the only point on which he could have fixed anything, that was its being a settled question; he admitted that it may be altered. Having got this length, he ought to have seen that so far as principle is concerned, he is gone.—But amid all these unpleasant circumstances we had reason to be glad that we have now got a ministry who had the nerve to grapple with the question, and they have done so in a wise and honest manner. The late Ministry as a Ministry never took up this matter. During the session of 1849 they wished action to be suspended, because they were conducting a correspondence with England. When the Inspector General was sent there on financial business it was currently reported that he had instructions not to touch the question. During the third session, from their action on the Price resolutions it was evident that they were not agreed. How different the course of the present ministry.—The Hon. Inspector General, the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, the President of the Council, all told their constituents that they were prepared to act firmly on the question of the Reserves. This pledge had been redeemed by the admirable resolutions which they have brought before this House, resolutions from which they could not recede. We have also proof that during the recess they took steps with the home Government, to bring this matter to a successful issue. And the correspondence between the Inspector General and Sir J. Packington reflects the highest credit on him [Mr. Hincks] it breathed the noblest Spirit and contained sentiments in which every true hearted Canadian must cordially join. He [Mr. Christie] never read with greater pleasure any state document; the rebukes which he administers to the Colonial Secretary and to the advocates of the present settlement, must cut them to the quick, if they had any respect for themselves and the constitution of the country. He was glad that the Inspector General had refuted the mischevious reference to endowments in Lower Canada. Those endowments were given principally by private individuals, or by the French Crown and ratified by treaty. Hon. members from Lower Canada are not to be deterred from doing their duty in this matter by any false alarm. But, although the majority in this House were agreed as to the desirableness of a different settlement from the present, there were hon. members who thought that the course pursued by the Government was not the proper course. Those hon. gentlemen thought that a bill predicated on Imperial legislation is the proper course.—Now this appeared to him [Mr. Christie] to be the plan of all others least calculated to attain this end. If all the communications from the home government breathe the spirit of attachment to Church Establishment, was it reasonable to expect that a measure for the secularization of the Reserves would meet with any favor in the Imperial Parliament? Could we expect them to give a direct negative to the principle of Church Establishment, to veto by their own act, their principles! Besides, when the opinion of the judges was taken on the question, they declared that the Legislature of Canada had no power to pass the bill of 1840, and Lord John Russell was compelled to begin *de novo*. Although the Imperial Parliament virtually set aside that opinion by giving a portion of the proceeds to Roman Catholics, yet the Parliament of Canada by assenting to the Price resolutions, recognized the rights of the Imperial Parliament only to legislate on the matter. And it was astonishing beyond measure that the hon. member for Kent, who contributed so largely to this result, who defended that course till within a month of the close of the last session of Parliament, should now in the coolest manner possible, turn his back on the whole scheme and denounce it as a piece of political intrigue. The hon. member for Waterloo, although he (Mr. Christie) thought he took a wrong view of the matter had always been consistent. The hon. member for Kent had not even the candor his third letter to the hon. Inspector General, dated 2nd October 1851, he thus speaks of the speech from the throne at the opening of the last session of Parliament: "The Speech from the throne at the opening of the session, was calculated to excite strong suspicion as to your sincerity on the subject. In the coldest manner, it merely alluded to the address of the House —expressed no feeling, indicated no *further movement on the subject*." Now, he wished to compare a few saying of this very consistent politician: what did he say on the 27th May, 1851, in an araticle headed the "Speech and the Reserves":—

"Our 'Constitution-mongering' cotemporary of the *North American* altogether mistakes our 'grief' that something 'more definite' on the Clergy Reserve question was not forthcoming. He seems to think that we expect the Ministry to introduce a Bill, without waiting the action of the Imperial Parliament,—as the Clear Grits proposed last Session, without consulting the Imperial authorities at all. He is mistaken; our grief arose from the lack of later information as to the movements of the Home Government on the subject, and the consequent fear that a final settlement of the vexatious question was unlikely to be obtained this Session. We can understand very well how an avowed Annexationist like the *American* advocates a measure so likely to lead to a collision with the Home Government; but as the friends of British connection, with no revolutionary aspirations, we cannot consent to trample on an Imperial Act—however strong might be the temptation to do so.

"It is very clear that in any view of the case a great gain has been made by Mr. Price's Resolutions. The subject has been placed before the Imperial authorities—we have demanded the control of the Reserves as a local matter—the justice of the demand has been admitted—and all we ask freely promised. Even had the argument of the *Examiner* been correct, that we have the *legal* right to legislate on the question, the assent of the Home Government must have been had to that legislation; and it would therefore have been wise, even on the *Examiner's* view, to secure that consent in any way resorted to by Mr Price."

Then in the same letter he says to the Inspector General: "Had you been true to your trust, the course suggested by Mr Boulton was the one you would have taken. You had stated the desires of the people of Canada to the Home Government, they had assented to them and promised action. Mr Boulton's Bill would have but hastened it. Had you framed such a bill and demanded of your colleagues to make it a ministerial measure—you might have lost office; but it was the only upright course open to you." Now mark that Mr Boulton's resolution for a Bill had been brought in and negatived on the 23rd June. On the 22nd July, a month after that, and within a month of the close of last session, he says:—

"There are Anti-state Churchmen who desired that the Bill should have been passed this Session (predicated on Imperial Legislation,) to settle the whole question of the Reserves, and who take offence because it was not done. On the contrary we rejoice that this was not done—for assuredly the Reserves would have been divided among all the sects: a much worse settlement, in our opinion, than the present. There are but two Churches corrupted now—by this system there would be many.—Does any one doubt that this would have been the result? Let him look at the speeches and votes of the majority of the Assembly.

Now he (Mr. Christie) admitted that on some occasions it was improper to refer so much to an individual member, but when an hon. member desires to be considered a paragon of excellence, when he proclaims to the country that he alone was a true patriot, the defender of the people's right, that the people should be able to gauge his claim to that distinction. One word in conclusion to the hon. member for Montmorenci. That Hon. gentleman charged us with advocating doctrines which lead to socialism, but says that we are not socialists. We are guilty then of an error of judgement; in such a dilemma he (Mr. Christie) would recommend his hon friends from Norfolk and Huron, who were put juvenile politicians, mere novices in the art of governing, to defer to the superior wisdom, intelligence and experience of the hon. member for Montmorenci and relinquish so bad a course as that which they followed. If overturning be socialism, then he (Mr. Christie) was almost tempted to call the hon. member from Montmorenci a socialist, for before and since the meeting of Parliament he had laboured to upset the Reform party, but happily his socialist views had not prevailed. If however the hon. member meant that a steady advocacy of civil and religious liberty, and and unpromising hostility to every species of despotism, be socialism, then he (Mr. Christie) pleaded guilty to the charge.

QUEBEC, Tuesday, Sept. 21, 1852.

Last night, after the reporter deft, Mr. Hincks explained on the part of the Government, in reference to the resignation of Mr. Young. He stated the Government intended to adopt to be truly a Canadian one, and one that would place Canada in a position to negotiate for reciprocity with the United States. He said that would pledge his reputation upon its success. He said that there were no other differences between the Ministry and Mr. Young, than upon the commercial policy.

The remainder of the evening was principally taken up in discussing in Committee of the Whole, a series of resolutions of Mr. Merritt, in favor of constructing a Ship Canal between the River St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain.

M. HINCKS stated that Government were in favor of the project Also, that the statements contained in the Report of the Commissioners of Public Works, in reference to this Canal, were of great importance, and were calculated to produce a deep impression on the public mind.

On the motion of Mr. Drummond, a Committee was appointed to take into consideration the state of the law, in relation to the authority under which houses may be blown up to stay the progress of fire; and also in relation to the indemnification of injured persons.

Mr. MORIN presented a return to an address for statements relative to the public deposits and the public debt.

Also an address for correspondence on the subject of Separate Common Schools, between the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto, and the Chief Superintendent of Schools. 800 copies were ordered to be printed.

The following bills were introduced.

To facilitate the redemption of Mortgages in Lower Canada.

To regulate the proceedings of real property in Lower Canada.

For the incorporation of a Navigation Company for the River St. Lawrence.

To amend the Act incorporating the Port Burwell Harbour Company.

To incorporate a Company to construct a Railroad from Fort Erie to Goderich, via Brantford.

The House in Committee of the Whole on the report leaves, on Mr. Robinson's Resolutions, relative to the employment of Steam Tugs on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ROBINSON condemned the coarse adopted by the Govern[illegible]

Mr. YOUNG is defending the Government.

Rumour is rife in the city, respecting the successor of Mr. Young. Mr. Chabot has been mentioned to day.

QUEBEC, 22nd Sept. 1852.

Last night after the reporter left, the House remained in Committee of the Whole for some time on Steam Tugs in the St. Lawrence, but rose without any resolution on the request of Mr. Hincks, who stated that the subject would be taken up by the next Commissioner of Public Works, with a view of remedying the evils now complained of. An address to the Queen was passing without opposition, and amid cheers, on the subject of the Fisheries, expressing thanks for the Imperial aid afforded in the protection, and praying Her Majesty not to give up any rights ceded by the Americans, by the convention of 1818, except in connexion with a general system of reciprocity.

Mr. HINCKS introduced a bill to amend the laws relating to the University of Toronto, by separating its functions as a University from those assigned to it as a College, and by making better provision for the management of the endowment thereof and that of Upper Canada College.—Second reading this day fortnight.

Also a Bill to extent the Elective Franchise, and provide a system for registration of voters. On motion of Mr. Young, the House went into Committee on improving the navigation of the river St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal. The Committee reported progress.

Mr. DRUMMOND introduced a bill to provide a uniform mode of incorporating Societies formed for charitable and educational purposes.

A Bill to supply an omission in Schedule B to the Upper Canada Municipality Corporation Law Amendment Act of 1850, was read a third time and passed, on motion Mr. Stevenson.

The bill to remove doubts as to the powers of the junior Judges of County Courts in Upper Canada, was considered in Committee. The House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Drummond's bill to authorize the appointment of Assistant Judges of the Superior Courts of Lower Canada in cases. The bill was then read, on a vote of to 6.

To night the Toronto and Guelph Railroad Amendment bill was read the first time. On motion of Mr. Christie, of Gaspe the public accounts were referred to the Committee of Public accounts. Mr. Chauveau said in answer to Mr. Turcotte, that it is not the intention of the Ministry to introduce a bill to alter the Lower Canada School law.

On motion of Mr. Boulton, a bill to authorize Toronto to raise a loan, was read a first time. Also a bill to amend the Toronto, Simcoe and Huron Railroad Act.

The following Bills were introduced; by Mr. Mongenais—To amend the Seigniorial Tenner Act; by Mr. Badgley—To authorize Montreal to raise a loan; also, by the same member, the Montreal manufacturing Company's Bill.

Mr. HINCKS rose in his place, and moved the postponement of the orders of the day, in consequence of the necessity of New Ministerial arrangements. He stated that the Commissionership of Public Works had been offered to Mr Cartier that gentleman had declined, to accept it, on the ground that if the Legislative Council word made elective, he would require a property qualification of £2,000 in real estate from each member, and that this was a condition the Government could not consent to excede to. In other particulars, Mr. Cartier agreed with the policy of the Government. The motion was carried, and the House adjourned.

THE PEN.—At the present time there is not one moment by night or by day where this faithful little instrument is not employed; for while we sleep, even by the Ganges in his tent embroidered by flowers, sits the faithful missionary transcribing the word of God for the benighted heathen. Everywhere is the pen wielded: in the present hour, amid solitudes where books were never seen, the wandering poet is pouring out his beautiful thoughts. And the shadow of death, crime and misery, as well as things bright and beautiful, hover over the unsullied sheet, while we write, the trembling fingers of the the dying man affix the signature to his last will and testament; the convict in the gloom and silence of his cell, sits inditing melancholy thoughts; the gambler writes how skillfully he has fleeced some poor green victim of his; all the world be murderers, his glances sharp with hate, pens an assignation.

ADVANCE OF THE CHOLERA.—The accounts from Warsaw are of the most distressing character.—The cholera has raged there with unprecedented violence.—On the 18th the number attacked was 192 of whom 207 died, and 1,474 cases were under treatment in the hospitals of the city. From the first appearance of the disease about one-half of the attacks had proved fatal, but a slight improvement in the returns gave some hopes that its fury had abated. But, however distressing these accounts are it is far more alarming to learn that this frightful malady is advancing westwards.

From Landesbergh it seems threatening Breslau, and its progress towards Berlin is watched with deep anxiety whilst northwards along the whole coarse of the Vistula to the Baltic, the inhabitants of the numerous towns and villiges have been carried away in great numbers. In some villiges two thirds of the inhabitants have perished.

At Berlin the alarm is very great, and medical men have been despatched to the frontiers to use their efforts to stay the pestilence.

As the course of this destructive disease is precisely that which marked its tract in former years the next accounts are looked for with anxiety.

A melancholy accident occured on Thursday evening last at Corbett's Inn, at Flamboro' West to Mr. Thomas Younger, farmer, near Fisher's mills, Waterloo. While driving his team loaded with flour barrels into the shed, he stooped his head to pass the cross girt, but the beam struck his shoulders so severely that his spine was broke, and after lingering for 30 hours death put an end to the unfortunate man's sufferings. Drs Mahan and Hamilton attended but could afford no relief, the diseased was well known and respected in this quarter as an industrious farmer, having lived a considerable time on a farm at Cedar Creek. He was a large heavy powerful man and we think his sudden and untimely end, (he was, we judge, about 45,) should act as a severe warning against the careless practice of driving hurriedly under [illegible] Reformer.

AWFUL CASUALITY—SEVEN YOUNG WOMEN DROWNED!—The following was communicated to the Buffalo papers on Friday evening, by telegraph from Fredonia, Chautauque county, in the State of New York:

"As a pic-nic party, consisting of a large number of young ladies and gentleman, from the town of Stockton, were crossing Casadaga Lake yesterday, about 11-2 o'clock, p. m., in a scow and a skiff, owing to the breaking of a row-lock in the skiff the ladies became frightened and it upset. Those in the scow seeing the accident also became panic stricken and rushed to the side, upsetting it, and all were thrown into the water. The boats were some forty rods from the nearest shore. No other boats were at hand to assist, and the lake was quite rough. There were five