

4 ADDRESS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF CANADA

deration of a free convocation of the clergy and laity of the United Church of England and Ireland, as proposed to be assembled by the Bishop of Toronto, a speedy and satisfactory result would at once ensue in so far as the said Church is concerned.

(signed) *E. Caron*, Speaker.

Legislative Council,
Wednesday, 9 July 1851.

Enclosure 2, in No. 1.

PROTEST against the Adoption of the Address to his Excellency, of Wednesday,
9th July instant.

Dissentient,

Encl. 2, in No. 1.

1. Because we do not think that the views of the Government, as expressed in the printed correspondence referred to in the proposed Address, are such as can be expected to appear just and satisfactory to the members of the Church of England in this province, who are a numerous and respectable class of our fellow-subjects.

2. Because we cannot join in characterizing as comprehensive and able what we believe must be looked upon generally as illiberal, short-sighted and unjust.

3. Because we believe that when the British Government first sanctioned the making a large reservation of land in Upper Canada to form an endowment for a university, they contemplated no other description of university than one in which religious instruction should be given, and degrees in divinity conferred, in accordance with the doctrines of the National Church, there having been no university ever founded by the Crown up to that time on any other principle, and the university of King's College in New Brunswick having been just before founded by Royal Charter, and, as a matter of course, on the same principle; that when, after many years of agitation by the members of other religious communities combined, the Charter of King's College was destroyed, and its endowment taken from it, and applied to the foundation of another college, from which all instruction in the doctrines of the Church of England is excluded, it seems extremely oppressive and ungenerous to deny to the members of the Church of England the same right which the Crown and Colonial Government and Legislature freely conceded to other religious communities, of applying their own funds to the support of a college in which their youth may obtain degrees in the arts and sciences, and at the same time be instructed in the doctrines of their religion.

4. Because the members of the Church of England have never shown so illiberal a spirit towards other religious denominations, but have always cheerfully united in the Legislature in conferring such privileges upon them, and have offered no opposition in any other manner to so reasonable a wish.

5. Because, when the members of the Church of England see efforts made to induce their sovereign to place them on grounds more disadvantageous than that of other portions of the population, they will unavoidably be under the impression, that either from inattention to their claim to equal justice, or from some cause even more censurable, their Government is lending itself to a design to injure and oppress them, and that discontent may be thus engendered, which it should be the object of the Government to prevent or remove.

6. Because the Correspondence to which reference is made in the address, appears to us to be intended to elicit from Her Majesty a decision unfavourable to the Church of England on very unfair grounds, by insinuating that the Government of this province has the means of indirectly compelling the members of other religious communities to surrender their College Charters; because without public aid they are unable to maintain their colleges, and that if that is done the Government can then with less difficulty refuse to charter a Church of England college; but that if a charter be in the meantime granted to the members of the Church of England, then their negotiations with the other religious bodies may be defeated, and the monopoly of education which the Government desires to secure to a university in which the doctrines of no church whatever are inculcated, will be firmly established.

7. Because there is, in their opinion, no ground for the confident hope which this House has expressed, that if the matter in question "were brought under the consideration of a free convocation of the clergy and laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in this province, a decision hostile to the wishes and claims of the friends of the university connected with that Church would be the result." On the contrary, the only evidence which exists should make a directly opposite impression, for in regard to the first, *i. e.* the clergy, out of 150, it is known that 130 members of that body attended on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of Trinity College, thus giving to its inauguration their presence and approval; and in respect to the second, *i. e.* the laity, they have not only not petitioned this House against the institution which the Bishop of Toronto has sought to establish, but they have publicly declared in a free assembly that religion ought to be inseparable from secular education.

8. Because we believe that a policy founded on such principles can never be long upheld in a free country.

(signed) *G. S. Boulton.*
James Gordon.
John Macaulay.