




**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1983

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The
to th

The
poss
of th
film

Orig
begi
the
sion
othe
first
sion
or ill

The
shalf
TINU
whic

Map
diffe
entir
begi
right
requ
meth

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of the Public
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:


La bibliothèque des Archives
publiques du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.



Fragment of text from the adjacent page, appearing as faint, illegible markings on the right edge of the main page.

LETTERS

FROM THE REVEREND EGERTON RYERSON

TO

THE HON. AND REVEREND DOCTOR STRACHAN,

PUBLISHED ORIGINALLY.

IN

THE UPPER CANADA HERALD.

KINGSTON, U. C.

PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE.

1828.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author feels it a duty which he owes to himself and to the cause he advocates, to state, that most of the following letters were originally composed for the *Newspapers*, and not with any expectation of their being published in the form of a Pamphlet. The imperious obligations which the author was under to write these letters, will be obvious to the reader as he proceeds in the perusal of them. The author has principally studied plainness and brevity—in no instance elegance: and in many instances, has preferred the common forms of expression to critical correctness. Of many important and most forcible arguments against Establishments, especially those derived from the Holy Scriptures, he has not availed himself. Nor has he referred to so many historical authorities, as might have been adduced, had not his peculiar circumstances and duties rendered it impracticable—having to travel nearly 200 miles, and preach from 20 to 30 sermons every month. With these remarks the author submits the following letters to the impartial examination of the public; and in doing so, feels conscious of having discharged a most important duty to his native country, the Colonial Government, and to the religion of Him, *whose Kingdom is not of this world.* Cobourg, 1828.

ERRATA.

Letter 1st.—Instead of “Sir,” read *Rev. Sir.* Page 6, fourteenth line from top, for “instructions,” read *institutions.*

Letter 2d.—6th line from beginning, for “in attempting this” read *in this attempt.* Page 9, 2nd line from top, for “challenge” read *challenged*—2nd line from bottom, after the word “same” insert the word *person*: Note 1, instead of “all omitted” read *are omitted.* Page 10, fifth line from beginning, for “separated by the several arguments” read *supported by the same arguments.* 2d column, third line from top, for “inclined” read *induced,* 8th line, for “instructions” read *institutions.* Page 13, 18th line from bottom, for “then” read *therefore.* Page 14, 8th line from bottom, for “outset” read *onset.* 2nd column, 11th line from top, after “there” insert a semicolon. Page 15, 26th line from bottom, for “neve” read *never.* 12th line, for “army or navy” read *the army or navy.* 2d column, 9th line from bottom, for “empire” read *empires.* Page 16, 20th line from top, for “the history” read *her history.* 21st line, for “in her” read *in its.* 2nd column, 24th line from top, for “wrote” read *written.* Page 22, 2nd column, 9th line from top, for “to ecclesiastical” read *to the ecclesiastical.* Page 23, 2nd column, 5th line from bottom, for “indentified” read *identified.*

Letter 7, 9th line from beginning, for “ought noi” read *ought not.* Page 27, 16th line from bottom, for “either denominations” read *other denominations.* Page 28, 2nd column, 18th line from top, for “Province above” read *Province alone.* 20th line, for “Christian knowledge” read *the Gospel.* 12th line from bottom, for “greater” read *greatest.* Page 31, 2nd column, 18th and 19th lines from top, for “in the times of some of the Asiatic churches,” &c. read *in the times of some of the Prophets, and with some of the Asiatic Churches, &c.* Page 32, for “Rev. William Urwin” read *Rev. William Urwin*—last line first column, for “references” read *reformers.* Page 33, 2nd line from bottom, for “ever sought” read *once sought.* 2d column, 9th line from top, for “elect” read *select*—23d line, for “foreign natives” read *foreign nations.* Page 35, 10 lines from top, for “perpetrated” read *perpetuated*—19th line, for “are that” read *that are*—2th line, for “worse so” read *more so.*

LETTERS, &c.

No. 1.

Sir,

At a time when parties ran high in the Republic of Greece, a law was enacted by Solon, the famous Athenian Legislator, to inflict capital punishment upon all *neutral* persons. If there is any justice in this law, as inexperienced as I am, and as feeble as my pen is, I should feel myself a proper object of its penalty, were I to remain indifferent or silent on the present occasion, not that I cherish any personal enmity against you—not that I indulge a rancorous spirit towards the Church of which you are a Minister—not that I wish to exalt one party by pulling down another—not that I desire to produce any unchristian excitement in the Province. No sir, far otherwise, as a father, a friend and a christian Minister, I entertain towards you and your labours the most cordial good-will—for your Church as a system of evangelical doctrines and precepts I have the most profound veneration—my only aim is to produce general harmony and good will in our Province, though it be necessary, after the example of our Divine Master, to detect and expose what I humbly conceive to be gross error in regard to both facts and doctrines, in order to effect it. It is the *public* course you have pursued that I feel myself compelled to find fault with—it is the *public* statements you have made that I am required to call in question—it is the *public* principles you have avowed that I think, for the *public* good, ought to be exploded—it is with your conduct as a *public* man I have to do in these letters. “And as the *public* conduct of *public* men, says the Edinburgh Review, is a subject of free investigation in a free state,” I shall, influenced by the dictates of duty and the request of friends, whose judgment I respect more than my own, attempt to examine a part of your public conduct—especially your

luminous speech before the Hon. the Legislative Council on the 7th March; and however plain my remarks may be, I hope they will never go beyond the limits of the following direction of the Homily on Strife: “When our infamy, or the reproach that is done unto us, is joined with the peril of *many*, then it is necessary in answering to be quick and ready. For we read that many holy men of good zeal have sharply both spoken and answered evil men; which sharp words came not of anger, rancour or malice or desire of revenge, but of fervent desire to bring them to the true knowledge of God, by an earnest and sharp rebuke.” Before I enter upon your speech, I beg leave to make one or two observations respecting the unanimous resolutions of the Legislative Council. To me, sir, it appears rather an anomaly in the administration of justice, whether it be in a legislative or a judiciary court, to put a man on his defence before he is legally accused, and to acquit him upon an *ex parte* statement of his own, and that while there is reason to believe the Grand Jury is forming an indictment against him. Had the House of Assembly *formally* sent up the abundant evidence (given before its Committee before and at the time you delivered your speech and obtained your acquittal) to the Legislative Council for its information, and to put you on your trial before the hon. body of which you are a member; could that hon. body have entered into an impartial examination of your case, on which they had, without examination already decided unanimously? And this is not all. How happens it that the Legislative Council are *unanimously* satisfied with your conduct, and yet several Members of that hon. body, flatly contradict your statements in their evidence before the Committee of the House of Assembly? In your letter and Chart to the Under Secretary of

B

State for the Colonies, you say that the Methodist teachers are rendering a large portion of the population hostile to British instructions civil and religious, and that they (the Methodist teachers) have come almost universally from the United States where they gather their knowledge & form their sentiments; this is contradicted by the testimony of several Members of the hon. the Legislative Council. One of the hon. gentlemen says that during the late war with the United States (when the Methodists teachers were under the conference in the U. S.) in the Niagara District (which was the seat of the unhappy contest) the *Methodist teachers encouraged their congregations to defend the Country*, and yet it is said that you explained your conduct in relation to those statements to the unanimous satisfaction of that hon. House. So much for the *Nemine Contradicente* Resolutions of the Legislative Council.

I now come to your speech. You say you have the approbation of your own conscience. This I feel no disposition to question, but it only proves that you are *sincere*, not that you are *right*. "What is conscience?" (says the late Bishop of Landaff in his letters to Thomas Paine, who said that in a fever which his friends thought would prove mortal, he knew by a *conscientious* trial of his principles—and remembered with renewed satisfaction, that he had written his former Age of Reason.) "What is conscience? Is it as has been thought an internal monitor implanted in us by the Supreme Being, and dictating to us on all occasions, what is right or wrong? Or is it merely *our own judgment* of the moral rectitude or turpitude of our actions? I take the word (with Mr. Locke) in the latter, as the only intelligible sense. Now who sees not that our judgment of virtue and vice, right and wrong, are not always formed from an enlightened and dispassionate use of our reason in the investigation of truth? Who sees not that on this account *conscience* may be *conformable* or *repugnant* to the laws of nature? may be certain or doubtful? and that it can be no *Criterion of moral rectitude*, even when it is *certain*, because the certainty of our opinion is not proof of its being a *right* opinion? A man may be *certainly persuaded*

of an *error* in reasoning, or of an *untruth* in matters of fact. An Inquisitor, who burns Jews and heretics; a Robespierre, who massacres innocent and harmless women; a robber, who thinks that all things ought to be in common, and that a state of property is an unjust infringement on natural liberty; these, and a thousand perpetrators of different crimes, may all follow the dictates of *conscience*; and may, at the real or supposed approach of *death* (much more in "calumny and reproach") remember 'with renewed satisfaction' the worst of their transactions, and experience without dismay 'a conscientious trial of their principles: But this their *conscientious* composure can be no proof to others of the rectitude of their principles, and ought to be no pledge to themselves of their innocence in adhering to them.'

You say that you have acted in a fair, honorable and consistent manner—that you are *proudly conscientious* you deserve the *friendship and esteem of all honourable men and the approbation of the whole Province*. How far you have acted in a fair and consistent manner will appear in the course of these letters—how far you deserve the friendship and esteem of all hon. men, will be decided at the proper tribunal—how far your conduct in the matter under consideration merits the approbation of the whole Province, has already been manifest in the indignation expressed by almost every religious denomination in the Canadas—by the numerous petitions which have been sent to the Provincial and Imperial Parliaments from every part of the Province—by the almost unanimous vote of the House of Assembly—by a pastoral letter lately published, signed by *eleven* Presbyterian Clergymen—and by the unprecedented excitement that now prevails throughout the Canadas. In the 27th page of your speech, you *indentify* yourself with our *civil* Government & insinuate that resolutions censuring your *conduct* prove the author of them to be *disloyal* to the Government. If to censure *your conduct* is to oppose the *Government*—and if your conduct has "occasioned a degree of excitement, (to use the language of the pastoral letter of the Scots Clergy) in all quarters, which will surprise no one competent judge of the statements the (your) letter

contains—& roused into indignant exertion even those who were previously passive in the matter”—if this is the case, I humbly beg you will duly appreciate the following caution of the learned Archdeacon Paley; “Let civil Governors be admonished, that *physical strength resides in the governed; that this strength wants only to be felt and roused, to lay prostrate the most ancient and confirmed dominion; THAT CIVIL AUTHORITY, IS FOUNDED IN OPINION; that general opinion therefore ought always to be treated with deference, and managed with delicacy and circumspection.*”

Having made these preliminary observations, I shall in my next, proceed to the examination of your statements.

NO. 2.

Rev. Sir,

The object of your speech you state, is to satisfy your numerous friends and the world that you have acted in a fair, honorable and consistent manner. If you have not been successful in attempting this, it is not, of course, for want of disposition, opportunity, ability, or information, since you say you now have full information on the subject, and are known not to lack ability to use this information to the best advantage.—Over the first 19 pages of your speech, containing nothing relative to the subject under examination, I shall pass, by merely observing that they contain an interesting detail of your various conversations and transactions while in England, related in a manner calculated to please and prepossess the reader in favor of the author. Nor would I notice your statements in relation to the *Church of England*, was not the face of the controversy somewhat changed from its original aspect. Had you confined your observations to the Churches of England and Scotland, as in your speech you frankly admit would have been better, I should have left the Kirk to carry on her own warfare—which I believe she is very successfully doing—& not troubled you with these letters. But notwithstanding, you say that the mention of any other denomination was by no means necessary to your argument, as you have spoken more reproachfully of other denominations, than of the Kirk itself,

and virtually unchristianized the Methodists, both in your *speech*, in your observations on the Clergy Reserves, and in your sermon on the death of the late Bishop of Quebec, I feel myself called upon to notice your statements generally, and show that they all proceed from the same source and have the same object in view. Whether your eagerly seizing every opportunity to shoot your gall-embued shafts at the Methodists proceeds from violent prejudice and implacable hatred or from true charity and christian forbearance, the public must determine. But so it is.

To me, sir, your *statements relative to the Church of England*, do not afford very satisfactory proof of the *consistency* of your conduct. In your observations on the Clergy Reserves, you state that the members of the Church of England are the most numerous of any religious denomination in the Province—in your evidence before the Committee of the House of Assembly, you say that you *never* knew the number of members belonging to the Church of England, and that you could not tell how numerous they are. In your letter to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, you say the people are coming forward in *all directions*, offering to assist in building Churches, and soliciting with the greatest anxiety the establishment of a settled Minister; and that the *prospect* of obtaining a respectable Clergyman unites whole neighbourhoods &c. in your sermon (printed in 1826,) you say—even when *Churches are erected*, the persons who give regular attendance are so few as greatly to *discourage* the minister. This would naturally lead us to infer, that in places where very few persons attend, as you insinuate and as the pastoral letter of the Scots Clergy affirms—the Clergymen are not respectable. In your letter and Chart you say—the Church of England is rapidly increasing—in your sermon, you say *sectaries of all denominations are increasing on every side*. In your letter you state the *tendency of the population* is towards the *Church of England*—in your sermon you say—unless the *Imperial government* renders immediate assistance, the mass of the population will imbibe opinions, any thing but favorable to the political & *religious* institu-

tions of England. In your sermon it is said—the Church of England is founded on a rock which can never be moved—in your observations on the Clergy Reserves, we are informed, that to *take away the Clergy Reserves*, would annihilate the Church of England. I might very easily multiply examples of this kind; but these are sufficient to show how *consistent* you have been, and how much weight your statements ought to have with the Imperial Government and the world. It will now be necessary to enquire whether your conduct has been as *fair* and *honorable* as it has been *consistent*—whether your statements are as *true* as they are *harmonious*.

To prove that your Chart for 1826 is correct, you present us with a Chart for the year 1828. Would this, sir, be received as evidence in any court of justice? If in a contest between the towns of York and Niagara for the seat of Government, I had affirmed that there were 300 buildings in the former, in 1826, and the correctness of my statement had been called in question, would it satisfy any court or the world, for me to produce even the most indubitable evidence, that in 1828, York contains 400 buildings? Would it not be immediately said, especially if it had long been rumoured about that I should be called to an account for my official report, and if I was a person of great wealth, influence and power, would it not be immediately said, that I had given orders and great encouragement to persons to erect and occupy buildings, in order that when the time of my anticipated trial came, I might deceive the court with plausible representations, and induce the judges of my conduct to wink at little inaccuracies and still retain me in office? This, sir, is a supposition in point, and is exemplified in the case before us. You state the number of Churches, congregations, &c. of the Church of England in 1826. As soon as your statements appeared in the *Canadas*, the correctness of them was doubted and denied from “all directions,” and in every way. You no doubt anticipated the time when “in the only way becoming your station in the Colonies, (to use your own words before the Legislative Council) you could vindicate your good name.” Your influ-

ence and power gave you a very fair opportunity to make every possible preparation for this momentous day. *Some* of your clerical friends received or took the hint, and began to preach around in various places where they had never preached before, and in *some* of which places they begin to rest from their labours already—and on the day of trial, behold! you present us with a Chart exhibiting 102, instead of 58 stations, and other considerable improvements likewise. Into the correctness or incorrectness of your Chart for 1828, I shall not at present stop to enquire. The question is, is your Chart for 1826, correct or not?

I gladly give you credit for *attempting* to justify your statements in one or two instances. For the detection of the errors in your Chart, respecting the Woolwich and Dundass Churches, you return your thanks to the Editor of the *Gore Gazette*; but I fear you will cease to be grateful to that gentleman, when you discover the dilemma in which it has involved you. You say you asserted that a Church was built in one place, *because* General Pilkington had given orders for its erection; and, in the other place, *because* you had *subscribed* to it. So far you seem to me to have had the shadow—and only the shadow, of excuse. But in your Chart, you not only affirmed that Churches were built in these places, but that *numerous and respectable congregations attended them*, and that from your own *PERSONAL knowledge*. This part you have passed unnoticed in your speech, and for what reason is not for me to say. It will also do much towards vindicating your good name and satisfying your numerous friends and the world, if you will present them with—what you did not touch upon in your speech and what I believe is not yet in existence—Churches building at Navy Point, Purdy's Mills, New Market, Markham, and Etobicoke, and the *respectable and numerous congregations* that you said—not from the testimony of any other person, but—from your own *personal knowledge* attended them. If you will do this, it will also give much greater force to your questionable assertion that the Church of England is rapidly increasing. I should have been happy to have passed

this part of your speech in silence; but as you challenge the strictest scrutiny into your public conduct and pronounced those calumniators who have censured it, I thought proper and indispensable thus to touch on a few circumstances, leaving the reader to judge for himself.

You express much friendship for the Church of Scotland and her Clergy. This doubtless is justly appreciated; and its worth may be estimated by reading their pastoral letter lately published. You show a wish to insinuate that you are not an apostate from the communion of Kirk of Scotland. To have avowed this, together with asserting the right every man has (and very often the *duty*) of changing his opinions, I dare say would have been *perfectly satisfactory* to the world respecting your conversion from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy. But to show a disposition to equivocate about what is actually true, and what no man ought to be ashamed of when he is actuated by proper motives, indicates I fear, a want of sincerity in the change. If you had not belonged to the Kirk of Scotland, and been educated for a Minister of that Church, how could you have thought of taking charge of a *Presbyterian* congregation? and if you were early impressed in favour of Episcopacy, as you say in your speech, that impression, sir, must have soon been removed when a *Presbyterian* Church in Montreal became *vacant*.

You say that whenever you had it in your power you were not backward in speaking in behalf of the Roman Catholic Clergy. I confess to you sir, it hardly appears consistent to hear you "speaking to the *advantage*" of the Roman Catholic Clergy at the foot of the *British* throne, and then to hear you at the *throne of Grace*, praying in the language of Homily, (1.) for Whitsunday, that the "Lord of heaven *would utterly* confound and put Popery to flight in all parts of the world, and work upon all men's hearts by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost to the beating down of sin, death, the Pope and the devil, and all the Kingdom of Antichrist." Can blessing and cursing proceed consistently from the same, on the same object, and at the same time?

You say you did flatter yourself that the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian (2.) Clergy would co-operate with the Clergy of the Church of England in promoting the "general peace and welfare of society." What you mean by the "peace and welfare of Society," must of course be gathered from your various observations in different parts of your several publications. Your general design appears to be to infuse into the minds of the "inhabitants of these Provinces a tone and feeling *entirely English*"—to give the *Clergymen* of the *Church of England* the *sole direction* of education and to bring the whole population of these Provinces into the *communion* of the *Church of England*. With respect to co-operation in the first of these objects, there is not the least doubt but the Roman Catholic, the Presbyterian, and the Clergy of all other religious denominations, as will appear more fully hereafter—have done and will continue to do all in their power to attach the people to the British Government. And I may remark the tone and feelings of the population in these Provinces are already British, and to intimate the reverse, is a barefaced slander upon their tried loyalty. As it respects co-operation in the two last objects you have in view, it is very doubtful in my mind, whether the Clergy of the Roman Catholic, the Presbyterian, or the Clergy of any other religious denomination in these Provinces, will ever co-operate with the Clergy of the Church of England to any great extent.

If spared, I shall in my next examine your statements respecting the Methodists.

Permit me to subscribe myself,

Rev. Sir,

Your Humble Servt.

E. RYERSON.

Coburgh, May 6th, 1828.

(1.) The Homilies are said in the 35th article of the Church of England, to contain "a wholesome and godly doctrine, and ought to be read in Churches." But this article, together with some others of the Church of England, all omitted in the creed of the Methodist Church.

(2.) It is pleasing to observe, that from your observations throughout, you look up-

on the Presbyterian Clergy—not as intruders into Jehovah's vineyard, but as *legally constituted* Ministers of the gospel; and as the ordination of the Methodist Clergymen is separated by the *several arguments* (and I may add the ordination of the church of England clergymen too, when they are arguing with Roman Catholics) as Presbyterian ordination is, it is to be hoped they will be treated at least civilly in that capacity. In these your concessions, you have yielded a point which has been warmly agitated in this Province, as well as, at various times, in Britain and other countries; and it is surprising, that when scripture, reason and history are as clear as day against that untenable doctrine of *Episcopal succession*, it had not long since been abandoned to the bats and the moles.

No. 3.

Rev. Sir,

In almost every page of your speech you give strong indications of the exalted opinion you entertain of yourself and your services; but in your observations on the Methodists, you elevate yourself quite beyond the ordinary height of self-importance. You say you are pleased to think that your observations have not been in vain, and that angry as the Methodists are, they find it expedient to act in conformity to *your advice*; i. e. in detaching themselves from the American Conference. Now sir, so far from *your advice* being the cause of this contemplated measure, the Methodists and their friends in this Province, to the number of several thousand petitioned their general convention to be detached upwards of *four* years ago. But their general assembly, with the advice of the delegates from the British Conference, (in England) thought proper, for reasons not necessary to be explained in this place, to defer complying with the request of the petitioners, until a future period. How, then, was it by what you call your *advice*, that the Methodists are about dissolving all ecclesiastical connexion with the American Conference? But where or when did you give this *advice*? Was it in your sermon on the death of the late Bishop of Quebec; when you say, the Methodist teachers betook themselves to

preaching the gospel out of *idleness*, or a zeal without knowledge, whereby they are inclined to preach what they do not know, and which from their pride they disdain to learn? Was it in your letter and Chart, where you say, the Methodist teachers are rendering a large portion of the population hostile to the instructions of the country, both civil and religious? Was it in your observations on the Clergy Reserves, where you make the same remarks? Was it in your appeal to the people of England,

where you manifest the same spirit? If you have given any such *advice*, the Methodists, as well as others, would be happy to see it; for I can assure you, it is the first we have ever heard of it; and if there is any such *advice* in existence, I fear it is yet amongst the sealed papers of the Privy Council. To make the best of it, we are constrained at present to resolve it into the poet's *Nequeo Monstrare, et sentio tantum*. But this is not all. You exalt yourself to the highest seat of civil authority, and make the authors of certain resolutions, which censured your representations, enemies of the *government*. Enemies of the *government*! for what? for speaking against or opposing the *government*? No such thing. But for contradicting *your* statements, and endeavouring to counteract *their* influence.—If to contradict *you* is to be an *enemy* of the *government*, upwards of fifty witnesses, among whom were several members of the Legislative Council,—the House of Assembly, the Clergy of the Kirk of Scotland, a great part of the Canadian population, and yourself sometimes, are all enemies of the *government*; seeing that they have all contradicted you.

One objection, you have against the Methodists, is the treatment they gave the Wesleyan Missionaries, a few years ago. I do not wish to excite feelings which I believe are already buried, nor recal differences, the causes of which I have reason to think are principally removed; but, I may remark, that whatever disunion there may have been betwixt the Methodists in this Province and the Wesleyan Missionaries, it was *amicably* settled by the two Conferences, and did not originate in a diversity of *political feeling*.—In this they were all agreed, believing,

teaching, and living in subjection to the powers that be.

You say you must consider the Methodist teachers hostile to the institutions of the country, so long as they show a rancorous spirit against other denominations. That this is one mark of bad citizenship, I readily grant; but I think it comes with a peculiarly ill grace from yourself. A rancorous person does indeed shew himself equally unfriendly to the government, and the people of the country, in which he lives: to the government, in as much as its permanence and strength depend upon the *unity* of its subjects; to the people, because harmony is essential to their prosperity and happiness. But, sir, if this is a mark of true loyalty, who ought to be esteemed the most loyal, *yourself*, or those religious denominations, whom you have, in the Pulpit, in the Legislature, and at the foot of the British throne, so wantonly attacked.

You admit that the mention of any other denomination besides the Kirk of Scotland, was by *no means necessary* to your argument, and yet you say more about other denominations, in your letter written for the *information* of the *Imperial Parliament*, than you do about the *Kirk of Scotland itself*—and you say nothing but evil of them. If the mention of other denominations was by no means necessary to your argument, why mention them at all, even if you had had information respecting them? And, if you *was* not in possession of sufficient information respecting them, why mention them, if it *had* been necessary to your argument? If you know very little of other denominations, as you confess in your speech, if the mention of them was by no means necessary to your argument, could your uncalled for reflections and crimination of them, have proceeded from a liberal policy, a charitable mind, or, to use your own criterion, a truly *loyal* feeling? I leave you to answer, and the reader to judge.

You say, “nevertheless they (the different religious denominations) have *no reason* to complain, as they have never, to my knowledge, given any authentic account of themselves.” You know, sir, the old adage, that none are so blind, as those who *will* not see. You *might* have known,

with *very little trouble*, that the different denominations have given an *authentic* account of themselves, their teachers, their stations, their numbers in communion, &c.; and that *annually*, for more than thirty years past. Has the Church of England done more, or as much? I trow not.

You say, the Methodists in this Province in connection with the American Conference, have always shown themselves the enemies of (what you call) the Established Church. “To this there is but one answer (to use your own words to Mr. Morris) which it becomes not my profession to make.” It is true, the Methodists have always felt and shown a preference for the peculiarities of their own Church; and have not the Church of England, and every other religious denomination done the same? Does this show that the Methodists are *enemies* of the Church of England? (or of any other religious body?) By no means. On the contrary, have not the Methodists always shown a friendship towards the Clergy of the Church of England, which they (the Clergy of the Church of England) have *never* shown towards the Clergy of *any other* religious body—in allowing the Church of England Clergy to preach in their (the Methodist) Chapels, in every part of the Province, whenever they have been requested? (1.) Does this manifest the disposition, is this the action of an *enemy*? The Methodists, to be sure, as well as the Presbyterians and others, have been under the *necessity* of defending themselves, and vindicating their character, for the last year or two; but this no more proves that they are *enemies* of the Church of England, than for you to bind a highwayman, would prove that you are an enemy of the public peace.

You show a wish to palliate your former remarks respecting the Methodist teachers, and say, they were confined to those teachers and Preachers, who come from the United States. But in your sermon, and letter to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, you say the Methodist teachers have come *almost universally* from the *United States*, and consequently, your remarks were confined to them *almost universally*.—What reason you had to make the one or the other of these assertions, I will stop a

moment to enquire. In your letter you stated that the Methodist teachers were almost universally from the United States.— This, in your speech, you seem to admit was incorrect; but insinuate that you had the opinion of others in your favour, who had had much better means of information than yourself. Now, sir, amongst fifty witnesses, examined before the Committee of the House of Assembly, not *one* was in your favour on this point, though they were well informed, and many of them members of your own Church. You appear to intimate that in the testimony of the Methodist teacher, it is admitted that the Methodist Clergymen came from the neighbouring Republic *till lately*. It is quite otherwise. It is affirmed that four fifths of the Methodist teachers have been *born and educated* in his Majesty's dominions, and consequently, they *never did come* from the neighbouring Republic.

With respect to your remark, that those teachers who have come from the U. S. are unfriendly to the institutions of the country, I beg to observe, that in coming to this Province, they must have been influenced either by a preference in favor of the institutions of the country, or a desire to do good, or both, since, in general, they are not so comfortably supported in this infant Province, as they might have been in the neighbouring Republic. Whichever motive they may have been actuated by, it is an ample security for their fidelity to the Ruling Powers. This remark is confirmed by the requirements of the Methodist discipline, the evidence before the Committee—and by the decision of the House of Assembly. The hon. Wm. Dickson, in his evidence, says, that during the late war with the United States, the *Methodist teachers*, in the part of the Province where he resided, *prompted, encouraged their congregations in defence of the country and in repelling the invasions of the enemy*. Please to observe sir, this was *during the late war*, when many of the Methodist teachers then employed had come from the United States,—in the Niagara District, where true loyalty was put to the severest test. Yet all this does not satisfy you. Disloyal they must be, because they are *Methodists*. So, in the

reign of the Roman Emperor, Trajan, the bastard loyalists said, that a certain class of persons could not be friends of the Government, because they did not profess the religion of the Empire, because they were *christians*. You seem to think it nothing but sound policy, sterling loyalty, and scriptural christianity, to discountenance, put down, and starve the Methodists, because they are not followers of your peculiar dogmas. How very similar this policy is (I hope the spirit that dictated it is not) to that of the Barbadian Rioters in 1823, in pulling down the *Wesleyan Chapel*, &c. the whole of which policy was a subject of serious and severe investigation in the Imperial Parliament of 1825. "Our motives were *loyal and patriotic*, (said these gentlemen of the first respectability, as they styled themselves) namely, to eradicate from this soil, the germ of *Methodism*, which is spreading its *baneful* influence over a certain class, and which will ultimately injure both *Church and State*."

You compliment the Wesleyan Methodists, that is those who have lately come from England; but this, like the policy of the Persians against the Grecian Republic, is an artful manœuvre, to divide your opponents, in order to obtain the aid of the one to exterminate the other, till you can make the whole an easy prey. This was the plan adopted in 1811, to forward lord Sidmouth's proscriptive bill against Dissenters. That daring measure failed, and was completely counteracted by the *united efforts* of Dissenters; and, if Dissenters in this Province will pursue a similar course, your unparalleled measures will likewise fail.— To aid in this, the language of the "Portraiture of Methodism" on the Sidmouth bill, may be profitably introduced on this occasion. "If this (your) design should be carried into execution, (says the Rev. Mr. Crowther, a Wesleyan Methodist) *one* sort of Dissenters may be left untouched, and perhaps *flattered*, till the *others* be bound hand and foot. *Dissenters* of every denomination should be aware of this and *unitedly* oppose every infringement upon our present liberties. For if an infringement take place in *one* instance, it may then be more easy to make *another*, and *another*, till liberty

and toleration may nearly cease to exist among us."

Your observations on religious Establishments are the next which require notice.

I beg to subscribe myself,

Rev. Sir,

Your Very Humble Servant,

E. RYERSON.

Cobourg, 7th May, 1828.

(1.) It is worthy of remark, that, in one place on your Chart (viz. Hamilton, Gore District) where you say *regular* service is performed by a *Clergyman* of the *Church of England*, this *regular* service is performed in a *Methodist* Chapel. The Clergy of the Church of England will not admit a *Methodist* Clergyman to preach even in their *school* houses. Who, then, are the most friendly or liberal?

NO. 4.

Rev. Sir,

You pronounce, with one word, all persons enemies of the government, who "are labouring to *separate religion from the state*." This is a general charge; and, as many other religious denominations, besides that of which I have the happiness of being a member, are equally concerned in the issue of it, I shall take some pains to expose its fallacy and injustice. As you produce no arguments to support your statement, it would be sufficient to answer it with a contradictory assertion; but it shall have a more respectful notice. I will, then consider, with all possible brevity, a religious establishment, first, as a means of promoting the interests of the *state*; secondly, as a means of promoting the interests of *religion*. Now, if it is found that a religious establishment is opposed to the interests of both, or of either, we will be fully justified and found in the discharge of our duty in "labouring to separate religion from the state."

The best and most able advocates of establishments, to whose works I have had access, confine the design of religious establishments to the purposes of *religion*, and to that only, except in as far as religion itself is subservient to the interests of the state. But in your ideas of establishments,

you prominently and primarily introduce a distinct object. Indeed you very slightly mention the promotion of true religion; but your great object, in introducing an establishment into this Province, is, as you say in your speech, "to give stability to good government;" or, as you observe in your letter to R. W. Horton, Esq. and observations on the clergy reserves, "to render the very *first* feelings of the *population* entirely *English*;" or, as you express yourself in your sermon—"to attach the colony to the parent state." Were your contemplated establishment to have this tendency, would it not be disgraceful to the heavenly religion of the immaculate Son of God, to make it serve the purposes of what you call "colonial policy?" Do you think that the King of Kings will submit to have his grand, perfect, and unearthly system, perverted to answer the insignificant, imperfect, and worldly policy of puny apostate creatures, who in his sight are as grass hoppers, as a drop of the bucket? Do you think, sir, that the fellow of the Lord of Hosts, assumed our nature, lived in poverty, died as a malefactor, and ascended as a conqueror, to reveal and give efficacy to a code of doctrines and precepts, that should be a stepping-stone to the accomplishment of your selfish system, your highly exceptionable measures, your (as the Kirk of Scotland clergy call it) "heartless policy?" The thought excites feelings of indignation; and lest I should be tempted to use expressions too harsh, I shall adopt the language of the learned Dr. Paley, who, even in advocating religious establishments, says, "The single end we ought to propose by them, is the preservation and communication of *religious knowledge*.—Every other idea, and every other end, that have been mixed with this, as the making of the church an *engine* or even an *ally* of the *state*; converting it into the means of *strengthening* or *diffusing influence*; or regarding it as the support of *regal*, in opposition to popular forms of government, have served only to *debase the institution*, and to *introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses*."(1.)

To support your position, as shocking as it is in itself, namely, that an establishment is necessary to attach colonies to the parent

state, you refer to the neighbouring Republic, and say, that had an efficient establishment been provided there, England would not have lost that colony. This admits of a full and unqualified contradiction. But that the clergy of the church of England in America—with a few exceptions—supported those enslaving enactments which were saddled upon the Americans by the Imperial Administration, I have no doubt; for those hostile measures were warmly advocated in the House of Lords in England, by the *bench of bishops*, who insisted upon forcing the Americans to submit by *fire and sword*. However this only proves that they were *arbitrary and intolerant*, and not that they were *promoting the stability* of the government. What said that politician, whom you call “the greatest statesman England ever produced,” respecting those horrible proceedings, supported by the *bishops* in the House of Lords, and by the clergy of the church of England in America? He said, in answer to Mr. Grenville,—“*I rejoice that America has resisted; three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty, as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest—The Americans have been wronged;—they have been driven to madness by injustice.*”(2.)

Had an efficient establishment been provided for America, or had the army of two thousand clergymen, whom you contemplate stationing in Canada, been posted on the American continent, 60 years ago, the Americans would not, according to your doctrine, have resisted, that is, they would have voluntarily submitted, as the great Pitt said, *to be slaves, made so by the efficient aid of an established clergy*. Is this the loyalty you would advocate? Is this your view of the duties appertaining to a christian clergy? No wonder then, sir, that the panic and consternation of the Athenians, at the first outset of the Lacedemonian fleet, seized the people of Canada, at the goliath-like aspect of your *two thousand clergymen*.

To return—if establishments attach subjects to their government more closely than they would otherwise be, the *members of the established church* must, of course, have always been more loyal than *dissenters*.—

This is the sole foundation of your whole argument. Have you any proof of this? Can you prove it from the Bible, from reason, or from history? No sir, the Bible would condemn you; reason would frown upon you; and history would contradict you. At present, I will confine myself to *historical testimony*; and, as I study brevity, I shall, out of the cloud of witnesses that might be brought, introduce the testimony of only two or three. And by these it will appear, that from the earliest period of Protestant, England, to the present time, *dissenters* have been the most faithful friends and supporters of the British Government. On the 26th Feb. last, while debating on the repeal of the Corporation & Test Acts in the British House of Commons, Mr. Wilbraham observed, that “a man might be an excellent communicant, might be an excellent *churchman*, yet might hold opinions *directly contrary to the constitution* and to the *government* of this country, (England) such was the case, for example, with respect to *bishops*, who under Charles II, all of them, with the exception of three, opposed the bill of exclusion, and in the succeeding reign, set themselves in opposition to the revolution, and to the election (3.) of William III. to be their King; so that not only did they seek to overthrow and defeat their own interests, but they deserted their own hierarchy, and *ultimately owed all their advantages, and all their honors* to those very *DISSENTERS*, whom they had the meanness to *pursue*.” Mr. John Smith, the same evening, stated, that “it was now some 23 or 24 years since the citizens of London were called upon to enrol themselves, as volunteers, in defence of their country. He had a command on that occasion; and if he were asked who were the *most loyal and independent* in his corps, he would mention the *DISSENTERS*, of whom there were a great many under his command. He believed that out of 800,000 volunteers embodied on this occasion, at least 200,000 were *dissenters*; and who could turn upon *any portion* of them, and say, that they were not as *loyal and as devoted* to the *service of their country*, as *any other class of the King's subjects*.” Observe, sir, these statements were made by competent and credible witnesses;

were made in public, where they would have been immediately detected, had they not been true; were made in the British House of Commons, in debating on the Test and Corporation Acts, in the presence of the most *capable* men, whose *duty* and *interest* it would have been to contradict them, could they have done it with truth. According to these undeniable facts, England owes her existence, as a Protestant government, to *dissenters*, (4.) and not to the *members* of the established church. Might not the same remarks be made respecting the dissenters from the church of England in this country? Although they have been restricted, abused, and provoked, at different times, and in different ways, have they not shown themselves sincerely attached to the government, and its faithful supporters and defenders in every time of danger? Have they not been, both in war (5.) and in peace, as *loyal* as the members of the church of England? You cannot, you dare not deny it.

The author of the "Portraiture of Methodism, in vindicating the Wesleyan Methodists against the charge of *disloyalty* (for they were once impugned as we are now) says—"There has never been *one* person belonging to the Wesleyan Methodists, executed for high treason, transported, or otherwise punished for sedition; or tried or imprisoned under any such charge. And whenever there has been a fair occasion for displaying it, their attachment to the government has been conspicuous. This was the case in Ireland, during the late rebellion; in the West India islands, when threatened by the French: to which I may add, the untarnished and distinguished reputation those Methodists have maintained, who have been in the army and navy.—Did ever a *single* Methodist desert from army or navy? I believe not. *Deserters are almost always churchmen.*" (6.) The same remarks are true of the Methodists (7.) in this Province—and to prove this I appeal to the public at large—to facts respecting the Methodists for more than 30 years past, to the evidence before the committee of the Provincial Parliament, to the decision of the Parliament, and last of all to *yourself*, sir: When it would answer your purpose, and in order to give your sentiments greater weight, you

say (in the language of a dissenting clergyman in a letter to Lord Liverpool) "as your Lordship knows something of the *religious principles, loyalty, and good conduct* of the *Methodists*, I shall notice them particularly. Their congregations in the Canadas are to the congregations of the Kirk at least *thirty to one*; and yet, my lord, even *these*, I am led to think, would deem it unjust, were a moiety of the Reserves, taken from the church, and to exclusion of all others, given to themselves." (8.) That you refer to the Methodists in this Province, is obvious; for the Wesleyan Missionaries, I believe, are not so numerous as the Ministers of the Kirk, and the congregations of the Methodists, of whom you here speak so honorably, are *thirty to one* to those of the Kirk of Scotland—and therefore can be no other than those Methodists, whom you in other places, and even in the 28th page of the same pamphlet, wonderful to tell!—declare are undermining the "institutions of the country both civil and religious!"

This, I presume, may be considered sterling evidence, and raises the truth of my observations to a *moral certainty*. What, then, becomes of your boasted doctrine, that a religious establishment is necessary to the stability of the government, to attach colonies to the parent state, to diffuse a truly loyal feeling? It falls to the ground; and, I hope, to rise no more for ever. So much on this part of our subject.

The second object of civil government, is to provide for the peace and happiness of its subjects. And does a religious establishment promote these? On this part of the argument, I will merely observe, that if a religious establishment [~~promote these?~~ On this part of the argument, I will merely observe, that if a religious establishment] promotes the peace and happiness of the subjects of a government, why were the eastern and western empire of *christian* Rome filled with persecution under the successors of Constantine? and why are the annals of church history crimsoned with the blood of martyrs, from that time till the days of Luther? Why were commotions and persecutions convulsing Germany, at the time of the reformation, if an establishment did not produce them? How was civil war produ-

ced, which commenced in the reign of Charles IX. and continued near thirty years to deluge all France, and which swept off christians without number, but through the intolerance and cruelty, that were reared and excited by a *religious establishment*? Please to reflect, sir, upon bleeding France, in the reign of Louis XIV. & say, does a religious establishment promote the peace and happiness of an Empire? Was it not an establishment, which caused a civil war in the low countries, that terminated in the deliverance of Holland from the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of Spain? Passing over inquisitorial Spain, turn to England, not at the time when the yoke of popery was first thrown off by Henry VIII, nor when the church of England was finally established, in the reign of Elizabeth, but at those later periods of the history, when the established church is said to have existed in her present and apostolic purity. If the established religion so extensively promotes the peace and happiness of the subjects of great Britain, why were more than five hundred ministers rejected and degraded; some burnt, and many thousand banished by persecution to America, in the reign of James I, the successor of Elizabeth? Why did different churches mutually harrass and butcher each other, in the reign of Charles I.? Why, in the reign of Charles II. were two thousand pious and learned clergymen turned out of their churches, more than eight thousand persons confined, reduced to want, and some to the grave, by the conventicle act; and the meek and peaceable Quakers persecuted and imprisoned in great numbers? Why are fearful alarms disturbing the minds of the people of great Britain, every few years lest their liberties should be wrested from them? Why are petitions pouring into the House of Commons from every part of the Kingdom, and that year after year, for the repeal of laws that would disgrace the Koran? Why is Ireland reduced to a desolation, and her children, like the Israelites in Babylon, almost weeping tears of blood, under the accumulated calamities of their indescribable privations? Why! not that the present reigning family are illiberal—no, they have shown themselves friends of religious freedom; but, sir,

a *bench of bishops* have always been in the *House of Lords* and *they and their adherents* have exerted their influence in the House of Commons. These dignitaries of the established church, with a few noble exceptions, have always been enemies of religious freedom. This unfolds the mystery; and he that runs, may read.

Why is discord disturbing the tranquility of these Provinces? Because the cloven foot of an ecclesiastical establishment begins to show itself here, and the iron claws of the beast are about grappling the civil and religious interests and liberties of the people; and, after looking to England, as you bid us, and seeing the wide—wasting sorrow inflicted by ecclesiastical usurpation, and anticipating a similar rod prepared to rule over these Provinces, we see more than half a million of people exposed to the most imminent danger, and feel it our duty to give the alarm, before ourselves and our posterity are for ever bound in chains, which our forefathers have wrote and suffered and died to break.

“Of all scourges, with which mankind is curs’d,

Ecclesiastic tyranny is the worst.”

“To my mind,” says a member of the British Parliament, “no two things are more distinct or more dissimilar, than *religion* and *government*; yet we have been taught to blend them together, to clothe the government with the sacred garb of religion, and to address religion with attributes, which are not hers, and to which she would lay no claim.”

I think, sir, we are now brought to the conclusion, that every judicious friend of the government ought to be “labouring to separate religion from the state,” knowing that an ecclesiastical establishment weakens the stability of the government, on one hand, and occasions discontent and misery among its subjects, on the other—and, therefore, we may say, with the Rev. Charles Wesley,

“Whatever call’d by man, ’tis purely evil,
Tis Bahel, Antichrist, and Pope, and devil.”

In my next I shall take up the *second* part of the argument, namely, to show how far an ecclesiastical establishment tends to advance the *interests of religion*.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Your very Humble Serv't.
E. RYERSON.

Cobourg, 11th May, 1828.

(1.) Works Vol. III. p. 445, 6.

(2.) The following are the sentiments of the learned Archdeacon Paley respecting the duty of submission to the civil government:—"So long as the interest of the whole society requires it, that is, so long as the established government cannot be resisted or changed without public inconveniency, it is the will of God (which will universally determines our duty) that the established government be obeyed, and no longer." (And) it may be as much a duty, (continues the Dr.) at one time, to resist government, as it is, at another to obey it; to wit, whenever more advantage will, in our opinion, accrue to the community, from resistance, than mischief." Works Vol. III. p. 345, 346.

(3.) This election, is now celebrated by the very clergy, whose predecessors in the second office, did all in their power to prevent.

(4.) Mr. Hume, who was no friend to religion, much less to protestant dissenters, in speaking of the despotic authority and conduct of Elizabeth, observes that "so absolute was the authority of the crown, that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved, by the puritans alive, and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous, and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution." Hist. of England Vol. 5, p. 189. Oct. Edit. 1763.

(5.) According to the report of the society (for the year 1821) by which the clergy of the church of England in Canada had been principally supported, it appears that there were but five clergymen of the church of England in this Province during the late war. Yet the people generally were loyal and bold in defence of the country; and the London Morning Chronicle, dated 14th March, 1828, says—"In the late war with the United States, we were chiefly indebted

for the defence of Canada to the colonists themselves." Now that only a mere iota of the population of this Province were at that time members of the church of England, is obvious; for the same report states, that even in 1821, the greatest number of communicants at any one was 367. What must have been their number in 1811? Hence it is evident, sir, that your army of two thousand clergymen is by no means necessary to "attach the colony to the parent state."

(6.) P. 320, 321.

(7.) Some of the Methodist teachers were in the hottest battles in the late war, which is more than can be said of the clergy of the church of England, while others, as the hon. Wm. Dickson said, encouraged their congregations to repel the enemy.

(8.) Observations on the clergy reserves, p. 30.

No. 5.

Rev. Sir,

I now come to consider a religious Establishment as an engine of religion, as a means of extending its influence and promoting its purity among mankind. Intending the utmost brevity, I shall decline availing myself of the advantage to my argument of noticing our natural aversion to what comes to us clothed with compulsory power; the physical unsuitableness of civil authority in spiritual matters; the unjustifiable power usurped by the civil Magistrate of the British realm, in the doctrines and duties of religion; the inconsistency, in many respects, between the constitution of the Church of England (owing to its connection with the State) and that of the apostolic Church. I shall desist from showing, what many writers of your own church have acknowledged, that the church of England is a mere creature of the State, and that even its Constitution is not vested in the hands of the Bishops, but in the King & Parliament, that even the 39 articles are inserted in Dr. Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," "not as a matter of doctrine, but as a matter of law" (preface p. 26, 27,) that the terms of conformity to the church are unchristian and cruel, that "they are suited to a set of men, (as the immortal Locke says,) who are taught to obey rather than understand"—that "the requiring of subscription

to the 39 articles (to use the words of the eminent Bishop Burnet) is a *great imposition*"—in short, that the very pomp and splendour of the established church of England are fatal to the spirituality of Christ's simple and unassuming religion. Passing over all these, and several other topics of argument, I shall confine myself to one, namely, the *effects which the Ecclesiastical Establishment has already produced upon its clergy, its members, and the nation, into whose government it has been incorporated.* Facts, you know sir, are stubborn things; and if the arguments you adduce, viz. the Establishment of Great Britain, and that to which the Bishop of Quebec has appealed, in his late Circular Letter, viz. the establishment of religion under Constantine, afford evidence of the enervating and corrupting tendency of Establishments, *your proofs become witnesses against yourself; your idolized fabric falls to the ground, and my position becomes immoveably established.*

In making this short appeal to the testimony of history, be assured, sir, that I am not influenced by any, the least unfriendly feeling towards the ministers or members of the church of England; nor would I wish to insinuate, that their motives and dispositions have been naturally worse than those of the rest of mankind. If their history present us with an example of degeneracy and corruption, I attribute it to the circumstances in which they were placed; and, if the ministers and members of any other religious denomination had been placed in the same circumstances as those of your established church, their history, no doubt, would have been stained with blood, and tarnished by corruption, & their example might have been held up as a beacon to future generations, to bid them beware of ecclesiastical establishments. I do not make even the *Methodists* an exception; and my sincere prayer is that that they may never have it in their power to lord it over the conscience of a fellow creature, with the rod of *civil authority.* We may, and we certainly do, like Hazael in the Bible, shudder at the thoughts of such wickedness *now*; but we know not what we should do, were the temptation thrown in our way. We, therefore, pray that we may not be led into temptation, especially such as has already proved the destruction of thousands, nay, of millions of immortal beings.

That there have been ministers and members of the church of England, at every period of her existence, whose knowledge talents and lives have illumined the literary, moral, and religious world, I gladly admit; and these, like Daniel and his friends in Babylon, are the very witnesses, who have borne testimony to the lethargy and vices which prevailed in their age and nation. It is a well known fact, that the union of church and state in England, called many of the *Bishops and Clergy* from their *spiritual* duties, lessened their usefulness, and had a tendency corrupt their lives. "Is it not a shame above all shames, (says Mr. Tindal, an early reformer) and a monstrous thing, that no man should be found able to govern a *worldly Kingdom*, save *Bishops and Prelates*, that are taken out of the *world*, and appointed to preach the *Kingdom of God*? To preach *God's word* is too much for *half* a man, and to minister a *temporal kingdom* is too much for *half* a man also. *Either* other requireth a *whole man.* *One*, therefore cannot well do *both.*—And ever since *lording* and *loitering* hath come up (said the apostolic Bishop Latimer) *preaching hath come down*, contrary to the Apostles, times. For they *preached and lorded not*; and now they *lord and preach not.*—Ever since the prelates have been made lords and nobles, the plough standeth; there is no work done; the people starve. The *prelates* are *otherwise* occupied (than in *preaching*;) *some in King's matters*; some are *ambassadors*, some, of the *privy council*; some to furnish the court; *some are lords in parliament*; some are presidents and comptrollers of the mints. Well, well! *Is this their duty? Is this their office? Is this their calling? Should we have the ministers of church comptrollers of the mints? Is this a meet office for a priest that hath the care of souls? Is this his charge?* I would here ask one question. I would fain know *who* comptrolleth the *devil at home* in his parish, while he comptrolleth the mint"? "*Our Bishops* have so much wit, (said the pious Bishop Hooper) they can rule and serve, as *they* say in *both* states; in the *church*, and also in the *civil policy*; when *one* of them is more than *any man* is able to *satisfy*, let him do *always* his *best* diligence. *They* know that the *primitive church* had *no such bishops* as be *now* *a days.*" Now that the example of the pre-

lates and the union of church and state had a tendency, and actually did spread the contagion of religious corruption through the *whole body of the clergy*, will appear very evident from the following observations of the well known Bishop Burnett: "I have *lamented*, during my *whole life*, that I saw so little *true zeal* among our *clergy*. I saw *much* among the *clergy* of the church of Rome, though it is both ill directed and ill conducted. I saw much zeal likewise throughout the *foreign churches*. The *Dissenters* have a great deal of zeal among them; but the *main body of our clergy* has always appeared *dead and lifeless* to me; and instead of *animating one another*, they lay *one another to sleep*.—unless a *better spirit* possesses the *clergy*, arguments, and what is more, *laws and authority will not preserve the church*." (1) I may here observe that there has in general been no reformation, except for the worse, in the clergy of the church of England, from the days of the evangelical Burnet to the present time. To prove this, a host of evidence might be produced; but I will content myself with saying, in your own words (ser. p. 14) *such the church of England has remained for many centuries*."

This remark of yours is as applicable to the *laity*, as to the clergy and constitution of the church of England; and therefore, one single witness from his ability, impartiality, and high standing will suffice to establish the second part of my argument, namely, to shew the unhappy effects of establishments upon the members of the establishment and the nation at large. "I would not" (says the eminent learned and pious Bishop Newton) "I would not presage ill to my country; but, when we consider the many heinous and presumptuous sins of this *nation*, the licentiousness and violation of all order and discipline, the factions and divisions, the venality and corruption, the avarice and profusion of all ranks and degrees among us, the total want of public spirit, and ardent passion for private ends and interests, the luxury, gaming, and dissoluteness of high life, and the laziness and drunkenness and debauchery of low life, and above all, that barefaced ridicule of all virtue and decency, and that scandalous neglect, and I wish I could not say contempt, of public worship and religion; when we consider

these things, these signs of the times, the stoutest and most sanguine of us all must tremble at the natural and probable consequences." (2) Such, sir, is the effect of the boasted establishment of England, to which you bid us look. Should it be said that it is the abuse of the establishment that has occasioned this general profligacy among clergy and laity, and that it is for the want of a more extensive influence of the establishment, that a general reformation is not effected, I answer, that your own observations, in your sermon, refute you; that the best English historians estimate four fifths, or the body of the nation, to be members of the *establishment*; that the above authorities assure us that the *dissenters* who are *not* under the influence of the *establishment*, are generally holy and zealous in religion; and lastly, that the most famous and successful ministers, missionaries and missions, with a few eminent exceptions, for centuries past, have been dissenters, and principally supported by dissenting interest.

Is it not a matter of gratitude and praise, that he who raised a few philosophers in Greece, to witness and lament the universal prevalence of ignorance and vice amongst the heathen nations, who preserved an Enoch and Noah, to expose and condemn the general wickedness and infidelity of the Antediluvians,—who taught and strengthened prophets to lift their voices against, and record the idolatrous apostacy of the Jewish nation,—who commissioned and emboldened apostles and evangelists to describe and proclaim the judgements of heaven against the immorality and idolatry tolerated and defended by the establishments of the age; that he, the holy God, "has kept a few, perhaps a few score of witnesses amongst the 18,000 clergymen of England, who have not bowed the knee to Baal; but have borne testimony to the truth, that England's establishment has, both in a *civil* and *religious* point of view, been a source of weakness to the government, and of discord and corruption amongst its clerical and lay subjects. Therefore, sir, every friend of religion or government ought to be labouring," as you say the Methodists are, "to separate *religion* from the *state*." Reader, is not this thy opinion? show thy faith by thy works—I have one

more fact to appeal to, under this head of my argument, namely, to the effect of the establishment under Constantine. I do this with the more pleasure, because the bishop of Quebec, in his late circular letter, has referred to this, as a principal argument in favour of establishments. It is doubtless the best that could have been produced, or his lordship would not have laid so much stress upon it: and, if it is found to have given a demonstration, not of the good effects, but of the corrupting persecuting tendency of religious establishments, his lordship's argument doubly confutes itself; and what patriot or christian will not arouse and oppose, with all his energy, the introduction of such a heterogeneous union in this Province? Amongst the numerous historians, who all concur in the same thing, I will, for the sake of brevity, only introduce the indisputable testimony of the discerning and judicious bishop Newton, & the impartial & learned Dr. Mosheim. The former says "though the establishment of christianity by Constantine, added much to the temporal prosperity, yet it contributed little to the spiritual graces and virtues of christians. It enlarged their revenues, and increased their endowments; but it proved the fatal means of corrupting the doctrine and relaxing the discipline of the church. It was attended with this peculiar disadvantage, that many clave to them with flatteries; many became christians for the sake of the loaves and fishes, and pretended to be of the religion, only because it was the religion of the Emperor. Eusebius, who was a cotemporary writer, reckons that one of the reigning vices of the times was the dissimulation and hypocrisy of men fraudulently entering into the church, and borrowing the name of christians, without the reality.—The spirit of persecution presently revived; and no sooner were christians delivered from the fury of heathen adversaries, than they began to quarrel among themselves, and to persecute one another. The Consubstantialists, even in the time of Constantine, led the way, by excommunicating and banishing the Arians. The latter, under the favour of Constantius and Valens more than retorted the injury, and were guilty of many horrible outrages cruelties towards the former. Such, more or less, hath been the

condition of the church ever since; and, generally speaking, those have fallen a sacrifice to others, some of the best and wisest men, to some of the worst and most ignorant." (3.)

Dr. Mosheim, speaking of the same period, says, "The number of immoral and unworthy Christians began so to increase, that the examples of real piety and virtue became extremely rare. When the terrors of persecution were totally dispelled; when the church, secured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the sweets of prosperity and peace; when the most of the Bishops exhibited to their flocks the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity and strife, with other vices too numerous to mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into slothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties of their respective stations, and employed in vain wrangling and disputes, that zeal and attention that were due to the culture of piety, and to the instruction of their people, and when to complete the enormity of this horrid detail, multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the prospect of gain and the fear of punishment; then it was indeed, no wonder, that the church was contaminated with shoals of profligate Christians, and that the virtuous few, were in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed with the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious. It is true, that the same rigorous penitence, which had taken place before Constantine the Great, continued now in full force against flagrant transgressors; but, when the reign of corruption becomes universal, the vigour of the laws yields to its sway, and a weak execution defeats the purposes of the most salutary discipline. Such was now unhappily the case; the age was sinking daily from one period of corruption to another; the great and the powerful sinned with impunity; and the obscure and the indigent felt alone the severity of the laws." (4.)

Such is the chief corner stone in his Lordship's Ecclesiastical building, and who does not see, that it is built upon the sand, which the current of truth speedily washes away, and sweeps into deserved ruin. Would not every friend of his country and of religion,

have been justified, nay would it not have been his *duty*, to raise his voice, however feeble, it might have been, against those antichristian invasions on the apostolic purity and simplicity of Christ's holy religion, in the *days of Constantine and his successors*? Equally bound is *every patriotic christian*, to oppose similar encroachments and corruptions, at the *present time*, and in *this Province*. May God give every christian and well wisher to his country wisdom, and firmness and zeal to do so!

Having briefly shown the evil tendency of Ecclesiastical establishments, in regard both to the civil and religious interests of the government and its subjects, I shall, in my next, endeavour to show that the church of England is not exclusively established by law in Canada; and, afterwards, that, according to *your own principle*, she ought not to be established in this country. I shall then be prepared to make some observations on your contemplated University, and show its tendency, according to the principles of the present Charter.

I have the honor to be,

Rev. Sir,

Your Humble Servt.

E. RYERSON.

Cobourg, 14th May, 1828.

- (1) Own Times, Vol. IV. p. 440.
 (2) Dissertation on Prophecies, Vol. 2. p. 262.
 (3) *ib.* p. 165, 166.
 (4) Ecclesiastical Hist. Vol. 1. p. 294, 295.

No. 6.

Rev. Sir,

I now address myself to the task of proving that the *Church of England* is not the established church of Canada.—It is hardly possible for any individual not to notice the utter inconsistency of such a measure, as exclusively establishing your church at the time when what you call our “Constitutional act” became a law, with the discerning policy of the great Pitt, to whom we are indebted for that act, seeing that both statesmen and divines agree, that no particular form of religion should be established in any country unless it includes at least a

majority of the population. No candid judicious person can therefore suppose for a moment, that so great a statesman and politician as the illustrious son of the great Earl of Chatham would think of establishing one form of religion in Canada, to the exclusion of all others, which, even according to your own statements, was scarcely in existence. This supposition, strong and almost conclusive in itself, is founded upon facts and arguments. I therefore proceed to introduce those, by which my opinion is supported. And here, sir, it is proper for me to observe, by way of explanation, that there are two senses in which the terms *church establishment* are used. In one, it signifies merely the legal recognition and protection of a church in the free exercise and enjoyment of its religious faith and worship, and the means necessary to that end. In the other and more usual sense, it signifies an incorporation of a church with the state, and the establishment of it as the state religion of the Kingdom or Province, in which it is so established. In the latter signification, the Roman Catholic church, for example, is *the* established religion of Rome; in the former, it is *an* established religion in Lower Canada and this Province: for, in the Statutes 14th Geo. 3rd, constituting the Province of Quebec, and the 31st Geo. 3rd, constituting the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, his Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the church of Rome in these Provinces, are secured in the exercise and enjoyment of their religion, and their clergy, in their accustomed dues and rights, with respect to the professors of that religion.

So, also, the Protestant Episcopal church is *the* established state religion of England and Ireland; and, in these Provinces, it is, like the Roman Catholic church *an* established religion, in respect to those who profess it, being recognized and secured in the possession and enjoyment of certain rights, specified in the same Statute, 31st Geo. 3rd.

To use your own word, “The Roman Catholic religion is fully established, in as far as respects persons of that persuasion, not in Lower Canada only; but also in Upper Canada:—and so complete is this

establishment of the Romish church, that it cannot be touched directly or indirectly by the Colonial Legislatures." In the 31st Geo. 3rd, c. 31, provision is made for the support of a Protestant clergy; but this provision is liable, under certain restrictions and limitations, pointed out in section, 42, to be altered by the Provincial Legislatures. From this it appears that the state of the two churches is very different. The Provincial Legislatures have nothing to do, either directly or indirectly, with the Romish church; but the same Legislatures may, vary, or repeal, or modify the 31st Geo. 3rd c. 31, as far as respects the church of England." (Obs. on the Reserves, p. 32, 33)

In this sense, I admit that your church is established in this Province, in regard to those who profess it, but not as a Provincial church, nor in respect to other denominations of christians.

In the same sense, although not with all the same rights and endowments, the church of Scotland, and the Lutheran and Calvinist churches, in this Province, are established, being recognized and secured in certain rights, in and by the marriage act; as are, also, the Methodists, Congregationists, Independents, Baptists, &c. in and by the act for the relief of religious societies. The advantages legally secured to these respective churches differ; but the religion of each of them is recognized and established by law.

Even in England, in the case of *Kemp vs. Wickes*, tried in the Arches Court of Canterbury, Dec. 11th, 1809, it was decided by Sir John Nicoll, the learned Judge of that Court, that *dissenting* Ministers, of all denominations of *dissenters*, regularly ordained according to the forms of their respective churches, are recognized, allowed, and established by the act of Toleration, although dissenters there have, until this year, been subject to civil disabilities and disqualifications by the Corporation and Test acts.

" In this sense, but without any such disabilities, and with more liberal provisions, endowments and privileges, the church of England is admitted to be an established religion in this Province; but I cannot agree with you, and I deny that it is established

by any law as the *state* religion of the Province, or in regard to any other religious denominations in the Province than its own professors.

The ancient statute, 1st Eliz. c. 1st, to which you refer, repealed the Statute of Philip and Mary, which had adopted the Roman Catholic religion, and subjected England to Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Pope. It restored the Protestant religion, and the authority of the Queen, instead of the Pope, as the supreme head of the church, and excluded all foreign Ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction over England, Ireland, or any of her Majesty's dominions.— That was the substance of the Statute. It had no effect, in theory or practice, to establish the church of England in the subsequent, chartered colonies and Provinces of Great Britain, as the religion of those colonies and Provinces. Such a construction of the Statute, I believe, was never admitted or claimed in the British colonies, which afterwards became the United States of America, during more than a century and a half of their continuance under the British government. In none of those colonies, if I rightly understand their Ecclesiastical history, was the church of England ever considered to be the established Provincial religion, or to have any further or other establishment or rights, than what was contained in the *Royal Charter*, or derived from the *Legislative acts of the colony*.

Whatever legal establishment, therefore, the church of England has in this Province must be found in the 31st Geo. 3rd, granting our Constitution, or in our Provincial Statutes. The "Constitutional act" establishes a Provincial Legislature, with authority "to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the Province, such laws not being repugnant to this act." That is the only limitation in the grant of Legislative power. After such a Constitution, established, not by a charter from the Crown, but by a solemn act of the Imperial Parliament, the King cannot, in the most extensive exercise of his prerogative. Legislate alone for the Province, as a conquered country, especially in a matter of such vital importance, as the establishment of a Provincial religion.

The derivation of such an establishment

from the erection of Upper and Lower Canada into an Episcopal Diocese, by the name of the Diocese of Quebec, the annexation of this Diocese to the Metropolitan Province of Canterbury, as an integral portion of it, and the subjection of the bishop of Quebec to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the same manner as the bishops within that Province are subject to him, and thereby bringing us within the realm of England, and consequently under the English Ecclesiastical laws, is too far-fetched and roundabout a fiction to bear the test of examination, even if his Majesty had constitutional power,—which he has not without the concurrence of the *Imperial Parliament*, to create such an establishment. The nominal annexation of these Provinces, by Royal authority, to the arch-Episcopal Province of Canterbury can no more bring us within the operation of the laws of England respecting the church establishment, and under the jurisdiction of the English Ecclesiastical Courts, than a Royal proclamation or an order in Council annexing this Province to the county of Middlesex in England, could legally subject us to the jurisdiction of the Courts of Westminster Hall. Your resorting to such a fictitious derivation of your assumed establishment shews that it has no solid foundation.

The lord bishop of Quebec and you are equally unsuccessful in your attempt to stretch the King's Coronation oath to the extent of binding him to establish and maintain inviolate the church of England in this Province, upon the same untenable & fictitious ground that Canada, being constituted an appendage of the Province of Canterbury, is thereby brought within the *realm* of England, to which the Coronation oath applies. "Whether the term *realm* (says his Lordship) comprehends the whole Empire, or not, the wording of the clause surely applies to all which is a regular appendage of the *Province of Canterbury*."

His late Majesty, George the Third, had scruples of conscience on the subject of assenting to an act for the emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland, under an impression, which Mr. Pitt could not remove, that it would affect the established church there, in a manner inconsistent with his Corona-

tion oath, Ireland being within the protection of that oath, as prescribed by the act of Union. But his Majesty had no such conscientious objections against allowing the Catholics of Canada all the rights and privileges of his other Canadian subjects, which he accordingly did in the Quebec act, passed in the 14th year of his reign, and in the Constitutional act, passed in his thirty-first year. He did not regard Canada as standing on the same ground with Ireland, in relation to the established religion, guarded by his Coronation oath; that is, he did not consider the church of England to be the established religion of Canada. His Majesty being a disinterested and impartial judge, his opinion is at least as high an authority, on this point, as the interested opinion of the Bishop of Quebec or yourself.

His lordship, in his letter, endeavours to prove that there is a state religion established in this Province, from the alleged necessity of such an establishment. He says "that in christian countries the *state* ought to be *christian*, and, being christian, *must* have a form of religion of its own; that with whatever indulgence for those who decline compliance with this form, or whatever extension, in some cases, of support to their institutions, it is some *one form* which the government *must* recognise and *identify* with *itself*."

In this position, that the government of a christian state *must* have some one form of religion established by law, and identified with itself, his lordship assumes the very point in dispute, instead of proving it. His *assumption*—for such it is at best—is not only unsupported by evidence, but susceptible of disproof, and is, indeed, actually disproved by notorious fact. The experiment has been fairly tried, in the face of the christian world, for the full term of half a century last past. The United States of America are a christian nation; (1.) but they have no national or state establishment of religion. All denominations of christians there are equally protected by the law, no one being identified with the government, or having any legal preeminence. Their government, unconnected with any religious establishment, has been in operation more than fifty years, and that with increas-

ing success. Both religion and the Government prosper. Neither of them suffers for want of an established connexion of church and state. His lordship may learn from his brother bishop of New-York, who has visited the British Islands, that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York, for all the purposes of religion, is as prosperous and flourishing as it is in England, and much more so than it is in Ireland, under a national establishment. The American Presbyteries, or Synods, or general assembly can inform him, that the Presbyterian religion is as pure and prosperous in the United States, as it is in Scotland, under the legal establishment of the Kirk. This national experiment, tried successfully in a christian nation for a sufficient period of time to test its practical effects upon both religion and government, is a standing refutation of the bishop's gratuitous assertion, that a christian nation *must* have some one form of religion established and identified with its government. His major proposition thus failing, the consequence intended to be drawn from it, and applied to this Province, falls to the ground.

The question respecting the clergy reserves is distinct from that relative to the establishment of your church as the state religion of Canada; but since you have connected them together, in your speech, I will devote a few moments to examine your exclusive claim to the reserves.

- It entirely depends upon the construction on the Statute, 31st Geo. 3, c. 31, taken in connexion with the 14th Geo. 3, and explained by contemporaneous circumstances, and the debates in Parliament upon the passing of the act.

The 14th Geo. 3rd, secured his Majesty's Canadian subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, in the free exercise of their religion, and their clergy, in the enjoyment of their accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons as profess that religion, with an explanatory proviso, that his Majesty might make provision, out of the rest of the accustomed dues and rights, *for the encouragement of the Protestant religion, and for the maintenance and support of a Protestant clergy within the said Province.*" The provision thus to be made was not for

the encouragement of the church of England, or of the church of Scotland, or of any particular Protestant church, but in general terms, "*of the Protestant religion;*" not for the maintenance of the clergy of the church of England, or of any Protestant church in particular, but "*a Protestant clergy*" generally. The object of the contemplated provision and the words used to express it extend to the religion and the the clergy of the Protestant inhabitants of the Province, as contradistinguished from the Catholic inhabitants, of whatever particular church or denomination of Protestants they might be.

This preliminary declaration was referred to and confirmed in the 35th section of the 31st Geo. 3rd, and, in the 36th section, his Majesty was authorised to reserve lands equal to a seventh part of the lands granted, or to be granted, in each of these Provinces, "*for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy within the same.*" In this clause, authorising the reservation, there is nothing to limit the benefit of it to the clergy of the church of England, or any other Protestant church in particular.

The 37th section appropriates the income of the reserves in these words: "That all and every the rents, profits or emoluments, which may at any time arise from such lands so allotted and appropriated, as aforesaid, shall be applicable solely to the maintenance and support of a Protestant clergy, within the Province in which the same shall be situated, and to no other use or purpose whatever." In this appropriation of the income of the reserves, there is no limitation of it to the exclusive benefit of the clergy of one Protestant church, in preference to others. It is appropriated, generally, for the maintenance and support of "*a Protestant clergy.*"

Each of these terms, the adjective "*Protestant,*" and the noun "*clergy,*" is as properly applicable to every other church or denomination of Protestants, as to the church of England.

It has, indeed, been pretended, that the word *clergy*, in the English use of it, is confined to the established church of England. But the pretence is unfounded. By the law of England, all the subjects of that realm are divided into two classes, the *clergy* and the *laity*; the clergy comprehending all per-

sons in holy orders, and the laity comprehending all others. 1 Blacks. Commentaries 376. All official grades or descriptions of persons "in holy orders" are clergymen, in the technical sense of that comprehensive term. In the Canons, a clergyman of the church of England is designated by the general term "*minister*," minister and clergyman being used as synonymous terms, meaning a person "in holy orders," in any form of orders recognized by the laws of England. In the case of *Kemp, vs. Wickes*, above referred to, decided by the proper tribunal, the Arches Court of Canterbury, it was held and settled, that dissenting clergymen, ordained according to the forms of their respective denominations, are *lawful ministers*, as really and truly such, as are the ministers of the church of England, Episcopally ordained. They are comprehended in Blackstone's legal definition of the *clergy*; and are fairly, strictly, and legally within the general terms "*a Protestant clergy*," used in the 31st Geo. 3rd.

That act itself expressly recognizes the existence in this Province, of other Protestant Clergymen than those of the church of England; in the 21st section, which disqualifies for a seat in the House of Assembly any person, "who shall be a minister of the church of England, or a *Minister, Priest, Ecclesiastic* or *Teacher*, either according to the rites of the church of Rome, or under any other form or profession of religious worship;" and in the 42nd section, which requires to be submitted to his Majesty, and laid before the Imperial Parliament, among other Provincial acts, any act relating in any manner to the granting, imposing or recovering any dues or stipends or emoluments whatever, to be paid to or for the use of "any *Minister, Priest, Ecclesiastic*, or *Teacher*, according to any religions form or mode of worship." These are descriptive names by which the clergy of different denominations are designated among themselves.

Thus the same act, which provided and appropriated the clergy reserves, has, in express terms, admitted and considered, that there are in this Province, besides Catholic clergymen, other *Ministers, Priests, Ecclesiastics*, or *Teachers*, than Ministers of the church of England, and has recognized them

all of every form of religious faith or worship. Here is an explicit recognition of other Protestant clergymen, than those of the church of England. The appropriation of the proceeds of the clergy reserves for the support and maintenance of "a Protestant clergy" excludes, indeed, the *Catholic* clergy, by the restrictive term "*Protestant*;" but as to *Protestant clergymen*, there is no exclusion or preference. In general terms, the appropriating clause puts them all, without exception or distinction, upon the same footing. They are all equally "*Protestant*," and equally *Ministers or clergymen*, recognized as such by the general law of England, and by this particular act.

In subsequent sections of the act, his Majesty is empowered to authorize the Governor to erect, in every township, one or more Parsonage or Rectory, or Parsonages, or Rectories, according to the church of England, and to endow the same with such a part of the lands reserved for that township, as he shall judge expedient, and to present to such Parsonage or Rectory an incumbent or Minister of the church of England, duly ordained according to the rites of that church. The endowment thus authorized to be carved out of the reserved lands, at the discretion of the Governor, are appropriated to the incumbents or Ministers of the church of England. To this extent, but no further, are clergymen of the church of England distinguished from the clergymen of other Protestant churches, in regard to the lands reserved for and appropriated to "a Protestant clergy."

The variance between the sections reserving the clergy lands, and appropriating their income, and the subsequent distinct sections authorising a part of those lands to be taken for the endowment of Parsonages or Rectories, is very striking and significant. In the former, there is no limitation to or mention of the church of England; in the latter, the endowments, expressed to be a part only of the whole Reserves, are expressly limited and appropriated to your church. This difference in the phraseology furnishes a good rule of interpretation. Had it been intended that the whole benefit of the clergy reserves should be confined to the clergy of your church, the reservation and appropriation

would have been expressed to be for the support of the clergy of the church of England, or a Protestant *Episcopal* clergy, or in some other words limiting it to the clergy of your church, and not in the general terms, "a Protestant clergy," comprehending clergymen of all Protestant Churches, and equally entitling them to the benefit of it.

In this sense the act was understood by leading members of the Parliament that passed it. In the debate upon the Bill, Mr. Fox said expressly, "by the Protestant Clergy he supposed to be understood *not only the Clergy of the Church of England, but all descriptions of Protestants.*" And again, "*The greatest part of these Protestant Clergy were not of the Church of England; they were chiefly what are called Protestant Dissenters in this country.*" This is the sense in which the act is now understood by the House of Lords; for Lord King, in March last, observed, *ne mine contradicente*, "That in 1792 or 1793, when the distribution of land in Upper Canada had been settled, one seventh of the waste lands in that colony had been set apart for the maintenance of the Protestant clergy; *not for the Episcopacy alone*, but for the protestant clergy. It had all been taken, indeed, by the Episcopal clergy; but it was resisted and he hoped would be successfully resisted, as *otherwise* it would effectually narrow the intention of the grant. He hoped it would not be exclusively appropriated to the church of England; *it was given for Protestant clergymen of all denominations, which included Presbyterians and others.*"

According, therefore, to the letter and spirit of the Act, the history of its enactment, the declared sense in which it was understood by the Parliament enacting it, and by the present House of Lords—which I presume is entitled to as much respect and ought to have as much weight, as the opinion of yourself, the bishop of Quebec, and of the young lawyer, whom you give a place in your speech—your church has not an exclusive right to the benefit of the clergy reserves; and, even if it had, it would not be thereby the state religion of this Province. -

I have the honour to be,

Rev. Sir, Your Humble Servant,
E. RYERSON.

Cobourg, 18th June, 1828.

(1.) The Americans enjoy all the blessings of religion without the scourge of Ecclesiastical tyranny. "In the religious freedom which America enjoys (says Mr. Duncan, an *English* gentleman) I see a most unquestioned superiority (over the British nation.) (Travels Vol. II. p. 328.) "In fact, (says the *Edinburgh Review*, for July 1824, p. 429,) it is hardly possible for any nation to show a greater superiority over another, than the Americans, in this particular, (of religious liberty) have done over this country (Great Britain.) They have fairly and completely and probably for ever, extinguished that spirit of religious persecution which has been the employment and curse of mankind for four or five centuries—not only that persecution, which by disqualifying from civil offices, and cutting a man off from the lawful objects of ambition, endeavours to strangle religious freedom in silence, and to enjoy all the advantages, without the blood and noise and fire of persecution.—In this particular the Americans are at the head of all the nations of the world. and at the same time they are, especially in the Eastern and Midland States, so far from being indifferent on subjects of religion, that they may be most justly characterized as a very religious people."

No. 7.

Rev. Sir,

Having shown that an Ecclesiastical establishment weakens a Government and disunites its subjects, is the means of corrupting the clergy, laity and nation in which it is tolerated—and that the church of England is not the established church of these Provinces, I now proceed to prove, that according to your own principles, the church of England, ought not to be established in Canada with peculiar legal privileges and endowments.

The foundation of your claims in behalf of the church of England, as an Ecclesiastical Establishment, is built upon the number of her members and the tendency of the population to her communion. The present Bishop of Quebec in his late circular, advances the same reasons.—The late Bishop of Quebec and his clergy, in their Report for 1823, (as given in the appendix (No. I.) to your obser-

vations on the clergy reserves) produce the same argument as the principal ground of their claims to exclusive patronage and support. (1) And it is the sentiments of almost all advocates of a religious Establishment, that it must include at least a *majority* of the population—all of whose sentiments may be summed up in the following words of that great Philosopher and Divine, Dr. Paley: "A doubt sometimes presents itself, whether the religion which the chief Magistrate ought to establish be that which he *himself* professes, or that which he observes to prevail amongst the *majority of the people*. In my opinion the *advantage lies on the side of the people*; and this opinion, if it be assented to, makes it the duty of the Magistrate, in the choice of the religion which he establishes, to consult the *faith of the nation* rather than *his own*." (Works Vol. III. p. 462.) According to these principles—inconsistent with which it is diabolical to establish a religion—how can the church of England be the established church of these Provinces?—From the unanimous testimony of nearly 50 uncontradicted witnesses before the committee of the House of Assembly, it appears that 2 or 3, or 4 denominations of christians in Canada, are *severally* more numerous than the church of England. By a report of the "Society for the propagating of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," (for the year 1821.) we are informed that the *greatest number of church of England communicants at any one time during that year, was 367*. Allowing that the communicants of your church have doubled since 1821—which is a greater increase than we grant to either denominations—they now amount to 734. We learn from an authenticated, though very imperfect report given into the select committee, that of the Baptist church in this Province, there are 1435 communicants—of the Presbyterians not in communion with the Kirk of Scotland, there are 848—of the Menonists and Dunkers, 1165—of the Methodists 9009—of the Kirk of Scotland, there is no return; but from Mr. Morris' evidence, who doubtless has had an opportunity of knowing, and whose well known candour would not suffer him to deviate from what he conceived to be truth, it seems her communicants are quite numerous. The Quakers likewise have given no re-

turns; but when it is considered that there are large settlements of these peaceable and upright people on Yongestreet—in Whitby—in the Newcastle, Midland, Niagara, and in different parts of the London District, besides other places with which I am not acquainted, it is certain that they must form a very considerable and important portion of the population. The Roman Catholics are probably equal in number to any other denomination in the Province. Several other sects less numerous I have not mentioned.—When compared with the communicants of all these denominations collectively or separately, what proportion do the 734 communicants of the church of England bear to them? What principles of justice—what principles of sound policy—what principles of the advocates of Establishments—nay, what pretensions of your own can justify the constituting of the church of England the established church of Canada? No, Sir from this consideration alone it would be unjust, impolitic and antichristian, to establish the church of England with peculiar privileges and endowments. In the 31st page of your observations on the Reserves, you object to the Establishment of the Kirk of Scotland, and say, "To put *other landlords* (besides the clergy of the church of England) *over the people, to exalt another body over their heads, will make the most moderate think themselves justified in expressing their dissatisfaction, and they will express it strongly*." If to give the clergy of the Kirk a share of the Reserves, "will make the *most moderate* of the people express their dissatisfaction *strongly*," will not the putting of the clergy of the church less numerous, to be the "*landlords*," of the people, exalting them (the clergy of the C. of E.) "*over their heads*," give much greater dissatisfaction, cause the "*most moderate*," to express it *much more strongly*—"be much more unjust, oppressive and cruel? The people have imbibed other views of the meek servants of Him who had not where to lay his head, than to make them their "*landlords*" or to "*exalt them over their heads*, and in this, as Dr. Dunlop said in his evidence before the committee, "*a very large body of the church of England concur*." Therefore according to your own principles the church of England ought not to be established in Canada.

But there is another and a still stronger objection to your projected establishment, namely, *the small progress which the church of England has made under comparatively favourable circumstances*. The prosperity of your church, it will be recollected, was a principal reason advanced by yourself, by the late Bishop of Quebec and his clergy, in their report quoted above, (in a note) and by the present Bishop in his late circular, for the continuance and increase of the benevolence and favours of the Imperial Government; but this very circumstance I shall adduce as an important argument against it.

That the church of England has had many disadvantages in Canada, I am ready to admit, and has not every other church had equal disadvantages. But that she (the C. of E.) has had many *peculiar* privileges and advantages, cannot be denied by the candid and impartial. You state indeed, that "the church of England has no *peculiar* privileges in Upper Canada, except the prospect of future support from the Reserves—that all denominations are *equally* free, and *none* has any political *power* or *advantage* over the other" (obs. on the Reserves p. 28) But how could you say so, sir, when you have been marrying persons belonging to other denominations—when you have been refusing, year after year, to sanction a Bill, passed as often by a large majority of the House of Assembly, to allow the clergy of other denominations to *marry*—a privilege of considerable advantage in itself, and important in its influence—a privilege—astonishing to say—you told the British Government *our House of Assembly never would grant!* (obs. on the Reserves p. 22) How could you say "the church of England has no *peculiar* privileges," when you have been throwing under the table a Bill passed session after session by the *House of Assembly* authorising different denominations to hold lands on which they might build their parsonages, erect their Churches, & in which they could bury their dead?

How could you say the "church of England has no *peculiar* advantage over any other denomination," when the principal officers of the Government who have been appointed in this Province are members of the church of England—when all the influence

of the Executive Government has been exerted in her behalf—when the public schools have been principally under her controul—when in addition to the salaries of all clergymen of your church ordained since 1821—besides the Lord Bishop's immense income (which Lord King, in the House of Lords said was £2000 *sterling per annum*)—exclusive of the vast sums which have been granted to aid in building churches in various parts of Canada—when, independent of all these expenditures, and several others which I have not mentioned, £89413 sterling have been appropriated to support the church of England *Clergy* in Canada? After all the above deductions £48673 *sterling* have been expended in supporting *your clergy* in this *Province* above. This estimate is taken from the Report of the Society for the propagation of Christian Knowledge in Foreign Parts, for 1821, p. 165, and of course the Report itself is a sufficient voucher for its correctness. With all those *peculiar* privileges and these *peculiar* advantages over other denominations has the progress of the church of England been as rapid as her means and opportunities of extending have been favourable and great? Certainly not. Her *clergy* have indeed increased considerably, especially of late years; but as the Scots clergy well observe, "the progress of a church is not to be estimated by the *multiplication of Clergymen* (whose number may be indefinitely extended so long as assistance continues to be afforded from the funds of a (foreign) society and the liberality of the Government) and places of worship, where the *great* body of the people is of a *different* communion" (Pastoral Letter p. 15.) What has been the increase of the *laity* of your church? In the Report above alluded to, it is stated, that the *greater* number of *communicants* at *any one* time in 1821, was 367 in Upper Canada and in Lower Canada, 210. Supposing them to have doubled since then, what would they amount to? Why, sir, I have omitted to mention denominations that could number nearly, if not quite as many as such an estimate would come to. The Methodists alone have increased nearly as much as that the present year. Should it be said, that there are many more members of the church of England than *commune*, I answer the same re-

mark, is equally true of other denominations. Is this the astonishingly rapid increase of which you speak so much to the British Government, and of which the late Bishop and his clergy were so triumphantly exulting in their Report quoted in a note at the beginning of this letter? Is this an increase proportionable to the superior advantages which the church of England possesses? Is this an increase sufficient to justify the expenditure of the enormous sums of money annually granted for the support of her clergy? Is it sufficient to justify her claims to one seventh of the lands of this Province? Is it sufficient to make her the Established church of Canada? Reason, sound policy, common sense, and the whole world *disinterested* world will say—NO.—Therefore the church of England ought not to be established in Canada with peculiar privileges and endowments.

But does the *moral* and *religious influence* which the church of England exerts upon the inhabitants of these Provinces authorise any pretensions to exclusive patronage?—Are her members *less* disposed to pride to extravagance, to ambition, to intemperance, to covetousness, to profaneness, to gambling, &c. and are they more exemplary, upright and pious than any other class of the community? Are the parishes (if I may call them so) of church of England clergymen, more Godly in their deportment, than other neighbourhoods where no such clergymen are settled? Or do they become more holy by the ministrations of your clergymen? Are such parishes more loyal than any other parts of the Province? To bring my enquiries to a point I would ask, are the inhabitants (at least that portion of them who attend the ministrations of your church) of *York*, the Great Pandemonium of church of Englandism in this Province, *more* meek, evangelical, and Godlike, than the people in various parts of this Province in which a church of England clergyman never put his foot?—Without fear of contradiction I am bold to say, they are not. In making these observations, I mean no reflection whatever upon the morals of the members of your church.—Of them the public must, and is the best judge. Nor do I intend any unjust insinuation against the lyes or labours of your

clergymen. My object is to show, that doing them utmost justice, the clergymen of the church of England, have comparatively done very little towards improving the morals of the Canadian population; and, therefore, it is unfair on the one hand, and impolitic and improvident on the other, to appropriate about £10,000 sterling annually (which is the present expenditure of your church at the least calculation. in *this Province* alone) to the clergymen of your church, while the clergymen of other denominations, who instruct the great body of the people, receive not one farthing from the Government.

Now, sir, will the experiment already tried of supporting clergymen of your church, justify a continuance of it, or the *establishing* of that church in Canada? You wish to multiply the number of your clergymen to 2000. To support these, according to your present economy, will require upwards of £400,000 sterling annually; and yet you say they never will cost this Province one farthing!!! The support of 46 Methodist Itinerant clergymen in this Province, amounts to less than £2000 per annum, and the whole expenditure of their Missionaries, Teachers and establishments among the Indian tribes, from their commencement to the present time, is between one and two thousand pounds.—Have the Methodists made no progress—have they been annihilated in Canada, (as you say the church of England would be, if the reserves were taken from her) and have they had no success in taming whole bodies of Indians and in christianising whole tribes? Yet the Methodists have not received one farthing from the government. The *merit* of a ministry must be estimated by the *effects* and *success* that attend it. This is the ground in which you have made your claims in behalf of the church of England. Judging then from this infallible criterion ought the clergymen of your church to be “exalted *over the heads* of the clergy of other denominations” (in your own adopted words) and become their “*landlords*?” God forbid! Policy says it will never do—Justice says it must not be—and religion, pure religion, weeps at the mention of it. Therefore, upon your own principles, your church ought not to be *established* in Canada.

These observations introduce another and a more weighty argument against such a measure, namely, the *general opinion and wishes of the people—vox populi*—on which, as Paley says, *civil government itself is founded.*

In your Sermon (p. 22) you call the *House of Commons*, in England, the *voice of the nation*. You say—"The feeble proposition of Mr. Wilberforce (viz. that it was the duty of the Legislature to promote the interest and happiness of India) was assented to with a chilling coldness, the *nation expressing* no feeling on the occasion." Upon your own principles then, as well as those of general consent, our House of Commons is the voice of this Province. And what does that say respecting the establishment of your church in this Colony? It says in a late address to the King—"Nothing could cause more alarm and grief in the minds of your Majesty's subjects in this Province, than the apprehension that there was a *design* on the part of your Majesty's government, to establish, as a part of the state, *one or more church or denomination of christians in this Province, with rights and endowments, not granted to your Majesty's subjects in general, of other denominations, who are equally conscientious and deserving, and equally loyal and attached to your Majesty's person and government.*" Shall the church of England be established contrary to the numerous petitions, the wishes of the people, to the *voice of the Province*? No, says the Scots clergy, "The most essential requisite to promote the prosperity of new settlements, is to make a provision for churches and schools suitable to the wants and wishes of at least the majority of the population. This we are persuaded, is the prime cause of the prosperity of the United States, and of any superiority which they may possess over these Provinces." (Pastoral letter p. 12.) The wishes of a majority of the population" are, that no "*one or more church*(as the above cited address, says) or denomination" ought to be established in this Province. And says the celebrated Doctor Paley, than whom a higher authority could not be produced on this subject, and who therefore cannot be referred to too frequently—"If the dissenters from the establishment become a majority of the people, the establish-

ment itself ought to be altered or qualified.—If there exist among the *different sects of the country* such a *parity of numbers* interest, and power, as to render the *preference of one sect to the rest*, and the *choice of that sect*, a matter of hazardous success, and of doubtful election, some plan similar to that which is meditated in North America, and which we have given in a preceding part (2.) of the present chapter, though encumbered with many difficulties, may perhaps suit better this divided state of public opinions than the construction of any *national church whatever.*" (Works Vol. III. p. 466.)—Hence according these principles it is utterly impossible for the church of England to be established in Canada.

Another and if possible, still more serious objection to your intended establishment is, the *political civil and religious liberties of the people*. On this point I can do no better than adopt the precise words of the Scots clergy, which in addition to their intrinsic merit and pith of argument, carry with them the authority of eleven learned and highly respectable clergymen: "How formidable in this respect (viz. to the cause of *political and civil*, as well as *religious liberty*) would be a numerous body of clergy, such as Doctor Strachan prospectively contemplates as likely to exist at no distant period of time, supported by funds altogether independent of the people—we might almost add of the government or state—and having not only the exclusive possession, but the exclusive management of the church lands and their Revenues—invested at the same time with the sole controul and direction of education, and by natural consequence, connecting exclusively with their own establishment, and rendering subservient to its aggrandisement, Universities, Colleges, Schools, &c. Add to all this the political influence which they could not fail to possess, and to exercise in the Legislative and Executive departments of the government; through their Episcopal head; and the no less formidable influence which would be united in their collective body, in virtue of the particular, personal, and local influence exercised by their numerous members, from the greatest to the least, distributed through every part of the country, and from the peculiar constitution of the

church of England, possessing every facility for combining, extending, and perpetuating that influence! Such an establishment would become *doubly* formidable in a country where there is no check or counterpoise to the clerical order, in the splendour of royalty, in the weight and dignity of a hereditary aristocracy, or in the spirit, virtue, and independence of a numerous and enlightened gentry. *Such an exclusive establishment, it must not be disguised, would be as perilous to the civil as to the religious liberties of this country.* (3.) Nor does Ecclesiastical history warrant the conclusion, however pleasing it might be, that clerical communities, or that a Protestant hierarchy, if scope and opportunity were given for that purpose, might not step in the footsteps of papal ambition.—The history of Scotland during the reign of the Stuarts, and the past and present state of Ireland, afford a melancholy proof that the same causes, in similar circumstances, will produce the same effects." (Pastoral letter p. 13, 14.) You say in your sermon (p. 16) that "in the British nation the light of freedom burns with the brightest radiance, and the rights and liberties of man are best understood and most abundantly enjoyed—that a lofty sense of independence is of universal growth,"—and that you wish to "infuse into the inhabitants of this Province the same feelings." Now, sir, as the establishment of the church of England in Canada, has a direct tendency, according to the above high authority and cogent argument of the Scots clergy, to extinguish the "light of liberty"—to endanger the "rights and liberties of men"—to check and destroy the "growth of a lofty sense of independence," it necessarily follows by undeniable inference, that *she ought not to be established.*

But probably the most weighty argument against the establishment of your church in Canada, and that which demands the most serious attention, is, the "ill effects it will have on the church itself,"—and this like all the foregoing shall be an *Argumentum ad hominem.*

It must be admitted upon all hands that your whole aim in all your extraordinary movements, is to advance the interests of the church of England, and cause it to spread over the whole Province—and will

the establishment of it do this? You say yes—I take the liberty to say no. This is the last and most important point at issue.

It is proper here to enquire, a moment, in what the real prosperity of a church consists? If it consists in wealth, secular power, & exterior grandeur, I admit that the establishment of your church will promote its prosperity. But, sir, you well know that a church, as well as an individual, may be increased in goods, be exalted by human power, and imposingly glitter in all the magnificence of external adornings, while she is, in the sight of Him who judgeth righteous judgment, nothing but *sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal—poor and miserable, and blind, and naked.* This was the case with the Jewish church in the times of some of the Asiatic churches in the first ages of the christian era—with the nominally christian church during the dark ages, and I may add at later periods of her history. On the other hand, a church, like the primitive churches, may have neither gold nor silver, and yet be rich in faith and an heir of the kingdom—may be persecuted by Kings and Emperors, and yet, like Mount Zion, never be moved—may be harassed and oppressed, and yet, like the Israelites in Egypt, abundantly multiply.

I apprehend that among the essential requisites to the prosperity of a church will be found, 1st, The holiness of its ministry; 2nd, The purity of its practical doctrines; and 3rdly, The spirituality and perhaps increase of its members.

You wish a legal provision for your clergy in order to give weight and dignity to their ministry. On this an able divine, who was a sincere christian and withal a member of the church of England, makes the following pointed remarks: "Much good may such a participation do them! They themselves know how much it amounts to—Pope says truly—

Worth makes the man, and want of it the fellow;

The rest is all but leather or prunnello."

If such a provision be any wise essential to the true dignity and usefulness of a ministry, the apostles and their successors were altogether destitute of dignity and success in

their ministry—seeing they—yes the greatest of them—*wrought with their own hands, and even their master was ministered unto by poor women.* And no sooner was the ministry enriched with a *legal* provision, than it was debased and its usefulness, lost. “Men began as bishop Newton says, to enter *fraudulently* into the church,” and they have continued the degrading horrid practice ever since. The effect of your fancied dignity was such, that Lord Burleigh, speaking of persons entering into the Episcopal department, said, that “the *places changed the men*”—made them lazy and covetous.

Your next object in enriching your church with one seventh of the Province and the great liberality of the British Government, is to hold out a sufficient prize to induce young men of virtue, talent and attainment to enter into the ministry. To this the excellent Cowper answers—“agreed. But the prize held out in the *Scriptures* is of a very different kind; and our Ecclesiastical baits are too often snapped by the worthless and persons of no attainments at all. They are indeed *incentives to avarice and ambition*, but not to those *acquirements* by which *only the ministerial function* can be adorned—*zeal for the salvation of souls, humility and self denial.*” (Letter to the Rev. William Urwin.)

It is plain therefore that the establishing of your church, will neither contribute to the sacred dignity, nor to the purity of the ministry, but will only tend to debase the one and corrupt the other. Therefore on account of the holiness of the ministry, your church ought not to be established.—And when the whole head is sick, will not the whole heart be faint? When the fountain is polluted, will not the stream be impure? When the priests are blinded with sloth, avarice and ambition, will not the “people be led into the ditch? This leads me to observe, in the second place, that to *establish the church of England in Canada, will corrupt the purity of her practical doctrines, and consequently, will be fatal to her prosperity.*

It has been shown from the authority of bishop Newton and Dr. Mosheim, that the establishment of religion under Constantine was the means of corrupting the *practice of the church*, and from the testimony of several references and Prelates of your church,

that it had the same tendency in England; it will now be seen by the following observations of Dr. Milner, that it had the same effect on her *practical doctrines*, and his testimony will have additional weight when it is considered that he devotes a chapter of his history to advocate establishments.—Speaking of the church under Constantine, Dr. Milner observes—“The *spirit of godliness was now low.* The *external appearance was splendid, external piety flourished, monastic societies in some places were also growing, but faith, love and heavenly mindedness appear very rare.* The *doctrine of real conversion was very much lost, or external baptism was placed in its stead, and the true doctrine of justification by faith, and the true practical use of a crucified Saviour for troubled consciences, were scarce to be seen.* There was *much outward religion*, but this could not make men *saints in heart and life.* *True humility and charity were little known in the christian world while superstition and self righteousness were making rapid progress, and the real gospel of Christ was hid from men who professed it.*” (Townsend Abrid. p. 164.) Similar causes under similar circumstances, will invariably produce the same effects; and the intelligent reader from past and present observation, even in this Province, can very easily apply the above observations of the learned historian. Therefore for the sake of her practical doctrines, the church of England ought not to be established in Canada.—And if her *ministry and practical doctrines* are debased and corrupted, where will be the *spirituality and increase of her true members?*

It is true, if your church were established in this country, her wealth and power might attract many to the ranks of both her ministry and laity, but these, as the Scots clergy quaintly remark, “will be actuated by a *bastard zeal, the offspring of self-love and secular interest*”—will in reality do her harm—will spiritually lift up their heel against her. By the architecture of your policy, the church of England may become a splendid building, but the voice of the *charakter* will not be heard in it—she may be gorgeously adorned, like whited sepulchre, but inwardly she will be a sink of corruption—her towers may be reared to the clouds, but “like an inverted pyramid it will become the more

unstable the higher it is raised." The spiritual light of your church and the purity of her members will be lost in the mists of secular policy and worldly aggrandisement, and she will be seen, like ancient Babylon, majestic in ruin—lifeless and dead. Her real prosperity requires that she should not be established. Facts prove it so. In your evidence before the committee, you say—"In the state of New-York where *no foreign aid is given for the support of the clergy*, there appears to be the same tendency towards the church," that is, the same tendency as you had formerly stated, was towards the church of England in this Province.—Your venerable friend Dr. Mountain, in his sermon on Ordination (p. 27.) observes that "among our neighbours in the United States the [Episcopal] church is most decidedly in a flourishing and increasing condition." Now, sir, if the tendency of the population in the N. Y. state, is towards the Episcopal church, and if in the United States, she is "most decidedly in a flourishing and increasing condition," without any "foreign aid"—& if she is, like a drooping plant, withering in Canada, [as has been seen in a preceding part of this letter] and that after having received more than a £100,000 sterling of "foreign aid," is it not sound policy for her to pray for its removal? Is it not an irresistible argument against the establishment of the church of England in Canada? Leave the church of England, like that in the United States, to look for the support of her clergy to the "free will offerings of the people"—let her success depend upon the Evangelical doctrines which her articles and Homilies contain—upon the beauty and excellence of her liturgy—[when like that in the U. States it is purged from extraneous matter and tedious repetition]—upon the symmetry in many respects of her Ecclesiastical constitution [especially when formed on the model of that in the United States:] and upon the labours of an enlightened and pious ministry—free her from the clogs of secular power and worldly policy—and though some of her present heartless flatterers—like the covetous Jews, who, thinking it would increase their wealth and power, ever sought to crown our Saviour—may gnash upon her with their teeth—though

some of her hirelings, who have been put into the priests' office for a piece of bread and morsel of meat, may to her great advantage, desert her—though some of her gaudy trappings may be succeeded by the majestic plainness of primitive simplicity—yet, from her "intrinsic excellence [as the justly celebrated Mr. Rolph said in his evidence before the select Committee] she will increase"—her tolling bells will make many a heart leap for joy—thousands of happy worshippers will be seen cheerfully travelling the "church yard path along"—her sanctuaries will be the house of God and the gate of heaven to her thronging assemblies—her ministers will speak as those having authority, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees—her borders will be greatly enlarged—thousands will see her prosperity and rejoice in it—other denominations will behold her example and imitate it—piety will flourish among all and happiness every where abound.—Then will foreign natives and domestic inhabitants exclaim—"Happy Canada! blessed art thou among the Provinces of the earth! In thee is God known, and on thee he pours his richest mercies. Thy pastures are clothed with flocks, thy valleys are covered with corn; they shout for joy, they also sing. Thy merchants are princes, thy prisons are become palaces. Thou receivest the word of life freely, thou sittest as queen among the nations. Thy political constitution is the glory of the world; and thy civil and religious rights are so confirmed and established, that thy people shall sit every man under his own vine and fig tree, and none shall make him afraid. Industry and activity are every where seen in thee, and contentment is depicted in every countenance. *Happy is that people that is in such a case: Yea happy is that people whose God is the Lord.*"

I have the honor to be,

Rev. Sir,

Your Humble Servt.

E. RYERSON.

Cobourg, 27th May, 1828.

(1.) The following are the statements of the late Bishop and his clergy in 1823, and from these extracts, which unfold the whole policy of the church of England in Canada, and which I will therefore give at considerable

rable length, the reader will be able to judge how far the British Government has been correctly informed respecting the religious state of Canada:—"When new Missions are established in any quarter, not only do those persons rapidly join, who are not yet particularly attached to any denomination, but even Presbyterians and Congregationalists attend public worship with their families, so that on many occasions the whole neighbourhood become united to the church, and not only are the dead buried according to its rites, but likewise the bodies of their friends and relatives are frequently collected from private places of interment, and again consigned to the grave in the public burial ground with the solemn offices of the church. Moreover their children are baptized, educated in the bosom of the church, and the greater number at length confirmed by the Bishop, and thus a congregation is formed in a few years strongly attached to our venerable Establishment. Even in those remote parts of the country, where the *Methodist Itinerants* are the most active, so soon as the population is sufficiently compact to admit and require the ministrations of a regular clergyman, he finds his congregations increasing by their more respectable adherents. There is every reason to believe that the greater proportion of the various denominations of Protestants may be expected to conform, so as at length to include the great mass of this population, a result which appears highly probable from the following facts: 1st. The *Lutheran* clergymen have generally conformed, and brought their congregations along with them. 2dly. Several Presbyterian or Congregational clergymen, have solicited the Lord Bishop to be admitted as candidates for Holy Orders. And the only Presbyterian clergyman in communion with the Kirk of Scotland, who died in this Province before 1818, educated two of his sons for the church of England, one of whom was in orders many years before the death of his father, and the other has just been admitted. 3dly. No objection is made by parents against teaching their children the church catechism, and the service of the church from the Book of Common Prayer; on the contrary all denominations are desirous of obtaining both for their own and their children's edification. 4thly.

The whole neighbourhood bring their children to the resident clergyman to be baptized, and submit in great numbers, both old and young, to the rite of confirmation, send their youth to the Sunday schools, and allow them after their tasks are heard, to walk in procession to the church. In fine there manifestly appears the fairest prospect that the church of England will be able to collect within its bosom the bulk of the inhabitants of the Province, should no prospect of supporting their clergy be held out to the various denominations." On the above statements, I have to observe, that I have been informed by a member of the late Rev. Mr. Bethune's congregation, that he (Mr. B) did all that he could to educate his eldest son to take charge of his own congregation after his decease, that this son did not enter into orders in the church of England until a short time before his father's death, that his youngest son now a very respectable minister at Cobourg—was but a small lad at the time of the decease of his amiable father. I would ask where do the "more respectable Methodists adherents," even in our most populous towns, villages or neighbourhoods, much less "in the more remote parts of the country," join the church of England? Was their ever a more flagrant untruth? I know of many (perhaps from 20 to 50) instances of members of the church of England joining the Methodists even in York and that within the last two years. If this is the case in York where three clergymen of the church of England reside, what must it be "in the more remote parts of the country"? Again could any statement be more incorrect than this—"that all denominations are desirous of obtaining the church (of E.) Catechism and Common Prayer Book, for their own and their children's edification and instruction"? And "that the whole neighbourhood bring their children to the resident clergyman (of the C. of E.) to be baptized, and submit in great numbers, both old and young to the rite of confirmation"? Was there ever a more unchristian, horrid request than this—"to hold out no prospect of supporting their teachers to the various denominations"? Did the apostles, or their followers, or any rational christian ever think of starving the heathens or their priests, in order to convert them to christianity? Yet the

Bishop and Clergy of Canada exhort the Imperial Government "to hold out *no prospect* of supporting their *clergy* to the various denominations," in order to convert the inhabitants of these Provinces to the church of England!! Would any friend to Canada wish to see, would he not do his endeavours to prevent the recognition of an *Establishment* that has been fabricated by deception and falsehood, and perpetrated by injustice and the most criminal calumny?

(2.) "The nature of the plan (says the Archdeacon in the place alluded to) is thus described:—A tax is levied upon the inhabitants for the general support of religion; the collector of the tax goes round with a register in his hand, in which are inserted, at the head of so many distinct columns, the names of the several religious sects are that professed in the country. The person who is called upon for the assessment, as soon as he has paid his quota, subscribes his name and the sum in which of the columns he pleases; and the amount of what is collected in each column is paid over to the minister of that denomination." Works Vol. III. p. 53.

(3.) It is somewhat surprising—and the worse so as they seem to look with an Eagle eye into every part of their subject—that the Scots clergy have not noticed, that if the establishment of *one* church be perilous to the civil and religious liberties of the country, the establishment of *two* churches must be more than *doubly* so.—This remark gains triple force from their luminous and masterly demonstration, that there may be *unity* where there is no *uniformity*. (p. 10.) If *two* churches were established in Canada, would there not be a "*unity*" of *interest*? Would not this "*unity*" of *interest* prompt to "*unity*" of *action*? And if the united and varied influence of *one* church would be formidable to our *countries liberties, civil and religious*, would not the united and varied influence of *two* churches be so in nearly a four fold degree? "In saying this (to use their own words respecting the clergy of the church of Eng.) I mean not to cast any, the least reproach on their clergy, who I believe are as disinterested a body of men as any other clergy in the world. We reason from the general principles of human nature—from the acknowledged laws of the moral world

—from the uniform experience of past ages—which all teach that though men *individually* may be capable of disinterested and generous conduct, *communities* have always been *invariably selfish and inordinately ambitious*." (p. 14.) I only add that the Ecclesiastical history of Great Britain before, and in the reign of Charles II. demonstrates the propriety and application of these observations, and induced Milton, that great friend to religious liberty (as Judge Blackstone calls him) "to exhort even Cromwell (to borrow the words of the *Edinburgh Review*) *to save free conscience from the paw of the Presbyterian wolf*."

To the Hon. and Rev. Doctor Strachan, &c.

No. 8.

THE UNIVERSITY.

Rev. Sir,

That education "forms the youthful mind and makes the man"—opens vast resources of pleasure to ourselves and to others—elevates the thoughts—enlarges the capacities—ennobles the powers—refines the feelings, and tends to purify the affections of the human mind;—That it is the safeguard of civil and religious liberty—that it extensively promotes the diversified interests of political, civil and religious society—that it is the brightest ornament of our nature, and is one connecting link betwixt man and celestial intelligences, is a glorious truth, founded on reason, upon the testimony of the wise and good in every age of the world, and happily illustrated by universal experience. And that *education* is much needed among the various orders of society in Canada, is a truth—though lamentable—equally plain. It therefore becomes a subject of the most serious and interesting enquiry, *what system of education* is best adapted to the state of our Canadian *population, and which will most amply supply our literary wants*?

This subject from its nature and importance is better suited to the scope of a volume, than that of a single letter. It therefore cannot be expected that I should examine it at large in so small a compass; nor is my intention to pursue it any further at present, than briefly to point out the impropriety of your measures and the radical defectiveness of your system in relation to it—

leaving the opposites of its objectionable parts to be selected as the prominent features of a judicious system of education in Canada, and hoping that some abler hand will suggest the necessary and proper improvements.

Here, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of congratulating the inhabitants of Canada upon the affectionate and parental feeling which is fondly cherished by the Imperial Government, in regard to our literary and religious, as well as our civil interests, according to the information it possesses. If any unpopular and offensive measures have been adopted by the British Government towards the people of this colony; or if any peculiar immunities and privileges have been granted to a small portion, to the exclusion of the great majority of the Canadian population, we are persuaded that the cause does not exist in any unfriendly disposition or even indifference on the part of the mother country, but the whole blame is to be attached to those agents who have been libellers under the character of Embassadors. No, England, like the ancient Patriarch, feels an anxious desire to bestow equal blessings on every class of her children—though she may, deceived by false swearing, sometimes bless Jacob, when she intends a blessing for Esau, or a *legal* and *just* portion for each. Misinformation, sir, I am confident is the sole cause of the present Charter of Kings College at York; and this gives rise to the first weighty and insurmountable objection to its continuance.

That your contemplated University has a sectarian tendency is undeniable. All its officers and professors are required to be of the church of England—it is entirely under the direction and control of that church—and you yourself, said, in your appeal to the friends of literature and religion in England, that it would be “essentially a Missionary College, for the education of *Missionaries of the church of England*,” and “as an argument to obtain from the members of that church (to borrow the words of the report adopted by our Provincial Parliament on the subject) contributions towards the funds of the College, *you* mentioned, that the effect of establishing this University, will be ultimately to make the greater portion of

the population of this Province, members of the church of England.” Observe, *the grand design of this University is, to educate Missionaries for the church of England, and to proselyte the inhabitants of this Province to that church.*

The enquiry now arises, how did you obtain a Royal Charter for a University of this character? Was it by telling his Majesty's ministers that there are three or four denominations more numerous than the church of England? that some of them are increasing more rapidly than the church of England? that the tendency of the population is as much towards them as it is towards the church of England? that their teachers are as peaceable and loyal as the clergy of the church of England? Ah no, sir, entirely the reverse; as is obvious from your several publications on the subject, quoted in the foregoing letters. The *disloyalty* of other denominations, especially of the Methodists (as Mr. Hume said in the British House of Commons)—the great numbers of the members of your church—her rapid increase—the tendency of the population to her communion—the general wishes of the people, were the reason which you assigned to the British Government, to grant the “most gracious boon” (as you call it) of your sectarian charter. Now sir, as your statements and reasons were incorrect and unfounded,—which I think has been fully proved in the preceding letters—in the evidence before the select Committee—and in the decision of our Provincial Parliament—the conclusions and measures resulting from them ought to be annulled. Seeing that the cause is removed should not the effects, upon every principle of nature, reason and justice, *cease*? It is granted by all advocates of christianity, that if the christian system—as excellent and sublime as it is in itself—could be proved to have been fabricated by imposture and falsehood, it ought to be renounced and abandoned. It has been proved that your system (your University) was fabricated by such means,—and that it is exceptionable in itself, (unlike christianity) therefore by a much stronger inference it ought to be renounced and abandoned. Can a tree corrupt at the root bring forth good fruit? ought it to remain in your garden, in the place of a

good one? How than can your University be productive of good to this country, and what can justify the continuance of the present Charter?

Again—it has been proved that the church of England is no more *the* established church of this country than any other church or denomination, and that even according to your own principles it ought not to be. Why then should the only endowed seminary of learning in the Province, be placed under the sole direction of that church? Why should the church of England have the control of a University, with an endowment of £1000 *per annum*, for 16 years, and 225,944 acres of land in this Province, to the exclusion of all other denominations, who, our Provincial Parliament says, “are equally conscientious and deserving and equally loyal,” & who are perhaps more than twenty times as numerous as the members of the church of England? What measure could be more impolitic—more disgusting to the generality of the population? What circumstance could excite more jealousy, and tend more to alienate the affections of the country from the British Government, if the measure is persisted in? Can the great portion of the Canadian inhabitants feel themselves kindly or justly dealt with, when they cast their eyes across the water, and see the light of science equally accessible to *all*—the means of education and literary distinction equally extended to diligence and merit of every creed, and then turn their eyes upon the land of their nativity and say—“tho’ we are British born subjects—tho’ we have never known or thought of any other civil creed than to be true to our Sovereign and country—tho’ our loyalty to our king and our diligence and faithfulness in obeying the laws of the country are unimpeachable—tho’ we are as useful citizens as any other class of the population;—yet the sun of literature—that highest of earthly blessings—is hid from us and our children! He shines upon a *few* others, but our *religious* profession prevents him from emitting one ray to our benighted minds—our *duty* to our *God* excludes us from the favour of our king—and unless we sacrifice the sacred principles of our holy religion, we must let our children grow up in the midnight shades of ig-

norance, or send them to a neighbouring Republic, in order to obtain blessings which are withheld from us and our posterity in our native land, which our forefathers have bled and died to secure to Great Britain!” Are not the subjects of a Government its support and dependance? And are not subjects equally faithful and loyal, equally deserving? And is it not a breach of faith in the government (if I may speak so) to grant to a *small portion* of its subjects, privileges and endowments, which give them a decided advantage, both in a civil and religious point of view, over the great body of their fellow subjects? If the subject owes a duty to the government, the government, as a minister of God for good, owes a duty to the subject likewise—and we believe the British government feels a peculiar pleasure in discharging this duty, and therefore we are assured “that his Majesty (to use the words of E. W. Armstrong and 51 others in their petition to the House of Assembly) was imposed upon by misrepresentations, and that if he had been truly informed of the condition of the Province, and the religious views and feelings of his people here, he would never have given his royal sanction to such a charter.” Therefore sir, as it was obtained by means of misrepresentation & incorrect statements, and as it is unjust and injurious to the interests of the country to give a minor church, which only numbers about 734 communicants, while several other churches number as many thousand, an exclusive control of education, the present charter of our York University ought to be cancelled.

To continue the present Charter would defeat the designs of his Majesty in granting it.

The reasons assigned in the Royal Charter for the granting of it, are *the promotion of the “welfare of the Province, and the application of many of his Majesty’s subjects.* This was the impression under which his Majesty sanctioned the Charter, and that was the object he had in view in granting it. Now what is the “application of the many of his Majesty’s subjects” in this Province, on this point? From the “application” of more than 7000 petitions to the Imperial Parliament—and the “application” of our House of Assembly, which has been seen, in the foregoing letter, according to your own

principles, to be the *voice of this Province*, it appears that the present Charter is directly opposed to the application of the many of his Majesty's subjects." If therefore his Majesty gave his royal sanction to your Charter under this impression—as is undeniable—he must have been misinformed, and as his Majesty can do no wrong, the minister who gave him this mal-advice and false information, ought to be punished, and the act of his Majesty recinded.

It was the design of his Majesty to give his royal sanction to the Charter of a University, that would "conduce to the welfare of the Province." But from the voice of the above mentioned petitioners—the address of our Provincial Parliament—and the unanimous opinion of eleven learned clergymen of the church of Scotland, it is obvious, that "a University upon such a partial and exclusive system (to borrow the language of E. W. Armstrong and 51 others) will be from year to year and perpetual source of religious, if not political animosity; as it will give to one church a permanent separate interest, adverse to the other more numerous churches; and all these churches, irritated by a two fold monopoly and domination, will upon the known principles of human nature, be induced to make common cause in their own defence, in opposition to the dominant church. The conflict will be a lasting one, and its effects cannot fail of being prejudicial to true religion, and to the peace and prosperity of the Province, so long as the irritating cause shall continue, that is, during the continuance of the envied monopoly."

Hence, his Majesty's grant, which was intended to "conduce to the welfare of the Province," being nothing but an apple of discord, a source of unjust monopoly on one hand, and of barbarous exclusion on the other, ought to be extended or withdrawn altogether.

But these observations are only introductory to the principal argument—which will in some respects include the preceding—against the establishment of *your University*—namely, *its unsuitableness to the state of the Canadian population.*

As an example and argument for your University, according to the principles of

the present Charter, you refer to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and to the Parochial schools of Scotland, and say, that to these, in connection with the establishment England and Scotland owe their vast superiority over other nations. But from a very short examination of those famous institutions, it will plainly appear that your statements are partly incorrect—that one of your arguments is totally inapplicable to Canada—and that the other is most completely against yourself.

The University of Oxford, which has existed (as Cowper says) "time out of mind," and that of Cambridge, also venerable for its antiquity, have indeed thrown a literary splendour around Great Britain, which very justly gives her the preeminence over most of the European nations, and have produced many of the brightest lights that ever graced any age or nation; but when it is recollected that these patronised seats of the muses, annually engross legal endowments so great and sums of money so vast, that they almost exceed the belief of the most credulous—that dissenting schools, without any legal endowment or support whatever, have produced many of the most eminent divines, orators, poets and scholars of whom England can boast—that the most illustrious Preachers of the present day—the most eminent Chemist, and the most distinguished Oriental linguist and philosopher, are dissenters, and have been educated at dissenting seminaries, we shall be far from giving to Oxford and Cambridge the sole meed of praise, or of supposing that they have even equalled, in usefulness, the dissenting schools in proportion to their resources and power.

You have taken those institutions as the prototype of your intended University, at York, and (intending to handle this subject in like manner with the former as far as possible, *historically*) a brief sketch, in some particulars, of the Oxford and Cambridge Universities, will therefore, serve to set forth in the strongest light the utter unsuitableness of Kings College to the present state of Canada. "The University of Oxford and Cambridge (says a good writer) have always been regarded as the depositories of *Ecclesiastical* influence, and the great bulwarks of the establishment. Every

interference with them on the part of the *laity*, has been viewed with the most jealous eyes; and while no one but themselves (the clergy) and their trusty and quasi-clerical allies, have been suffered by the priesthood to touch the government of their affairs, no other establishments have been deemed tolerable as places of liberal education: and thus it has become almost part of the true English Creed, that the *church* should superintend education, and that education means three or four years residence, at one or the other of the two cities of Oxford or Cambridge." It scarcely need be observed, that you have advocated the same principle in the strongest terms, and how ardently you are panting to establish the same creed in respect to Kings College, while you anticipate the day when your clergy will "acquire the sole direction of education in Canada." Considering the statements you have made, the doctrines you have advocated, and the feelings you have manifested towards those who do not follow you, would it not be generally thought nearly paramount to establishing the Inquisition in Canada, to tolerate your ill founded University, altogether under the control of the church of England clergy, with you at its head.

But Oxford and Cambridge Universities are not only under the exclusive direction of the clergy, they are also expressly designed for the *members of the church of England and for no other*. The Edinburgh Reviewers, whose knowledge or authority, I presume you will hardly venture to call in question, speak decidedly on this point.—"Founded by priest craft, (say they) closely linked with its professors in the earliest times, and always in the hands of the ruling powers of the church, the Universities (of Oxford and Cambridge) have in every age been most exclusively appropriated to the education and uses of the *establishment and its members*. The most rigorous compliance with its doctrines, has always been exacted; the strictest exclusion of *all Dissenters* from it has uniformly been practised. As long as *Poperly* was the *religion of the state*, the *Universities* were rigidly *Catholic*; and indeed their *endowments*, in by far the greater part, proceeded from the bounty and piety of

Romanists, and were given for the propagation of the *Romish faith* and the inculcation of the *Romish discipline*. When the *state* threw off its allegiance to the Pope, and became *Protestant*, the *Universities* followed, and *piously* directed all the donations and bequests of their *Catholic* founders to the *destruction of the Catholic religion*—embracing the reformed faith, with the intolerance of their old profession, and transferring to *dissenters* the hatred which they had *formerly* borne to the doctrine and discipline of *Protestants*. But this hatred was very *cordial*, if not very consistent; and *no participation* in their endowments could ever be hoped for by *any one* who was not prepared to avow an *implicit belief* in the *dogmas of the church*, and testify it by an outward observance of her ritual every day, as well as by occasional declarations and signatures of a more solemn kind. Hence where a man was even rich enough to pay the expenses of an University education, (which are £150 per annum at the very least calculation) and careless enough of his children to send them unprotected among other young men as entirely left to themselves, still he could have no access to Oxford or to Cambridge, unless he happened to be a *member of the established church*, or cared so little about religion as to embrace any form of faith and worship for a secular purpose—the *UNIVERSITIES* making *no difference* between persons of their *own religion*, and persons of *no religion at all*, but only excluding *conscientious believers*, whose faith varied, by a slight shade, from their own" (for Aug. 1825, p. 356, 357.) Not only are those great Halls of literature confined to the members of the church of England, but we learn from the same high authority, that "Oxford and Cambridge teach no more than from two to four thousand young men, out of at least two hundred times that number, of an age fit for instruction"—that "no man could think of an University education for his son, who had not a fortune sufficient to give him an immediate income,—that letters and science were confined to the Universities; the Universities were open only to the most wealthy; therefore all the middle classes must let their sons grow up, with such learning as they

could pick up at a grammar school—that the number of proficient in classical and mathematical attainments is extremely small compared with that of the whole students.” (Ib. p. 347, 249, 351.) Such, sir, are the examples of your famous liberal University, intended to benefit all classes of the Canadian inhabitants! Can any thing more preposterous be conceived than the introduction of such a system? Would it not be an intolerable burden, a curse that should be deprecated by every friend to literature and religion? Even in England, where the great body of the people are members of the establishment, respecting those famous English Universities, Lord Bacon (whom you hold up as an illustrious example and scholar, in your address to students, published in 1827) long ago observed—“In the customs and institutions of schools, Universities, Colleges, and the like conventions, destined for the seats of learned men and the promotion of knowledge, all things are found opposite to the advancement of the sciences: For the readings and exercises are here so managed, that it can not easily come into one’s mind to think of things out of the common road. For the studies of men in such places are confined, and pinned down to the writings of certain authors; from which if a man happens to differ, he is presently reprehended as a *disturber* and *innovater*.” So bound up in bigotry where the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and so opposed to evangelical piety, that *Locke*, that great light of his day and benefactor of the literary and christian world, was expelled from their priest-governed halls; and the memorable John Wesley, (who, the Rev. Mr. Adam, a clergyman of the church of England, in his *Religious World displayed*, Vol. III. p. 128, 9, says, “shone as a star of the first magnitude—was an extraordinary and highly distinguished character—was a singularly great and worthy man,”) together with several others, equally eminent for their holy department, shared the same fate, for “singing hymns, reading and expounding the scriptures in private houses.” (see Col. III. 16. II. Tim. IV. 2 Acts XX. 20.) What assurance have we that the same example will not be followed, in Kings College at York, if suffered to remain under the sole control of a

body of clergy, who have already prayed his Majesty’s government to starve all *dissenting* ministers out of the Province? You say, indeed, that “young men of every christian denomination are freely admitted to all the advantages of education, and although such as are of the established church, are placèd under the more immediate care of the institution in regard to religion, it is *presumed* that others will be consigned to their respective teachers.” That “young men of every christian denomination will be freely admitted to all the advantages of education,” I have no doubt, but upon what condition? Upon condition, doubtless, of their conforming to the rites and ceremonies of the church of England. For can it be supposed, for a moment, that a College council, all members of the church of England, with you at its head, will make laws that will meet the conscientious scruples of other denominations, whom you have sought, by every means in your power to exterminate, and whose members, you pray in the service for consecrating a church, the Lord God would lessen? Chimerical in the extreme is such a supposition! You “*presume*” that a liberal arrangement *can* be made to meet the wishes of all; but from the very cautious manner in which you express yourself, in addition to numerous other considerations, I think we are warranted to “*presume*” to the reverse. You wish to allay suspicion and all apprehension of danger until you can secure the success of your measures and bind all that differ from you in perpetual chains—like the famous Cardinal Wolsey, who said, “if he could only get one foot into the English Court, he would soon introduce his whole body.” But why should the country be exposed to unnecessary danger? You say—“In Edinburgh, Episcopalian youth go to the University for science and literature, but for religious instruction, they attend Dr. Walker, an eminent divine belonging to the Episcopal church.” Why may not Episcopalian, as well as the youth of other denominations be instructed after a similar arrangement in Canada? I imagine the “Episcopalian youth in Edinburgh,” receive as much theological and religious instruction, as they do in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge,

v
c
s
th
at
tu
th
th
B
yo
ev
roo
ass
dic
abs
tion
mer
con
that
Uni
vate
Hen
only
of m
of h
state
alarm
in re
farce
lian y
ample
futati
duced
Episc
fore th
ought
We
by ano
ample
make
schools
ing to
a few h
of these
ply the
the sub
“By
I. of En
quests th
make pr
This rec
tute of u
statute u

which are altogether under Episcopalian control and confined to Episcopalian: For says the Edinburgh Reviewers, "which of the lay youth, at Oxford or Cambridge, ever attends, or thinks of attending a single lecture on Divinity? The handful destined for the church, no doubt, go to such lectures on theological matters as are there delivered.—But what young man of fortune, or what youth intended for the army and the bar, ever entered the door of a divinity lecture-room in either University?—We venture to assert, without the least fear of being contradicted, by the fact or the reason, that there is absolutely no religion taught and no attention to its observances inculcated, by the mere existence of divinity lectures, and the compliance with certain outward forms; and that, whatever is learnt or imbibed at either University, is through the operation of private instruction." (for Aug. 1825, p. 360, 1.) Hence it appears, that your system has not only been brought into operation by means of misrepresentation in defeating the designs of his Majesty—unsuitable to the present state of Canada, and brought with the most alarming dangers, but that your pretensions in respect to religious instruction, are a mere farce; and your concession, that Episcopalian youth in a Scotch University, receive ample religious instruction, is a complete refutation of every argument that can be produced to support the establishment of an Episcopalian University in Canada. Therefore the charter of Kings college, at York, ought to be altered or annulled.

We are brought to the same conclusion by another argument and example—an example to which you refer and on which you make your boast namely, the *Parochial schools of Scotland*. It cannot be uninteresting to the intelligent reader, for me to give a few hints relative to the origin and outline of these justly celebrated schools, and to apply the principles of the Parochial system to the subject under examination.

"By an Act of James VI. of Scotland, and I. of England, 10th December, 1616, he requests the Bishops to solicit the heritors to make provision for a school in every parish. This recommendation was ratified by a statute of his son, Charles I. 1633. By a second statute under his reign, in 1646, the heritors

in every parish were bound to provide the School Master with a yearly salary not below £5 10 1/2, and above £11 2 3, which, with the quarterly fees of such as could pay, and other emoluments, was, in those times, considered adequate to support a teacher, although these salaries have been increased, yet the augmentations have not kept comparative pace with the diminished value of money.—Should the heritors be inattentive to the interests of the parish schools, any five of what is styled the committee of supply, who consist of the principal landholders, have it in their power, by the direction of the Presbytery, within whose bounds the school is, to enact every necessary assessment. The *Ministers and Heritors unite* in the electing of the School Master; but he is to be finally examined by the Presbytery, and to be sustained or rejected as they see cause to determine. This statute passed in 1693, under William and Mary. Indeed the Parliament of Scotland enacted, in 1646, that a school should be established in every parish, for the education of the poor. [Edinburgh Christian Instructor, Vol. XV. p. 219.]

No one can read the above without noticing the singular contrast between the Scotch parochial system, and that which you are striving to introduce in Canada. Observe, sir, the parochial system was introduced and established by an act of the Scotch Parliament—yours is directly contrary to the opinion of our Parliament. The great body of the Scotch population were members of the Established Kirk, and therefore the principles of the Parochial schools were conformable to the sentiments and wishes of very near the whole community. It is quite otherwise in Canada, in respect to Church of Englandism and your University. Again in the parochial system, the school teachers were chosen by the united voice of the *Ministers and Heritors*; but, in your system, "the clergy is to acquire the sole direction of education."—Very moderate salaries are allowed the teachers, in the parochial system; but, in yours, they are comparatively exorbitant. Even already, in York, the Teacher of the Central School—virtually under your control—receives, not £11 2s, 3d. as the laborious and useful Scotch teacher, but from £000 to £500 Sterling per annum, for not very carefully

L L
25th 300

overseeing, on the Lancasterian plan, perhaps not above 50 boys. But though it is left to the Presbytery to sustain or reject the teachers presented to them by the Visitors or committee of supply, and though nearly the whole of the Scotch population are Presbyterians, and though the Kirk is and has been for centuries, by law, the established Church, of Scotland; yet the parochial Schools are not, as you say, "placed under the *immediate superintendance of the clergy*," if the Edinburgh Reviewers, who, I dare say know as much about their own church and schools as an *Episcopal* clergyman does—may be credited; for say they—"The Presbyterian religion was established before the Act passed for putting the blessed system of parish schools in activity. Nor do the *Presbyterian clergy interfere, except most remotely, with the schools even now.*" (E. R. for Aug. 1825, p. 454.)—Such sir, is the system of education to which Scotland owes her high reputation for intellectual improvement, and such is the system of education we would advocate in Canada—a system established by Acts of our Provincial Legislature—a system on an economical plan—a system conformable to the wishes of the great mass of the population—a system promoted by the *united* efforts of the laity and clergy (of every denomination, no matter, the *principle* is the same)—a system, in immediately superintending the schools of which the different bodies of clergy will "not interfere, except most remotely"—a system which will afford a school to every neighbourhood or parish, and bring the blessings of education to every family throughout the Province—a system which is like to immortalize the United States (1)—a system the principles of which *you* recognize in referring to the Edinburgh University—a system, which, if adopted, will at no distant day, make Canada an ornament to the British Empire, and fill every habitation with joy and gladness. But, sir, in order to introduce this blessed system, the present Charter of your University must be cancelled, which has deception, misrepresentation and calumny for its foundation—apparent extravagance for its introduction—an aspiring and ambitious clergy for its sole governors and conductors, to the entire exclusion of all others of every description—which is opposed to the decisions of our Provincial Parliament, and to the general wish-

es of the people—which is unsuitable to their condition, at variance with their common interests, and dangerous to their political, civil, and religious liberties.

Rev. Sir, I have now done. The foregoing investigations have been as painful to me, as they can possibly be unpleasant to you.—"But though I love Cæsar, I love Rome more." Justice to myself, to the church of which I am a member, and to the Country that gave me birth, has imposed upon me the arduous and disagreeable task, which I have thus endeavoured, to the best of my feeble ability and unfavourable circumstances, faithfully to discharge. In doing this, I can confidently say, that I have not been, to my knowledge, influenced by any personal feeling, with any private animosity. The cause I consider a public one, and, as you very justly observe, "never ought to interfere with the charities of social life."

While as an *Ecclesiastical Establishment*, I oppose your church, as a Church, or "congregation of believers," (to use the words of your 19th article) I pray God to give it prosperity. While as a public man, pursuing your present measures, I feel myself in duty bound decidedly to differ from you; as a private individual, I entreat the smiles of Heaven upon yourself and family. With some of the clergymen and many exemplary and highly respectable members of your church, I have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance, and am happy to call them my friends; and it is my sincere prayer to Almighty God, that all our errors and inproprieties may be corrected and forgiven, and that it may be your and my portion, and that of all with whom we may be respectively blended in church fellowship, to be enabled to say at our approaching departure—"I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith, and henceforth there is a crown of life laid up for me, which the Lord the Righteous Judge shall give me in that day."

I have the honour to be,

Rev. Sir, Your Humble Servant,
EGERTON RYERSON.

Cobourg, 14th June, 1828.

(1) "Too much praise (says the Edinburgh Review, for July, 1824, p. 432), cannot be given to the Americans for their great attention to the subject of education. They quite put into the back ground, every thing which has been done in the Old World for the improvement of the lower orders, and confer deservedly upon themselves, the character of a wise, reflecting, and virtuous people."

ble to their
common in-
titical, civil,

e foregoing
ul to me, as
t to you.—
love Rome
e church of
he Country
upon me the
, which I
best of my
circumstance-
doing this, I
not been, to
ny personal
osity. The
and, as you
ght to inter-
life."

stablishment,
ch, or "con-
the words of
give it pros-
n, pursuing
yself in duty
you; as a pri-
miles of Hea-

With some
emplary and
your church,
acquaintance,
friends; and
mighty God,
ieties may be
at it may be
at of "all with
r blended in
bled to say at
I have fought
the faith, and
f life laid up
ghteous Judge

ble Servant,
RYERSON.

e Edinburgh Re-
be given to the
to the subject of
back ground, ex-
the Old World for
s, and confer de-
aracter of a wise,

