

The Church.

"Her foundations are upon the holy hills."

Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

TORONTO, CANADA, OCTOBER 26, 1854.

[No. 13]

Vol. XVIII.]

ADAPTEDNESS OF THE CHURCH TO THE GENIUS AND WANTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.
Genius and Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. By Rev. CALVIN COLTON, LL. D., Professor of Public Economy, Trinity College; author of "Reasons for Episcopacy," etc. etc. pp. 306.

The necessities of a young Republic, and the countless exigencies arising out of untried experiments in the science of Government, have constantly forced change upon us since the beginning of our history as a nation. The vast prospects opening upon us as a people, and the absence of all historic ties associating us with a venerable antiquity, have rendered us peculiarly exposed to temptations of this sort. But that a love of change is to be a permanent national trait, we firmly deny. There is too much of the old Anglo-Saxon sturdiness of character for that. Hobby after hobby must still continue to have their day; but against this perpetual doctrinal chaos, against this being forever afloat in religion without anchor or compass, there is already a strong public sentiment rising up. Against it, every right-minded citizen feels himself called to protest not only as dangerous to the State but as jeopardizing all domestic peace and tranquillity. To have a Church then accommodated to the genius and wants of the American people in this respect, they must have that in which they can feel sure, that what they are taught to confess as an article of faith to-day may not tomorrow be entirely ignored; a Church which has some better warrant that it will be the home of their children, than the mere fact of its having been specially created to be their own; they must have proof in past experience that it is able to resist the fierce tide of faction which they have seen already rending asunder the strongest of the sects, each engaging with bitter asperity in the most violent contentions; each hurling against the other missiles, which like the teeth of Cadmus, seem, as fast as they are thrown, to spring up into new bodies, and carry on the warfare thus begun.

This then opens before us another striking illustration of the adaptation of the American Church to the genius of our Republic, which has been so skillfully portrayed by Dr. Colton. Granting that as a people we love excitement, which is more than we are willing, without several qualifications, to admit; yet it assuredly is not religious excitement, which in the end finds favour even with the masses. They are growing tired of perpetual excitement, and are longing for rest. They manifest a growing repugnance to making that religion which was intended to promote peace, and here it is, too, that the Church System comes out in prominent contrast with all other religious organizations. It is so noiseless and quiet in its operation, yet so steady and certain in its effects, that its influence is exerted without the use of those expedients which most sects regard as essential, even to the existence of Divine life in the soul.

Dr. Colton says, "it cannot be denied that the Americans are less attracted by much ceremony in religion, than any other people in the world;" and we even more than agree with him. The system of publicly relating experiences, and proving by an aptness at relating the rise and progress of religion in the soul, in evidence of "the genuineness of a conversion to God" is proving itself as repugnant to the tastes of the people, as it is opposed to all Bible teaching. That instinctive delicacy, which is an evidence of true refinement, will always follow, nay, rather go hand in hand, with the growth of true religion in the soul. And many of the sects are already beginning, by sad experience, to learn, that these ceremonial demonstrations will not do—that our religion may indeed call upon us to make sacrifices of personal attachments, but it never sanctions the oblation of individual dignity in its most general offices, much less demands it as an evidence of what God has declared Himself the One only Judge.

It has frequently been urged against the Church, that she is unfaithful upon all these points; that the terms of admission within her pale, are entirely too easy; that she requires no evidence from her members of a change of heart, &c. There is a kind of evidence which she does not require; the evidence which is tested by cant phrases, and *historical* demonstrations. But no one who knows anything upon the subject ever complained that the standard of personal piety which the Church herself holds up is not sufficiently high. In the piety which the Church tends to foster, there is a rare symmetry of proportion, a beautiful blending of graces. In it there is nothing distorted, nothing overwrought. It is a kind of piety, into which, as formative elements, there have entered faith and love, praise and prayer, zeal and meditation, purity and watchfulness, self-denial and humility and obedience. It is a piety witnessed by the world rather in its effects than in its noisy protestations; in the quiet walks of daily life, rather than at the corners of the streets. It has its subjective as well as its objective part, both equally necessary, and both essentially different in their offices. The excitement of sectarian religion may continue, for a time, to attract those who do not look below the surface, but such a system has the seeds of decay within itself; and true Christian humility will learn in the end to shrink back from everything which looks like affected display.

We assert then, in addition to our author's statement upon this point, that the genius of the American people is as little in harmony with the exciting cere-

monialism of sectarian religion, as it is with the sensuous mediocrity of the Church of Rome. If Dr. Colton asserts in proof of his statement, that converts are seldom made from Protestantism to Romanism, on this account; the still less frequent defections from the Church to the ranks of Secularism, may, *a fortiori*, adduce in support of our addition to the text. It is their repugnance to any such personal exhibitions, that has year by year been largely swelling our numbers, both clerical and lay, until now "the little one" of 1734, "has become a thousand," and no longer stands as the "least among the princes of Judah," and it is this her noiseless and quiet working, that is fast giving practical evidence that "the American Church has a mission to the American people."

We must differ however from our author, upon one point in this connection. He says: "It is true, undoubtedly, that people become attached to the ceremonial of the Episcopal Church, when they get used to it; and it is equally true, that they who have been accustomed to little ceremony in religion, are not naturally attracted by the Episcopal service." To his inference from this we heartily subscribe; as, by Lord Mansfield's authority, we are allowed to accept inferences, though we reject premises. "It is prudent, therefore, to consider this last named fact if we desire the enlargement of the Church, and well to be content with our time-honored, and long established service, without introducing novelties in the ceremonies, borrowed from a history, which is no part of the history of our own Church." p. 217.

Now, we have ample proof in our possession, that people, long before they get used to it, become fervently attached to the ceremonial of the Church. We are able to give the repeated declarations of some of the most pious, and intelligent among Christians of every name, who have asserted that they actually loved her services. They have dissented from her doctrines, but have always expressed, and we doubt not felt, after having attended upon our services, that "it was good for them to be there." We have now before us the recorded statement of one of the most bitter and violent opposers of Episcopacy, in which he declares that during his attendance on a recent occasion at an Episcopal Church—"I had never had such a trance of worship, and I shall never have such another view till I gain the gate. I was dissolved; my whole being seemed to me like an incense wafted gratefully towards God." No! it is not only with ourselves that our beautiful services find favor; those who are not of us have learnt from their own wants to estimate their worth.

And further still, we must dissent from the statement, "that they who have been accustomed to little ceremony in religion, are not naturally attracted by the Episcopal Service." How comes it then, that our Church is so popular among "the Society of Friends," who have no ceremony at all? That this is so is a fact too well established to admit of being questioned. Those worthy people seldom leave their own quiet body, to unite themselves with any other than the Episcopal Church; and there is scarcely a congregation of any size in the country but has a very fair representation of ex-Friends among its members. They are instinctively drawn by the silent working of our system, as being congenial to their own tastes; they observe all things moving in noiseless beauty and order on, and have a home feeling at once, as soon as they enter a church. But place a Quaker in a "Conference meeting," and he would be decidedly out of place. To such motions of the spirit, he is entirely a stranger, and were the members to wait for the rendering of "his experience," it would be a protracted meeting; and he would be decidedly out of place. Again then we say, no, Doctor! Accustomed to it or not—used to it, or otherwise, they all like it, and if they had your good judgment and penetration, they would all, a long while ago, have followed your example, and come where "they could have such another trance of worship, and such another view, before they gain the gate."

The American people are fast learning the worth of a Liturgy; and some among the sects are beginning to appreciate in this respect, the genius of the nation. A report just handed us, of the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, in session at Hudson, shows that the matter of a Liturgy for regular use is having a very prominent place in their deliberations. It is found that many of the brethren have not "the gift of prayer," and that in consequence the people are the sufferers from their necessity, and "thereby the Church is not edified." Particular attention too, it seems, is being paid to a form for special services, such as private baptisms, marriages, funerals, etc. On these occasions there are generally miscellaneous gatherings, and it has been found that extemporaneous productions cannot so well meet the general necessity, as some firm of sound words which the united wisdom of the Synod may prepare. A similar movement is on foot in the German Reformed Communion of this country; and a Liturgy has already been prepared and recommended. These are cheering indications, favorable signs of the times; and we hope the day is not distant, when these respectable bodies of Christians will make still further advances towards Catholic customs, till John Calvin's earnest desire shall be realized, and they shall seek those appointments of Episcopacy, which in his own language, "were instituted by the authority, and defined by the ordinance of God."

A Liturgy has been proved also more essentially Democratic, inasmuch as it is intended for all, without distinction of persons. It is in fact the only preservative

against the Procrustean torture of adapting the form to the capacity of the individual. The American people never lose sight of their character as the sovereigns; but the sectarian preachers often in their attempts to suit the service to the occasion, run unwittingly into strange mistakes. We remember a prayer made by a distinguished divine, in one of our northern cities, a few years since, on occasion of a public calamity, when several lives were sacrificed to the carelessness or something else of the "powers that be." Those "powers," anxious to show their sympathy at least to the sufferers, determined upon a funeral at the public expense—a movement the more commendable, as all of those thus lost, were laborers whose untimely end would involve dependent families in untold suffering. The divine in question, was self aware of their social position and in his prayer thanked God "that all of those so suddenly taken away, were men of such humble station that their loss would not be severely felt in such a community." The attending friends, not thinking this exactly a suitable subject for thanksgiving, had of course, few thanks to bestow upon the preacher, and still fewer commendations on his prayer.

Our General Government is so well aware of the liability to this sort of mistakes, and of the more Democratic as well as Christian and orderly character of the Episcopal Office for burial, that it is commonly used on such occasions in both our Army and Naval Services. Beautifully has Mr. Coxe described this noble feature of the Church:

"Our Mother, the Church, hath never a child To honor before the rest:
But she singeth the same for mighty Kings And the poorest babe on the breast:
And the Bishop goes down to his narrow bed As the ploughman's child is laid,
And alike she blesseth the dark-browed serf, And the chief in his robe arrayed."

It is utterly impossible, where the officiating minister is unrestrained in sentiment, as well as language, that he should not partake of the prejudices of his congregation. We never yet have known the temptation to personal allusion to the deceased resisted, or a chance for individual laudation suffered to go by unimproved. Wealth and station are never unnoticed in the burial, however disregarded they may be in the grave; and it is very certain, that among the sects, "the dark-browed serf, and the chief in his robe arrayed," are never laid down in their narrow beds alike.

The Church can know nothing of such distinctions; for her whole system is opposed to any recognition of the titles of earth. Her words are never altered to suit the condition of any mortal man. She takes the beggar's and the noble's child in the same arms, and with the same form receives them both to an equal station in the Family of Christ. She signs them with the same holy emblem, and is sworn to give them both the same nursing care; with the same words of invitation. She welcomes both alike, to the same Holy Table; and has no language for either princes or peasants, but these "have mercy upon us, miserable sinner." And when the time arrives for both to be laid down in the house appointed for all living, though the trappings of wealth may distinguish the lordly dust from that of the beggar, the Church receives the one no better than the other, and with no court phrases for the velvet pall, and mock pretension for the deal coffin. She lays them both with the same committal, in the ground, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," till they shall both stand before Him Who "is no respecter of persons."

What can be better adapted than such a policy, to Republican simplicity; and what better suited to the genius of a people, whose boast is that their Constitution is based on the principle that "all men are created free and equal?"

Our subject has already carried us far beyond our intended limits, and yet it is not half exhausted. There is such a variety of points in which the Church seems peculiarly adapted to the American people, that the temptation to notice them is almost irresistible. Dr. Colton certainly merits the thanks of the Church for having directed attention to this important branch of an important subject. No true American can be insensible to the destiny of his country, and as he sees this glorious confederacy of States so often in danger from the machinations of designing men, he will naturally seek for some conservative influence, which by its steady operation, shall prove successful when all other efforts are powerless. And this sort of influence, the wisest and best of our statesmen admit exists only in the protestant episcopal church.

"Viewed only as an engine of human policy, and of our most distinguished Jurists," I regard the Church as the strongest and best of the bonds which bind together our National Union, one which may save it when nothing else can—as our most efficient safeguard, sure though poor, against all unlawful assaults on order, property, or morality—as our constant and unfailing antidote and protection against the excesses and disorders, to which the life of a young nation like ours is so peculiarly subject."

THE CLERGY RESERVES.

A Letter from the Bishop of Toronto, to the Honorable A. N. MORIS, Commissioner of Crown Lands.

Sir,—The prominent position which you have for so many years occupied in the Government of Canada, and the great increase of influence which recent events may confer upon you, induce me to address you on the subject of Church property, the most important question that is likely to come before the present session of the Provincial Parliament.

I believe that you are able, with the assistance of your friends and colleagues, to avert anything like injustice, and to settle in a friendly spirit cause of agitation, if taken up in a friendly spirit of conciliation—and deep will your future regret be, should you return to private life without

accomplishing so desirable an object which seems so clearly within your power.

So regarding their aggregate number I will only say that their aggregate number is 294,339, which added to the six denominations gives a total of 436,885, or nearly one-fourth of the population of Canada, which are said to be hostile to Church endowments of all descriptions, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant.

In this enumeration I have omitted the Wesleyan Methodists, because they are so busy to consider them hostile; and since they have never spoken out as a body, I take it for granted that they are as friendly as their great founder would have been.

On the other hand, we have, in favour of Church property and endowments,

Roman Catholics	614,561
Church of England	268,692
Church of Scotland	61,689
Total	1,244,742

Thus, the friends of ecclesiastical endowments in the province of Canada are nearly twice as numerous as their opponents.

But some may object to placing the Roman Catholics in this category, because they have unfortunately more than once recorded their votes as secularizers—may, the Catholic Institute of Toronto appears so eager to promote secularization, that at their late meeting the members very modestly petitioned the Legislature for a share of the spoils of our endowments for the support of their separate schools. In the face of all this, I have advisedly placed the Roman Catholics among our friends; because the danger is common, and they have more than four times as much to lose as we have, and may be induced to direct their attention to the strange and perilous course which they have hitherto pursued. They hold their own opinions, as indeed they ought to do; and yet they are at the same time strenuous in their endeavours to destroy those of the Church of England. This monstrous inconsistency cannot be much longer maintained, and if persevered in, will result in the utter destruction of all church property in Canada.

It is not much surprised that socialists, or as they are called, the Clear Grits of Upper and the Republicans of Lower Canada, should band together against every kind of ecclesiastical endowment. And I can even conceive, though not without some difficulty, that they may be joined by the dissenting churches, because they are the universal experience of many countries, that religion ought to have no support except on the voluntary principle,—but I am quite unable to discover the cause which urges you to protect the Roman Catholic endowments while you obstinately advocate the confiscation of those of the Church of England, unless from the wretched jealousy of her original endowment, more especially as she more accustomed to consider her the great obstacle to the spread of popery through the whole Province. This, Sir, is a very dangerous ground. You are at present in the ascendancy, and most of the dissenters, struck with spiritual and moral blindness, are with you; and we are comparatively alone; but we shall not be long without a champion.

The foregoing enumeration further proves, that if the three national churches were to agree in this one single thing, viz. the protection of their respective endowments, they might be retained peacefully for ages, since their number will always command a majority; whereas, if the Church of Rome persist in her present course; they will in a short time be wholly swept away.

Hitherto the rich and splendid endowments of the Roman Catholic Church have been kept in the background, and concealed from the eyes of the people; while all the bitterness and odium which the most wicked imaginations could conceive, have been poured on the defenders of the wretched mistake of her original endowment, which now remains to the Church of England. But this must no longer be permitted; both properties rest on the same foundation; and both will sooner or later share the same fate.

It is not my intention to proceed to an exposure of the falsehoods of the manifesto already issued, more especially as its true character has been depicted by one more accustomed to such work, and better acquainted with the peculiar merits and talents of the six ministers by whom it is signed and put forth; and, though a stern secularizer himself, he has still some regard for truth and honesty of purpose.

The *Leader* of the 23rd March, 1854, thus writes: "It does not follow that secularization is to be advanced by misstatements and fraudulent tricks. This is wherein we differ from the manifesto concoctors, while they practice petty frauds, which characterize diminutive minds, we have the abiding faith, that honesty is the best policy." After pointing out many gross misstatements, we have," he adds, "scarcely noticed a typo of the errors, and we advise those who have inadvertently signed such a string of falsehoods to remove their names as soon as possible."

This is a specimen of the course pursued by the enemies of ecclesiastical endowments, to deceive the people. They feed them with false statements, and thus delude them, until their moral feelings become so blunt and obtuse that they cease to perceive the turpitude in robbing the Church of God of her just rights. Nor is the reviewer of the manifesto altogether free from his share of moral obtuseness on the subject; for, with ludicrous inconsistency, he applies to this measure of spoliation and sacrilegious robbery, the noble maxim that, "honesty is the best policy."

Act passed on the 9th of May last, by the Imperial Parliament, giving power to the colony to legislate on the Clergy Reserves, was brought forward, Ministers say, in the spirit of conciliation; but, as it would seem, not without reluctance, as Lord John Russell declared his regret that the settlement made by the Duke of Newcastle, should be disturbed. He had given power to the colony for ten years; a piece which would have continued but for unprincipled office hunting, and a desire for reckless innovation. Being a coalition ministry, which always implies timidity and weakness, they seem to have been driven to the measure by the violence of the misstatements and fraudulent tricks. They determined to make a virtue of what they foolishly construed into a case of necessity, and satisfied their conscience by calling it a boon to the colony. It is, however, right to admit that one of their objects was to remove all grounds of religious collision in the hands of the colony. If the Provincial Legislature would be exercised with justice and moderation. So far, the hope was creditable; and through the whole of the proceeding the government and their supporters disapproved of secularization or unfair dealing of any kind.

Mr. Peel, on introducing the Bill on Tuesday, 12th February, 1854, does not look forward to alienation or secularization of the property; and contends that it rests on the same footing as the

endowments of the Roman Catholic Church; but as the policy of government is to give the colonies entire control over all their local concerns, the endowments of both churches are placed under their control; and he repeats the same words in the debate of the 19th April, and expresses his hope that Canada would continue to be a home for the Church of England, and acknowledge in no manner to new, she could not cherish and extend her mission with effect, unless largely endowed by the public.

Mr. V. Smith, though in favour of the bill, would rather that the present settlement by 3rd and 4th Vic. chap. 78, should stand.

Mr. John Mackenzie opposed the measure, because it would remove the guarantee from the endowments of the Church of England, while it left in force the guarantee on that of the Church of Rome. Whereas at present the one guarantee was as good as the other.

Lord John Russell would have been glad if the Canadian Government had continued the settlement of 1847, and so that whether it was in the hands of the Imperial Parliament to disturb it. But though that was his individual opinion, and it might even be the opinion of the government, it would not be proper to maintain it against the Canadian Parliament if it wished to deal with the subject.

Lord John Mackenzie—declared in the debate of the 12th March, that his bill would take away from the Churches of England and Scotland in Canada that protection and those safeguards which were recognised by statute in the case of the Roman Church, and if this was their measure of religious equality, he hoped the House would not sanction it.

Lord Mackenzie stated that the measure was neither more nor less than a measure of Church plunder; and its progress was towards the destruction of all religious establishments.

Mr. Child—was totally opposed to the bill, and exclaimed—shall we show less zeal in the propagation of our pure faith, than the Pagans for their corrupt worship? Our fathers were not in the least slack of their duties. They granted the Reserves for the support of the Christian Faith; and much as he desired to promote self-government, he could not give his assent to a measure which sanctioned, if it did not suggest, what was denounced by the Prophet Isaiah—'Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me: why then wherein have I robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse for ye have robbed me, even the whole nation.'

Mr. Doring—in voting for the bill, looked with confidence to the religious feelings of the people of Canada, and that they would follow the just course, and would, by voting for the divisions which had so long unfortunately rent the colony, secure the blessings of internal peace and tranquillity, and thus contribute to its lasting welfare.

The Duke of Argyll was in favour of the bill; but as the endowments of the Roman Catholics were justifiable in the colonial legislation, he said the Reserves, he thought they would join the Protestants in resisting secularization.

The Bishop of Oxford—voted for the bill, and called it doing justice; but when told that he was agreeing to vote for confiscation, he said that he agreed to no such thing. If the question was, will you vote for secularization, no voice would be more distinct, no vote more emphatic, than his. He should give to such a proposition. He did not undervalue what the evil would be, if the Reserves were secularized, that is, confiscated. He saw plainly that consuming such a property upon mere secular matters, would be a degree of folly which would be barely equalled by the loss of a few acres of a colony, which could not allow to be reproduced in its neighbourhood. He had, therefore, the strongest hope that he would see no such confiscation of the Clergy Reserves.

The Duke of Newcastle maintained that if this measure were passed, the Clergy Reserves would stand precisely on the same footing as the Roman Catholic endowments; and he was not without hope that the Canadian Parliament would treat the question in the same spirit as their Lordships; and that if the bill became law, the decision of the Colonial Legislature would not be for the secularization of the Reserves; for their Lordships might look upon this as an axiom, that there was no better security against abuse of power than responsibility. And if they could not be satisfied with the Legislature would be responsible in the administration of the Reserves, he believed their Lordships would be taking the only and the best security they could take against any undue or improper use of the power which they intrusted to the colonial legislatures.

Lord St. Leonards said, that while defending the rights of the protestant clergy, he would strenuously oppose any attempt to destroy the rights of the Roman Catholics, but pass this bill and you deprive the protestant clergy of their property; but it could not deprive the Roman Catholic clergy of their property without sending it over to this country for that purpose, which must lie on the table of parliament for thirty days, and might be disallowed by the Crown at any moment within that period. Would their Lordships sit quietly and see the rights of the protestant clergy destroyed, while those of the Roman Catholics were preserved? Protestants Catholics were in favour of the measure, because it struck at the property of the protestant clergy; but the time would come, when the Canadian legislature would attack the Roman Catholic tithes and endowments. His Lordship further observed, that the question before the house was not, whether they were to alter the law, but whether they were to destroy an actual endowment, which the church possessed in Canada, and possess it by good title as it could possibly exist. He voted for 3rd and 4th Vic. while in opposition, as he would again, upon the ground of its being a national settlement.

The Bishop of London said, that the simple proposition on which the proceeding was grounded, the Canadian legislature had 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, in fact, of these clergy reserves, was one of the conditions of the Canadian constitution, conceded by this country. The reserves were a sacred trust, placed in the hands of the Imperial Parliament, and that to permit the alienation of any portion of that fund, would be a criminal abandonment of that trust, and a flagrant violation of a sacred compact. Earnestly, then, would he oppose any measure, which went to deprive the Canadian Church of the means with which so good a work was done.

The Bishop of Norwich was in favor of the bill, because it was the fulfilment of a pledge; but if the Roman Catholics in the colony should wantonly expose the principle of endowment, they would expose themselves to the risk of losing their own endowments. But he did not believe the Canadian parliament would commit such an unjustifiable act as secularizing the clergy reserves. If, indeed, they were unwise enough to alienate this property, the church in Canada would have an equitable claim to compensation.

control of the one is to be consigned to the colonial legislature, so must the other.

Second, that the ministry, as such, did not anticipate the secularization of the clergy reserves, at the passing of the act, nor from the recent declaration of the Duke of Newcastle; do they anticipate such a catastrophe now; and, though parliaments are said to be omnipotent, they have no right to perpetrate injustice or to trample on their own acts and engagements.

Third, had secularization been anticipated, they could not have carried the measure; too many of their adherents, even when supporting them, spoke severely against confiscating the church property; and had they suspected that the Canadian legislature would commit such a flagrant and revolutionary act of injustice, they would have voted against the bill, and it would have been lost.

On this point the sentiments of all the members of the imperial government are clear, and almost unanimous. They give you and your colleagues credit for honorable intention and fair dealing, and it will neither favour of probity nor good feeling, to disappoint their honest expectations. The Duke of Newcastle stated very lately, that he neither heard from Mr. Hincks while in England, nor any one else, a word about the secularization of the clergy reserves; and that he believed the church property in no danger of secularization, or, as it is now called, to smooth the inquiry, adjustment.

But on this matter we have still further evidence, and indeed the best possible. Lord Eldon, the frankness of and high worth distinguish a true British nobleman, thus speaks at the great dinner given to his lordship in London, on the 6th of April last—

"I have often warned my Canadian friends against doing anything that might lead the people to suspect that they were capable of abusing the powers conferred upon them. I pointed out to them, that if they did not pay the same scrupulous regard to the rights of property as the people of England, they would bring a blight upon the land, and cause the fair flower of their prosperity to wither in its root. And, what is more, they will bring scandal to one of the best names ever connected to our name; because, I believe, on the success of our Canadian experiment, not only the liberties of many other colonies depend, but to a greater extent than many suppose, the future greatness and happiness of the mother country. It has been said, that the new system of responsible government, which is happily taking place of the old, is a triumph to us all; but, my opinion; but my belief is just the contrary of this, and, if the new system is made permanent, I think a more temperate tone will prevail among colonial politicians than has hitherto existed, and will, by and by, take possession of the colonial press."

It is evident that the Governor General is equally anxious with the Duke of Newcastle, to avert the crime of secularization, as ruinous, morally and politically, to the character of the province. With such sentiments, we cannot wonder that his lordship, in conversing with the Duke of Newcastle, made no mention even of the possibility of such a measure, or the confiscation of the clergy reserves. Yet, notwithstanding this sound advice, with which, as a member of government, you cannot be unacquainted, your proceedings altogether oppose it. Nor do you seem to perceive, that your threats to destroy the church property are incompatible with the rights of the clergy as society together, and at variance with the favorite maxim of your party, "to follow in all things the will of the multitude." You have not one-third of the population with you, and that the least independent, being in a great measure composed of party men, morally and religiously unprincipled, who are in a constant and violent assent of this irreparable minority appears, to the timid and indolent, irresistible.

Of their regard for truth and honesty, we have a notable example in the proceedings of the Anti-Reserve Association, already mentioned; which, in defiance of all that is just and honorable, seeks the gratification of such a measure, and violent assault of the churches; for they are equally ferocious in their opposition to Roman and protestant endowments; and if some of them profess a sort of outward regard for religion, they make such profane subservient to the destruction of all that promotes evangelical truth and order.

The Duke of Argyll and the Duke of Newcastle, you must be as much aware as I am, that since the first settlement of the country till the union in 1840, there existed a courteous and uninterrupted interchange of social amenities between the members of the church of England and the church of Rome; and, although since that period, some of the clergy have grown more and sometimes estrangements have arisen, yet we have still continued to count your people as friendly to our endowments, as we have hitherto been to yours; and have felt persuaded, that all such causes of irritation might not only be greatly diminished, but effectually removed. But if your course in your present attitude, the two churches, instead of returning to friendly intercourse, will soon be at open war; and the battle between them will be fought on the floor of the legislature. If this indeed be your policy, I am compelled to confess, that from all appearances you will be victorious; for the most violent enemies of our church, and equally violent enemies of the clergy, have now arisen, for their plan is, "divide and conquer." These are nevertheless victories, which destroy the conquerors, and yours will be one of them. How you can continue blind to the rise of the socialist party among yourselves, already in possession of considerable influence, and in close connection with the clergy, who have now entered in this section of the province, and are eager to destroy them, I cannot conjecture. Certain it is, that your safety as well as ours, lies in the mutual agreement of the two protestant churches with yours, on this vital question of endowment, and on this only, leaving all other matters to be settled by the clergy and your property except by Roman Catholic votes; and if we are vanquished, your turn will soon follow; for it will be impossible for you to resist the torrent which a bitter sense of injury will create, and which will in a little time sweep before it all your national and distinctive institutions. It is true, some of your adherents have been saying, that they would be glad to see the endowments, and rather risk a civil war, than give them up. This would be the height of madness; for no longer having the protestant churches of England and Scotland to stand with you in the breach, you would soon be overcome by numbers, and your total defeat effected by the thought, that you might have prevented such a calamity, and blessed the province with a long period of peace and happiness, had you adopted a truer and more just course of action.

Reflect, Sir, on your high position, and your numerous friends and supporters, and inspire them with justice before it be too late. The national churches of Great Britain and Ireland have no desire to molest your church property; on the contrary, they hold it in reverence, because it is dedicated to God's service, but you in return, ought to show the like regard for theirs.

It is no longer to be concealed, that democracy and infidelity are the two powers which menace religion in every part of the world, wherever opportunity offers. In 1848 they were rampant over the greater part of Europe, nor were they overcome without much bloodshed and extensive misery. And is it not as much our duty to join against them in this country, as it was in Europe. Nor need such co-operation

lead to any change in our religious feelings and principles, for such matters are not involved in our agreement, which is confined to a single and well-defined object.

As regards the construction of the present ministry, of which you seem to be virtually the head, I have no desire to speak reproachfully, much less to sit in judgment, or to search curiously into the motives which may have led you to their own master they must stand or fall. My object is, conciliation and permanent peace. And this object I must endeavor to promote because of its infinite value, even at the hazard of many repetitions. And it invites me to inquire in the first place how far you are, as a government, pledged on the question of church property; and so far as the church endowments of England and Ireland are concerned, in what way you may be able, if inclined, to effect an equitable and final arrangement. I begin with dismissing from the inquiry, all vague assertions made by the members of the present ministry, and so far as the church endowments—whether they belonged to or opposed the former government.

The change of an administration is always accompanied with some alteration or modification of policy. And I take it for granted, that yours is not an exception. Gentlemen who have served in some important points, can never settle them satisfactorily without some degree of mutual compromise; and, if so done for the sake of future peace, and without infringing upon substantial justice, or inherent rights, such a guarded respect for each other's views is reasonable, and may be admitted. There are, indeed, many questions so clear and pointed, as to admit of no compromise, without incurring moral guilt, but a fair and judicious arrangement of the clergy reserves does not appear to be one of the number, nor is the present administration pledged to any course except an honorable adjustment.

By we must take care, in coming to a wise conclusion, not to be led away by mere words; which may be used in different senses by different persons; and this, without mutual explanation, might produce much confusion, and even fierce contention—as happened to the two knights with the shield, which was gold on the one side and silver on the other. Now it is so, with regard to the clergy reserves, which means the conversion of spiritual property to common use, has been applied in a bad sense to the clergy reserves, as implying their absolute confiscation. And this sense having been adopted by the enemies of ecclesiastical endowments, it has obtained very general currency. But we must not allow ourselves to be misled by such words, which are so inappropriate and so ambiguous. For example: when A or B purchases one or more clergy reserves, and they are turned into farms, their secularization is complete. But the price paid for them remains with the church, or the government, as the case may be, and can be applied to ecclesiastical purposes. In this sense, the word secularization, is not a forfeiture, sacred or profane, but literally secularised; but it is not a necessary consequence that the institution should be robbed; if it has lost the land, it possesses its value in the purchase money.

I do not think that there is a member of the present government, who adopts the bad interpretation of secularization; but he thinks it may, so sensible was the language of the inconvolution of the word, that adjustment was substituted in the Governor General's speech, and adopted in the House of Assembly by a very large majority. The word adjustment means to put in order; to settle in the right form or way; to make accurate. This allows ample scope, but implies far more than a formal and evidently excludes anything mean, narrow, or disingenuous. Hence, the ministry, by the vote of the Legislative Assembly, seem to me pledged to an honorable adjustment of the clergy reserve question. They can therefore, come forward without party bias, to the just settlement of the question, and in such a principle, although there may be some latitude in detail.

Thus, a measure fair and honorable to all parties, may be framed without any great difficulty, which shall command a triumphant majority. First, the conservatives, who not only would not be led away by such a measure, but would furnish a powerful and valuable support to such an arrangement: nor can I hesitate in believing that the Roman Catholics, now fully sensible that it is a common cause, will give you a majority; since, besides their magnificent endowment in Lower Canada, they are entitled to the endowment of the Duke of Newcastle, and of the Duke of Argyll, and other large interests in the clergy reserves of the West, of which confiscation would deprive them. And singularly blind must they be, if they do not see from the occurrences of every day, that the present supporters of secularization are the most bitter foes of all churches possessing endowments.

Now proceed to mention what I consider the true method of settlement, and here I would premise, that it must be one which shall carry along with it a friendly conviction of the more intelligent inhabitants of the province, that it is the best possible arrangement to insure future peace and harmony. It must also be such, that it will not leave any permanent, or even a temporary, incumbrance; a treacherous vision, which would gradually waste away the church in a manner most heartless and degrading, and keep her still in thalldom to the government, and open to incessant irritation and growing agitation; which skillfully managed, may be made to appear a very formidable contest that we have yet encountered.

It was the intention of the British parliament in 1791, to make ample provision for the maintenance of a protestant clergy in Canada, and to place the national church on an equal footing with that of Rome. How that glorious intention has been frustrated, by neglect and mismanagement, and the pernicious interference of the provincial government, will best appear by contrasting the temporal position of the two Churches at the present time.

1st. The average livings of the French clergy, about four hundred in number, exclusive of those employed in colleges, monasteries, and other religious houses, may be taken at £250 per annum; showing an annual revenue of £100,000 per annum; a sum, which represents a capital of at least two millions.

2nd. Various endowments, of some great value, such as the St. Sulpice endowment, covering the whole Island of Montreal, and considered to be worth nearly a million; besides lands, wild and cultivated, to the extent of rather more than two millions of acres, and which are in the aggregate, at the present time, worth at least two millions more, showing that the endowments, tithes, and other dues of the Roman Catholic church in Lower Canada, may be fairly taken at a capital of four millions sterling; which at five per cent, would yield an income of two hundred thousand pound sterling, yearly. I do not mention these particulars as grounds, and finding fault with their largeness; on the contrary, I would not willingly diminish them by one farthing, because they have been dedicated to holy purposes; and even should we lose our expected endowment by our Roman Catholic votes, I should be most reluctant to meddle with their property; but my abstinence would be of little account, for the moment that the Roman Catholic votes dispose of our church property, and we were set less in it, by their votes, they seal the doom of their own, and make it a mere question of time. And indeed it does seem clear, that if you continue as you have been doing, since 1850, I may say since