

not to a disinterested, but to a partial tribunal, and all with the view of damaging the bill of our Provincial Parliament, because it sanctioned the righteous claims of the Church of Scotland as co-ordinate with their own. Do these men not know that our parish ministers are bishops, yes, and bishops who agree fully as much with the definition of a bishop as given in the word of God, as those of the episcopal communion? Our ruling elders are presbyters (of which priest is only an abbreviation), and although in many quarters the eldership might be improved; nevertheless, speaking generally, they will bear a comparison with the presbyters of the Episcopal Church, for the dutiful discharge of their unbought services, in visiting the sick, exhortation in private, and "ruling" within their appropriate jurisdiction. And to come to the last order, we have our deacons, of whom it is enough to say, they manage the concerns of the church with discretion and frugality, and have under God warded from our land and people the incubus of pauperism. We would ascribe the chuckling of some of the bishops at the mention of the three orders, as not applicable to the Church of Scotland, to sheer ignorance, inasmuch as the Presbyterian system of church government declared in our formulas, and ratified by parliament, has a place and province, according as they are delineated in the word of God, for all the three. The bishop labors in word and doctrine—the presbyter rules and exhorts, and the deacons manage the concerns of the poor. And yet we are told that the mention of these three orders shows that the Church of England is meant,—why we say it tells conclusively in favor of the Church of Scotland. Had the Church of England been meant exclusively, they would have described her as consisting not of three orders which she has in common with our own church, namely, men who preach, rule and manage the concerns of the poor—they would have described her as consisting of many more orders than three; they would have spoken of arch-bishops, bishops, arch-deacons, deacons, deans, sub-deans, prebends, vicars, curates and the like; but seeing there is no such special reference so as to identify the Church of England as specially pointed out in the act, but a more general description which applies as much to the Church of Scotland as to that of England, we say (connecting this act with the stipulations of the union, securing to Scotland her integral rights as a nation and specially the the Protestant religion,) that the ministers of the Church of Scotland must come in for their

full share of these reserves, along with the clergy of the Church of England, as has been already decided by our provincial parliament. We have deemed it our duty to say this much to enable our readers to understand the present position of this most important question. We have purposely refrained from whatever might cause irritation to the members of the Church of England, being only intent in stating the nature of our claim. We were happy to find the Earl of Haddington stand up so firmly in his place in the house in support of our righteous demands.

"The Earl of Haddington regretted that the Right Reverend Prelate should, in his observations, have used language calculated to create hostility between the Church of England and the Established Church of Scotland. Notwithstanding the opinion expressed by the Right Reverend Prelate, many were of opinion that in all colonies that had been or might be conquered since the Union, the Church of Scotland ought to be considered as an Established Church. The noble Earl entered into an argument to show that the words Protestant clergy clearly comprehended the Church of Scotland. His countrymen, said his Lordship, in Upper Canada resembled their brethren at home. Attachment to their own church was perhaps the strongest feeling they had; and he thought that there could not be a greater misfortune than to raise in their minds any idea that there was an intention on the part of the Legislature to lower the church to which they were attached, and which they knew to be the church by law established in their own part of the United Kingdom at home. If clergymen of the Church of England were provided sufficient to teach the whole of them, the only effect would be that they would not listen to those teachers. Persons would come from the United States and preach more congenial doctrines; but he need not remind their Lordships that there would be no guarantee of the character of those persons, and that their politics would probably be of a very questionable nature. He wished to take the opinion of the judges, but he suggested to the Right Rev. Prelate whether, in the first question he proposed to put to the judges, he would not include words that would put it to them to say whether or not the clergy of the Established Church of Scotland were entitled to participate in those reserves?"

The opinion of Lord Ellenborough is equally decided. His Lordship has obviously paid some attention to the doings of a small section of high churchmen in this province, at whose door all the inconvenience and injury inflicted on this province by the late rebellion, may very justly be laid.

"Lord Ellenborough hoped the noble Viscount would consider well before he consented to the putting the first of these questions to the judges. It was not such a question as ought to be put to the judges. The bill passed by the colonial Legislature on the subject appropriated a part of these reserves to the Roman Catholic clergy. This was clearly beside the intent of the 31st Geo. III, and rendered the question one of expediency for their Lordship's decision, rather than one of law for the opinion of the judges. His own opinion was, that under the provisions of that act the colonial Legislature was clearly entitled to appropriate