

they don't love liberty, (we owe Magna Charta to them) but because, without subverting the constitution and the law, the Romish religion can never be restored.

The reformation was not the work of force.---Science had begun to dawn, and to dispel superstition. The tyranny of Rome was become hateful, and her authority contemptible, when that great event took place. The desires and opinions of the people coincided with the humours of the King : and the moment parliament had established the Protestant religion, it became not the voice only, but the act of the whole nation. The case of Canada is totally different. The people *there adhere to their religion, and did not surrender* without a stipulation and solemn engagement for the free exercise of it. Your Lordship was Minister when the capitulation was granted by Sir Jeffery Amhurst, and you found no fault with that able General for that prudent and humane concession. This freedom was again insured at the peace, approved and confirmed by parliament ? nor did your Lordship, in your long display of eloquence \* on that occasion, once blame that part of the treaty. But you are now pleased to call the measure *atrocious, shallow, and inept*, because it has secured to the clergy their property, and because it has substituted an oath of allegiance instead of that of supremacy as required by the 1st of Elizabeth. The best distinction I know between establishment and toleration is, that the greater number has a right to the one, and the lesser to the other. The public maintenance of a clergy is inherent to *establishment* ; at the reformation, therefore, as much of the church estates as were thought necessary for its support, were transferred to the protestant church as by law established. Surely then, when the free exercise of the national religion was given

\* Lord Chatham spoke three hours and a half against the peace.