

only an annual income of £50,000. Thus to give "free education" to all the children of the country would require at least another £100,000, for which the people must be taxed directly or indirectly; for if the annual grant from the provincial chest does not give free schools to all, no more will the £50,000 that is to be derived from the Clergy Reserves do so. They would yield about 1s 3d currency for each person in Upper Canada.

In conclusion, your managing committee would call upon all those who may peruse this argument to consider—

1st. That by the supreme authorities of the empire this property was solemnly set apart for the support of religion in this province.

2nd. That the proposed alienation of this property is for the promotion of mere secular education, from which all religious instruction is systematically excluded, and from which it is now proposed, by "the party of progress," to *shut out the Bible*.

3rd. That unless the Churches of England and Scotland consent to this secularization of the Reserves, those who would in anywise countenance such an act would be aiding in doing a great wrong,—they having given up a portion of their claim in 1840, trusting to the public faith pledged on that occasion that the settlement would be a "*final one*," and that they would be secured in the peaceful possession of the remainder.

4th. That a breach of faith in the public is as bad as a breach of faith in an individual, and productive of more extensive injuries to the public morals.

5th. That when once the principle is adopted that any bodies can be deprived of their property because even a majority (which in this case is a questionable point) covet it for the public use, an agitation may as justly be raised to deprive the Canada Company of the remainder of their lands, because the people of the country never consented to their sale, and the company have already realised enough from the lands which they have sold to pay them the purchase money,