

management a comparatively barren territory is the richest, most populous and flourishing in the union. It must be conceded also, that, as you recede from these states, and advance to the west and south, you find the externals of religion less apparent, the grossness of immorality more evident, and even the development of the natural resources of the territory less complete. These undeniable results require no comment. But, it is said the opinion of the people of the United States themselves, is in favour of what you call unsystematic voluntarism; and they must be the best judges of what is most advantageous for themselves. We acknowledge the fact, but deny the conclusion. Whoever is acquainted with the course of public opinion in the United States, will see that there are two circumstances sufficiently accounting for the predomance there, of what is called the voluntary principle. In the first place their national vanity—those exultant feelings that naturally arise with the consciousness of the fresh energies of national youth—inspire them with a persuasion that theirs is the best possible condition of humanity—that whatever is with them is right. Now at the time of their declaration of independence, the voluntary system was the general system. It therefore naturally became the universal system. But, again, the tendency of all their political movements has been to give predominance to what may be termed *ultra* democratic views and principles. They conceive not, that liberty is to be preserved and perpetuated by the increasing power and sway of the moral principle throughout the community, rendering it possible for man to trust man still more and more, as the complications of society render such confidence more necessary; but that their only safety consists in trusting no man, and making the whole movement and mechanism of their polity depend on the immediate will of the immediate majority.

We think this principle erroneous. We think events show that it is so. We trust it is so: for it admitted, it would put a speedy limit to any great ameliorations in the condition of civilized man. But having been adopted it is a natural consequence that it should be carried out through the whole social system, religious as well as political. It is also to be considered that the adoption of any general principle of the sort generates a practical aptitude in working on it in all cases. This is especially observable in the present instance. No where will you find a set of people so ready to combine for carrying into effect any object of general and immediate interest as the population of the United States. The general interests of religion partake of the advantages of this national aptitude for

combination, and without any general organized system, are usually provided for in a manner which it were in vain to hope for in any other nation, were they in this matter to be given up to the mere promptings of popular impulse.

In so far, therefore, as in the history and condition of the United States we can trace effects to causes, it seems to us that the evidence is decidedly in favour of the state systematically providing for the support of religion, instead of leaving to accidental individual efforts what, it is the general persuasion, is the duty of all to provide for. The contrary method has not yet had time to work out all its effects; but, in so far as we can see, it is far, from producing the same degree of good, and there is reason to fear that evils one day to become apparent are now growing out of it.

As we conceive therefore that it is the duty of the state in all instances to see that the religious wants of the people are provided for, so we think this a duty incumbent on all who legislate for this Province—the general principle necessarily includes the particular case. The contemplation indeed of the particular case presses home on us very forcibly the propriety of the general principle. The mother country conceives herself bound to uphold and protect the infant communities she settles in so many different regions. She spares not blood or treasure in defending their rights, or redressing their wrongs. Such a course is worthy of her. The cost is indeed great, but it is by a disregard of such immediate sacrifices, that her greatness has proceeded, and the world gives her credit for pursuing in this matter the path of true policy. Now while she thus unhesitatingly runs, in this matter, to the expense of millions to secure the existence of these embryo states, is it not wonderful that she should sometimes hesitate to contribute an amount, comparatively inconsiderable, to ensure the permanent growth among these of an element of that existence, which, merely politically speaking, is so essential to its happiness and security, as religion proves itself to be. She settles her sons far from their fatherland amid pathless woods and by lonely waters, and though the whole course of her policy is based on the notion that they will grow up to a resemblance of their ancestors, she takes no care that they be supplied with that which was essential to the growth of all that was great and ennobling in the bosoms of these their ancestors.

We ought now to speak of the mode in which the state should proceed in making this provision so that it may be effective and not liable to abuse. We perceive however that to attempt here to trace out general principles would protract our observa-