the purpose of creating a fund for the religious instruction of the inhabitants of the Province, still, the question whether that arrangement is to be maintained or altered, is one so exclusively affecting the people of Canada that its decision ought not to be withdrawn from the Provincial Legislature, to which it properly belongs, to regulate all matters concerning the domestic interests of the Province. It has therefore appeared to Her Majesty's government that it would be impossible for them consistently with the principles on which they have always held that the government of Canada ought to be conducted, to advise Her Majesty to refuse to comply with the prayer of the address of the House of Assembly." Such are the assurances of Earl Grey, and the high constitutional principles on which they are given. We ask for the repeal on this further ground, that our past colonial bills, instead of being ratified, were disallowed; and that disallowance was a virtual reference to us of the question again. In 1840 under the administration of P. Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, a bill was passed by the Canadian parliament intended for the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question, and transmitted to England. It was disallowed. —The British parliament might have assumed to pass a law to give validity to this bill of 1840. It would have confirmed the seeming wishes of the people, however justly abortive and distasteful it might have proved in the end. The bill, though void, was a guide to the British parliament; and those who furnished the guide, all things being in good faith, could not complain of its being followed. Under a sincere desire to realize the expressed desires of the country, we should naturally expect this opportunity earnestly sought to embody that expression in a British act, if British action in the case was deemed justifiable at all. It would have stampt sincerity perhaps, on a profusion of promises through a course of years, always to fulfil the pleasure of the Colonists. This course, however, was avoided. The invalid bill, instead of being converted, by the transforming influence of the British Senate, into a valid law, was formally disallowed. The moment this bill, seemingly consummated in this country by mysterious agencies, was disallowed, we were restored to the position we occupied before the bill was passed. Had things so remained, we might now legislate as freely as ever; and it might be fairly presumed, till the contrary appeared, that the disallowance was intended to again transfer the matter to the constitutional action of the colonial parliament. —The justness of this expectation is verified by numerous despatches—extracts from some of which, he would read to the House. Lord Glenelg, in 1836, addresses himself thus to Sir F. B. Head :—

"Your predecessor and the Council agree in the opinion, that it is vain to expect the concurrence of the two branches of the local legislature in any adjustment of this question, and they therefore invoke the interposition of Parliament; which interposition the Assembly, on the other hand, deprecate with equal earnestness.

"The chief practical question, then, which at present demands consideration, is whether His Majesty should be advised to recommend to Parliament the assumption to itself of the office of deciding on the future appropriation of these lands."

From this course His Lordship decidedly dissents, and remarks :—

"In referring the subject to the future Canadian Legislature, the authors of the constitutional Act must be supposed to have contemplated the crisis at which we have now arrived —the era of warm and protracted debate, which in a free government may be said to be a necessary precursor to the settlement of any great principle of national policy. We must not have recourse to an extreme remedy, merely to avoid the embarrassment which is the present though temporary result of our own deliberate legislation.

"I think, therefore, that to withdraw from the Canadian to the Imperial Legislature the question respecting the Clergy Reserves, would be an infringement of that cardinal principle of colonial government which forbids Parliamentary interferences, except in submission to an evident and well established necessity.

"Without expressing any further opinion at present on the general objects of the Bill of last session, I think the effect of that Bill would, as it appears, have been to constitute the Assembly not merely the arbiters respecting the disposal of the funds to be raised by the sale of these lands, but the active and independent agents in effecting those sales, and thus to invest them with the appropriate functions of the executive government."

Again His Lordship remarks :—

"Until every prospect of adjusting this dispute within the Province itself shall have been distinctly exhausted, the time for the Interposition of Parliament will not have arrived, unless, indeed, both Houses shall concur in soliciting that interposition; in which event there would of course be an end to the constitutional objections already noticed."

And again :—

"I think myself bound to abstain from advising His Majesty to refer this question immediately to Parliament, because the authors of the Constitutional Act have declared this to be one of those subjects, in regard to which the initiative is expressly reserved and recognised as falling within the peculiar province and the special cognizance of the local legislature."

The country under these circumstances had grounds for entertaining the highest assurances of their constitutional safety; and when the bill of 1840 was disallowed, the reference of the subject matter to our own Legislature, seemed the only course consistent with official pledges, too numerous to be forgotten, and too sacred (one hoped) to be violated. But in the face of all these official protestations, the bill of 1840, having been disallowed, the further legislation was retained in England, and the 3rd & 4th Vic. cap. 78 was substituted—the product of a transatlantic assumption of an irresponsible authority. We ask for its repeal, therefore, because it unconstitutionally superseded the reference of the question back to the people of Canada. Again, we ask for the repeal on this further ground; that it has by its provisions outraged public opinion, and even outraged the Canadian bill of 1840. It rivalled it in that policy of pensioning churches and their ministers, against which we had entered so many solemn protests; and these protests had been respected and sanctioned by official correspondence. —The following extract from a despatch of Lord Sydenham, discloses the existence of mysterious agencies in the passage of our bill of 1840, and candidly tells the colonial minister how outrageously it violated public sentiment :

"I will not conceal, however, from your lordship that even to this Bill, thus proceeding on the principle of an equal distribution among different religious persuasions, nearly insuperable 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 for religious purposes at all, and have steadily maintained its distribution to educational or State purposes; and it is only the strong desire which is entertained of coming now to a settlement which has led many, who formerly advocated these opinions with success, now to withdraw their opposition, and to assent to this measure. But I can safely say, that so far as this Province is concerned, their 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 unfortunately again brought before it, it would not be possible to obtain any such terms for the Established Church or for religious instruction."—Despatch to Lord John Russell, Jan. 22, 1840.

Lord Glenelg had, under previous administrations, recognized public opinion in Canada as the basis of any settlement. His Lordship, in 1837, declared—

"That he could not venture to prescribe to the Legislatures of the Canadian Provinces the principles on which they should endeavour to make provision for the religious wants of their fellow colonists." And when he did afterwards (Dec. 1837) venture the statement that "the contributions of the State towards the support of the different christian communities should be regulated by the extent of the voluntary efforts which the members of each should make for