

HURON SIGNAL

TEN SHILLINGS IN ADVANCE. "THE GREATEST POSSIBLE GOOD TO THE GREATEST POSSIBLE NUMBER." TWELVE AND SIX PENCE AT THE END OF THE YEAR. VOLUME I. GODERICH, HURON DISTRICT, (C. W.) FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1848. NUMBER 2.

The Huron Signal,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
BY CHARLES DOLSEN,
MARKET-SQUARE, GODERICH.
THOMAS MACQUEEN, Editor.

THE BROKEN HEART.

A TALE OF THE REBELLION.

Early in the November of 1745, the news reached Cambridge that Charles Stuart, at the head of his hardy and devoted Highlanders, had crossed the Borders, and taken possession of Carlisle. The inhabitants gazed upon each other with terror, for the sword of the clansmen had triumphed over all opposition; they were regarded, also, by the multitude as savages, and by the more ignorant as cannibals. But there were others who rejoiced in the success of the young Adventurer, and who, dangerous as they were to confess their joy, took but small pains to conceal it. Amongst these was James Dawson, the son of a gentleman in the north of Lancashire, and then a student at St. John's College. That night he invited a party of friends to sup with him, who entertained sentiments similar to his own. The cloth was withdrawn, and he rose and gave, as the toast of the evening—"Prince Charles—and success to him!" His guests fired with his own enthusiasm, rose and received the toast with cheers. The bottle went round—the young men drank deep, and other toasts of a similar nature followed. The song succeeded the toast, and James Dawson sang the following, which seemed to be the composition of the day—

"Free, o'er the Borders, the tartan is streaming,
The Dirk is unsheathed, and the claymore is gleaming,
The Prince and his clansmen in triumph advance,
Now needs he the long-promised succours of France,
From the Cumberland mountains, and W. Cumberland lake,
Each brave man shall snatch up a sword for his sake;
And the Lancashire Witch on her bosom
Shall wear the snow-white cockade, by her lover placed there."

But while he yet sang, and as he completed but the first verse, two constables and three or four men burst into the room, and denounced them as traitors and as their prisoners.

"Down with them!" exclaimed James Dawson, springing forward, and snatching down a sword which was suspended over the mantelpiece. The students vigorously resisted the attempt to make their prisoners, and several of them, with their entreaties, escaped.

He concealed himself for a short time, when, his horse being brought, he took the road towards Manchester, in order to join the ranks of the Adventurer. It was about midday, when he reached the town which is now theemporium of the manufacturing world. On proceeding down Market Street, he perceived a confused crowd, some uttering threats with consternation expressed on their countenance; and in the midst of the multitude, was Sergeant Dickson, a young woman, and a drummer boy, beating up for recruits. The white cockade streamed from the hat of the sergeant; the populace vented their indignation against him, but no man dared to seize him, for he continued to turn round and round, with a blunderbuss in his hand, and threatening to shoot the first man that approached, who was not ready to serve the Prince, and to mount the white cockade. The young woman carried a supply of the ribbons in her hand, and ever anon waved them in triumph, exclaiming—"Charlie yet!" Some dozen recruits already followed at the heels of the sergeant. James Dawson spurred his horse to the crowd.

"Give me one of your favours," said he, addressing the sergeant.

"Ay, a dozen, your honour," replied Dickson.

He received the ribbon and tied it to his breast, and placed another at his horse's head. His conduct had an effect upon the multitude; numbers flocked around the sergeant, his favours became exhausted; and when the Prince and the army entered the town in the evening, he brought before him an hundred and eighty men, which he had that day enlisted.

The little band so raised were formed into what was called the Manchester regiment, of which the gallant Towly was made Colonel, and James Dawson one of the Captains.

Our business at present is not with the movements of Charles Edward, nor need we describe his daring march towards Derby, which struck terror throughout all England, and for a time seemed to shake the throne and the dynasty; nor dwell upon the particulars of his masterly retreat towards Scotland—sufficient to say, that on the 19th of December, the Highland army again entered Carlisle.

On the following morning they evacuated it; but the Manchester regiment, which was now composed of about three hundred men, was left as a garrison to defend the town, against the entire army of proud Cumberland. They were the devoted as a sacrifice, that the Prince and the main army might be saved. The dauntless Towly, and the young and gallant Dawson, were not ignorant of the desperation and the hopelessness of their situation; but they strove to impart their own heroism to the garrison, and to defend the town to the last. On the morning of the 21st, the en-

tire army of the Duke of Cumberland arrived before Carlisle, and took possession of the fortifications that commanded it. He commanded the garrison to surrender, and they answered him by discharge of musketry. They had withstood a siege of ten days, during which time Cumberland had erected batteries, and procured cannon from Whitehaven; before their fire the decaying and neglected walls of the city gave way; to hold out another day was impossible, and there was no resource left for the devoted band, but to surrender, or perish. On the 30th, a white flag was hoisted on the ramparts. On its being perceived, the cannon ceased to play upon the town, and a messenger was sent to the Duke of Cumberland, to inquire what terms he would grant to the garrison.

"Tell them," he replied haughtily, "to hold out no terms but these—that they shall not be put to the sword, but they shall be reserved for my Majesty, to deal with them as he may think proper."

There was no alternative, and these doubtful and evasive terms were accepted. The garrison were disarmed, and under a numerous guard placed in the cathedral.

James Dawson and seventeen others were conveyed to London, and cast into prison, to wait the will of his Majesty. His now his parents were ignorant of the fate of their son, though they heard of his being compelled to flee the university, and feared that he had joined the standard of the Prince. Two soon their worst fears were realized, and the truth revealed to them. There was another who trembled for him, whose heart felt keenly as a parent's—she who was to have been his wife, to whom his hand was pledged, and his heart given. Fanny Lester was a young and gentle being, and she had known James Dawson from her childhood. Knowledge ripened to affection, and their hearts were twined together. On the day in which she was made acquainted with his imprisonment, she hastened to London to comfort him—to cheer his gloomy solitude—at the foot of the throne to see for his pardon.

She arrived at the metropolis, and was conducted to the prison-house, and admitted. On entering the gloomy apartment in which he was confined, she screamed aloud, she raised her hands, and springing forward, she exclaimed, "Oh, my dear Fanny!" he exclaimed, "you here!—weep not, my sweet one—come be comforted—there is hope—every hope—I shall not die—my own Fanny—be comforted."

"Yes!—yes there is hope!—the King will pardon you," she exclaimed, "he will spare my James—I will implore your life at his feet!"

"Nay, nay, love—say not the King," interrupted the young enthusiast for freedom, "it is all over—the Elector cannot seek my life."

He strove long and earnestly to persuade, to assure her, that his life was not in danger—that he would be speedily released, and would be allowed to return to his home. The jailer entered, and informed them it was time that she should depart, and again sinking her head upon his breast, she wept "good night!"

But each day she visited him, and they spoke of his deliverance together. At times, too, she told him with tears of the efforts she had made to obtain his pardon—of her attempts to gain admission to the King-of the repulses she met with—and the applications to the nobility connected with the cause—the compassion she experienced from others—the interest that they took in his fate, and the hopes and the promises which they held out. She fondly dwelt, she looked into his eyes to perceive the hope that they kindled there, and as joy beamed from them, she half forgot that his life hung upon the word of a man.

But his parents came to visit him; hers followed her, and they joined their efforts to hers, and anxiously, daily, almost hourly, they exerted their energies to obtain his pardon. His father possessed an influence in selecting matters in Lancashire, and here could exercise the same in an adjoining county. That influence was now urged—the members they had supported were importuned. They promised to employ their best exertions. Whatever the feelings or principles of the elder Dawson might be, he had never availed himself openly—he had never evinced a leaning to the family of Stuart—he had supported the government of the day; and the father of Fanny Lester was an upholder of the house of Hanover. The influence of all their relatives, and of all their friends, was brought into action; peers and commoners were supplicated, and they pledged their intercession. A high in office took an interest in the fate of James Dawson, or professed to take it; promises, half official, were held out—and when his youth, the short time that he had been engaged in the rebellion, and the situation that he held in the army of the Adventurer were considered, no one doubted but that his pardon was certain—that he would not be brought to trial. Even his parents felt assured—but the word of the King was not passed.

They began to look forward to the day of his deliverance with impatience, but with certainty. There was but one hope that fostered, and it throbbled the bosom of poor Fanny. She would start from sleep, crying—"Save him!—save him!" as she fancied she beheld them dragged to execution. In order to soothe her parents and his, in the confidence that pardon would be extended to him, she said that the day of his liberation should be the day of his bridal. She knew her fears, and her heart struggled with her to believe the flattering tale. James tried also to cheer her—he endeavoured to smile and to be gay.

"Fear not, my own Fanny," he would say; "your apprehensions are idle. The Doctor's hope deferred makes the heart sick."

And here his father would interpose earnestly, "speak not against prices in your bed-chamber, for a bird of the air can carry the tidings. Your life is in the hands of a King—of a merciful one, and it is safe—only speak not thus—do not as you love me—as you love our Fanny, do not."

Then would they chase away her fears, and speak of the arrangements for the bridal; and Fanny would smile pensively while James held her hand in his, and as he gazed on her finger he raised it to his lips, as though he took the measure of the ring, and heaved a sigh.

But, "hope deferred makes the heart sick," and though they still retained their confidence that he would be pardoned, yet their anxiety increased, and Fanny's heart seemed unable longer to contain its agony and suspense. More than six months had passed, but still no pardon came for James Dawson. The fury of the civil war was spent—the royal Adventurer had escaped—the vengeance of the sword was satiated, and the law of the land, called for the blood of those whom the sword had saved. The soldier laid down his weapon, and the executioner took up his. On the leaders of the Manchester regiment, the vengeance of the blood-thirsty law first fell. It was on the evening of the 14th of July 1746, James Dawson sat in his prison, Fanny sat by his side with her hand in his, and his parents were present also, when the jailer entered, and ordered him to prepare to hold himself in readiness for his trial, in the court-house at St. Margaret's, Southwark, on the following day. His father groaned, his mother exclaimed, "my son!"—but Fanny sat motionless. No tear was in her eye—no muscle in her countenance moved. Her fingers grasped his with a firmer pressure than she would have been capable of, and he heard her murmur that was delivered. They rose to depart, and a low, deep sigh issued from her bosom; but she showed no sign of violent grief—her feelings were already exhausted—her heart could bear no more.

On the following day eighteen victims, with the gallant Towly at their head, were brought forth for trial before a grand jury, and Fanny, who was the wife of the chief, was James Dawson. Fanny had insisted on being present. She heard the grand jury pronounced with a voice of sympathy that she had evinced at the answer to her prayer, but she shed not a single tear, she breathed not a single sigh. She arose, she beckoned to her attendants, and accompanied them to the court-house. Still his friends entertained the hope that the Pardon Power might be moved—they redoubled their exertions—they increased their importunities—they were willing to make any sacrifice so that his life might be saved—and even then, that at the eleventh hour, they hoped against hope. But day after day she sat by her lover's side, and she, as her turn, became his comforter. She no longer spoke of his trial—but she spoke of eternity; she spoke of their meeting where the ambition, the rivalry, and the power of princes should be able to cast no cloud upon the happiness of the soul. Fourteen days had passed, and yet she evinced none of a woman's weakness. She seemed to have mastered her grief, and her soul was prepared to meet its God. Let her three days ago she spoke to him her soul appeared entranced, and her body lifeless. On the 29th of July an order was brought for the execution of the victims on the following day. James Dawson, who had delivered the warrant, and calmly answered, "I am prepared!"

The cries of his mother—through the prison-house. She tore herself entreated Heaven to spare her child. His father groaned, he held the hand of his son, and his tears gushed down his furrowed cheeks. Fanny alone was silent—she swelled her bosom, she dashed in her countenance, or burned in her eye. She was calm, speechless, resigned. He pressed her to his bosom, as they took their way to the gallows, he cried—"my Fanny, farewell—an eternal farewell!"

"Nay, nay," she replied, "say not eternal—we are met again—'Tis a short farewell—say firmly, 'We shall meet soon.'"

Next morning the prisoners were dragged in sledges to Kensington Common, and James was the place appointed for the execution, sitting over his pillioned horse with a drawn sword in his hand. A minister of religion attended, and around the sledge followed a number of soldiers, some few expressed sympathy, the majority following from curiosity, others venting their execrations against traitors. In the midst of the multitude was a hackney coach, following the sledge, and in it were the Fanny Lester, who was accompanied by a relative and a female friend. They had endeavoured to persuade her from the fearful trial; but she was calm, resolute, and not to be moved, and they yielded to her. The coach drew up within thirty yards of the scaffold; Fanny pulled down the window, and leaning over it, she beheld the piles of faggots lighted around the scaffold—she saw the flames ascend, and the soldiers form a circle round them. She saw the victims leave the sledge; she looked upon him whom her heart loved as he mounted the place of death, and his step was firm, his countenance unmoved. She saw him as he flung

papers and his hat among the multitude. She saw the fatal signal given, and they held the truth, how are we to find it out? What should we think of the missionary, who, distrustful of the reasonableness of his own faith, would be unwilling to convert freely with the people he was sent to convert? Yet such is the conduct of those who obstinately refuse to meet their opponents on the common ground of reason. We are all missionaries, for as Christians it is our duty to do all in our power to benefit others. If we think that our faith will not benefit others, we are insincere in our profession of it. Men in their narrow-mindedness seem to fancy that their religion is like a heap of gold which cannot be bestowed on others without impoverishing its owner. Religion, on the contrary, is more like the widow's cruse, the more it is used, the more it is replenished. We do not refuse to believe in the efficacy of our treasure, like misers we impoverish ourselves. In all its various forms, and however detected, there is still one common feeling of religion, which consists rather in the love of God, than in the profession of all his mercies, than in the groveling fear of punishment, and in that intolerance towards other sects, which so often disgraces the professors of religion. There is an exclusive feeling in all sects towards others, which partakes but too much of the interested jealousy observable in worldly pursuits, where gain is the main object. We are too much disposed to consider our own opinions as the course within the narrow limits of our own sects. It is no doubt, no more than natural that we should give them the first place in our affections; but while we love our own particular opinions, we should not forget that all men are our brothers, whether they are Christians or heathens; and we should endeavour to hold that friendly intercourse with them which will be most likely to produce that conformity of opinion which we so much to be desired. This can only be done by a direct appeal to that reason which is the universal guide given to all men by the Author of our being. The jealousy, so common to all sects, and the intolerance of parents, and of their flocking together mixed with the flocks of another fold, is a proof or symptom of a latent distrust of their own professed, or at least it shows that they regard human reason as a dangerous opponent of their faith. There is a step in the history of true religion which such fears are reasonable and justifiable; that is, when the mass of the people are extremely ignorant, and have received their religion by the means of sense but indiscriminating faith. In the early days of the Christian era, it would have been in vain to have trusted to reason alone, as a means of establishing the new religion—a religion so unlike all others, in the face of such an impenetrable host of tangled prejudices, and of the superstitions of men. With the learned Jews, and Saviour appealed to their reason, and to the prophecies of the Old Testament, which they all believed. Their want of faith was not in the prophecies of the Old Testament, but in the interpretation given them by Christ. With the mass of the people, on the contrary, reason and history were less powerful, and miracles were more especially resorted to as the surest means of producing entire conviction on the minds of the ignorant multitude, of the Divine mission of the Saviour. When miracles ceased, we have regular human reason, which is certain, and which civilized nations, to whom the leading doctrines of the Christian religion have long been preached, and who are capable of acquiring the testimony of the Old Testament, and of the prophecies, and of such testimony should fail to bring conviction to their minds, miracles would also fail. When a certain degree of knowledge has been acquired, we are enabled to interpret reason takes the place of miracles, and when this is the case, it can no longer be overthrown by imposture. Religion is never so safe, or in so healthy and vigorous a state, as when the narrow prejudices of sects, and the delusions of superstitions, are only confirmed in their errors, if they are in error—for the pride of the mind is aroused by every species of intolerance, and intolerance becomes impossible. When these things are duly considered, it appears sufficiently that reason is the best friend to religion, and can never be its enemy. Reason, certainly, will not explain those truths of religion, which are above human reason; but the Almighty has given it to us to direct us in our choice of a faith; and we are no where required to believe what is contrary to reason. When knowledge and reason exercise their full sway, and when the elements of intolerance and prejudice are once swept away, it will be just as natural for truth to prevail as for water to find its level. As religion is given us to direct our conduct, we shall be in the most favorable posture to judge of each religion by its practical results. Soon or later all religions will have to submit to the test. In a country like Canada, where few of those artificial embankments have been raised to obstruct the free passage of truth between different sects, and a greater intermixture hath taken place, many uncharitable prejudices have already disappeared. Here, perhaps, more than in any country in the world, are we in a position to give our reason free play; and here, especially, is it our duty, and our interest to promote free discussion, and to bear with truth ever penetrate the dark masses of the

RELIGION AND LOYALTY.

BY J. W. DUNNAN MOORE.

No terms in the English language are more uncertain, indefinite and circumscribed in the signification attached to them, than Religion and Loyalty. They are terms which seem to have the peculiar property of exciting the worst passions of mankind—when they are distorted by the conflicting opinions of narrow-minded and intolerant men, it seems strange that two words which should convey the idea of something good and desirable, should unhappily produce such effects. We are ready enough to profess to believe that there is a God, and highly prayerfully when directed towards what we consider the proper objects—that is towards our Religion and our Government; but very few can extend their liberality so far as to believe that there is any intrinsic merit in such feelings, irrespective of such limitations. With regard to the latter, it is considered as worse than none by a great many. The same may be said of Loyalty. No one would deny that there must be one true religion, though perhaps no portion of the human race have yet professed it in its purity; and there must be one true form of government superior to all others. In the progress of the world, the religion professed by ourselves and our kindred, and we are placed in the perplexing position of being judges in our own cause, and of course, the decision will be in conformity with our own views. Religion, in ninety-nine cases in a hundred has been stamped on our tender and passive minds by our parents, long before we were capable of forming any opinion of our own. The family seal is inherited by our parents from their ancestors, and we know not whether it bears the stigmata of the Lamb or of the Devil. With the wisest and best, the question is simply reduced to this—We believe ourselves to be in the right path, and all others who profess a different faith to be in the wrong one. It may seem to some that we are treading on dangerous ground when we venture to discuss such exciting topics as these; but happily we live in a country where rational and tolerant opinions prevail all classes of the community in a degree surpassed by no country in the world, and where, we may add, we are especially bound to respect the opinions and prejudices of others for the common good. It is not our intention to dwell on the peculiar doctrines of any religious sect or of any form of government, but simply to survey the common grounds on which we all or should agree for the good of all. We wish to promote peace—not to stir up war. In saying that the minds of men have passively adopted, in most cases, the opinions impressed on them in early infancy, whether true or false, we are far from looking upon this as an evil. On the contrary, we hold that almost any religion is better than no religion, and the sooner the ideas of moral restraint are impressed on the mind the better.

Taking an extended view of all the different forms of faith professed by mankind—the members of each sect believing conscientiously that they are walking in the true and only road to salvation, and using their utmost efforts to spread the doctrines which in their hearts they believe will lead to future happiness; we are naturally inclined to survey the common grounds on which we all or should agree for the good of all. We wish to promote peace—not to stir up war. In saying that the minds of men have passively adopted, in most cases, the opinions impressed on them in early infancy, whether true or false, we are far from looking upon this as an evil. On the contrary, we hold that almost any religion is better than no religion, and the sooner the ideas of moral restraint are impressed on the mind the better.

world? If we hold the true faith, are we selfishly leaving them in ignorance? and if they hold the truth, how are we to find it out? What should we think of the missionary, who, distrustful of the reasonableness of his own faith, would be unwilling to convert freely with the people he was sent to convert? Yet such is the conduct of those who obstinately refuse to meet their opponents on the common ground of reason. We are all missionaries, for as Christians it is our duty to do all in our power to benefit others. If we think that our faith will not benefit others, we are insincere in our profession of it. Men in their narrow-mindedness seem to fancy that their religion is like a heap of gold which cannot be bestowed on others without impoverishing its owner. Religion, on the contrary, is more like the widow's cruse, the more it is used, the more it is replenished. We do not refuse to believe in the efficacy of our treasure, like misers we impoverish ourselves. In all its various forms, and however detected, there is still one common feeling of religion, which consists rather in the love of God, than in the profession of all his mercies, than in the groveling fear of punishment, and in that intolerance towards other sects, which so often disgraces the professors of religion. There is an exclusive feeling in all sects towards others, which partakes but too much of the interested jealousy observable in worldly pursuits, where gain is the main object. We are too much disposed to consider our own opinions as the course within the narrow limits of our own sects. It is no doubt, no more than natural that we should give them the first place in our affections; but while we love our own particular opinions, we should not forget that all men are our brothers, whether they are Christians or heathens; and we should endeavour to hold that friendly intercourse with them which will be most likely to produce that conformity of opinion which we so much to be desired. This can only be done by a direct appeal to that reason which is the universal guide given to all men by the Author of our being. The jealousy, so common to all sects, and the intolerance of parents, and of their flocking together mixed with the flocks of another fold, is a proof or symptom of a latent distrust of their own professed, or at least it shows that they regard human reason as a dangerous opponent of their faith. There is a step in the history of true religion which such fears are reasonable and justifiable; that is, when the mass of the people are extremely ignorant, and have received their religion by the means of sense but indiscriminating faith. In the early days of the Christian era, it would have been in vain to have trusted to reason alone, as a means of establishing the new religion—a religion so unlike all others, in the face of such an impenetrable host of tangled prejudices, and of the superstitions of men. With the learned Jews, and Saviour appealed to their reason, and to the prophecies of the Old Testament, which they all believed. Their want of faith was not in the prophecies of the Old Testament, but in the interpretation given them by Christ. With the mass of the people, on the contrary, reason and history were less powerful, and miracles were more especially resorted to as the surest means of producing entire conviction on the minds of the ignorant multitude, of the Divine mission of the Saviour. When miracles ceased, we have regular human reason, which is certain, and which civilized nations, to whom the leading doctrines of the Christian religion have long been preached, and who are capable of acquiring the testimony of the Old Testament, and of the prophecies, and of such testimony should fail to bring conviction to their minds, miracles would also fail. When a certain degree of knowledge has been acquired, we are enabled to interpret reason takes the place of miracles, and when this is the case, it can no longer be overthrown by imposture. Religion is never so safe, or in so healthy and vigorous a state, as when the narrow prejudices of sects, and the delusions of superstitions, are only confirmed in their errors, if they are in error—for the pride of the mind is aroused by every species of intolerance, and intolerance becomes impossible. When these things are duly considered, it appears sufficiently that reason is the best friend to religion, and can never be its enemy. Reason, certainly, will not explain those truths of religion, which are above human reason; but the Almighty has given it to us to direct us in our choice of a faith; and we are no where required to believe what is contrary to reason. When knowledge and reason exercise their full sway, and when the elements of intolerance and prejudice are once swept away, it will be just as natural for truth to prevail as for water to find its level. As religion is given us to direct our conduct, we shall be in the most favorable posture to judge of each religion by its practical results. Soon or later all religions will have to submit to the test. In a country like Canada, where few of those artificial embankments have been raised to obstruct the free passage of truth between different sects, and a greater intermixture hath taken place, many uncharitable prejudices have already disappeared. Here, perhaps, more than in any country in the world, are we in a position to give our reason free play; and here, especially, is it our duty, and our interest to promote free discussion, and to bear with truth ever penetrate the dark masses of the

RELIGION AND LOYALTY.

BY J. W. DUNNAN MOORE.

No terms in the English language are more uncertain, indefinite and circumscribed in the signification attached to them, than Religion and Loyalty. They are terms which seem to have the peculiar property of exciting the worst passions of mankind—when they are distorted by the conflicting opinions of narrow-minded and intolerant men, it seems strange that two words which should convey the idea of something good and desirable, should unhappily produce such effects. We are ready enough to profess to believe that there is a God, and highly prayerfully when directed towards what we consider the proper objects—that is towards our Religion and our Government; but very few can extend their liberality so far as to believe that there is any intrinsic merit in such feelings, irrespective of such limitations. With regard to the latter, it is considered as worse than none by a great many. The same may be said of Loyalty. No one would deny that there must be one true religion, though perhaps no portion of the human race have yet professed it in its purity; and there must be one true form of government superior to all others. In the progress of the world, the religion professed by ourselves and our kindred, and we are placed in the perplexing position of being judges in our own cause, and of course, the decision will be in conformity with our own views. Religion, in ninety-nine cases in a hundred has been stamped on our tender and passive minds by our parents, long before we were capable of forming any opinion of our own. The family seal is inherited by our parents from their ancestors, and we know not whether it bears the stigmata of the Lamb or of the Devil. With the wisest and best, the question is simply reduced to this—We believe ourselves to be in the right path, and all others who profess a different faith to be in the wrong one. It may seem to some that we are treading on dangerous ground when we venture to discuss such exciting topics as these; but happily we live in a country where rational and tolerant opinions prevail all classes of the community in a degree surpassed by no country in the world, and where, we may add, we are especially bound to respect the opinions and prejudices of others for the common good. It is not our intention to dwell on the peculiar doctrines of any religious sect or of any form of government, but simply to survey the common grounds on which we all or should agree for the good of all. We wish to promote peace—not to stir up war. In saying that the minds of men have passively adopted, in most cases, the opinions impressed on them in early infancy, whether true or false, we are far from looking upon this as an evil. On the contrary, we hold that almost any religion is better than no religion, and the sooner the ideas of moral restraint are impressed on the mind the better.

Taking an extended view of all the different forms of faith professed by mankind—the members of each sect believing conscientiously that they are walking in the true and only road to salvation, and using their utmost efforts to spread the doctrines which in their hearts they believe will lead to future happiness; we are naturally inclined to survey the common grounds on which we all or should agree for the good of all. We wish to promote peace—not to stir up war. In saying that the minds of men have passively adopted, in most cases, the opinions impressed on them in early infancy, whether true or false, we are far from looking upon this as an evil. On the contrary, we hold that almost any religion is better than no religion, and the sooner the ideas of moral restraint are impressed on the mind the better.

In the present day, and among the intelligent people, no religious sect requires peculiar support on the part of the state, which is not extended to others. If we take upon ourselves to say that any particular religion is the only true one—that all others are in error, and, therefore, require the state to uphold our religion alone—we need wonder that all other sects will be actuated by a covered hostility to us and to our institutions.

One of the strongest arguments for mutual forbearance and charitable feelings towards our opponents in religion in a country such as Canada, is the difficulties religious prejudices create in the civil government of the country. This will readily be admitted by all who have observed the influence of such feelings have in aggravating the evils of political antagonism. In the fulness of their self-sufficiency, each sect may say—"Ours is the true religion, and let others conform to the faith which is taught by the Holy Scriptures." Yet all Christians appeal to the Scriptures, but no two sects exactly agree as to their interpretation. The members of one great branch of Christians believe that their clergy are divinely authorized to interpret strictly and thus a great degree of uniformity of faith is insured. All the other sects, again, disagree in all manner of ways. It is not for us to venture to say which sect is right, but it appears to us, that while the minds of men continue to differ in capacity and susceptibility of cultivation, it is vain to expect anything like entire uniformity in religious faith, without the usual degrading sacrifice of all freedom of thought and action. The state has a great duty to perform in these matters. It has no right, we contend, to make a selection of any particular sect, to the prejudice of the others. All human governments are intended for the protection of all their subjects alike in their lives and property, as well as in freedom of action in every direction, which may be injurious to others. Liberty and property are protected by the state, why should not our religion, whatever that may be, receive the same protection. Our choice of a religion is the result of our natural freedom of thought. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so.

It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer than life itself. Is it not, then, the sacred duty of all governments to protect all their subjects alike, in the free enjoyment of their religion. It is not easy to break through long established usages, and all governments have it not in their power to do so. It is a species of property, to many, dearer