

In the different schemes which I have suggested for arranging with the Church (except that of the Earl of Derby) I have adhered to the principle of claiming all conferred upon her by the 3rd and 4th Victoria, or a fair equivalent; but, confiding so much on his Lordship's honor and sagacity, I should feel disposed to accept the compromise he proposed, though attended with very considerable loss to the Church, and this for the sake of future peace and tranquillity, which are of greater value than the loss sustained.

All of you must have seen by this time the measure before Parliament for confiscating the Clergy Reserves. It leaves nothing that unrestrained power can take away, nor do its promoters give even a solitary indication of fair adjustment:—Nevertheless it appears to be a solemn duty on our parts to remonstrate against a proceeding which disregards all vested rights and all just and honorable dealing, and by every lawful exertion in our power to prevent its adoption.

The history of the Clergy Reserves is not without great moral value. A message from the Crown to the Commons was sent to Parliament in 1791, stating the desire of His Majesty George III. to form a provision in the Province of Canada for the support of a Protestant Clergy, and to make the provision perpetual out of the Crown Lands—lands which by right, by law, and the constitution, belonged as much to the Crown as any property of an individual belongs to himself. This provision was called Clergy Reserves: and in order to give an additional guarantee to that of the king and Parliament, the Church accepted the Reserves in lieu of tythes, and consented to an Act passed in February, 1823, to that effect; a proceeding which embraces in its nature a regular purchase. Was then all this recognition, says Lord St. Leonards in the House of Lords on Friday, 22nd April, 1852, by the Crown, the Parliament, and by the colony, of no avail in settling a title? How could one stand more secure? If it were the title of a private