

toleration of wickedness. When meanness or hypocrisy is detected. Let men give the largest scope to their indignation, the freest course to their invective. But let them not confine such treatment to rogues of the opposite party. Let them excommunicate the knaves of their own following. Let them be sure that a bad man cannot make a good Churchman, a good Puritan, or a good anything. And let them remember that it is a duty, enforced upon us by the highest examples, to expose the interior of whited sepulchres, however fair may be their outward appearance.

Nor would we desire them to spare even lighter faults than hypocrisy, and more harmless absurdities than falsehood. For no absurdity in religious men can be entirely harmless; nor can the follies of pietism be altogether free from moral deformity. Hence it is the duty of a Christian to abate them as far as possible. And this is the appropriate field for ridicule, which in theological argument is out of place. Its employment in this, its proper province, cannot lead to evil, provided we be careful not to forget our reverence for the reality in our contempt for the travesty. "Are some ridiculous," says one who spoke to a scoffing generation, "and for that will you turn religion into ridicule? If you do, it will at last turn a scornful laughter."

But while we advocate the unsparing exposure of vice and folly, let us be careful to discontinue the use of unlawful weapons in the assault. Above all, let us disavow that tendency to settle theological quarrels by Lynch Law, which has lately disgraced our countrymen. If a clergyman is foolish, he may be laughed at; if he has introduced Popish rites and illegal ceremonies, he may be prosecuted in the courts of law. In either case it is shameful to hound on the mob against him. Yet we grieve to say that this method of attack has been resorted to by men who profess to advocate freedom of conscience. We shall not be suspected of viewing the so-called "Exeter Synod," with any peculiar favour. Yet we could not learn without indignation that London agitators were stirring up the populace to interrupt its deliberations by violence. It is not long since we saw the congregation of a metropolitan church disturbed in their devotions by the outrages of a crew of ruffians, for the honor of Protestantism. And, only the other day, a clergyman was prevented from administering the Communion on New Year's Eve to some of his parishioners who wished to receive it, by a threat that if he attempted a "midnight mass," the communicants should be dispersed by violence. This is nothing less than religious persecution; and those who employ such poisoned weapons, will find their shafts recoil sooner or later, upon themselves.

While civil discord thus convulses the Church, many of her children are falling away from her and abandoning the distinctive doctrines of Christianity. We have

* Archbishop Leighton's Sermon to the Parliament 1669.

† This happened at Exeter a place which was also disgraced by the notorious "Surplice riots." The latter, however, had more apology, because they sprang from a feeling on the part of the laity that the clergy had no right, without lay consent to introduce innovations into the service. No doubt the real remedy for these disorders, as for all the diseases of the Church (as we are forced so often to repeat), is to restore its true organization, and give to all its members a legitimate voice in its government. They would then have less temptation to employ Lynch Law.

already noticed the diffusion of infidel opinions among the lower classes; but the mischief is not confined to them. The highest ranks and most intelligent professions are influenced by sceptical opinions, to an extent which, twenty years back, would have seemed incredible.* This state of things, so far as the upper classes are concerned, has been directly caused by the dissensions of the Church. "When doctors differ, who shall decide?" is the expression of an almost inevitable scepticism. These unnatural hostilities must cease, if we are ever to re-convert the Pagans of the factory, and the Pantheists of the forum. How, indeed, can we hope to move them, if we are unable to answer that most obvious retort of the unbeliever, "I will hearken, when you Christians can agree upon the lesson which you want to teach me?" And how can we answer this, but by acknowledging a substantial unity of faith, and an absolute identity of holiness, in the midst of endless diversity of opinion? "Oh, what are the things we fight for," says Leighton, "compared with the things of God!" Surely it is time that we should agree to differ about Prevenient Grace and Surplice Preaching, and turn to the true battle which is raging round us; a battle not between Anglicans and Calvinists, nor even between Popery and Protestantism, but between Faith and Atheism. We believe that the end is sure, and that truth will conquer. But who can say how many ages of defeat may precede that final victory?

* It is true that as far as the upper classes are concerned, the last half century (taken as a whole) has been characterized by a religious reaction against the fashionable scepticism of the preceding century. But in England the tide turned, ten or fifteen years ago.

† Leighton's Works, vol. iii. p. 480.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

QUEBEC, 21st June, 1854.

Last night, on motion of Mr. Stuart, an Address was ordered to his Excellency the Governor General, praying for copies of the Reports of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the origin of the Parliament fires.

On motion of Colonel Prince, a Bill to prevent cruelty to dumb animals was read a first time.

The Petition of the Clerks of the House for an increase of salaries was ordered to be printed.

The debate on the address was then begun by Mr. Hartman, who moved an amendment to Mr. Cauchon's amendment so as to add a censure of Ministers for not secularizing the Reserves to that of Mr. Cauchon, for not passing the Seigneurial Tenure Bill. Lost: Yeas 16, Nays 84.

Mr. Sicotte moved another amendment to add the Clergy Reserves to that of Mr. Cauchon, with this gentleman's consent.

After several members had spoken thereon, at half-past one this morning the vote was taken and the amendment carried, by a majority of thirteen against the Ministry. The division being Yeas 42, Nays 23.

The same vote having been concurred in with regard to Mr. Cauchon's amendment as now framed.

Mr. Hincks moved that the House should adjourn till Thursday next, in order to afford the Ministry time to decide on what course they should adopt under the circumstances.

The House adjourned accordingly.

SECOND REPORT.

QUEBEC, 21st June, 1854.

The debate on the address was continued last evening in a very full house. All the members were present during the debate, but Messrs. Christie (of Wentworth), Johnston, Lehoullier, McLachlin, Mornin, Smith (of Frontenac), Terrill and Viger. The Galleries were crowded with strangers, and the utmost interest was manifested in the proceedings.

The debate was opened by Mr. Hartman who censured the Ministry for not calling together Parliament in February according to promise, though he was not prepared to join in the amendment conveying the formal censure, as some discretion was left the government; but thought it plain executive influence must be reduced. He moved the amendment to be found below.

Mr. Langton followed, condemning the Ministry for not dissolving the house sooner, or not at least (having failed to do so) going on with the business of the country now.

Messrs. Hincks and Rolph defended the government, saying that if, as was alleged on the other side, a dissolution should have followed the Representation bill. It is now better late than never, and that it would violate all constitutional principles to proceed with Legislation without an appeal to the people.

Mr. Brown spoke for upwards of two hours, taking the ground that there ought to be a vote of censure on Ministers for violating all their pledges.

Other members followed.

Mr. Gall defended the Grand Trunk Railway policy.

Mr. Carner defended the position of the Ministry, and contended that the worst consequences must result to the reform party for turning them out.

Mr. Young said he should support the amendment, and traced the backwardness of Lower Canada as compared with Upper Canada, to the commercial policy which had been pursued on one hand and the Seigneurial Tenure on the other.

The discussion proceeded upon four several amendments offered to the 4th paragraph of the ministerial address.

Mr. Cauchon moved that the following words be inserted after the 4th paragraph: "That this house sees with regret that your Excellency's government did not intend to submit to the Legislature during the present session a bill for the immediate settlement of the Seigneurial question."

Mr. Sicotte moved that the following words be inserted after the 4th paragraph: "That the Seigneurial Tenure is, in our economic and social condition, opposed to the interests and prosperity of the country, that, notwithstanding the increasing and energetic expression of opinion by the whole people of this Province, condemning it for many years past, it is a matter greatly to be deplored that such Tenure has not been abolished, and this house can forbear an expression of its regret that the administration have announced their intention to put off to a future session and to an indefinite period any legislation on one of the most important questions affecting so vitally, so nearly, and personally, the large majority of the Inhabitants of Lower Canada, and in its effects and tendencies, the economic condition of the whole Province."

Mr. Hartman moved that, after the word "established," in the fifth line of the sixth paragraph, the remainder of the paragraph be expunged, and the following inserted: "And not, however, considering the passage of the Act to enlarge the representation of