

sufficiently large to mount within its inclosure eight guns of large calibre. The site of the new work of defence is a little below, and to the south of, the flagstaff at the Drop Redoubt, and near to the face of the cliff. Thus situated, it will take in a more extended range along the beach, both to the east and west, than the Drop does. It will also have full command of the harbour and the entrance to it; and one angle can be brought to bear upon the Deal-road as far as the toll-gate. Guilford battery, situate between the castle and the sea, and a little above high-water mark, is undergoing an entire renovation. It is at present completely dismantled, every gun being dismounted. This is to be raised and enlarged to a six-gun battery. The artillery and a number of the 30th depot have been engaged, under the direction of officers of the engineer department, in carrying out the contemplated improvements.

REPORTING THE DEBATES.—It is pleasant to look over the papers in the morning, after having spent the night in the House. But how great the discrepancy between what you there saw and heard, and what you now read! Here, for example, is the terrible speech of the hon. member for North Wiltshire. For a full hour we had to endure the infliction of his insufferable, dull, and dreary oratory, and that, too, unfortunately, at a time when, like another wedding guest, we "could not choose but hear," the house being so nearly empty, that all the noise the members present could make did not suffice to drown the drowsy voice still drawing in our ears. Well, here is that speech in print; and, besides that you can read in easily in twenty minutes, it really is very tolerable—sensible, pertinent, and with some point in it, too. Whence all the difference, then? Ask the reporter. Then, usually expresses himself in somewhat lengthy and complicated sentences, finds great difficulty at times in getting fairly to the end of them; and occasionally, after backing and floundering about for a while in the endeavour to escape from one of these verbal intricacies, gives the matter up as hopeless, and bolts to the beginning of a fresh sentence; even he becomes quite a respectable speaker in the hands of the gentlemen of the press. His speech here, in the newspapers, reads as smoothly and evenly as you could desire; there is not a broken or unfinished sentence throughout, and all the painful embarrassment, hesitation, and tedious repetition in its delivery, give place to a steady and sustained flow of language, such as no one could object to. Two-thirds of the speeches delivered in parliament are similarly metamorphosed; they are corrected and condensed, and become so improved in character, that even the makers of them must sometimes fail to recognise their own productions.—*Houshold Words.*

HOUSE OF LORDS.

CANADA CLERGY RESERVES.

The EARL OF DERBY presented between sixty and seventy petitions from Scottish Presbyterian congregations in Canada, praying that the settlement of 1840 might be maintained. His Lordship went into the whole case, of which we can only give an extract:

Having recapitulated the history of the reserve fund, and the legislation connected therewith, Lord Derby insisted that the object of the great bulk of those now seeking to disturb the present settlement, was to alienate from religious purposes altogether that provision which the piety of former Sovereigns and Parliaments granted, and to introduce throughout Canada the republican principle of voluntarism adopted in the United States. "Let not the house deceive itself by supposing that the object of the parties was a better distribution of the revenues for the purposes originally intended—the maintenance of a Protestant clergy, the support of the Protestant religion, or of any religion whatever; the object, the avowed object, of a large portion of those who were proposing to deal with this question, was the secularization of these revenues, and their application to other than the original objects. It might be said, indeed, that if such an attempt should be made, the Crown could still interpose its veto. But the argument of the Government was, that with regard to these affairs the colonial legislature was the best and only judge; and to give that Legislature a power of dealing with these revenues, and then, by authority of the Crown, control the manner in which they should think fit to deal with them, would be, if you could maintain such a position, a mockery; and if you attempted to maintain it must lead to interminable discord and confusion. He was speaking with a full sense of the gravity of the alternative when he said that if, in truth, it was the desire of the people of Canada that they should exercise a wholly independent power of legislation, that they should in no respect be checked by the vote of the Crown or the interposition of Parliament—far better admit that principle frankly, and at once relieve the minister of the Crown of a nominal and often a very painful responsibility, declare openly that over the legislature of Canada we exercise no control, and refuse to go through that farce (as it would then be) of advising the Crown, by a responsible minister, to assent to or to withhold assent from

any specific measure. Admit the independence of Canada; if the colony remained connected by the tie of the Throne with this country, in that case let it be distinctly asserted that the Crown acted upon the advice, not of the imperial, but of the colonial Legislature and that this country stood towards Canada in the same relation in which it had formerly stood towards Hanover. Such an arrangement would give him cause of regret, but it would be far preferable to that doubtful position in which they at present stood, affecting to exercise a control which they dared not exercise, and responsible, or nominally responsible, for the approval of measures which, whether they approved them or not, whether such measures were in violation of the pledged faith of Parliament, of the guarantees of the Crown, or of the rights of property, they equally held themselves bound to assent to upon a general and board principle that the colonists were the best judges of their own affairs, and that which the Legislature of the colony had acceded to, the Minister of the Crown was not entitled to forbid, or justified in forbidding in this country. In a pecuniary view, the result of such separation would be very great. With regard to the friendly relations which might still be continued, he did not despair but that those relations might be maintained and upheld, or even improved, by the absence of a nominal control; and, if the province desired to place itself in that position, he for one, would not be the person to withhold the consent of Parliament. But so long as the province remained a province,—so long as the Minister of the Crown was charged with the vindication of the rights of British subjects,—so long as Parliament reserved any portion of the colonial legislation in its own hands, and maintained the rights of British subjects guaranteed by that legislation,—so long whatever might be the hazard, he would not be a party to assenting to sacrifice those rights, or to allow any interposition with regard to the rights of property which he would not sanction in this country, which he would not sanction with regard to the rights of the Church in Scotland, with regard to the rights of the Church in Ireland, or with regard to the rights of any portion of the community whose rights of property was guaranteed to them under the faith of the Crown, and by an authority competent so to guarantee them. Their lordships must not flatter themselves that if they passed the bill of the Government they would avoid future controversy and future religious discord. On the contrary, they would do much to perpetuate, to aggravate, and to embitter such controversy. When the colonial legislature should have been enabled and empowered to deal with the clergy reserves, there would arise a bitter strife between all the contending parties who sought to appropriate these reserves to their own service, and between them and that larger body still which sought to deprive all religious bodies of these reserves, and to secularise the whole amount of the revenues. They must remember that this was a question which mainly applied to the Province of Upper Canada; but in the Province of Lower Canada there were very large endowments in land, and very large compulsory payments in force by law in aid of the Roman Catholic Church, and those rights of property rested on a footing not one whit more strong than that of the clergy reserves. (Hear, hear.) The noble dukes opposite (the Dukes of Newcastle and Argyll) cheered that observation. Did they believe it possible that, with the sanction of the Government, the principle of secularization once introduced, the Protestants of Upper Canada and the Protestant minority of Lower Canada would be satisfied with the the assertion of the principle that there should be no dominant church, so far as related to the Protestant body—that all parochial and all territorial revenues appropriated to the purposes of the clergy should be secularised, and converted to other purposes? And did they believe that that body of men would tamely submit to the continued endowment of the Roman Catholic Church with enormous revenues as the only endowed church, after the British Parliament had sanctioned the confiscation of the only provision which their ancestors had made for the conservation of Protestant worship in a Protestant portion of the colony? From that moment would arise a bitter feud for the alienation and confiscation of the provision made for the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Canada. From that moment all the differences of race and of creed would at once be brought into hostile collision. At the present time the superintending and controlling authority of Parliament kept all these elements in check, and by sanctioning a provision, which once received the sanction of all as a final arrangement and compromise of this difficulty, withdrew these elements of controversy and contention from the province and the local assembly, and had, to a great extent, saved the colony from the agitation arising out of them; but the

instant they sanctioned this principle of confiscation, differences of religion and race would again arise, and they would have perpetuated and aggravated these differences and dissensions which were for so long a time the bane and curse of Canada, and the obliteration of which, by one great act of justice, was the object of the union of the provinces in 1840. Their lordships must not flatter themselves that, by what he looked upon as a dereliction of principle, they would escape from the difficulties of asserting the jurisdiction and supremacy of Parliament or that they would produce peace in the province. They would not produce peace, but perpetual and increased discord and dissension. When they had made these first concessions they would find themselves step by step involved in difficulties in which in vindication of the rights of property, of the rights of the Crown, and of the rights of the fellow-subjects, they were unable effectually to interfere, and they would be compelled to give the unwilling—he had almost said degrading—sanction of the British Legislature to objects and purposes, one after another, of which that Legislature could not approve. If he had spoken strongly upon this subject, it was because he felt strongly that the honour and dignity of the Crown were endangered by the bill. He knew there might be risk from the firm and temperate maintenance of the rights of the Crown, but, whatever risk there might be, no risk could be run by a British Parliament or a British statesman so great as the risk of abandoning, for purposes expediency, the claims of principle, of justice, and of the rights of property. As long as he had had the honour of holding office under the Crown, altho' not unaware of the temptation which existed for the adoption of a different course, he was prepared to risk the existence of the administration of which he was a member upon the maintenance of the rights of property; and, in his place as a peer of Parliament, he could not refrain from entering his protest against Parliaments being induced to do that which, as a Minister of the Crown, he never would have consented to sanction."

The Duke of Argyll replied, and urged the fact that Lord Derby had formerly admitted that a redistribution of the fund might be found necessary as circumstances altered. Had a re-distribution been proposed, the Bishop of Exeter would have denounced that as "sacrilege."

The Earl of Desart defended Sir J. Pakington's conduct on this question, and disapproved of the present Government's mode of dealing with it.

The Bishop of Exeter wished that the Duke of Argyll would quote his language and opinions correctly. The fact was that he did not apply the word "sacrilege" to the re-distribution at all, but to a measure which would lead to the confiscation of the reserves, because he held that money once devoted to the service of the Almighty could not be torn away from the sacred purpose for which it had been given without incurring the guilt of sacrilege. He did not wish it to be supposed that he was ready to acquiesce in a measure of re-distribution, if it were suggested; most probably he would not; but certainly he did not mean to say that that would be sacrilege. (Hear.)

The Duke of Argyll apologized for misunderstanding the Bishop.

The Bishop of Oxford, after much consideration, had arrived at a different view of the subject from that of the Canadian Bishops. He thought that however inexpedient, it was a matter of strict justice to give the Canadian Legislature the power of dealing with this as with all other internal matters. Even if that Legislature would abuse their rights, it was no more an argument for withholding them than it would be to withhold an estate from the lawful heir because he would squander it away. All that we could do would be to give good and earnest counsel, in either case, and he did not feel those fears others felt, that this counsel would be thrown away in the present case. The noble earl (Derby) held that in 1791 the reserves were so entirely set aside for the benefit of the Church of England, or "the Protestant Clergy," that it was not competent to deal with them. If this were so, the £1,369 per annum which was given to the Roman Catholics in 1840 was a most direct act of spoliation and sacrilege, according to the Right Rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Exeter). He contended then that the legislation of 1840, to which the Right Rev. Prelate was an actively assenting member, cut down altogether the argument that the legislation of 1791 had so dealt with the property that it could be a subject of legislation no more.

The Bishop of Exeter said, that what his Right Rev. friend had said of his (the Bishop of Exeter's) having supported the measure of 1840 was not only not true, but the very contrary of truth. So far from assenting to that measure, he had done his utmost to oppose it, and in Committee he had moved the insertion of the word "Protestant" for the very purpose of preventing that which his Right Rev. friend had charged him with desiring to effect. Upon that occasion he had even gone so far as to divide the House, but he had been beaten. He would venture to suggest some little fallacy in the illustration which his Right Rev. friend had employed. He said that the case was as if he were trustee for a minor, and, though he saw that the minor would dissipate all his fortune, yet he must give him up his fortune when he became of age. But the real illustration would have been, that there should be a

reserve in the trust to the effect that he should have the enjoyment of the estate upon the payment of certain charges for the benefit of the Church in his parish. Would his Right Rev. friend say that he was to dispense with that condition, and allow the minor to neglect altogether that reserve? His Right Rev. friend contended that we had already conceded to Canada the right of legislating upon all domestic matters; but if so, and his Bill come within that category, whence was the necessity of introducing it in the Imperial parliament? It was because the right was withheld that their Lordships were called upon to consider the whole question; it was because the colonial Legislature had not had these reserves surrendered to it, that their lordships had still to consider whether they would surrender them to it. There was a College in Canada, founded and endowed by the British Government, and it was the earnest desire of William IV. that there should be instituted a professor of divinity in that College. What had become of these endowments? Why the very liberal local Legislature which it was proposed to intrust with the Clergy reserves in Canada, had swept them entirely away.

Lord Redesdale would really beg to call the Right Rev. Prelate to order. The Right Rev. Prelate must himself see that he was altogether exceeding the utmost limits of explanation. (Hear, hear.)

The Bishop of Oxford, for his part, had to call upon his Right Rev. brother of Exeter for an explanation. (Laughter.) He must really put it to his Right Rev. brother, that it was not agreeable to hear it roundly stated that what one had said was not only untrue but wholly contradictory to truth. (Hear, hear.) He would really suggest that such phrases as these had better not be bandied about. (Hear, hear.) He was quite aware that his Right Rev. brother had divided the House upon the word to which he had referred, but there was much in the measure which his Right Rev. brother should, on the same principle, have resisted, but which he had not resisted either by vote or by protest.

The Bishop of London said that the simple proposition on which he proceeded was, that the Canadian Legislature has no right whatever to deal with the money of the Church in Canada. Such a right was never given to that Legislature; on the contrary, the maintenance intact of these Clergy Reserves was one of the conditions of the Canadian constitution conceded by this country. Were Canada to become independent, the question might assume a different form, but so long as the dependence subsisted that condition would subsist also. His Right Rev. friend had spoken of the secularization of the property under the proposed change as a far remote contingency—a vision; but he must confess, after maturely considering the history of the proceedings of the Colonial Legislature, that such a result appeared to him by no means a vision, and anything but remote. He would quite as soon trust to the Canadian Legislature the disposal of the Clergy Reserves, with the notion that it would deal generously with them, as he would trust the lamb to the wolf. Assuredly, if the language of his Right Rev. brother of Oxford were based on truth and justice, he did not see how the Church could go on at all. (Hear, hear.) With slight variation, the arguments of his Right Rev. brother applied to the case of Churches nearer at home. It appeared to him (the Bishop of London) that the Clergy Reserves of Canada were a sacred trust placed in the hands of the Imperial Parliament, and that to permit the alienation of any portion of that fund, more especially at a crisis like the present, would be a criminal abandonment of that trust, a flagitious violation of a sacred compact. Consider the state of things in Canada; look at the tide of civilization flowing thither year after year, at its accession of immortal souls year after year, numbering, in each twelvemonth, he believed, not fewer than 500,000. (Hear, hear.) What would become of this great population without spiritual instruction? And whence was it to derive spiritual instruction, except from the provision set apart in these reserves? Was England, then, after all, to stand alone in withholding from her distant dependencies that support which every Christian nation in the world deemed it a sacred duty to supply to those of its subjects who had left its shores for distant provinces within its realm? No colony, no dependence of France was left unprovided with a Bishop and Clergy of the National Church. Was it to be the reproach of England, that her dependencies alone were to be deprived of this consolation and support? It was only wonderful how much the Clergy of Canada had done with the miserable pittance placed at their disposal,—a pittance which, were it equally divided among the 550 parishes of the province, would give to each Clergyman no more than £70 per annum. There was no doubt that, since 1840, when this question was thought to be finally settled, the Church of Canada had greatly progressed, and agitation against it greatly diminished—a result attributable to the indefatigable energy of our Clergy, and to the admirable manner in which their very limited resources had been husbanded and applied to the best possible advantage. Earnestly, then, would he oppose any measure which went to deprive this valuable member of our Church of means with which so much good was effected.

The Duke of Newcastle spoke briefly; some explanations followed, and the subject dropped.

TUESDAY.—The Law of Evidence (Scotland) Bill was read a third time and passed. The Bill in Error Bill went through Committee and was ordered to be read a third time on Friday.

The Earl of Malmesbury moved for certain returns relating to railway accidents during the past year, the number of which had been so great, as to create a general opinion that the lines of railway were in a dangerous state. Ordered.