

**CLERGY RESERVE
DISCUSSION.**

SIMCOE:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE STANDARD.
MDCCLII.

PRICE, 2s. 6d.

REPORT

OF A

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

AT SIMCOE,

ON WEDNESDAY & THURSDAY,

July 16 and 17, 1851.

ON THE

Clergy Reserves and Rectories.

PUBLISHED AT SIMCOE, N. CO. C. W.

1851.

REPORT of a Public Discussion at Simcoe, on Wednesday and Thursday, July 16 and 17, 1851, upon the Clergy Reserve Question, the Rectories, Voluntaryism, and Church Establishments.

~~~~~  
TAKEN IN SHORT-HAND BY GEORGE SHEPPARD.  
~~~~~

FIRST DAY—Wednesday, July 16.

Shortly after 11, A.M., the following Clergymen, parties to the Discussion, took their places around the table in the Court-House, which was filled with spectators:—

Advocates of Endowments—Rev. WM. BETTRIDGE, Rector, Woodstock; Rev. BENJAMIN CRONYN, Rector, London; Rev. FRANCIS EVANS, Rector, Woodhouse; Rev. GEO. BELL, Presbyterian, Simcoe.

Advocates of Voluntaryism—Rev. J. GUNDRY, Baptist, Simcoe; Rev. A. DUNCAN, Baptist, Vittoria; Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM, Baptist, Woodstock; Rev. W. LANDON, Baptist, Woodstock; Rev. JAS. PYPER, Baptist, Toronto; Rev. J. GILMORE, Baptist, Peterborough; Rev. DR. BURNS, Free Church, Toronto; Rev. J. ROAF, Congregationalist, Toronto; Rev. W. RYERSON, Wesleyan Methodist, Simcoe; Rev. JAMES RICHARDSON, Episcopal Methodist, Toronto; Rev. W. ORMISTON, United Secession, Clarke.

On the motion of Rev. F. EVANS, seconded by Rev. J. GUNDRY, ISRAEL W. POWELL, Esq., of Port Dover, was called to the Chair, with Messrs. WILLIAM WALLACE and OLIVER MABEE as Referees.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his sense of the honour conferred upon him; and of the importance of the duties which were imposed upon him, coupled with a hope that he would be supported by his colleagues and by all present. He then read a Proclamation which had been issued by J. B. CROUSE and T. W. WALSH, Esqrs., Justices of the Peace, pursuant to a Requisition, calling the Meeting under the provisions of the Act of the Provincial Parliament, entitled “*An Act to provide for the calling and orderly holding of Public Meetings in this Province, and for the better preservation of the public peace thereat,*” and intimating that all persons attending the Meeting would be within the protection of the said Act. It had been arranged by mutual consent that there should be no ejaculations or other expressions of feeling on either side; and it was hoped that all excitement and unpleasantness would thus in a great measure be avoided.

The Rules that had been agreed upon were then read, the principal ones being those which fixed the time allotted to the respective Speakers. Twenty minutes were to be allotted to the leaders on either side, on introducing the various Propositions; a speaker on either side was then to occupy fifteen minutes; and the leaders were to have ten minutes each to reply: the whole time appropriated to each Proposition being an hour and a half.

After prayer by the Rev. B. CRONYN and the Rev. DR. BURNS,

Rev. F. EVANS said—Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen—In making the preliminary arrangements for this discussion, it was agreed that a few minutes should be devoted in the first place on our side, to explain our reasons for giving this challenge—if I may so call it; after which gentlemen on the opposite side are to

give theirs for accepting it. It is known that the proposal originated with me, and I should be somewhat embarrassed to-day if I did not feel that I might adopt the language of one of old and say For what have I now done is there not a cause? There does indeed appear to be abundant cause why we who hold the sentiments that we are known to entertain should manifest a readiness to defend them upon the principles of reason, justice, and the Word of God. My hope and confidence is that we are entering on the undertaking with a sincere prayer that God will defend the right. I was first led to wish that a fair discussion of this subject should take place in consequence of discovering that, notwithstanding all that had been said and written upon it, there still remained a very large amount of ignorance. Intelligent individuals have owned to me that notwithstanding all the speaking and printing of the last twenty years, they had never had the subject fairly brought before them. What they did hear or read was now a little on one side, and by-and-bye a little on the other side; the only effect produced being a conviction that there must be misstatement and false reasoning somewhere, though for the most part they were at a loss to tell where. Now, it appears to me, that the way to assist these plain, honest people, is to bring the facts and the arguments into closer proximity. Such a course will bring what can be advanced on both sides into more immediate juxta position; but, more than this, I shall be much mistaken indeed if we do not find that what has been boldly advanced in what may be called one-sided meetings, will be revised and corrected before it be produced in a meeting like this. The greatest orator that ever lived used to call a distinguished cotemporary and frequent antagonist, the pruning hook of his periods. If there be any gentleman who intends to play the part of Demosthenes to-day, he cannot do it without remembering that he has his Phocion on the other side of the platform. Such a reflection, coupled with the fact that speakers will be limited as to time, will have a tendency, I hope, to make gentlemen on both sides avoid redundancy and clap-trap. We shall endeavour to bring forward what is to the purpose, and avoid advancing that which a well-furnished antagonist would have no difficulty in pulling to pieces. The proceedings of this day are to be embodied in a report which is to go to the public with the stamp of authenticity put upon it by the signature of the Chairman, of the two gentlemen who have consented to act as Assessors, and of the gentlemen on both sides who take part in the discussion. I hope that this document will serve as a *Vade Mecum*—a guide to every honest mind throughout the Province—in all matters where duty calls for the exercise of an enlightened and conscientious judgment on the subject in question. It was in the hope that such a document would be produced, containing the pith and marrow of what could be said on both sides, that I proposed the discussion, which I did with the full concurrence of some valued brethren in the Ministry. At the same time, I have considered the objection, that may be raised to the proceeding as it regards us of the Church of England: it may be said, "What if you fail?" But to this there can be but one answer—we do not intend to fail. Again, it may be said, "This proceeding is unseemly in men of your calling." "The servant of the Lord should not strive." But the duty of answering this objection devolves on the gentlemen of the other side. Our intelligent and learned opponents have been for some time zealously labouring to procure the alienation of the Clergy Reserves. In proof of this, I need only refer to the *Examiner* newspaper of the 15th of May, 1850, *passim*, which lies on the table before me; and to other newspapers of more recent dates. The arguments that will be produced by the Reverend Gentlemen who take so prominent a part in these proceedings, to prove that there are cases where the servant of the Lord "may strive," will all of them apply with still greater force to our case; so that we may leave to them the task of furnishing our apology. We wish to retain a property which we feel convinced of right belongs to us, for the express purpose of promoting by its aid the spiritual welfare of the Province, and we feel that it is our duty to use all proper means to protect it. I will mention another objection. It has been said, "to what purpose is this discussion on a question which must, after all, be settled at the hustings?" Suppose that the tendency of this discussion should be to establish the justice of our cause, and suppose that with our arguments before them a majority in many constituencies vote contrary to justice, we shall only have another

illustration of the fact that in matters of this kind the language of the majority is, *Sic rolo sic jubeo—stet pro ratione voluntas*: "thus I choose that it shall be; thus I command that it may be: my good pleasure stands instead of argument." But I do not think it at all unreasonable to hope that there are many who wish to be guided in the discharge of their duty as freeholders by truth and justice. Three and twenty years' residence in the midst of a population essentially Canadian, and those years spent, too, in the most friendly intercourse with persons of all denominations—aye, in the not unfrequent discharge of the duties of my calling towards persons of all denominations, conducting family worship in their houses, praying with them in sickness, rejoicing with them in prosperity, condoling with them in affliction, setting Christ's Gospel before them in public, baptising their children, and burying their dead;—I say that three and twenty years thus spent have given me such a knowledge of Canadian character as leads me to believe that many would be influenced in the recording of their votes by what they saw was right and just, notwithstanding the bias of prejudice, education, or inclination. A few words more I have done. An intelligent Minister on the Voluntary side said to me the other day something in substance like this, "To what purpose is the discussion of the questions involved in the first three propositions (Theological ones), since the subject has been treated of by the very ablest men in Great Britain?" To this I answer that with the highest opinion of those who are to manage this part of the discussion on our side, I still expect that they will bring forth from the treasury of their well-stored minds, more things old than new. But while no reader of the public prints can be ignorant of the fact that it is the fashion to treat our theological views of State endowments as something untenable and exploded, it is of no small importance that by means of this discussion we should show that we stand on Scriptural ground, and that we stand upon ground that has been occupied by men of vast erudition and gigantic powers of mind—by McNeile in the present day, by Chalmers in recent days, and by hundreds besides of the excellent of the earth. The propositions which we on this side appear to sustain are as follows:—

- 1—That the endowment of the Church by the State is not repugnant to the Word of God, nor to the spirit of Christianity.
- 2—That the State being a divinely appointed instrument for the promotion of the glory of God and the welfare of mankind, is bound to acknowledge, protect, and support the Church, but that in the discharge of this duty the rights of conscience are to be held sacred.
- 2—That before we abandon the principle of endowing and supporting the Church, satisfactory evidence should be afforded of the righteous tendency of the Voluntary system, and of its sufficiency to supply the spiritual necessities of the nation.
- 4—That it is evident from the wording of the Statute Geo. III., cap. 31, that the Clergy of the Church of England were intended to be designated by the use of the term, a Protestant Clergy; and that the settlement made by 3 and 4 Vic., was a compromise by which the Church of England relinquished a part of her just right.
- 5—That neither the Imperial Parliament nor the Provincial Parliament can be accessory to the alienation of any part of the property secured to the Church of England by the 3rd and 4th Vic., without great and manifest injustice.
- 6—That irrespectively of the uses to which the Clergy Reserves were to be applied, the fact of their having been reserved has proved a great boon to the actual settlers in Canada.

Rev. JONATHAN GUNDRY—In rising on behalf of the Baptist Ministerial Conference it may not be amiss to notice the reasons which induced them to commence the discussion of the Clergy Reserve question. These were, their conviction that the union of the Church with the State is both unscriptural in its nature and injurious in its tendency—that the Church of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, and should depend for its pecuniary support upon the free will offerings of its members. They conceived also that the Clergy Reserves have the same evil tendency as State endowments of religion have in older lands—that they have already produced much evil instead of good to the community, and if left unopposed will involve the Province ultimately in all the evils that accompany National Churches wherever they exist. Anxious for the preservation of the Church of Christ from so baneful a connection as that with the State—anxious that the Christian Ministry may be preserved in the independent position which the character of their office requires them to sustain, and not to be

degraded to be the mere hirelings and servants of any State government—anxious that Christianity may appear, especially in this youthful Province, in her primitive simplicity and native vigour, diffusing her unalloyed blessings to the children of men, promoting their temporal peace and prosperity, securing their spiritual and eternal salvation—and thus accomplishing the ends of her advent, “peace on earth, good will to men, and glory to God in the highest.” Entertaining these views, without any reference to party politics or to the political aspect of the times, the Baptist Ministerial Conference conceived the present period a suitable and proper one for the agitation of the subject; a period when those who differed from them were making new and great efforts to preserve if not to increase their present emoluments, arising from the Clergy Reserve fund; a period when many who had immigrated into Canada during the past few years, are comparatively unacquainted with the origin, the history, or tendency of the Clergy Reserve grant; a period, too, when many who were formerly very zealous for the appropriation of these funds to secular purposes, appear to have lost at least a portion of their zeal, whether from regarding the triumph of their principles as hopeless, or from altered views of the subject, we cannot tell. Under these circumstances, the Baptist Ministerial Conference conceived that it would be criminal in them to remain any longer silent. They therefore appointed a series of public meetings, to be held in the churches of their own denomination, where they were accustomed to labour, for the discussion of the Clergy Reserve question, and to proceed in the exercise of their constitutional right and privilege of petitioning the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to some secular purpose that may tend to the general good of the Province—such as the secular education of the whole people, without reference to sects or creeds. Whilst conducting one of these meetings in the Baptist Church, Waterford, the Rev. Francis Evans requested to be allowed to take a part in the proceedings. He declared he rose to support the following resolution, which had been moved by the Rev. A. Duncan, and seconded by the Rev. A. Slaght: “That this meeting considers it to be a matter of great importance that the religion of Christ, the Son of God, should be supported now as it was in Apostolic times, and during 300 years of the Christian era, in a voluntary manner, and not in the way of exaction, coercion, and unjust taxation.” It is but justice to remark that though the Rev. Gentleman declared he rose to support the above resolution, the arguments, the illustrations, and the anecdotes with which his speech abounded had all of them an opposite tendency.

Rev. F. EVANS—This is a one-sided statement, the correctness of which I deny; I made no statements beyond a general view of the subject. This has no bearing, however, on the matter before us.

Rev. J. GUNDRY—I think you will find it has a bearing on the subject, I am now setting forth the circumstances and reasons which have led to this discussion.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Mr. Evans can have no objection to allow our friend to finish his statement, as he can afterwards interpose a caveat against receiving it with implicit confidence, if such a step be deemed necessary.

Rev. F. EVANS—I object to the statement.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—I move that Mr. Gundry be allowed to proceed.

Rev. J. GUNDRY—At another of the meetings of the above series, held in the Baptist Church, Simcoe, the Rev. F. Evans (having previously intimated to some members of the Conference his intention) made a proposition to have the whole question of the Clergy Reserves publicly discussed on equal terms. At this meeting there was much confusion,—the only one of the whole series that was accompanied with anything of an unpleasant character. The conduct of many who were opposed to the object for which the meeting was convened was anything but commendable or reputable, and we have no doubt has yielded no pleasure or satisfaction to their minds, upon mature reflection. Notwithstanding the confusion which prevailed in the meeting, it was agreed that a public discussion should take place. Since that time, the rules to be observed in debate, the propositions to be discussed, the choice of chairmen, and the time and place of discussion, have been most amicably and satisfactorily agreed

upon by both parties. The reasons which induced the Baptist Ministerial Conference to accept the challenge given by the Rev. F. Evans may be inferred from their attachment to the principles which they were engaged in promulgating when the challenge was given. They are perfectly willing to submit the principles they entertain in reference to the Voluntary principle and the Clergy Reserves, to the test of public scrutiny, conscious that if they would not bear investigation—and that, too, of the most critical and severe character, they could not be scriptural, nor worthy of further countenance. Again, they conceived that such a discussion as the one proposed would bring before the public a great amount of important information upon which they might rely, and that it would be the means of regulating and establishing the public mind, of preserving and extending the influence of civil and religious liberty in the Province. Again, they could not but hope that to a certain extent, however humble it might be, such a discussion would have a tendency to free the Church of Christ from some of her earth-born entanglements, which impair both her beauty and usefulness, and operate as hindrances to the fulfilment of our Lord's sublime prayer, that all His disciples might be visibly one, that the world might be brought to believe in Him. These are some of the reasons that have prevailed with them to accept the challenge of the Rev. F. Evans. And that this discussion might not be regarded as too sectarian in its character, they have invited the co-operation of several distinguished Clergymen of other denominations than their own. Consequently, the Baptist Ministerial Conference and their kind and talented friends, stand before you this day, prepared to defend the following propositions:—

- 1—That State endowments of Religion in any form are anti-Scriptural.
- 2—That governments are the result of human necessities, and not the agent or instrument designed of God for the direct or indirect control of religious faith and opinion, which are to be based on the Word of God only.
- 3—That the Voluntary principle in the Church, for its pecuniary support, has Christ's express sanction, and has proved adequate to all the necessities that have occurred for its maintenance and furtherance.
- 4—That the term "Protestant Clergy," used in the Imperial Statute of 1791, must have been used in contradistinction to Roman Catholic, and not intended to be restricted in its application to the Clergy of the English Church. That the term "Protestant Clergy," being intended to exclude Roman Catholics only, the settlement made by 3 and 4 Vic., was an act of injustice, and so far from being a compromise, was a fraud upon those who were not assenting parties to the arrangement.
- 5—That the 57 Rectories were established in violation of the public faith, contrary to the instructions of the Imperial Government, and at variance with the oft-expressed wishes of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Upper Canada.
- 6—That the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments have power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to any secular purpose that is adapted to promote the general welfare of the Province, such as the secular education of the whole people.
- 7—That the Clergy Reserves have proved a source of bitter contention to the various religious sects, diffused a blighting influence over the Churches which have participated in them, and impeded Missionary enterprise, and the general good of the Province.

CHAIRMAN—It is your turn now, Mr. Evans, if you desire to make any further explanation. Perhaps it may have been considered that it was my duty to interfere before; but I think that where difference of opinion arises, the most convenient way is to reserve explanation until the close of the speaker's observations.

Rev. F. EVANS—It may be the better way merely to enter a protest against the statement; and if anything happen afterward that ought not to be admitted, to move that it be expunged from the report. With reference to the excitement in the Baptist Chapel, I do solemnly declare that it was first produced by the marked personalities with which I was attacked; and with regard to my challenge, as it is called, I think it right to state that it was generally intended to apply to gentlemen of all denominations who chose to take part in it.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Allow me one or two minutes to say that although I appear here at the request of the Committee, as a member of the Free Presbyterian Synod of Canada, it is perfectly understood that there are points on which our Synod, as well as the members of it who may be present, may not see their way to the conclusions that are implied in the statements of either party. We agree in the great principle of the

appropriation of the Reserves in a different way than that which has been hitherto sanctioned.

Rev. F. EVANS—Really, this is most irregular.

CHAIRMAN—Order.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Allow me just to say that I do this to exculpate myself from the charge of having accepted the invitation on the grounds, out and out, of the friends with whom I am associated. I come to plead exclusively for the abolition of the Rectories.

CHAIRMAN—I am afraid that I cannot allow this to go any further. These matters must be explained and agreed upon between yourselves—that is, the parties who are to engage in the discussion. If these explanatory speeches were allowed here, a great deal of unnecessary discussion would take place, and the matter would never be brought to a close.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—The arrangement you suggest has taken place already. I have given all the explanation I desire to give. I was anxious to take my seat here on understood grounds, to save myself from being charged with inconsistency in anything I may afterwards say.

The Court-House being now crowded, and the heat excessive, a motion was made for an adjournment to a neighbouring grove, where a platform and a large range of seats had been prepared. This was objected to, however, and was finally overruled.

The CHAIRMAN having read the first proposition on the Voluntary side,

Rev. A. DUNCAN rose to commence. He said—I rise under a pressure of feeling which perhaps it would be burdensome for you to listen to, or for me to attempt to describe. I feel, as my brethren around me no doubt feel, that to us is this day committed a most important trust—namely, to defend the truth of God against the influences and traditions of men. And feeling the importance of the position that we occupy—our responsibility to the churches, and our higher responsibility to the Saviour, I am disposed to hope that every word that is uttered will be spoken with becoming reverence, and under the influence of a holy feeling. In the first place, I shall be permitted to assert the supremacy of the Word of God is absolute in this discussion. Whatever may be the authenticity and the authority of documents, and historical evidences, and acts of parliament, our great statute book here must be the statute book of Heaven; and wherever the authority of man has interfered—whether with the best intentions or in carrying out a subtle policy—with the statutes of the Lord Jesus Christ, we are bound to maintain the one, and to pray God that the other may be withdrawn. We have a positive rule on this point in Deuteronomy, 18 chap., v 18 and 19, where speaking of one that was to succeed Moses, the Lord says: “I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.” This shows the sanction and authority with which Heaven accompanies the revelation of its own truth; and wherever the Lord Jesus Christ utters anything like a declaration or a guidance, human wisdom in such circumstances will not be required or accepted. The supremacy, then, of Christ in His own church is, a truth on which all His servants delight to dwell, and when grace is given, they rejoice in yielding obedience to Him. We find in Matthew, ch. 17, v. 5, that “while He yet spake, behold a bright cloud overshadowed Him, and behold a voice out of the cloud which said, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him.” It is evident from this command of the Most High, that in all matters affecting the Church of Jesus Christ, we are to hear Him, and to hear Him alone. We are to know not the good intentions of pious kings—we are to know not what may be deemed a christian duty on the part of a nominally christian parliament. We are bound

to hear Christ. to the exclusion of the most pious monarch on earth, or the most religious parliament in the world. When the Holy One says, "Hear ye Him," surely the inference is, that all other authority in matters of religion is excluded. We find in 2nd Timothy, 3rd c. 16th v., that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." We have here the same authority, reiterating its claims, and this reiteration must exclude all interference with what springs from Heaven, whether relating to matters within, or external to, the Church. In Revelations, c. 22, v. 18, it is written, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." It is evident then, that state churches have not the authority nor sanction of the Word of God; and we are confined to God's Revelation, and are bound to yield obedience to it in all its universality—in all its claims, extensive or minute as the case may be. When we take this Word of God, then, and deliver it up to a Privy Council, or to a Parliament, or to a pious Sovereign, we are abandoning our trust, and setting aside the authority of God, and—it may be with the purest intentions—trusting to the wisdom of men. State churches imply the exaction of taxes for their erection, Whether in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, or any other British Colony, the existence of a state church presupposes that the community are bound to erect places of worship in connection therewith. But we learn from Exodus, c. 35, vs. 4 and 5, that "Moses spake unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, saying, this is the thing which the Lord commanded, saying, take ye from among you an offering unto the Lord; whosoever is of a willing heart let him bring it, an offering of the Lord; gold and silver and brass." The effects arising from this request on the part of God, for rearing His first house or tabernacle, in this world, are set forth in the same book, c. 36, beginning at part of 3rd verse: "And they brought yet unto him free offerings every morning. And all the wise men, that wrought all the work of the sanctuary, came every man from his work which they made; and they spake unto Moses, saying, the people bring much more than enough for the service of the work which the Lord commanded to make; and Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing." It is plain that these strong and explicit passages of the Word of God have ever been overlooked or set aside, in all the arrangements of state churches, whether in reference to rectories or to buildings of smaller pretensions. It is not for me to echo the general and mournful tirade, that the people have not the faith now which they had formerly. It will be found that when faith is small in the church, it is still less among the ministers. When there is a faithful ministry, there are always found to be a faithful people; and when selfishness and the corresponding passions in the human mind usurp the sway, and seek to transfer the burdens of God's house from the shoulders of believers to the states of the world, it is because the clergy themselves have become weak in the faith—because they have turned their eyes to the world, instead of the cross of the Saviour. We know that the church is supported in Canada from the Clergy Reserves, the exact bearings of which will be pointed out by succeeding speakers. It appears to me that those who lay claim to the historical verity of an apostolical succession, certainly ought to be clothed with apostolical authority and shine forth brightly as apostolic examples. We know that even tithes in the Old Testament Church depended not upon the sword, but upon the power of faith in the soul. In Proverbs, c. 3, it is said, "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase: so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." And in Malachi, 3 c., "Will a man rob God? yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for, ye have robbed me, even this whole nation. Bring ye all the tithes into the store house, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts

if I will not open you the windows of Heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall the vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of Hosts. And all nations shall call you blessed: for ye shall be a delightful land, saith the Lord of Hosts." This shows the principle of free-will offerings on which the servants of God depended, even under the Old Testament dispensation. And in Luke, c. 10, we learn that the apostolic instructions were: "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before His face, into every city and place whither He himself would come. Therefore, said He unto them, the harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few: pray ye therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest, Go your ways: behold I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes; and salute no man by the way." Let me then ask, who are the successors of the apostles? Are they those men who go forth in entire dependence upon the promise of the Most High, that all their earthly wants will be supplied, and remembering the command that they are to serve Him, and rely on Him, only? or are those to be regarded as the successors of the apostles who keep the gospel quietly in their own souls until the governments of this world make arrangements for their temporal support? Undoubtedly the statutes of Heaven are in contradiction to the statutes of this world; and truly Christ might say, looking over this assembly and the propositions before us, "When the Son of Man shall come, will he find faith on the earth?" How did the voluntary principle work in reference to those who were first sent forth to preach the gospel. We have an answer in Luke, c. 22, v. 35: "And He said unto them, when I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, nothing." This declaration is most important, proving as it does that—the voluntary principle is perfectly able to sustain itself wherever there are those who will receive the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ into their souls. What is the gospel of Christ? It is pardon for our sins, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit to purify our hearts, and to sanctify our souls. And think you that those that have received this gospel of love into their souls, and the well-spring of water into their hearts, springing up into eternal life—I ask, will those who have received this Divine principle nourish in their mind the selfish principle, which says, "I will knock at the door of a human government, and plead that Christ's ambassadors be fed, and clothed, and housed, out of the general taxes of the land?" Such an one will rather say, "The Lord has redeemed my soul, and washed it in the blood of the Lamb, and I will glorify Him by giving of my substance to sustain his servants in their work, independently of any human government." Such, it seems to me, is the result of the spirit of faith, working by love, in the mind. Such is the great vital principle of Scripture, which we are called upon this day to preach and proclaim, and to exemplify in our own persons. I hope that the day of Gospel light is dawning upon this portion of the world; that the time when professed followers of Christ trust for support to the arm of flesh, and can stand and see the sword unsheathed that His ambassadors may be fed and clothed, will pass away; that men will arise full of the Holy Ghost, with the Word of God in their hands, and the sacred principles of the gospel deeply seated in their hearts; and that these will feel it to be an honorable and a holy calling to go forth into the wilds of Canada to preach the gospel of pardon and peace to guilty sinners, and to stand strong in the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. A preacher of this class will say, "Brethren, it is not your goods I seek, but the salvation of your immortal souls." He will be an ambassador of Christ, perhaps clothed in rags—perhaps, dishonored by the world,—it may be, having an obscure dwelling—but nevertheless having his name written in the Lamb's Book of Life. The apostles worshipped in an upper chamber: they went forth hungering and thirsting after the Spirit of the Living God; like their Divine Master, they often had no where to lay their heads; they were taught to drink out of the cup of His humiliation and suffering. And it is

only this gospel, full of life and power, in the souls of the ambassadors of Christ that can overawe the wickedness of this world, and cheer, enlighten and elevate the lost sheep of the House of Israel. With the Bible in our hands, and this gospel in our hearts, we can say to the king upon the throne, "We are under the government of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and can say to those that hold the national purse, "We have no claim upon it, and were you disposed to offer to us a modicum of your revenue, we should abjure it, because Christ has promised that He will be with us to the end of the world."

Rev. G. BELL—I was very happy indeed to hear the opening remarks of my reverend friend who has just sat down, because of the great stress which he laid upon the supremacy of Scripture in this matter. Proceeding to the subject which is more immediately before us, I maintain the scripturalness of a state endowment of religion, on the great principle of the supremacy of Christ Jesus over the nations of the world, as well as over individuals. The Word of God expressly declares in the book of Proverbs, c. 8, v. 15, "By me, kings reign and princes decree justice;" and it does appear to me that the inference to be drawn from this is, that the people of a nation have a right to expect that they shall be ruled in accordance with the Word of God. They have a right to expect that those principles which the Bible lays down, shall be acted upon by their rulers, as well as that they shall act upon them in the obedience which they render to those rulers. Notice another of the declarations of Scripture on this point in the 2nd Psalm, v. 10: "Be wise now, therefore, O, ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth." This is a plain declaration that kings and rulers shall look to the Word of God for instruction as to their duties. Then, again, in Jeremiah, c. 10, our Lord is called by the title, "King of nations;" in the 89th Psalm, v. 27, it is said, "I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth," or as it is often translated, "Most High, above the kings of the earth;" and in Revelations he is called, "The Prince of the kings of the earth," and the "King of kings, and Lord of lords." All these passages shew most conclusively that the rulers of this world are under the law of Christ, as much as the individual christians of which the christian church consists. If an individual, then, has a moral responsibility owing to his position in this world, so have communities, so have the governments of nations as the organs of the communities over whom they rule. That this is an evident truth, in accordance with Scripture, we learn from the circumstance that moral characters are ascribed to nations and communities in Scripture. We read, for instance, of "a righteous nation," "an ungodly nation," and so on; showing that there is a national and official responsibility and moral character, and, as a necessary consequence to be deduced from this, the possibility of national and official sin against Christ as the King of nations. The great duty of rulers, then, I presume all will admit, is, the glory of God; but on this I do not now enter, as it will be discussed afterward. God has expressly declared, "The kingdoms and nations that shall not serve me shall perish." If we seek an illustration of this truth, we find it in the 5th prophecy of Daniel, vs. 22 and 23, where a message is sent to Belshazzar: "And thou his son, O, Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this; but hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of Heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou and thy lords, thy wives and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver and gold, of brass, iron, wood and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know: and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified." The manner in which the King of Heaven was not glorified by Belshazzar was by his taking the vessels that belonged to the temple of God—the church—and applying them to secular purposes; a lesson surely, and an example to modern rulers, who would take the property of the church and apply it to secular purposes—no matter what those secular purposes may be. Further, it is upon this principle alone, I conceive, that a missionary of the cross of Christ has a right to go to a hostile shore, to preach the gospel. Were he not to go upon

this principle—were he forbidden to enter a country, and threatened with punishment if he preached the gospel there,—I cannot see how he could do otherwise, consistently with his duty, than submit, unless he had this higher authority and felt on the authority of Scripture that nations are bound to receive the gospel, that they are bound as communities to submit themselves to the command of Christ, and therefore that he is sustained by a higher law than the law of nations. I look upon all the commands of God—the whole decalogue—as obligatory on kings and governments of all kinds; and if so, then the first and second commandments are obligatory upon them—thereby making it necessary that they should make a public profession of religion, and—as a necessary consequence flowing from this—that it is their duty to support the church of Christ. The question is not if it be the duty of a state to establish and support a false religion, but if it be the duty of a state to endow and support the true religion. It is not, if it be the duty of the church to seek alliance with governments that are immoral—with the world that lieth in wickedness; but if it be the duty of the church to seek alliance with, and endowments from, a christian government—one that recognizes in all things the ordinances of God. The question is, if it be the duty of a state to afford positive favor and support, or merely to give negative protection. It is not if the church can exist without state endowments, for this we all admit; but if it be the duty of the state—the non-performance of which is the commission of sin against Christ—to extend endowments and favor to the church. And lastly, it is not if the state have authority in the church, for that we do not admit; but if the state have authority to make arrangements with respect to the outward support and comfort of the church. Having laid down these principles, then, I say, the supremacy of Christ Jesus involves the duty of recognizing him as the appointed head over all things; and it becomes the duty of those who are under his authority to support and sustain in every possible way the gospel of Christ in the world. Surely, then, states have some means of serving the interests of the gospel. The Word of God expressly declares that the civil ruler is designed to be a minister of good, and a terror to the evil. Surely, the gospel is something that is good. Surely, offences against the gospel are something that is evil. Our opponents must show, then, that the gospel is not good, before they can show that governments have nothing to do with it; and on the other hand they must show that offences against the gospel are not evil, before they can shew that the state has nothing to do with them. Upon two reasons, then, I would ground my argument for the scripturalness of the civil establishment and civil endowment of the church: first on the example, and second, on the predictions, of Scripture. First, of the example. The Jewish Church existed in the Jewish nation. There was there a union of church and state, although the peculiar provinces of the church and state were separate and distinct. There were separate tribunals and separate rulers over the civil and over the ecclesiastical affairs of the church and nation. There was a legal countenance and endowment given to religion, showing necessarily that it cannot be wrong to give one or the other the legal countenance and endowment which were given and continued with the expressed approval of God. The ceremonial observances of the Jews have passed away, but the lessons which are to be derived from them, are still ours; and thus the apostle—although the christian ministry is essentially different from the Levitical priesthood—argues for the necessity of supporting the christian priesthood, from the nature of the support rendered to the Levitical priesthood. The judgments which descended upon Israel were different from the judgments that may come upon us, yet they are an example to us. That which is moral—which existed as moral amongst the Jews—is still to remain. It was in force before the Mosaic rites, and continues afterward. The moral principle is not dependent on the mere concomitant circumstances of the ceremonial law. It is the same in all the degrees of the church's development—under the Mosaic dispensation, and under the complete development of Christ. But, again, the Old Testament Church was not a mere ceremonial thing. The established church of Israel was not merely ceremonial; and the conduct

solemnly enjoined and pursued in building or repairing the House of God, and conduct which commends itself to the heart of every man, as worthy of all time and of every country. And when Jehosaphat sent forth teachers throughout the whole land to teach the Word of God, the result was that the blessing of God descended in a most emphatic manner upon the land. That was an example that was not ceremonial—an example for state systems of education at the present day, of which religion should form an essential part, and without which, a system of education would be a curse and not a blessing to a people. The system of religion as established amongst the Jews was intended to be a witness to the world; and if the civil establishment of religion were an error, that very establishment was fitted in the fullest manner to perpetuate that error in the minds of all the nations of the world. The state of Israel had, then, laws respecting religion—laws which came from God, and which were therefore true and right. But there are other examples besides the Jewish, about which there can be no question, in connection with ceremonial things. I would allude to the case of Cyrus, who issued a proclamation declaring that the temple of God in Jerusalem should be built; and further, to the example of Darius. In Ezra, c. 6, we find a proclamation for carrying out the former proclamation of Cyrus, and further appropriating the tribute of a certain portion of the empire for the purpose of carrying out this object of building the temple at Jerusalem. In Ezra, c. 7, we find another proclamation of Artaxerxes in which he, in the first place, appoints voluntary contributions to be made to carry out this object, which was to receive supplementary aid from the public treasury,—precisely in the way in which the Clergy Reserves are appropriated now in this country. In the second place, I rest my argument on the predictions which are given in the Word of God of the support and endowment of the Church of Christ by civil governments. Thus, in the 72nd Psalm, vs. 10 and 11: "The Kings of Tarshish and of the Isles shall bring presents: the Kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve him." And in Isaiah, c. 49, v. 23: "And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers." We frequently hear in the present day that the whole duty of civil governments—aye, of a christian government—is to leave the church alone. I ask, what parent, having a proper sense of parental responsibilities, would consent to leave the bringing up of his children to a nurse whose highest sense of duty was, that she should leave the children alone? In Ezekiel, c. 45, v. 17, we read: "And it shall be the Prince's part to give burnt offerings, and meat offerings and drink offerings, in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all solemnities of the House of Israel: he shall prepare the sin offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, to make reconciliation for the House of Israel." In Daniel, c. 7, v. 14, it is declared: "that all people, nations and languages should serve" Christ. I wish to notice the word people. It may be said that this term is applied only to people individually, but when it is followed by the word nations, it is evident that reference is made, not to the people individually, but to the people in their corporate capacity; so that while the people individually are to serve Christ, the nation, as a nation, under the christian church, are also to serve him. In Revelations, c. 11, v. 15, we read: "There were great voices in Heaven, saying, the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." This speaks not of the people of this world, but of the kingdoms; showing that the kingdoms, as such, are bound to become the kingdoms of Christ. In Revelations, c. 21, v. 27, it is said, that "the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor unto it," that is, unto the christian church. Besides these passages, frequent mention is made of nations, and of the services which they are to render to the church; but to these I cannot now more particularly refer. It must be acknowledged by all then, that there was once a pecuniary provision which could not be withheld from the church, without violating the law of God, and subjecting the people, so doing to civil coercion. If this be forbidden in the New Testament, show us the prohibition. Until the prohibition be shown, that

the same principle ought now to regulate human governments which regulated human governments then. A nation is bound to profess the religion of Christ, if it be true that there is such a thing as a moral responsibility connected with that nation or community. Does not every one admit that a necessary concomitant to the profession of the truth of the gospel is, that pecuniary support is a duty incumbent on the professor? If a nation then, profess the gospel of Christ, it is bound to contribute to the pecuniary support and diffusion of the gospel. The christian religion is fitted to do all for a nation, in all its interests, social, political and religious. In all its interests, religion does much—we may say, does everything—for a nation. Surely, it is not inconsistent with Scripture that a nation should do something to support and diffuse that which does all for it. If the kings of the earth are the nursing fathers of the church, and the queens of the earth its nursing mothers, I think that not mere toleration is implied, but authoritative protection of the true religion. The idea that all creeds are alike, and that all religions are alike, is an idea springing from heathen sources, and is one of modern invention. The equality of all belief, whether true or false, is not a principle which is to be found in the Word of God at all. It will be said that the recipients of the benefit are those who are to contribute to the support of the gospel. True, and it is because a nation as a nation receives benefits from christianity, that the nation is bound to contribute to its pecuniary support.

[Time expired.]

Rev. T. WINTERBOTHAM—We are discussing the important question, whether state endowments of the christian religion are scriptural or anti-scriptural. My young brother who has last spoken, supports the scriptural foundation of state churches. Let us examine the arguments upon which he has based this plea. The first is, the supremacy of Christ the Son of God, over all nations and kingdoms. Now I contend that the supremacy of Christ completely overturns all state religions, because he is the King of kings, and the Lord of lords; and the responsibility of kings to Him is just the same as that of the beggar. The kings of the earth who stand at the head of national churches, assume the prerogatives of the Son of God, and are called heads of the church. Therefore, if the supremacy of Christ is to be carried out to its full extent, state churches and state endowments can have no existence. Our young brother's second argument for state churches and state endowments, was drawn from the Jewish church—the Jewish establishment—under the Old Testament. But let me remind this audience that there is a perfect and an obvious difference between the nation of the Jews, and all nations that now exist beneath the sun. The nation of the Jews was the church, and the church was the nation. This cannot be asserted of any nation now. The nation of Israel was the church of God, and God was the lawgiver; but now, human kings and human parliaments are the lawgivers. The church of Israel had an endowment annexed to it, but it was by the authority of God. Now, national endowments are by the authority of men. The tithes and the endowments under the Old Testament, were given to the tribe of Levi, instead of the inheritance which they had given up. They received no inheritance, and therefore they had the tithes in lieu of it. Who amongst the bishops, and archdeacons, and rectors of the state-endowed church of the present day, has given up an inheritance, for the clergy reserves or for any other of the privileges that they enjoy? I observe, again, that the endowments of the Jewish church were not enforced by coercion. Our brother has asserted that they were, but no instance can be brought to sustain his assertion. The obligation to pay tithes and bring first fruits rested between God and the people alone. There was no magistrate to persecute,—no constable to haul away to prison those who did not pay,—no soldier to shoot down the widow that could not raise the necessary tithe, as at Rathcormac. No coercion of this nature existed in the ancient church of Israel; and beside this, we say that the whole structure of the Jewish church was completely different from the existing structures of the world, because no human wisdom or authority was then permitted to legislate at all. The only authority was that of God. He spake and gave the laws. But now, human

parliaments speak and give the laws. God commanded the rituals and the payment of the tithes. He alone exercised prerogative over all—kings, and judges, and priests and people; and I want to know if this is so now. Look at Canada. Does not our respected Governor General appoint the rectors? Does he not exercise in church affairs a direct authority? This was not the case in Old Testament times. God then commanded who should be priests, and he prescribed their duties; and therefore, our brother's argument from Jewish customs falls dead to the ground—particularly when we remember that all the Jewish customs were wiped away when the Son of God came to establish the gospel church. He put aside the former dispensation and established the present. The Jewish church and customs having accomplished their object, the New Testament church has been established. Where, then, is the authority of state endowments? Where are the commands to establish national churches? Absent entirely. We have no law to enact them—no rules to regulate them. Our young brother's argument for state churches and state endowments was drawn, in the third place, from the example of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes, and the building of the temple at Jerusalem after the Babylonish captivity. When I heard this argument, I thought that our young friend felt himself in a dilemma when he found it necessary to go into heathen countries for an example for christian practices, and christian order, and christian state churches: and I thought, moreover, that the example was a little wide of the mark. But the facts concerning Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes are all the same. It was the decree of Cyrus that the temple at Jerusalem should be built, and why? Because that wicked nation had robbed the Jews; they had stolen the utensils of the temple—they had desolated the country of Judea—and Divine Justice demanded that recompense should be made to the injured Israelites by the rebuilding of their temple; and this was the sum of their whole proceeding. Let, then, those who plead for national churches proceed upon the same principle. Let them go and pay back the spoils of the church—rates in England. Let them pay back the spoils of the annuity-tax in Edinburgh. Let them make recompense for the ruinous consequences of the tithe system in Ireland. Having done this, they will be able to say that they had imitated the example of Cyrus and Darius, and, further, that they have done a good work. My arguments to prove that state endowments of religion are absolutely anti-scriptural in every sense, are the following: Because state endowments are at variance with the equitable discharge of the duties of civil magistrates in nations. Every magistrate is to do justice to all, and the magistrate who takes from me and gives to Brother Evans is not a just magistrate at all. Experience shows that state endowments, followed out to all their legitimate consequences, interfere with the proper execution of justice and equity in all the dealings of men, in regard to life, liberty, and estate. All these proceedings, or interference, by the magistrate, are wicked; and therefore I say that state endowments teach magistrates to sin, because they take the goods of some people, to support the religion of other people. Thus, in Canada, the clergy reserves are given to support the churches of England and Scotland, while other religious bodies have no chance of being placed on an equality; and I say, therefore, that the magistrates are guilty of the sin of injustice, and that this guilt is traceable to the influence of state endowments.

The CHAIRMAN—I don't think that this is relevant. I hope that the speaker will confine himself to argument on the question before us.

Rev. T. WINTERBOTHAM—I contend that the scriptures do not sanction injustice by the magistrate in anything, and that endowments which teach magistrates to be wicked, are anti-scriptural. If you can pronounce that irrelevant, Mr. Chairman, you may. In the second place, I argue that state endowments of religion are not scriptural because they place civil rulers in a false position. State endowments have introduced a system into the British Empire which places rulers and parliaments in the place of God. I speak this with reverence. These powers pass acts of parliament setting forth what the church shall do—what the bishops shall do—what the rectors shall do. The Church of England must, then, obey the Parliament of England, although that body is composed of wicked men—a great number of them, I am sorry

to say, being infidels, and others libertines. To these wicked men, meeting in London, the Church of England is subject: she must obey all that they enact. She dare not disobey their enactments, now, I say, a system that leads to wickedness like this, can never be justified by the Word of God. In the third place, I maintain that state churches are repugnant to God's word because they lead to violence and persecution. Show me an endowed church in the last 1500 years, that has not been a persecuting church—from the Roman Catholic, which is the worst state endowed church, to the church of Scotland, which is the best, show me a single endowed church that has not been a persecuting church. So far as the Roman Catholics are concerned, all know that their church has been a persecuting one from the hour of its birth, and that it will be so until its death. [Time expired.]

Rev. B. CROXEN—It devolves upon me to meet, as far as time will permit, the arguments which have been advanced by the two gentlemen on the other side. One of those gentlemen pleaded from the scriptures of the old testament for the voluntary principle, as that which existed in the Jewish church. He quoted from Exodus, c. 35, where we read concerning the building of the tabernacle, to show that it was by the voluntary contributions of the people that that work was executed. But when we turn to the passage we find that this was by no means the case. The words are, "This is the thing which the Lord commanded." The command of God goes first. Is obedience to that command the purely voluntary principle of which these gentlemen now speak? It was God's command that we should keep the Sabbath. Are we therefore to suppose that it is a voluntary act in us to keep the Sabbath? In the same chapter (Exodus 35) we find a command given by Moses that the Sabbath should be kept as of God. The children of Israel were to keep the Sabbath, and those who did not keep it were stoned to death. That is not much like voluntarism, as explained to us by these gentlemen. In the same chapter, we have the command of God that the children of Israel should bring of their substance to rear the temple. Is that voluntarism? We read that they did bring as they were commanded; and when enough was brought, they got the command to stop, and they all stopped. They were voluntary in stopping as well as in bringing, but all was done under the command of God, who enforced it. If they had not obeyed it, would they have been entirely harmless in the sight of God? Most assuredly not. As the sabbath-breaker was stoned, so would have been those who did not bring of their substance to build the tabernacle of the Lord. Again, tithes were not a voluntary offering altogether; for if they were not brought in, pains and penalties were incurred, although one of the gentlemen has said that there was no pain or penalty. The soul that did nothing in tithes was "cut off" from Israel. How was this done? We find in Exodus c. 31, that if a man broke the sabbath he was taken and stoned by the people. This was his punishment because he had trespassed the command of God. That soul, then, was "cut off" from Israel. But all the arguments of the first gentleman tell against all endowments, of every shape and form. We are here to-day speaking of state endowments, and, assuredly, if he can prove that all endowments are wrong, state endowments must fall with the rest. What he said concerning ministers of the Gospel going forth, and not taking aid from the state, will tell equally against ministers of the Gospel being supported from any source—by any endowments whatever. But how do people act in the present day? How do these voluntaries, as they style themselves, act in this matter? When they send the Gospel to heathen lands, how are the individuals who proclaim that Gospel supported? By those to whom they minister? By the heathen, who have not yet received the Gospel at their hands? Why, I was reading but yesterday an account of Williams's Missionary labours in the Pacific, and know that this is not the case. Christians in England and elsewhere, by their contributions, raise means for endowing missions, and send forth missionaries, and supply everything necessary for their support, while they labour in the lands to which they are sent. Here, then, is the principle of endowment. And if individual christians in England may raise endowments for pious missionaries, why may not endowments be furnished in any other way by a Parliament or a Prince? Assuredly, if endowments may be employed for the glory of God, and as the instrument for making the Gospel of Christ known throughout the earth, that is all

that can be expected from them ; for endowments can do nothing to bring home the Gospel to the hearts of men : That is the work of God's Holy Spirit. He alone can order the unruly wills and affections of men, and convert the sinner to the Saviour. Endowments are externals—instruments—means of conversion, and of bringing the Holy Word of God within the reach and hearing of individuals ; and if we are to use endowments of individuals, assuredly we may use endowments of societies and states. The last gentleman spoke of a wicked parliament, sitting in London, and he said that we are bound to obey that parliament. I hope so is he. I, at any rate, feel bound to obey that parliament, or rather the law of the land, proceeding from them. But with regard to anything that parliament can do to interfere with the spiritualities of the church, we spurn their interference altogether. They cannot interfere with our spiritual functions. They cannot make a minister. They may take a minister already made, and may put him in a position where he can do the work of an evangelist—where he can proclaim Christ to men—but they cannot make one. That is the work of the church. We retain that in our own hands. No power on earth can force our church to admit an improper man. They can take a man thus made—thus having the seal and sanction of the church—thus independent of them—and can place him in a particular position ; and while he works there, in that particular calling, the state may support him, even as individuals at home may support a missionary in the Sandwich Islands. But, again, the gentleman who has just sat down has said that the system of endowments is wicked, because it makes the magistrate take from him something, and give that something to some one else. This kind of statement may do very well in popular assemblies, where, just at this moment, a thing is spoken to produce effect, and draw forth a cheer, but it will not do with reasoning men, when they go home and reflect. They'll see that it is a falsehood of the grossest kind. No such thing as this is done. Drawing arguments as he does from taxation at home, in Ireland, and throughout the continent, he falls altogether when he comes to apply them here, because they are wide of the mark. We speak not of taxation, of taking from him and giving to another ; but we speak of that which has been given, of that which has already been bestowed, which has been rightly and justly, and legally bestowed, for the maintenance of religion in this country ; a portion of which is taken by the state, and given to one denomination—and the remainder of which is offered to all other denominations. He says, other denominations do not get any. It is offered to them, however. All know that there is a certain portion of the proceeds of the sales of the clergy reserves remaining in the hands of government, of which all Protestant denominations in the country are invited to partake. I may be wrong, but I think this is the case, and therefore it is not fair—it is what is vulgarly called clap-trap—to say that what is taken from him is given to Brother Evans. That is not done. No injustice of the kind is perpetrated. Half of the clergy reserves remain in the hands of government, and that gentleman may come and take a share if he likes. He says his conscience will not let him take any. His conscience, then, is to be the measure of my conscience ; and if I conscientiously believe that endowments ought to be furnished by the state for the maintenance of religion, he comes, and with that liberty of conscience which he appears only to know by name, he says, " Ah, but your conscience shall have nothing to do with the matter—mine shall govern." Such is the principle on which that gentleman would act. I am as fully persuaded in my conscience that endowments—whether from individuals or christian governments—for the maintenance of religious instruction, are good and right, and lawful, as endowments for the maintenance of education—nay, more so. If I am thus persuaded, ought I not as a British subject, to avail myself of an endowment that is already provided ? Ought I not to do this as belonging to a body who wish to see endowments employed in carrying the gospel throughout the land. And, shall the conscientious convictions (for of course, convictions are conscientious) of any section of the community, be brought in as a measure of my feelings or of my actions on the subject ? I think that true liberty of conscience should be allowed to each and to all in the country ; and as christian men, may we not employ the endowments that may have been provided, and which are as righteous as endowments springing from individuals—as righteous as the endowments collected

by the London Missionary Society, and which, to their honour be it spoken—they have so nobly employed in the dissemination of the Gospel throughout the South Sea Islands, and various other parts of the earth? This gentleman has also said that the Levites gave up an inheritance, but that no bishops or rectors have given up an inheritance for what they now get. He must know that in this country every man's time is his money. The inheritance which God has bestowed on me are my talents—whatever they may be—and the education which brought these talents into the market. If he had brought his great forensic talents into the market, might he not have obtained a competency through means of them? Or might he not, by some honest calling, earn sufficient to maintain and support him, by means of these talents? But he gave them all up—I dare say exclusively—to the preaching of the Gospel, all these powers he employs for the good of the church and the benefit of mankind—and ought he not to receive something for his labour? He says the Levites gave up an inheritance in the land. Well, in the present state of this country—where there are no great inheritances amongst us—are not every man's time and talents his inheritance? If we surrender these, and devote ourselves exclusively to the ministry of the Gospel, assuredly the gentleman will not say we ought to labour with our own hands, at some trade or calling, in order that we may support ourselves? Perhaps he does this—I don't know. Perhaps he receives nothing. Perhaps he does not get enough to support him while he preaches the Gospel. We know he has a high scriptural example. The Apostle Paul, though he claimed the right of living by the Gospel—though he based this on law and example—though he said, they that preach the Gospel should live by it even as they that practice any other calling; yet still, he wrought with his hands, that he might not be chargeable upon the churches, while he proclaimed the Gospel amongst them. Thus, though he asserted his right to a maintenance while he preached the Gospel, he did not use it. [Time expired.]

Rev. A. DUNCAN—Some remarks which dropped from my excellent friend, Mr. Bell, are, I think, entitled to my notice, and I hope I heard him correctly enough to be enabled to take down his words, or the purport of them. One is, that the state has no right to endow a false religion. He does not recognize in any state in the world a right to endow a false religion. Of course, then, the state must have the capacity, the discernment, and the power to establish the true religion. Presuming, then, that the state to which we belong is the best in the world—and in my opinion it is, for I think there is no presumption in believing that the British nation have more virtue, more intelligence, and more uprightness, than any other in the world—I am yet unable to recognize in the British government either the spiritual discernment to know the true religion from the false, or the capacity to establish it; yet as it is in Jesus, to the exclusion of that which is opposed to the religion of Christ. And as I do not recognize either in the British government, will he tell us to what other country we are to look? It would not be to infidel France—it would not be to superstitious and lethargic Austria—it would not be to any country that I know of on the Continent of Europe. Again, he said, in another portion of his address, that to recognize the equality of religious creeds is infidel. Now does he mean to charge his own government with being an infidel government? It is a notorious fact that they recognize Catholicism in Lower Canada, and give it full and complete sanction as a civil establishment. It is as notorious that they recognize the Episcopal Church of England, and give to it exclusive powers as an establishment, south of the Tweed. It is equally true that they recognize the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and give to it the exclusive powers of an establishment, north of the Tweed. Are we, then, to understand that these churches are all equally divine in their origin, equally apostolic in the administration of their authority, and equally sound in the great fundamental doctrines of Jesus Christ? Yet, as I have said, we find the British government standing on the same platform with Catholicism, with Church of Englandism, and with Presbyterianism, in different parts of the Empire; and here we find the same government willing to bestow the clergy reserves on Baptists, Methodists, and on Free Churchmen, as well as on the Church of England, and the Established Church of Scotland—in short, ready to sanction every religious denomini-

nation in Western Canada. They are willing to maintain denominations with or without a creed. Let me ask, is this anything like the recognition of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, on the part of the British government? We are told that if we desire a portion of the reserves, it has been reserved for us, and can be had on application. I repeat, then, my enquiry—where is the recognition of the principle for which Mr. Bell contends, namely, that a nation has no right to establish the false religion, but that it has the capacity to discover, and the authority to declare, which is the true church? We find, then, that this darling principle—this principle which is so dear to his own nature, and apparently so wrapped up in his christian affections—is repudiated, in practice at least, if not in theory, by the British government. It is not for me to accuse the government. It is not for me to impute to men wrong or bad motives in any sense; but I am at liberty to deplore their church policy, and I pray daily that they may be restricted to their proper duties—namely, to defend the country against foreign aggression, and to maintain equity and peace within her borders; allowing the ark of God to be superintended and presided over by Christ, who is King in Mount Zion. He, who is our great High Priest, declared that His Kingdom is not of this world—that it is a spiritual kingdom, planted in the hearts of believers, and nurtured and watered by the holy spirit—and that this divine principle, planted by God in the souls of men who were once sinners but are now saints, is powerful enough to lead them to do all that is required to sustain His cause. In 1st Corinthians, c. 9, it is written, “Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth the flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man, or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care of oxen. Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: That he that ploweth should plow in hope; and he that thrasheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather! Nevertheless, we have not used this power; but suffer all things lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ.” I apprehend this is one of the passages to which Mr. Cronyn referred. He referred also to Exodus, c. 35. Did not God there command the voluntary principle? Did God there command expulsion? If I do not err greatly, God there gives a distinct command to Moses, that he should cause to be proclaimed throughout the camp that “whosoever was of a willing heart” should bring an offering to the Lord—that God was ready to receive these free will offerings, or, in other words, God was willing to recognize and receive the fruits arising from the voluntary principle. And the people, in reply to the command, brought more than enough, not only of rude materials to construct a house, but also of gold, and silver, and other valuable articles. I think, then, we may safely affirm that the Word of God establishes and commands the voluntary principle, and that compulsion is in no case enjoined to advance the service of God. [Time expired.]

Rev. G. BELL—We have just heard a great deal about the voluntary principle. In a certain point of view, I am just as ready to acknowledge the voluntary principle as the rev. gentleman who has just sat down; but, at the same time, I say that that which is voluntary is not always necessarily optional. It may be voluntary: I trust that the obedience which the true believer renders to the law of God is always voluntary; but it is not optional whether he render that obedience or not. This, I think, is a most important distinction, which should not be lost sight of; and while we maintain the propriety of a legal provision for the support of the christian church, in a pecuniary point of view, at the same time, that legal support may not necessarily be compulsory. Those, to whom allusion has been made, the Jews, who contributed to the building of the tabernacle in the wilderness—gave free-will offerings; and I trust that a free-will offering was also given, when the British Government set apart the Reserves in this Province. We claim no compulsion. So far as voluntary contributions are concerned, we claim no right of compulsion in a government. A government may do right or

it may do wrong. We assert that the principle of the endowment of religion is scriptural. A government may not acknowledge this principle, but its scripturalness cannot be affected by that circumstance. The gifts of the state must of course be voluntary, or they would not be given at all. I would reply briefly to what was said about the position of the state in endowing the true religion. I understood Mr. Duncan to say, that I had stated that an equality amongst creeds was an infidel principle. I think I did not state this. So far as I recollect, the words I used were, that this principle of the equality of creeds, and the equal goodness of all religions, sprang from a heathen source, or was of modern invention, because it is not found in the Bible. I still maintain that a state has to do with the true religion, in comparison with that which is false; and I maintain, further, that civil governors, members of parliament, or kings, have every means of knowing what the true religion is—just as private individuals have these means. Civil governors are as deeply interested in discovering which is the true religion as other persons, and their legislation in reference to it can be open to no further objections, than are urged against legislation on any other topic or concern of life. It is not left to opinion. The Word of God is given to tell what the true religion is, and to this, rulers as well as other individuals have access. It is objected to the application of this principle, that the christian church is divided into a great number of sects, but I ask, what has caused this division? It was not the Bible. It is not state endowments. It is the sinfulness of man which still remains in the heart, even when that heart is under the influence of the Spirit of God. It is the remaining sinfulness of the human heart which causes divisions in the Church of Christ; and I maintain that it is entirely apart from the argument to take that which exists owing to man's own wickedness, and assign it as a reason why the government of a country should not do the duty which the supremacy of Christ requires that government to do. References have been made to government endowing Popery in Lower Canada. It is well known to the persons who make that reference, and to all present, that we do not approve of the government endowing popery, and we hope—and earnestly hope—that the time may soon come when a change in this respect shall take place. What if the government of this or any other country may not be doing their duty—may be acting inconsistently with their duty? This does not impair the validity of the principle by which they are bound to act; and it is the duty of the christian church to labor and pray that the state, and all in authority, may be brought to a sense of duty, and led to act in accordance with it. A general endowment of all that is right and all that is wrong, is a principle which I do not recognize, whether it be acted on by the present Canadian Government or not. I do not believe that that is the principle on which they act. But if it be, it merely removes the difficulty one step further back: instead of overthrowing our argument it simply shows that that government are not doing their duty. It does not alter the nature of their duty. I maintain from the positive declarations of Scripture which I before adduced, that it is incumbent on the government to endow, and countenance, and support the Church of Christ in the land. I speak not of sects, but of the Church of Christ. It may be said that the christian church existed at the earliest period without state endowments. This may be true; but it does not necessarily follow that it ought always to exist so. If this be a sound argument in favor of the voluntary principle, it is an equally sound argument to say, that the church should always exist in a state of persecution. It existed then in a state of persecution as well as purity; and if it be argued that it should exist without legal support and countenance, because it so existed in Apostolic times, it may with equal force be argued, that we should seek persecution in order to put the church in its true position. With respect to what was said about Cyrus and other kings of Persia, I did not go to them for the purpose of learning what should be the duty of a christian ruler, but I went to them to show, that while we maintain as a principle that a government is bound to be christian, and, being christian, is bound to act up to the precepts of the gospel in supporting the gospel, we at the same time contend that if the government is not conducted strictly in

accordance with these principles, the church has a perfect right to receive pecuniary support from that government. Cyrus and Darius were not christian rulers. They were not rulers in accordance with the revealed will of God, as it was then; but when they were willing to devote these tributes out of the revenues of the empire, to the support of the true religion, the church of God accepted it. And in like manner, I maintain, that it is the right and duty of government to act on christian principles; but supposing the government does not act strictly in accordance with these principles, there is nothing wrong in the Church of God accepting pecuniary support from that government.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—I rise to introduce and support the second proposition, which is as follows:

2—That the State being a divinely appointed instrument for the promotion of the glory of God and the welfare of mankind, is bound to acknowledge, protect, and support the Church, but that in the discharge of this duty the rights of conscience are to be held sacred.

On entering upon the consideration of a topic like this, our primary care should be to define the terms that are used in the discussion. Before going any further, therefore, I will take the liberty very briefly to define the term "state," adopting as my authority an individual who enjoys an European reputation—I mean Vattel, author of the "Law of Nations," who defines a state to be "A moral person who possesses an understanding and will peculiar to herself, and is susceptible of obligations and rights." "A nation, while she acts in common or in a body, is a moral person, who is not less obliged than any individual to obey the laws of nature (and its author.)" "That moral person resides in those, who are invested with the public authority, and represent the entire nation." "Whether this be the Common Council of the nation, an aristocratic body or a monarch, this conductor, representative, or monarch, is indispensably obliged to obey." "A nation ought to be pious. The superiors entrusted with the public affairs should constantly endeavor to deserve the approbation of their Divine Sovereign, and whatever they do in the name of the state, ought to be regulated by this grand aim." "If all men are bound to serve God, the entire nation, in her national capacity, is doubtless obliged to serve and honor Him." It will be admitted that these are the principles of natural religion. They are the principles by which men regulate their conduct, and they evidently show to us that a nation derives its existence originally from God—that a nation is bound to consult the honor and glory of God—that a nation is responsible to God for its actions—that a nation is as responsible for its collective acts, as an individual is for his individual acts. It will be allowed, further, that if a state is bound to serve and to honor God—to recognize His authority—it must be the same whether that authority be suggested by the law of nature, or whether it be by the revealed law. I mean by this, that a state is bound to acknowledge and obey the Revelation of Jehovah, in which a state will find principles laid down for its guidance. I here feel that I am entering ground which my friend Mr. Bell has just traversed, but the subjects are so closely related that I find I cannot sustain my argument without in some measure going back to the very position which he has occupied. A state recognizing the Revelation of God, will there find a distinct statement of some of its duties, and of the duties of its subjects. To a few of them I will refer. It is distinctly declared by the Apostle, that "The powers that be are ordained of God," and, moreover, that the state is "A minister of God for good" to the subjects of that state—also, that it is "a minister of vengeance, to execute wrath on those that commit evil." We find, moreover, that all power belongeth to God; and if all power belongeth to Him, it is a talent entrusted to the possessor of that power; and the possessor of any talent, any blessing, which God in his providence or grace bestows, must be employed to the honor of God. God declares that the silver and gold are His, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. In a word, all things are Jehovah's. All things, then, are to be made to subserve the honor and glory of God—whether possessed by a state or an individual. Whatever may be the possessions, power, or influence, that power, that influence,

those possessions, are derivable immediately from God. The state owes these talents and powers immediately to God, and I think the conclusion very obvious and certain, that they must be employed to subserve the honor and glory of God. I argue not the Divine appointment of a state, because I think, our friends opposite do not deny it. I pass on to the end for which the state is appointed, and that, we are told, in the proposition, is the welfare of man. That is one of the designs for which the state is a minister of God for good to the subjects of God—that is, in the terms of the proposition, for “the welfare of mankind.” There can be no doubt of this. But the question now recurs, what are we to understand by the term welfare? I shall only ask our friends on the other side, whether it would be possible for them to find any declaration in Scripture that would exclusively confine the talents, the power, the possessions of the state, to the furtherance of the temporal good of its subjects? Because on this, the whole hangs. We must, then, appeal to the law and to the testimony—to the law of Revelation, in which the Lord distinctly declares to us what is the duty of a state. That law reveals to us that there is one thing especially needful for the welfare of man, and that is, the knowledge of that truth and revelation of which we are now speaking. I say, then, with Mr. Bell, that the state is bound to know what is good. If a state is the minister of God for good, and the executor of wrath—of vengeance—on those that are evil, it necessarily follows that the state must know what is good and what is evil; otherwise, how can it reward the good and punish the evil? The question then, legitimately arises, are we to take the varying standard of the world as to what is good or evil? I think that our friends opposite would not like to do that. They will agree with us that there is only one standard, and that is, God’s Word: to that we must make an ultimate appeal. I do submit, then, that the state is bound to know that Revelation—that the state is bound to consult that Revelation, in order that it may know how to reward the good and punish the evil. Here, then, we see, that a state must immediately conform to the will of God, which is the ultimate law of its actions. There are three methods by which the welfare of man may be promoted and maintained: these are, first, by military force, secondly, by penal laws, thirdly, by the influence of religion. Now our friends on the opposite side are perfectly willing that we should employ military force, to keep the subjects of a state in obedience to its laws: they do not deny that some force of this kind is necessary in dealing with those who rebel against the laws of the land. They are perfectly willing, also, to see this Court-house employed in enforcing laws—to see a gentleman sitting on the bench in the capacity of a judge, to execute vengeance against those who violate the laws of the land. They are willing to go thus far. But when we come and tell them that we conceive that there is another thing whereby the state may be enabled to regulate its affairs, and keep its subjects under its control and authority, in perfect obedience, not only to its own laws, but to those which are superior—namely, the laws of God—these gentlemen demur, and are not willing that the state should occupy this position. It seems to me that this is an extraordinary view which our friends take of the means that may be employed for the well governing of a state—that it may employ means of coercion, and penal enactments, but that the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ may not be employed by it. I am not going to put the dispensations of religion in the hands of a state, but I say that there is a method by which religion may be employed to advance the welfare of a state. The Revelation of God points out that method—it points out to the state, His own church—the church which he has appointed, and the uses of which are also distinctly shown in that Revelation. I say, then, that it seems to me that the state ought to be enabled to employ the means ordained by God, co-ordinate with its own authority, for the great end—the welfare of mankind. Under these views, we hold that the state is bound to acknowledge, protect, and support the church. I hold that the state is bound to acknowledge the church—that is, to acknowledge its Divine mission, which I repeat is co-ordinate and co-extensive with that of the state—namely, the welfare of mankind. The Divine mission of the church ought to be acknowledged by the state: that is

to declare the will and purposes of God—to declare the condition of men rulers as well as subjects. The Apostle Paul, in that part of his Epistle to the Romans to which I have referred, where he says, "The powers that be are ordained by God," does most distinctly point out the duty of the state, at the same time [that he points out the duty of subjects. In this way, the Divine mission of the church is to declare the will of God to all, whether rulers or subjects. In obedience to the directions given in God's holy Word, we as ministers of the gospel, are bound, as far as in us lies, to convince men that they are sinners—rebels against Divine law and authority. We are to do this according to the mission given by Christ to his apostles. We are to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. This Divine mission the state is bound to acknowledge. But again, I say, the state is bound to acknowledge the independence of the church. It has been insinuated here, that the Parliament of Great Britain has power to dictate to the church of England. I can allow no dictatorship. The Parliament cannot dictate in things spiritual. We claim to be as high and independent as any gentleman at this table. I defy the Governor General to come into my church to control it, or to say one word as to the doctrine I profess. Here is the doctrine I preach—the Word of God. Parliament can in no way interfere with this. The independence of the church regarded in the matter of ordination. The powers of the "keys" may be exercised without infringing on the powers of the state; so the power of the state may be exercised without impairing the independence of the church. The state is bound to acknowledge the independence of the church in all matters of theology. Our articles tell you what we declare to be our doctrine, and with this, we allow no authority of the state to interfere. The state has nothing to do for instance, with ordination. The state cannot make or break a minister. It may employ a minister—put him into a vicarage, or rectory; but it is for the Bishop to judge of the qualifications of ministers. Some authority—whether called Bishop or Synod is immaterial must—decide as to the qualifications of individuals to bear the ministerial office. I have said that the state is bound to acknowledge the Divine mission and independence of the church; but I go further and say, that the state is bound to protect the church. Not, however, by allowing the church to assume temporal power. We know that for many centuries one church has assumed the sceptre of temporal power; but we claim none of this. We conceive that the state has not in any one instance to resign its temporal power into the hands of the church; but I say that the state is bound to protect the church in the discharge of its duty. The very mission of the church clearly involves this duty on the part of the state. Why, the ministers of Jehovah are commanded to go forth into the world to tell men that they are rebels against the authority of God—against all constituted authority, (for we know sufficient of the human heart to be aware that it is enmity against the mind and heart of God.) The time has been when men considered that they were doing good service by destroying the faithful servants of Jehovah, who have a right to look for protection to the state. We ask this protection, in order that we may be free to do our duty, in declaring from pole to pole, the unsearchable riches of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. We seek not unreasonable power, but merely that which shall enable us to discharge our duty. I go further, according to my text, and say, that the state is bound to support the church. By support I mean, of a pecuniary kind. The very fact of the church having to go forth to discharge this duty would necessarily involve the duty on the part of the state to support it—not only for the church's sake, but also for the sake of the state itself. Our friends on the opposite side, lay rather undue stress on the support given by the state to the church, as though it necessarily involved the thralldom of the church. These gentlemen appear to suppose that the state says in effect, to a minister, "There is a sphere of labor before you—a location large enough; we'll give you the means of laboring there, but you must preach such and such a doctrine." We say, on the contrary, "we preach the pure gospel, and it is not for the state to interfere with our doctrine; we have an authority higher than your's—co-ordinate

with your own; supply us with means—we want no more—and we will go forth and do our duty as preachers of the gospel.” Support may, then, be rendered and received without trenching at all on the independence of the church. I cannot see that the independence of the church would be at all perilled by such a course. I do not see how the independence of any minister can be perilled, merely because he receives £100 a year from the state. I think a set of more independent-minded men do not exist in the world than the clergy of the Church of England.

[Time expired.]

Rev. W. LANDON—The thesis I am to support is this:

“That governments are the result of human necessities, and not the agent or instrument designed of God, for the direct or indirect control of religious faith and opinion, which are to be based on the Word of God only.”

This thesis contains three distinct propositions: 1. Governments are the result of human necessities. 2. Governments are not the agents or instruments designed by God for the control of religious faith and opinion. 3. Religious faith and opinion are to be based on the Word of God only.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—This is not the plan we adopted. The other side took their own proposition, and we followed it through. We have now put forward our proposition, and the other side are going to discuss something quite different.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM—This is an evident attempt at dictation.

Rev. F. EVANS—Certainly we have no desire to dictate.

Rev. J. GUNDRY—I put it to our friends, whether we are not at liberty to select our own proposition.

Rev. F. EVANS—Of course by doing so, you leave Mr. Bettridge's arguments untouched.

Rev. W. LANDON—I think not, I think I shall be able to notice them.

Rev. F. EVANS—Well, go on then. We shall be satisfied.

Rev. W. LANDON—I shall not occupy much of your time upon the first of the propositions which I have laid before you, for I do not expect it will be seriously disputed. It may indeed be objected, that Governments are the ordinance of God, which will be readily admitted, though not as an objection, as the two propositions are perfectly consistent with each other. Many other institutions might be mentioned, which are the result of human necessities, and at the same time ordinances of God, as marriage, parental care and instruction, the rights of property, and others.

But lest this admission should be strained beyond its proper limits, I shall just remind you, that Pagan and Mahometan Governments are ordained of God, not less than Christian governments, and consequently, no argument can be raised upon the fact of such ordainment in favor of christian rulers as such, interfering in behalf of the christian religion, which would not at the same time, and to the same extent, go to authorize anti-christian rulers to persecute and proscribe that religion, if they should find it existing in their dominions. The truth is, the Divine ordinance has respect to the human necessity, and is co-extensive with it. The extent of the one limits and defines the powers and operations of the other. Now, as members of the state, men in respect to their fellow-men, need nothing but protection. This single word expresses the human necessity in its fullest extent. And hence it follows that the powers that be are ordained of God, and invested with the sword to be a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well. Here their functions are exactly limited. They are to repress violence, to prevent fraud and injustice, and to afford the most perfect safety to every good citizen, (*i. e.* to every citizen who does not invade the right of others,) and to all his lawful interests. If they attempt anything beyond this, they exceed the authority given them in the Divine ordinance, as much as they surpass the limits of the necessity to supply which the ordinance was provided. In respect to men,

all such acts are superfluous—perhaps tyrannical; but in respect to God's ordinance, they are usurpation and unauthorised intrusion; and in both respects null and void, having none of the sanctions of righteous and constitutional laws. "The law is not made," says the Apostle, for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers," and such like.

But I proceed to the second proposition, which contains the question of the chiefest importance of any with which I have at present to do. Governments are not the instruments or agents designed of God for the control of religious faith and opinion. This proposition is negative in its quality, and it is sometimes said that negatives admit of no proof. But in the present case it seems to me nothing is easier. I might observe, in the first place, that nothing like the authority here supposed, is conferred upon civil governments, or recognized as belonging to them, by Divine Revelation. The superficial thinker may have supposed that the Jewish Government was invested with powers of this description. But a more careful attention to the subject will discover that nothing of the kind pertained to the rulers of that singular people. The precepts of religion on the contrary, as well as the laws by which the state was to be governed, were all based upon the authority of God alone, and delivered with the utmost precision. To those who were well disposed, therefore, a question of doubt could scarcely arise. But when this, even, happened to be the case, and a matter of extraordinary difficulty arose, involving any uncertainty in respect to the path of duty, the question was left to be adjudicated upon by no human tribunal. It was referred to neither Magistracy nor Priest. Jehovah reserved that prerogative to himself. He must be immediately consulted. To this purpose the Urim and Thummim were provided. When these failed, a prophet or holy seer was specially appointed and Divinely inspired. Here, then, was no room for human authority, as nothing was left to human opinion. It is further worthy of remark, that as often as these princes interfered, by virtue of their own authority, in matters of religious worship, it was always to corrupt it, and to "make Israel to sin." They were skilfull to lead the people astray, but they had no judgment in the matter of bringing them back. In case of reformation, we always observe either that a copy of the book of the law is discovered, and serious attention awakened to its instructions, or (which is more common,) the messages of God are authoritatively delivered by an inspired prophet, accompanied with such demonstrations of his Heavenly mission, as render his credentials indisputably clear. Hence, it is too evident, to require farther argumentation, that the Jewish Government was not an instrument or agent designed of God for the control of religious faith and opinion. In the second place, I might argue this point from the disclosures of modern christian history; to wit, from the fact that every christian government that has at any time assumed to exercise such powers, have utterly failed to accomplish the object at which it has aimed. Fortunately, for our argument, there are not wanting a sufficient number of examples to refer to. Most christian princes have claimed this as one of the functions of their office. Nay, they have seemed to think verily with themselves, that the first, the highest and the holiest of all their gubernatorial duties was to direct the consciences of their people, and control the worship of God in their dominion. Hence they have addressed themselves to the discharge of this duty with a zeal and a diligence proportioned to the supposed importance of it. To secure its accomplishment, they have called into requisition all the resources of their states both physical and moral. By power, by terror, by intrigue and stratagem, by diplomacy, by flattery and gold, by every expedient which human ingenuity could invent, or human authority command, have they exerted themselves to accomplish this one point. But they have failed. They have signally failed. They have all signally failed. Not one exception to the most signal failure can you point out to me. I grant you, that in several cases, their Most Christian and Most Catholic kings have succeeded to a certain extent and for a short time in putting down or preventing dissent. I say to a certain extent, and for a short

time. But no one will, I apprehend, claim these as instances of success, who is acquainted with the means that were pursued in reaching the end. First; the Word of God was suppressed to prevent, as was pretended, the possibility of a wrong interpretation of it. Just as wise a course it would be to put out a man's eyes to save him from becoming the victim of optical illusions, or to extinguish the sun in the firmament to prevent men from witnessing unlawful representation. Next, the sword of persecution was drawn forth, and dyed with the blood of the saints. The work of conversion pursued with fire and faggot. In order to purify the church and promote christian charity, cities were sacked and razed provinces desolated, virgins ravished, infants dashed against the stones, and scenes of blood and cruelty enacted, too horrible to be narrated on earth,—fit only to furnish themes of triumph to the most depraved of the devils of hell. Such scenes, I repeat, have been enacted in every case where governments have succeeded, for any considerable time to control the religious opinions of their people. Is this success? Is it not the most signal of all failures? I might add, furthermore, though it may seem superfluous, that though the establishment of a christian church by law, and the endowment of a parochial clergy for the instruction of the people, and the suppression of error, looks very well in them, yet aside from the enormities before adverted to, the system has been proved by a thousand years' experience to be utterly inefficient as a means of promoting religious knowledge and elevating the standard of christian morality; but on the contrary, wherever this system has been most perfectly organized, and most strictly maintained—wherever the state has given the most liberal aid to the church, and furnished her with the most absolute authorities, there genuine religion has languished most, and ignorance, vice, and immorality have most prevailed. Witness the state of France after the Revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the condition of Italy, Spain, and the South American States, to this day. And on the other hand, wherever the principle of toleration and religious freedom has been admitted, a revival has immediately, in most instances, ensued. Extraordinary activity in religious matters has succeeded to apathy and indifference. The gospel has been propagated, and christian morals and christian institutions have been diffused among the people. The unparalleled spread of the gospel in the American States has been effected without government aid, or government control, and it is believed few will deny that England owes much of the proud position she holds among the nations of the earth, in a moral and religious point of view, to the voluntary efforts of her christian people. Her Bible Society, alone, not to mention her numerous missionary, educational, and other societies, has done more towards the evangelization of the world, than all the state churches that ever existed and that now exist. Churchmen, it is true, have taken a high and honorable part in these noble enterprizes. The Church Missionary Society is of itself, an institution of which any church or country might well be proud. Besides, it is well known that large amounts are derived to the Bible and other Societies from the same source. But there are contributions of the christian people, members of the church. The Church of England as such, has had no hand in the work, nor can have. Her unhappy position as a pensioner of the state, precludes her from this honor. She cannot pass beyond the limits of her own parishes to save a sinking world. Even there she is not free, but is entirely under the control of a power quite distinct from the church—a power which is not necessarily Protestant—a power not necessarily, even, christian. The vote of a Roman Catholic O'Connell—an infidel Hume or Byron may, at some time, entirely change her course, or restrain her will. Of herself she is helpless to do any part of her Master's bidding. Some may say, in reply, that she has sent a Bishop to Jerusalem, and another to China. But this is not correct. It was the state, not the church, who did it. As to the church, she has no voice in the appointment of her own Bishops, even at home, or if she has, it is not a free voice. She is obliged under pains and penalties, to vote as the Queen, or rather the Minister, who may some day be a Roman Catholic or an infidel, shall direct. And now, I ask, is it likely that an instrument for the accomplishment of

a certain object, appointed by the all-wise Jehovah, to whom the end, as well as every step in the progress, is perfectly known from the beginning, and who has also promised to be present by his Holy Spirit to superintend his own work, to supply strength to his agents, and to give efficiency to all his instruments—Is it likely, I say, that instrumentalities so appointed and so aided, should for a thousand years together, fail to produce the slightest beneficial effect; or that it should in every case, mar and hinder that work, for the advancement of which it had been Divinely appointed? Impossible. Then it is impossible that governments are the agents, &c.

But thirdly, there is another method of pursuing this argument. It is by showing the utter incongruity, or want of fitness or adaptation of the supposed means to the end proposed to be accomplished by those means. And this must be admitted to be a very satisfactory kind of proof when the incongruity can be clearly shown. For instance, should it be asserted by any party, that a post chaise was designed by a wise and skilful mechanic who built it, as an instrument or the appropriate machinery for spinning cotton, or fabricating crapes and muslins; even in the absence of every other evidence, the error could be made sufficiently obvious by pointing to the evident unfitness of that instrument for the performance of operations so nice, or the productions of commodities so delicate. With equal distinctness shall we be able to show, that there is absolutely no such relation between the civil government and the religious faith and opinion of the people, as must exist between every instrument and its appropriate work,—between an appointed means and the end it is designed to accomplish. For this purpose little more will be necessary than clearly to state what is implied in the terms religious faith and opinion, or in other words, what is aimed at by those governments which assume the management of the nation's religion. This, perhaps, will best be shown by laying down two or three simple propositions, as: First, Religious opinion is of no value except in so far as it tends to develope Christian principle and form right christian character. Secondly, Religious faith, (except when taken in the sense of opinion, in which case it is already disposed of,) is that operation of the renewed mind, or that grace of the heart by which the sinner comes to God by Christ—by which the sinner apprehends Christ in his true character as Saviour—in short, by which he is freely justified from all things, &c. Thirdly, Religion has respect to God, to his government and our relations to him. One of our ablest lexicographers defines it in these words: "Virtue, as founded on reverence for God and expectation of future rewards and punishments; a system of divine faith and worship as opposite to others. Hence it appears. Fourthly, That religion has its seat and operation in the heart and conscience. What is essential to it is confined to the hidden man of the heart. What appears outwardly, in virtuous action, is not of the essence of religion, but its circumstances or consequence. Its essence is conformity with the divine will, obedience to God's law. Its fruit is holiness, the end everlasting life. It is through the affections and disposition of the heart, then, and not by overt actions and outward conduct that we either obey or violate God's law. I do not say that wicked actions are not sinful. Undoubtedly they are. But, I say, the sin was committed, the law was violated before the action was brought forth; at the moment the wicked purpose was formed in the heart, or the lustful desire indulged in the mind, the command was violated, the sin matured and the sinner ripe for condemnation. "But I say unto you," with the great Teacher, "that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer," saith the apostle. And again our Lord, "Those things that come forth from the heart defile a man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murder, adulteries, fornication, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." These are the things which defile a man. It follows then that he is a good christian whose heart is right in the sight of God, though in exterior appearance he be rude, ignorant and uncouth; and he is an infidel who banishes God from his heart, or who withholds his affections from God, however carefully he may have studied his creed, or however punctually he may observe all the outward forms of religion. Such is the nature of our most holy religion

—inward, hidden, spiritual; and such the tendency of religious faith and opinion when rightly directed. The object is to correct the heart, and to reconcile the sinner to God. It aims at nothing less; it points to no lower attainment. Till all this is accomplished, nothing whatever is done. The almost christian is no christian at all. And now need I ask, Is there any congruity between a political government, managed by the sword, and carried on by means of a system of coercion and force and such a work as this? Any fitness or adaptation in the office of king, parliament, courts of law, sheriffs, bailiffs, policemen, prisons, penalties and pains, as means for the accomplishment of such an end? [Time expired.]

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—In my first address, I endeavored to show what the duty of the state is towards the church—acknowledging the church in its divine mission and in its independence, and protecting it, and when my time expired, I was saying that it is the bounden duty of the state to support the church. I concluded with the observation that I did not concede that the pecuniary support of the church in any measure compromised the independence of the church, and I still entertain this opinion, notwithstanding the remarks of Mr. Landon to the contrary. It will be for the public to decide between us. We seek not for the state to interfere as we know was done in the dark ages. We are well aware that in the reign immediately succeeding the Reformation, the temporal sword was placed in the hands of the church, which punished those who refused to obey the rules of the church; but that is not the position in which we desire to stand. This is not a scriptural position. I am afraid that if you look narrowly into history, you will find that there is scarcely any denomination, which, having had power, but have abused it, we are not therefore to ascribe it to to the principles of the church or churches. Let us rather attribute it, in most cases, to the circumstances of the times. I should deny history if I denied that the Church of England did in other times commit persecution. Did not the Independents in the reign of Cromwell do the same thing? Has not the Church of Scotland done the same thing! I will not judge any church by particular accidents or incidents in its history, but by its principles. Now I defy any man to point out in the Church of England, any part or portion of its doctrines which can lead to the supposition or conclusion that she can ever contemplate persecution for conscience sake. When she did persecute, it was owing to the circumstances of the times. No wonder that when she had emancipated herself from the thraldom which she had for centuries endured, a reaction towards persecution was manifested! I grieve to say that there is one church that authoritatively recognizes and sanctions persecution, and we know that that church only requires the power, to re-enact former scenes; but this cannot be said of the Church of England. Reverting to my former line of argument, I again say that the support we seek from the state, and which we conceive the state is bound to give to the church, by no means involves the thraldom of the church. The church may still be perfectly independent. On the other hand, the support given by the state to the church in no measure perils the authority of the state: as long as the church holds its even, onward, path in the work of evangelizing the subjects of the state, it sustains rather than perils the authority of the state. The two authorities—that of the state and that of the church—are co-ordinate, and may exist together in perfect harmony—neither infringing upon the independence of the other. I say, moreover, that to attempt to deprive the state of the assistance which the church can give to the state in furthering the end of its institution—that is, the welfare of mankind—would be to deprive it of the most efficient means which it can possibly possess. Many things are laid to the charge of the Church of England, which she never recognizes. Do not judge of the church, then, by what is imputed to her by her adversaries, but by what she actually adopts and recognizes. I should be sorry to judge of the principles of any denomination by any other standard. I should be sorry to suppose that the principle of persecution is to be found in the heart of any man here. Therefore, I claim for my church, the examination which they claim, and which they concede to them. I believe that in the present day it is utterly impossible to find any church, with the exception of the Church of Rome—which holds any persecuting principle; or (with the same exception) which cannot fulfil its divine mission, by preaching the gospel, without trenching in any measure

on the authority of the state, I say, then, that the state should support the church, and may do it without in any way endangering its own powers. In the discharge of this duty, the rights of conscience are to be held sacred. The state has no business to coerce any man. Mr. Landon is perfectly right in saying that wherever an effort has been made to coerce the religious principles of any man it has failed. Under the severest persecution that the church ever endured, it passed into a proverb that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." While some men were being consigned to the flames for their religion, others came forward, and invited persecution, by professing the faith of Jesus Christ. I say, then, that coercion never has succeeded, and never can. Where, in the present day, is there a church—always excepting the Roman Church—which desires to infringe on the rights of conscience? Where in Canada, at any rate? We are told that elsewhere, a whole people are taxed to support the church of a portion only; but there is nothing of the kind here, and we have no wish to see it introduced. I think one of our friends violated good taste when he referred to Rathcormac. We Canadians (for I have adopted this country, and would speak to you as having done the same) do not wish to raise the feelings of the people against anybody of men. Take us as we are. In the discharge of the duty which the state owed to the church—that of providing for the dissemination of the word of God—I ask whether there must not be an extraordinary elasticity of conscience in any man who can include the clergy reserves amongst his grounds of offence. It is most extraordinary to me that any man can really say that his conscience is offended because the Church of England or Church of Scotland, receives a certain revenue from the clergy reserves—from which any of the gentlemen opposite can derive assistance if they choose to take it. Suppose any one of our friends says, "My conscience is grievously offended by the system," I reply, "Don't take the money. But as I allow you to have a conscience, do allow me to have one too." As a member of the Church of England, I believe that the state is doing its duty in assisting the church, as I believe that while accepting the boon of the state, I maintain my independence. Refuse, if you please to accept support to enable you to preach the gospel or to educate your children, but do not assume the right to regulate my conscience, seeing that I give to you a perfect right to regulate your own. The support I seek is open to all denominations. Let it not be said that the Church of Rome has any. I protest as much against Romish doctrine as any man here. I am as sound a Protestant at heart as any man. I yield to no man in my love for Protestantism. I yield to no man in my desire to maintain the rights of conscience. But I claim to have my conscience, and to be permitted to receive the endowment which the state provides.

Rev. W. LANDON—I now resume the argument which was broken for a time by the rules of this debate. I ask with what sort of sceptre can the Queen of England govern my thoughts? By what statutory enactments can parliament bind my feelings? What court can adjudicate upon the state of my affections? Yet if the government would make me a christian, or being one, would keep me such—in other words, if government is to control my faith and opinion, this is the only legitimate field of its operation. It must place a preventative police force in my soul. Its bailiffs must bind my conviction. Its prisons must hold my thoughts. Its informers would need be essences of the moral world, and its witnesses disembodied, nay omniscient spirits. I cannot think it necessary to add a word. I regard the argument as complete, and the conclusion inevitable; to wit: That governments are not and cannot be the agents or instruments designed of God for the control of religious faith and opinion; it having been shown that they are no more fitted for accomplishing such a work than a post chaise for spinning cotton or weaving lace. No more congruous to it than the multiplication table is to the electric fluid, or the first book of Euclid to the day of judgment. As it respects the remaining propositions: Religious faith and opinion are to be based upon the word of God only, I ought to be allowed to take it for granted. Our controversy being with Protestants, I should have felt myself justified in assuming the truth of it and waiving all argument, were it not that certain profound Protestant Divines, in our day, have been heard to complain of being "beset with the clamour that the Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants;" and to decry what

they call the "nondescript system of religion now in fashion, that nothing is to be believed but what is clearly in scripture." I wish what is here stated were true; that the religion now in fashion required nothing to be believed but what is clearly in scripture. I fear, however, we have not reached that point yet. When we shall reach it, when that sort of religion shall really be fashionable, that is, when all men shall truly reverence God's Word, and implicitly bow to its authority, then will be the millenium and the latter day of glory. Angry controversy will thence for ever cease. Then the churches will have rest and be edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, will be multiplied. Would that happy season were come. The Lord hasten it in his own good time. It being, therefore, required to support the proposition with evidence, I shall proceed to state in the shortest possible way, a few arguments for that purpose—the time at my disposal will admit of no more. The word of God, of itself, is either a sufficient basis for our faith and opinion, or it is not. If not, then we must seek for divine truth from some other source. These must either be written or unwritten. If written they must either be inspired or uninspired. If inspired they are scripture and already admitted. If uninspired they are not God's words, and therefore their teaching requires exactly the same sort of support as our opinions; viz., That they are exactly accordant with God's word, in which case we need them not as we have God's word already with which to compare our opinions. But if these extra fountains of divine truth, on which we are, in part, to base our faith and opinion, are unwritten traditions, then two things require to be proved before we can receive them: 1st. That our Lord and his Apostles did really deliver, orally, to the churches certain truths above what was written, and which themselves were not designed to be written, but which were, nevertheless, necessary to be known and believed by all in order to salvation; and, 2ndly, That these have been faithfully handed down to us, in the same form in which they were delivered—unadulterated and unchanged. Neither of which admit of proof, but on the contrary the strongest probabilities lie against both. Probabilities which, in the absence of all counter evidence, must be regarded as sufficient proof. Let us examine the strength of these probabilities. These two classes of truths, it is said, (the written and unwritten) are precisely of the same nature and of equal importance and authority. I ask them, why were not all written? Or, why was any part written? Would not the same reasons which made it necessary to write a part, equally require that the remainder should be written also? Or, if there could be any reason for suppressing a part and intrusting them to the oral vehicle, would not the same reasons be equally valid for treating the whole in the same manner! Otherwise it must follow that the suppressed portion is not of equal importance with the written. In other words not necessary to be known and believed. In the next place, it is in the highest degree improbable that any such traditions could have reached us from the apostles' days without adulteration or change. The sense of all mankind is, that nothing is so liable to loss or corruption as unwritten reports. We never place the least reliance on the traditions of another age, on other subjects, any further than they are supported by concurrent history, or are accordant with known facts. Who has pretended to give us an authentic history of any of the North American nations, even for a single century prior to the landing of the pilgrims? And do not our courts of law, composed of persons who are supposed to understand the value of evidence as well as any other, promptly reject everything of this description? The witness is not so much as allowed to relate what he heard, from a third person only a week ago. Nor will they receive the testimony of an absent witness, however great the necessity, except with such precautions as show that they regard with the utmost jealousy the transmission of evidence from one to another, as exposing it to almost certain corruption. In capital cases where life is at stake, no such evidence is admissible in any civilized country. If such is the acknowledged worthlessness of tradition on all other subjects—what security have we, or what warrant is offered us, for the truth of those in question. It evidently would not be reasonable for us to receive them on anything less than the assurance that all those through whom they have been transmitted, since the apostles, were inspired men; which would imply a perpetual miracle of nearly 2000 years standing.

Is this pretended? If so can it be proved? If not we are bound to reject all tradition as evidence in matters of religion. Hence then, either the Bible supplies us with a sure and sufficient basis for our faith and opinions as christians,—a perfect rule of life. Or else we have no such foundation, no certain guide. Then religion is a dream, and virtue the foundation of the schools, and vice and sin the popular errors of the vulgar, and a future judgment a bug-bear of priest-craft, and time and eternity are crowded with doubt and uncertainty, and canopied with darkness and horror, ending in despair. Christians, is such the case? On the contrary, does not God's word do good to them who walk uprightly? Is not the law of the Lord perfect? And are not the Holy Scriptures able to make us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus? In conclusion, I would notice two or three remarks that fell from Reverend Gentlemen opposite. We are told that there is no such thing as persecution for conscience sake, in the present day, except in the Church of Rome. This is not correct. There are at least two other churches in the daily habit of persecution. It appears to me that if the Church of England fulfil the duties prescribed to her in her own formularies, she must persecute.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—Show that.

Rev. W. LONDON—Have you not taken a solemn oath—

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—To banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines.

Rev. W. LONDON—Banishing and driving away imply coercion, and coercion is persecution. But in proof of the persecuting habits both of this and another church in the present day, I have only to remind you that it was but the other day that Baines, of Leicester, and Shott, of Edinburgh, were immured in prison for their conscientious adhesion to what they considered a christian principle.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I shall notice the last observation first. The gentleman says that we are bound to be ready to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines. I hope that as far as his ability goes, he is ready to do the same. But he appears to confuse words and ideas. We are bound to banish and drive away doctrine—not persons. And how to drive away? By preaching contrary doctrine. By doing as was done some time ago at Woodstock, viz., by lecturing against error, and maintaining truth. That is the way in which we banish and drive away false doctrine. I wish the gentleman had read what we really are bound to do, instead of saying that, to be consistent, we must drive away persons—degrade them—persecute them—on account of their opinions. That is all a fancy of your own brain, Mr. London. It seems to me, that if we be faithful to Christ, it is our bounden duty to drive away error.

Rev. W. LONDON—We are bound to give a reason for the hope that is within us, and to speak the truth in love.

Rev. B. CRONYN—To rebuke and exhort, with all long suffering, if you be faithful; and this is what we are bound to do. What persecution is there in this? None. It is absurd to make mention of persecution, coupled with such expressions as these. The homily to which the gentleman refers is as wide of the mark as any thing that can be conceived. All that he has said concerning tradition would do very well if we were combatting a church that held unwritten and oral tradition, as well as the written Word. But as applied to the Church of England, all that he has said goes for nothing. We did not come here to discuss such matter. We have nothing to do with it. I will give him in a few words—much better words than those which he has selected—what the doctrine of the Church of England on this head really is. I quote the sixth Article of Faith: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." And I believe my reverend friend on my left (Mr. Bell) of the Church of Scotland, can read from the accredited formularies of his church equally strong language, setting forth the sufficiency of God's holy Word.

So that the gentleman might have left unsaid, all that he has advanced concerning tradition. Then with regard to what has been said concerning the State. I was surprised to hear a great deal of it. We have heard about the state regulating our opinions by putting a constable in my soul, a policeman in my heart, and a judge in my affections, and so on. Now is not all this plainly absurd? Who says that the state is to regulate the religious opinions of any man? No one. But we say the state is to employ a good scriptural church: that is the proper means—that is the only instrument we recognize, and God will bless the instrument, and the labour of that church. We don't call on the state to interfere at all with the religious opinions of the people. Our state, we know, is representative. We are governed by a representative government; and the Parliament of England—which has been so much spoken of here to-day, so much villified—is the representative of the people of England. Well, then, the Parliament of England makes a compact with the Church of England, or any other church. We enter into that compact, which is that the church shall perform a certain work, namely, the instruction of the people in religious doctrine and morality; and that in consideration of this work, the church shall receive certain support. It is a compact entered into between the government of the country—the representative of the people of the country—and the church with which that government deals. The church is to do its work of instruction, and the government is to do its part, which is, to maintain the church while it performs its duty. In the same manner parliament employs judges to try criminals, with the assistance of juries. In this way, the parliament carries on the work of the country. We say, then, that there is one work which should not be neglected, and this is the point to which we should confine ourselves to-day. We say that government ought to provide religious instruction for the people, as the best means of promoting the welfare of the people at large. In so doing they are not to put any constable in our souls, or to take any control of our affections—as these gentlemen imagine—but are to provide ministers of Christ—missionaries of his word, to go forth and proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ; while the government are to maintain, support and protect them, in the discharge of this duty. This is the real nature of the compact which exists between the government and the church; and, being so, there is no ground for saying that the government undertake no such thing. If the Parliament of England, to-morrow, or next session, were to be so changed in its elements that it would come to the decision that the Church of England could not or ought not to be any longer employed in the religious instruction of the people, the Church of England would be deprived of the maintenance now afforded by the state but still it would not cease to be a church. The government might adopt the Baptist, the Methodist, or some other body, to do the work now done by the Church of England, but the government in doing that would only be using its discretion without abandoning the work which we maintain it is bound to perform. But it is said, “Your prayer-book bears the impress of parliamentary authority.” We know that the prayer-book has been accepted by the parliament of England as containing that which the church is to teach; but the church settled her own articles, her own doctrines, and her own formularies. Not one word could be changed by any parliament. The church said, “We will teach this.” The parliament said, “We accept your teaching.” If any change be proposed, it must come, not from parliament, but from the church—from the convocation, the united body of the church. If it is expedient to make any important change, the church alone can make it, not the parliament. Let this be plainly and clearly understood—that where the state, as England, enters into a contract with the church, it is because the majority of those who manage the affairs of the state, and who are in England the majority of the people—approve of what the Church of England settled in her own convocation and with her own authority, and without any interference of Parliament. So long as Parliament approves of this, and maintains us, we teach it in connection with the state. If Parliament disapprove of this, and wishes to alter it, we must withdraw and stand on our own footing, and do the work of evangelization without assistance, maintenance, or support by the government. I think that this plain statement answers a great deal of what has fallen from Mr. Landon. One or two other things

yet remains to be noticed. He spoke, for instance, of the necessity of the state coercing men, in order to protect property and life, and in order that any man in the community may have the protection of law; and this, he says, is all that is required at the hands of government. But is it not always said that prevention is better than cure? Would it not be better to convert a thief, or a murderer, into a peaceable, quiet, orderly and honest citizen, than to hang him, or to banish him to a foreign land? Most assuredly it would. Shall we give power to punish men—to erect gaols, pay turnkeys, employ judges, and ultimately a hangman to execute the last sentence of the law—but withhold from the state power to employ ministers to preach the gospel to ignorant and sinful men? Is that the light in which we are to view British society? We forget the real interests of the state, as we are assuredly unmindful of the real duty of the state, when we speak in this way. If it be the duty of an individual, after he has been converted to a knowledge of Christ, to do everything on christian principles, (and certainly it is his duty,) it is equally the duty of the government, of the state, of members of parliament, of every man, to be as religious in the discharge of his public as well as his private duties. When you enter the walls of the House of Assembly are you to put off your christianity? Are you to leave your religion at home with your family, or at church—to be very religious elsewhere, but to have no religion in Parliament? I believe that every man, whatsoever position he holds—whatever station God in his Providence has assigned to him—is called on to act on christian principles; and if he be impressed with a right sense of this duty, he will endeavor to extend the influence of these principles throughout the land. Such a man will not confine himself to taking care of pounds, shillings and pence, but will seek to plant good seed in the hearts of all around him by employing a proper instrumentality. Mr. Landon's reference to a post-chaise being employed to weave cotton, and his application of this illustration to the case of a government identifying itself with religion, seems to me to be very far-stretched. If you want to weave cotton, you must employ a cotton weaver, and the best loom you can get, in order to have the work done efficiently; and if it be not performed satisfactorily, you withdraw your support. In order to discharge its duty in relation to the community, the government is to see that ministers of the gospel be provided in every part of the country—the poor as well as the rich—especially the poor, in order that those who cannot pay on the voluntary system—who cannot subscribe to the building of a church—who cannot themselves support a minister, while he labors among them. The government are bound to do this, and I only regret that the government are not now performing it. We are suffering now for the sins of governments in days past. We see vast tracts in this country, in which the government has not performed its duty. O, if this country were studded, as it ought to have been long ago, with houses of God, supplied with faithful ministers of Christ, whose ministrations could reach the lowest cottages and the most recent comers into the wilderness, how different would be its condition and prospects! It is entirely wide of the mark to come here to speak about the government coercing our consciences, and forcing us to believe this or that. No one in the present age advocates any such thing. Mr. Landon made reference to Jewish history, and he rather, of course unintentionally, falsified, the history he quoted. He said, that whenever reforms were made amongst the Jews, they were not done by kings, but by some other instrumentality.

Rev. W. LANDON—I said that such was the case generally.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I believe they were always done by kings. When we find Josiah reforming the people, or when we find Hezekiah bringing about a partial reformation, you will find it emanated purely from the king, and was carried out by him. We have an account of Hezekiah's reign in 2nd Kings, c. 18.

[Mr. C. was reading from this chapter when his time expired.]

Rev. J. PYPER—In listening to the sentiments which have fallen from our friends opposite, I have felt that in many instances I could respond a hearty amen

to much that they have said. It seems to me however, with regard to the sentiments advanced by Mr. Bettridge, that while he presented to us much truth—much truth that we all love—some of the sentiments were presented in such circumstances, and in such relations, as rendered them in a great measure untrue; there being no logical connection between many of his premises and his conclusions. He read an extract, presenting to us the fact that a nation is a moral person, and is bound to serve God. This is true. A nation is bound to serve God. Rulers are bound to carry out the principles of the Gospel of the Son of God. Rulers are bound to be christians. They are bound to do everything that may devolve on any rational being that has heard the sound of the Gospel of the Son of God; they are bound to do this just in the circumstances in which Almighty God has placed them. But what we say of the ruler, we say equally of the tailor and of the shoemaker. The man who makes my shoes is under the most solemn obligation to select his stock on christian principles, and to perform his work, and to sell it to me, on the same principles. But because he is thus bound to be a christian, and to act as a christian, does it follow that, therefore, he ought to have any control in the church of the Living God? or that a board of tailors ought to have any control, or a board of shoemakers? They are bound to be christians; and in the same way, those who are placed over us as rulers in the state, are called upon to carry out, as far as they possibly can, the principles of the Gospel, in that particular position in which the Eternal God has placed them. I was glad to hear from all gentlemen that have spoken, that they acknowledge only the power of the Eternal God, who possesses all power in Heaven and earth—the power of the Saviour—and the ultimate authority of the Bible. But it was said that this which God possesses must be given to others—that God, must, as it were, delegate His power to a body of human beings. I ask, to whom can He, the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace, communicate his power? Where shall we find a created intelligence strong enough to grasp His wisdom? Where shall we find a mind sagacious enough to employ the proper instrumentality in order to the carrying out of His purposes? and where shall we find a heart large enough to contain his needed love? An archangel would shrink back from such a position as this. The highest archangel before the Throne of God would recoil in conscious weakness from such a task. And yet men do “step in where angels fear to tread.” Gentlemen have informed us that Government is a Divine appointment. This has often been asserted, but I deny it. The magistracy is a Divine appointment; civil society is a Divine appointment. But, where, I ask, in the Word of God, do we find the warrant for the conclusion, that what we essentially call government, is a Divine appointment? If we refer to writers on practical ethics, they present to us a very just distinction between civil society and civil government. It must have been the parent of civil government. We have first the parental relation; we have the parental relation growing into the patriarchal, and the patriarchal springing into the kingly relation, and, higher still, into the imperial relation. Here we find civil society progressing. We find step by step, along with the development of civil society, a corresponding necessity for laws and enactments; and these laws and enactments may be regarded as government—we cannot regard this as of Divine authority. But when we look at the magistracy, we see that it is an ordinance of Heaven. We see that the powers that be are ordained of God, whether it be a Nero, with his blood thirsty disposition, or our own Victoria, with her tender feelings and generous heart, we say, the powers that be are ordained of God; and in certain circumstances, we should be under as much obligation to submit to Nero or the Khan of Tartary, as we are to submit to Victoria. But it cannot be argued from this, that the church and state should be connected—that because God has ordained that we should not live in a state of anarchy—because he has ordained a civil magistracy—therefore we are called upon to submit in church matters to the citation of the powers that be. I am aware these gentlemen, have said, again and again, that the state cannot control them, and I think that they

speak the honest sentiments of their hearts. I think there is principle enough and manliness enough, on the other side, to repudiate the thought of being controlled by the state. Nevertheless, there are some things which I cannot understand in the light of the expressions used by the gentlemen here. Is it not a fact that if the estimable Rector of Woodstock were taken to his Father's home in the Heavens, and his place were left vacant, it would be for Lord Elgin to fill that vacancy? Lord Elgin might fill it if he chose, or he might leave it without a rector if he were so pleased.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE---He does not touch the minister.

Rev. J. PYPER---I state a simple fact. Lord Elgin alone could put a rector there.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE---The Bishop would put the rector in, but he could not give him the temporality.

Rev. J. PYPER---The Bishop could not put the rector there, without Lord Elgin. Such is the state of things even in Canada. I ask, does not the King make a Bishop. Can a Bishop be made without the monarch, in England?

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE---Yes.

Rev. J. PYPER---You say that the church does all these things. I have certainly read history to little advantage, if it is not a fact that a Bishop is made by the king.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE---No.

Rev. J. PYPER---Not exclusively. There is a portion of the work that the church does. Again: can the Church of England alter one single article of her faith? These gentlemen are under her thirty-nine articles, and are subject to her canons. Can they alter one of these articles, or set aside one of these canons.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE---No.

Rev. J. PYPER---Here, then, the state controls them. The state gave its sanction to the prayer-book. The state enacted these canons, in the reign, I believe of James the First. These canons are yet binding upon the members of the Anglican church. These gentlemen speak of the true church. I am satisfied it is contrary to the feelings of their hearts, but still it is matter of fact, that they cannot---dare not---recognize any church as the true church, but the Church of England. They dare not do it under pain of excommunication.

Rev. B. CRONNY---False---utterly false.

Rev. J. PYPER---The eleventh canon decrees that the individual who admits that a non-conformist congregation may assume the name of real churches, is to be excommunicated. I give you the sense of the canon. Who says it is false?

Rev. B. CRONNY---So it is. That canon is not ours at all.

Rev. J. PYPER---That canon belongs to the Church of England. I speak understandingly, and what I affirm, I can sustain and prove. Again: wherever the Church and State are united, the church is brought into thralldom to the state, and I would, as briefly as possible, look at this idea. The church of God is allied to an earthly king. Look at our spiritual king, Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world." Here, then, we have a king. He, and He alone, has a right to sway the sceptre in Zion. To substitute an earthly king, for Christ, as the head of the Church, is, then, a piece of usurpation which might fill an intelligent universe with astonishment. Who can assume the authority of our Lord, and who can reign for him? This is no small matter. The individual that grasps the authority of a temporal sovereign, is deemed guilty of one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against society; it is high treason, punishable by death. And shall the sceptre of the King of kings be taken from his hand, and swayed in Zion? Shall not the Lord visit those who take such an attitude as this? But it is said here to-day, that these individuals are themselves in subjection to the Saviour---that they themselves obey his laws, and acknowledge his supremacy. I ask what would be thought of an individual in England who

should assume regal power, and begin to enact laws for Victoria's subjects—to sway the influence which she sways, and then gravely assert, in extenuation of the course he was taking, that he himself was subject to the Queen? Why, such an individual would find a resting place in a dungeon, on a scaffold, or in a mad-house. The Queen could not lay down her authority on such a plea. And will Christ allow men to step into his position, and legislate in Zion—enact laws—enact canons—and fasten them on his people? Will he allow them to build up tests and standards of orthodoxy, and say, "This is the faith once delivered unto the saints?" Is it possible that man can do all this, without usurping the place of the Son of God—that Saviour who alone can legislate in Zion? These gentlemen say, that they are subject to Christ. I say that the law of the land must sanction even what Christ has taught, in order to make it legal in the church of which they are members, and in any state church. The state is the ultimate authority—not Christ. Appeal to the law of Christ, and will you have a hearing? Will a man under trial before any tribunal in England, be permitted to defend himself from the Word of God, and that alone? Will not the law of the land at last meet him, and control him, and settle the case? These gentlemen affirm that the church is not under the power of the state. Not under the power of the state? Why, the state enacts laws that bind the church at every point. Though the church may in certain cases do what she pleases, it is because the state allows her so to do; but if the state should decree otherwise, then these gentlemen cannot do what they please in the circumstances in which they are placed by the state.

[Time expired.] *An interval of an hour was agreed upon for the purposes of refreshment; at the expiration of which,*

The CHAIRMAN read the third proposition on the voluntary side, as follows:

3—That the Voluntary principle in the Church, for its pecuniary support, has Christ's express sanction, and has proved adequate to all the necessities that have occurred for its maintenance and furtherance.

Rev. W. GILMORE—The proposition which has just been read may be viewed in a two-fold aspect: the voluntary principle as enjoying the sanction of Christ; and the competency of the voluntary principle to meet the exigencies of the church—whether to sustain her spirituality, or to propagate her religion in the world. It appears to me that the first part of this proposition has been already discussed this morning, and I may therefore pass immediately from it, with a few remarks, and attend to the competency of the principle to accomplish the ends for which it was established. One of the rev. gentlemen on the opposite side thought that when there was a Divine command, we could not exercise the voluntary principle. We think, therefore, that it is very desirable to explain terms. We do think that when we exercise submission to Divine authority, we may be quite voluntary in our exertions. The simple fact of there being a Divine command, and our obedience to that command, surely does not prove that we are not voluntary in doing it. If, then, I understand the proposition rightly, in this connection, we use the word voluntary in opposition to civil compulsion. If I am incorrect in that, I am quite ready of course, to submit to any representation that is made. I wish to state again, that in submission to a Divine command we exercise the voluntary principle; but when we are compelled to give of our funds, or to part with anything that belongs to us, in our capacity of subjects, and this is forcibly done, then we conceive that this is a violation of the voluntary principle. It has been represented that tithes were not voluntary but legal. If the rev. gentleman who made that remark meant that they were legal because God commanded them, we do not differ; but if he meant that the tithes could be exacted by the authority of the civil magistrate, that we deny. There was no civil legality—there was a Divine legality. Let it be further observed that the tithe is uniformly put thus; or, if not uniformly, at least six times out of the twelve in which there is reference to it in the Old Testament; I say that at least in six instances the principle is put thus: the tithe is given to the Levite, to the widow, to the fatherless, and to the stranger; and if the civil magistrate could

not enforce tithes to be paid to the Levite upon the same principle he could not enforce tithes to be paid to the stranger, to the widow and to the fatherless. My reason for referring to this is, that I think it has not been sufficiently explained. For I never could view the tithe in any other light than as voluntary. It originated in a voluntary act. Who enforced Abraham to pay the tenth of his spoils to Melchizedeck? Who was the civil authority? was it not voluntary? And what was it that induced Jacob to give a tenth of all that he had acquired in his absence? And then, be it observed, that the Levite, the king, the magistrate, could not know whether a man had given a tithe or not: this was left entirely to his own conscience, and he had to appeal only to his Creator that he had given tithes. The magistrate could not know whether he had done so or not, nor could the Levite. I beg leave to read a passage; I might quote many, but I shall read one where I think this principle is very clearly and very fully sustained. My object is to show that tithes, under the former system, were voluntary, so far as the civil magistrate was concerned—done under Divine authority, but left to the conscience of the man that made the tithe in his own house, and laid it up on his gate, to meet the wants of the Levite, the stranger and the widow. I quote Deuteronomy, 12 c., 26 v.: “When thou hast made an end of tithing and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, that they may eat within my gates and be filled; then thou shalt say before the Lord thy God, I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow, according to all thy commands, which thou hast commanded me.” He says this in his conscience, in the presence of his Maker, making an appeal to Him that he really made the tithe. The text goes on: “Look down from thy Holy Habitation, from Heaven, and bless thy people Israel, and the land which thou hast given us, as thou swearest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey.” I understand by this, that the civil magistrate did not know that that man had given a tenth of his property, and could not know of it except by his own information: and the civil magistrate could not constrain him to pay it, any more than he could constrain him to pay the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. Consequently, I conceive that there was no civil coercion employed—that it was a voluntary offering, made according to the Divine command, and in the sight of God. And now, without dwelling any longer upon this subject, I may further observe, that it must be taken for granted, that it has been proved that Jesus Christ has established the voluntary principle in the New Testament as the reverend gentleman opposite do not deny that the voluntary principle is established, and established too, by Divine command. That law was read this morning, as it occurs in the 1st Corinthians, c. 9; and having been already discussed, I think it unnecessary to go into the merits of it; but it is very obvious to me, that even late as the days of John, it was the method, and if you please, the only method, of propagating the gospel. In the 3rd Epistle of John, it is written: “Beloved, thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren and to strangers, which have some witness of thy charity before the church; whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a godly sort, thou shalt do well: because that for His name’s sake, they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles.” We should not be beholden to any worldly man to support our spiritual religion. We feel that there is competence and energy sufficient in the principle, which the great Head of the Church has established, at once to edify the people of God, and to extend the kingdom of Jesus Christ. And now I come to the competency of the principle. The rev. gentlemen on the opposite side thought it was necessary I should pass over that part of the proposition, but this I do not intend to do. The second part of the proposition is, that it—the voluntary principle—is competent to accomplish the object, namely the edification of the church, and the extension of the church. Now, if my time would allow me to go into pecuniary arrangements, which however, it will not, I might say a great deal upon what is understood by this “competency,” for I am fully persuaded

that the voluntary principle is a very economical one, and must be very skilfully managed. If it be deemed necessary that a clergyman should get £1000 per annum, or £500, or even that he should get £150, under all circumstances I do not know that the voluntary principle would do it. It would perhaps be said, "We think you might live on less." It might be said further, "Won't it be enough if you get three times the average income of our members?" For I imagine that the average income of members of congregations would not exceed £40 per year, though some would have less, others would have much more. Probably then, the voluntary minister might be asked, "Would you not be satisfied with three times £40, to labor amongst us?" Then the question arises, how much would it take per individual to support a minister who has a church of a thousand souls? I suppose it would take three shillings from each individual. But supposing that one half of them would not be voluntaries, let us take six shillings as required to be paid yearly by the other half. And verily I hope we are not going to be inferior to the Jews in their liberality. They gave a tenth of their income; and are we to be satisfied with giving a thirty-fifth of our income—for in the case I have supposed that is all the contribution amounts to. But I pass from this point because there are other things demanding my attention. You observe that the voluntary principle has its elements, and that it is to be skilfully managed. In the first place, looking at the voluntary principle as laid down in the Scriptures, we find that "every one" is spoken of. The law was quoted in Exodus: "every one." And again, we come down to the Epistle to the Corinthians: "every one of you." And then after this, there is another element: "every one, as God as prospered you." And there is a third element: "willingly." "Every one," and "willingly." Now these are the three elements found in the voluntary principle, and if each be attended to, we are not at all afraid of its sufficiency. I take up the voluntary principle as thus laid down in the New Testament, and there is no exception to it in the Old. I presume that the Divine Spirit intended to instruct us in this principle. Then it was to be done periodically—every week. And if we look at church history, we find that they paid great attention to this weekly contribution, and, in the churches of Africa, afterwards, monthly. Now who will doubt that the christian religion prospered exceedingly during the first century. Let us take the authority even of a heathen writer on this point—I mean Pliny, and whether the date of his letter was 107 or 110, you must admit that the christian religion had spread most extensively throughout that region of country. In addition to this, the Apostle Paul tells us that the gospel was preached throughout all the earth, when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians—say A. D. 60, or 65; so that there had been a very rapid spread of the gospel of Jesus Christ in about 36 years. And it is a fact to which I wish to call the attention of the rev. gentlemen on the opposite side, that in the course of all their itineracy, never do we hear the apostles complain of want of funds to keep them in any locality. Never, I say; and yet we know that at that time the state afforded no relief. It stands before us that they never did leave any locality unattended, for want of funds; and I am sure the spirituality of the church was as well preserved as it is in the present day. I have been gratified exceedingly by the very definite and repeated reference of the rev. gentlemen on the opposite side, to the simple gospel of Jesus Christ as then preached. Yet, as I have said, the wants of every locality were then met. And as far as my memory will allow me to range over church history, at least during the second and to the middle of the third century, I do not remember an instance where there was a complaint that the church could not keep the preachers of the gospel for want of funds. Still, up to that time, there was no assistance afforded by the state. The rev. gentlemen on the opposite side may perhaps be able to find an instance, where at the time spoken of, the gospel was not preached for want of funds: but I cannot now call one to mind. If the matter be, then, as I state it, I think we may conclude that there is an efficiency in the voluntary principle, skilfully managed—scripturally managed—at once to support the religion of Christ, and to sustain the edification of the church.

Rev. B. Croly—In replying to the gentleman who has just sat down, I shall, in the first place, take up the subject of tithes, which he has handled somewhat at large, though that subject has in reality no reference whatever to the proposition before us. But still I would beg to correct his statement with regard to tithes. He speaks only of one tithe, as commanded by God, and as paid by the children of Israel; forgetting that there was another tithe—a tithe given altogether to the Levite, and paid to the Levite. We find a statement concerning it in Numbers, 18 c., 21 v. "And behold I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel, for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation." Thus we see there was a tithe appointed, which was to be paid to the Levites, and was of course created for them. But we read also of that other tithe mentioned by the last gentleman. The mention of it occurs in the latter part of Deuteronomy. It was a tithe which was intended for the Love Feasts, as they were called amongst the Jews—the feasts which were given to the fatherless, the widow, and the poor that inhabited any of the towns. This second tenth which was or purposes of charity, was not to be paid over or accounted for to the Levite. This is altogether a different showing from that of the Rev. Gentleman. He will see that these two tithes are distinct and different things. Every writer of authority you consult on the matter will tell you the same thing—that the tithe paid to the Levite was accounted for to him, and given to him as his due—as his portion and inheritance, because he served the tabernacle of the Lord; whereas, the other was given to these feasts of love and charity, at which they were to entertain the widow, and the poor, and the fatherless, within their gates. But with tithe we have here nothing to do. Tithe, we know, has been paid in England—nominally, at all events—and in Ireland. These tithes were given of old for spiritual purposes, by individuals who had a right to property in the land, and they have been retained as a rent charge on the land there. But we have nothing to do with it here. We are here speaking of an endowment provided by a pious king, which we wish to have retained for the purpose for which it was originally intended—that is, the dissemination of religion, and the propagation of the gospel, throughout the land. These gentlemen wish to have it alienated from that object. With reference to the sufficiency of the voluntary principle, I was somewhat amused with the financial calculation of the Rev. Gentleman, and I do think there are some here who were disposed, as well as myself, to smile at it. He calculated the average income of all men in a congregation at £40 a year. Now we know there are persons here who have congregations (I am not speaking of the clergy of the Church of England, but ministers of other denominations) whose average income is not £40 a year, but £400 or £500. I am sure that the congregations in Toronto average far beyond £40. If three times the average incomes of the congregation is to be the scale on which the clergy are to receive sustenance, then there will be very great inequality—very great injustice. The man who lives in a town, and ministers to a wealthy congregation, will have three times the average income of those wealthy men: he will have to £1,000, or more. Whereas, the minister in the country will have three times £40, perhaps, or not even that—for in poor and scattered neighbourhoods, the average does not amount to that. But this matter, again, has nothing to do with the question in hand. The question is, is voluntarism sufficient, not merely to preach the gospel in towns and villages, and throughout densely populated places, where men are able and willing to support the worship of God—but, is it a system that can cover the country, and fill all its nooks and corners, with the gospel? Is it a system which can carry the gospel to every man's door in the country? I say it is not. I can prove that it is not. In the early days of christianity, it did not accomplish this. For 300 years, men laboured—men of God, men of inspiration, men who possessed the influences and gifts of God's holy spirit in a large measure; these men laboured for 300 years, and yet what do we read at the close of that period? I call your attention to the beginning of the fourth century, as we have it in the Ecclesiastical History of Mosheim:—

"There remained still in the European provinces, an incredible number of persons who adhered to the worship of the gods; and though the christian bishops

continued their pious efforts to gain them over to the gospel, yet the success was by no means proportionable to their diligence and zeal, and the work of conversion went on but slowly."

This was the state of things after 300 years of labour, and the voluntary system, under all the advantages that could possibly be given to it. Men working miracles—men endowed with God's spirit—men gifted with tongues that they might go throughout the nations of the earth: these men laboured 300 years, and laboured incessantly, and yet we find that in the European provinces, there still remained an "incredible number" of those who worshipped false gods. But we read shortly afterwards, that when Constantine was converted—when he began to act as a christian man, and to employ his exalted position and influence in the propagation of the truth in his empire—there was an immense spread of the gospel throughout all the provinces, and beyond the bounds of the empire. We find that in one century christianity made more progress throughout the world, than in the three centuries before. This is an historical statement, and I challenge examination with regard to it. Here, then, we see that the Emperor Constantine, when he was convinced of the truth of christianity, under the teaching of the men of God who then lived in the church in its pure state (for it was then comparatively pure, though some corruptions had been introduced) regarded it his duty to employ his influence as emperor in spreading the gospel throughout his dominions, and in discountenancing idolatry and the worship of the gods. Such is the statement with regard to the sufficiency of voluntarism in those days. It was not sufficient in the primitive times, and we know it is not sufficient now. Look at England, where an establishment exists. That establishment is not commensurate to the wants of the country; it has not kept pace with the growth of the country; the state has not done its duty by enlarging the bounds of the establishment, and supplying additional church accommodation, and additional ministers, as the people increased. We know parishes that were formerly villages, having one church, that now contain hundreds of thousands of people, yet have still only one church and one pastor. If that be the case, whose fault is it? It is not the fault of the system, but the fault of the state, which does not work out that system. If, then, England is left in the state of spiritual destitution in which—according to the best statistical accounts—it is, we must come to the conclusion that the voluntary system is insufficient to perform the work of evangelization—the work of preaching the gospel, and bringing it home to every man in the country. The gentleman who has just sat down appears to me to take a very limited view of what we, as ministers of Christ, ought to aim at. His views appear to be bounded by this—that the gospel shall be preached to those who are willing to hear it—those who are willing to pay for it—those who have £40 a year, and who will give three times that sum in order that a minister may live amongst them. But we should go beyond that, we should preach the gospel to every creature. And we say that provision ought to be made for it. We cannot do so individually, as men. We have no organization, or instrumentality, to enable us to do it, unless provision be made for it. We say, that the Apostles were commanded by God to teach nations as well as individuals; and a nation cannot be discipled—every part of a country cannot be visited, and provided with the ministrations of religion—the gospel cannot be brought to every man's door—without a full and adequate supply, by the state, of good, and proper, and spiritual, and scriptural instrumentalities. The state has a duty to perform. We heard something from the gentleman who spoke before the adjournment, about a corporation of shoemakers or tailors, being formed to christianize the world, or manage the church. This is not the way to argue upon solemn subjects. These men have their duty to perform to their customers, and they are bound to act on christian principles—to let their work be good and honest; but they have nothing to do with government. Who made them governors? Who placed on them the responsibility of christianizing a people? If they belong to a church, they have a right to a voice in that church—to a place in it—but to the place of those who are ministered unto, not of those that minister. We might as well say that because, as shoemakers or tailors, they are bound to get and supply good material, therefore they are bound to get and give good

sermons. The responsibility of providing the latter rests with the minister. And in the same manner, the responsibility rests with the state to do the work of the state—with a government to do the work of a government. A responsibility rests on our gracious Queen, and I trust and pray that she may be able to discharge that responsibility, by her influence and her example in her position in society; and that by every means within her reach she will aid and assist the propagation of sound, scriptural principles throughout the land. Is not the virtue of our Queen a glorious example to her people? And if she were to forget her high station—if she were to forget her high responsibilities—and were to abandon the gentle, womanly demeanor that marks her on all occasions, would it not be a bad example alighting upon christianity? If she were to forget her christianity, would it not be worse still? If she were to forget the living God and Christ, and were to forget that she is bound by her example, and by every means that come within her reach, to promote the interests of Christ's religion in the land, and thereby to promote the best interests of her subjects—it would be a greater evil than all the others put together. I had marked several passages in order to prove from ecclesiastical history that under the voluntary system, during the three first centuries, the church of Christ, not only did not exist and spread as it afterwards existed and spread,—not only did not increase in the empire—but that it was only in large towns, where there were large and wealthy congregations (having a higher average than £40 a year) that christianity did take root. The villagers—the *pagi*—throughout the Roman Empire, were left without the gospel. Hence, pagan became another name for villagers, because they lived where the gospel of Christ had not been preached. The small communities were necessarily neglected, while in large communities christianity was established, and large numbers were converted to the faith. But under that system, was the church so altogether pure? Was the church so altogether perfect, that no fault could be found with it—that no evil could be traced in it? Are we to say that when Constantine was converted, and when he established christianity as the religion of his empire, all kinds of corruption then came in? We read concerning the second and third centuries, as they are described by Mosheim in his Ecclesiastical History:—

“There is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of men will not in time alter for the worse, and load with a ditions foreign to its nature and original design. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of christianity. In this century [the second] many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the christian worship, the introduction of which was extremely offensive to wise and good men. These changes, while they destroyed the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, were naturally pleasing to the gross multitude, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external institutions, than with the native charms of rational and solid piety, and who generally give little attention to any objects but those which strike their outward senses.”

This was under the voluntary system. This was before connection with the state had at all corrupted the church of God. To what must we trace this circumstance? To the innate depravity of the human heart. It was foretold that the Man of Sin should be revealed—the son of perdition—and nothing could stop it. It was foretold that the apostacy should take place, and nothing could hinder it, that apostacy has continued in existence up to the present time, but we know that its days are numbered. Prophecy declares to us that the time will come when it shall be pronounced—“Babylon is fallen, is fallen.” But the evil has existed for a long period—even from the very commencement of the christian era. The Apostle Paul tells us that in his own time the “mystery of iniquity” was working—it was beginning to work. We are told also that in the days of the Apostle John interests were set up, opposed to Christ's interests. We know that there were false teachers everywhere. We know from the Epistles, that errors had crept into the church, and that some of the Epistles were written to correct these errors. Therefore, the voluntary system did not preserve the purity of the church. Under the most favourable circumstances—with all appliances and means to boot—it did not do it. Corruption spread. Up to

the beginning of the fourth century, when Constantine was converted, corruption went on abounding and increasing, more and more. [Time expired.]

Rev. Mr. ORMSTON—It gives me great pleasure to meet you here to-day, for a variety of reasons. I always like to meet where there is the “feast of reason and the flow of soul,” sanctified by religion, and where the sympathies of many hearts are pledged for the advancement of a great cause. But there are other reasons why I am exceedingly pleased to have been among you here. It is that I should have had the pleasure of hearing sentiments expressed by these reverend rectors, which I never heard from rectors before. I never before heard such large-hearted benevolence and beneficence from any rectors, addressing a public meeting; and therefore I rejoice to have had an opportunity of being present on this occasion. Methinks I have a much higher opinion of rectors than I ever had before. The western atmosphere is purer than the eastern; but at any rate your western rectors are much more large-minded than rectors I have seen in the east. Here we are recognized by them as brethren; but in the east, rectors stigmatise us as schismatics, and our places of worship, instead of being recognized as churches, are derided as conventicles. I have been so kicked and cuffed by eastern rectors, that I am glad that I have now heard from the lips of ordained episcopalians, words so kind and cheering as those which have been spoken here to-day. Then, again, I have heard our brother of the Scottish Kirk confess that the church can do well without support from the state. Hence, my advocacy is not needed, because the proposition is to a certain extent granted. Moreover, I have heard that all denominations may receive aid from the reserves. The exclusive days, when the church of England ministers claimed to be regarded as the only “Protestant clergy,” are over. The exclusiveness is abandoned. The time when the church of Scotland had to seek the assistance of the Attorney General in order that her ministers might be classed among “protestant clergy,” are over—never, never to return. We have now an improved system in this matter—decidedly improved. We hear of “changes coming over the spirit” of men’s dreams, but here we have a change in fact—in things real and solid. I cordially greet you, brethren, and congratulate you on this improvement in your manners. Another new and most delightful doctrine which I have heard to-day, for the first time, is this: that if Parliament does not behave itself, the church of England will be its servant no longer; and, again—still another novelty!—that if Parliament pleases, it may withhold support from the church of England, and transfer it to the Wesleys, the Baptists, or any other body. I never heard that before. I never heard churchmen admit, until now, that Parliament has a perfect right to do as it likes—even to the extent of severing its connection with the church of England. We mean to go to Parliament and say it shall do this. Another thing worthy of notice is, that the church—or at all events, our friends the rectors—utterly repudiate every vestige of persecution. That is another glorious doctrine. No poor man’s clock shall now be seized to pay church rates. No poor dissenter shall have his family Bible sold, to enrich the minister of a church to which he does not belong. No cannie Scot shall be again thrust into prison, because he will not pay the annuity tax. No half-starved peasant’s pigs shall be tithed at the bidding of the rector. I never expected to see so many new lights spring up in the quarter whence these have emanated. Why, the old dominant church is gone—positively gone—gone with the consent of the rectors. They say there are to be no more penalties. Every man is to give what he likes—exactly what we have all along proposed. It is plain that with so many concessions, this establishment is reduced to a nonentity. What is a law without a penalty? What is a penalty without a collector? and what is a collector without a sword? The truth is, the time has gone by when fires and faggots can be employed by any church. But there is a kind of persecution more horrible and more excruciating still—a system of perverting influences, brought to bear on the heaven-endowed intellect of man. This is the very hardest kind of all persecution. Barbarous terms—“dissenter” or “heretic”—are hurled against a man, and forthwith men shut him out from their sympathies.—Unfortunately, a conscientious dissenter cannot come within the circle of rectorial

socialities. This is the case in the east; in the west it seems to be somewhat different; and therefore I say again, I am pleased to be here. Let me, however, notice the question now before us. Is the voluntary principle sufficient to cover the whole country—to fill it with God-serving, God-loving people? Gloriously sufficient: God hasten the time when it shall be triumphant! We have heard a great deal about the first three centuries, and documents have been read to show that, under the voluntary system, christianity did not succeed. But we have never seen anything like it since. I attach very little weight to what was said as to the rapid spread which it made when Constantine took it under the protection of his sword and crown. That sort of general conversion may be done by consecrating the waters of an immense river, and calling that making the country christian. Such a plan, or mode of practice, may christianize a whole nation, nominally, but it can never christianize a single heart. Again, we are told that in England the state has not supplied the gospel to the poor. That was a noble confession. I, too, say the same thing. The state church has not done it—never can do it—never will do it. She has four millions at her command, but give her forty millions, and she would not do it. She has done so much (the rector says) with four millions, give her forty, and she would do much more. I may paraphrase the idea, and apply it to voluntarism: under all its disadvantages it has done much; let it have fair play, and it will do more. Hear our commission: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” A splendid and most holy commission! A commission that will not be fulfilled until every soul has heard the glad tidings! But there is nothing in this commission about giving authority to states to christianize whole peoples. I want to know, then, who gave Parliament authority to christianize the country. Assuredly not my God—not my Lord—not the Bible. And on the same principle that a board of shoemakers and tailors cannot do it. I maintain that neither Parliaments, nor kings, nor queens can do it. The Queen has been referred to by the last speaker. We all revere her; I respect her for her virtues, and if she—withal so virtuous—gave of her pocket money to promote the diffusion of the gospel, I should revere her still more. But to make her the head of a religious establishment—to impose upon her the responsibility of christianizing the nation—is to forget the actual duties of her high office. Amongst the arguments that have been used on the subject of endowments, one gentleman has pointed to the fact that the London Missionary Society endow men, and give them £100 a year to preach the gospel; and that, he says, is inconsistent with voluntarism. Of course these are voluntary gifts; and if they were more frequent, so much the better. If splendid endowments of this nature were more frequent, voluntarism would remain firm as now, while it would be enabled more extensively to spread a knowledge of the gospel, and to overcome the benumbing, the chilling influences of church establishments. I hope to see thousands rolling in more rapidly than now, feeling quite sure that that may be the case without at all jeopardising the integrity or strength of voluntarism. I have been much amused by the ideas which some of the speakers have endeavoured to represent as voluntarism. Their policy, in this respect, seems to have been to imitate the old practice of manufacturing and putting up men of straw, that they may display their valour in pulling them down again. We have heard something about defining terms, and I admire the plan. Let me, then, try to explain what is meant by voluntarism. It is often misunderstood or misrepresented. Men who want to do battle against it, very often draw on their imaginations very largely, and conjure up something hideous and absurd. According to these oracles, voluntarism is infidel in principle, and vicious in practice. Voluntarism does not imply that we are under no obligation to promote our religious opinions. We feel that in this respect every man is under obligations to the law of God, which is a law much higher than the law manufactured in Parliament. It is impossible that men can have religious opinions, and not desire to propagate them. They cannot keep them if they would. Every man is bound by the law of heaven to promulgate his opinions: voluntarism says that the obligation is not voluntary, but the act is. Religion is a purely individual thing, resting between man and his Maker. What we call national religion, is the religion which all the individuals in a nation profess and practice. But as for that

corporate thing, which our friends opposite call national religion, it is a thing having a huge body; I always thought it had nothing else, but I have learned to-day that it has a soul, and consequently responsibility. Now I conceive that no really godly whole can ever be made by a conglomeration of ungodly parts. We do not mean that kings and queens are not christians. Alas for them if they are not! Do not accuse us of wishing that they were not christian. We want them all to be such; but we do not wish them to do more in their official capacity than they are required to do. They are not required to take charge of religion in their kingly or queenly capacity; and by the same rule, Parliaments are not required to legislate in religious matters. Voluntaryism does not mean that there is no religious truth; but it does mean that the state has no right to take any particular creed by the hand, and say, "this alone is truth." We declare that there is religious truth—

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—So do I.

Rev. Mr. ORMSTON—But we say further, that no man should be compelled to support another man's faith, nor even be compelled to support his own. Voluntaryism says that christianity should be left to maintain and protect itself in the world, by its own inherent, divinely-given powers. It neither needs nor desires foreign aid; but, on the contrary, repudiates all alliance with civil powers. The illustration of Paul, which is so often dragged in to support the state payment of the clergy is specific. The ox that treadeth out the corn is not to be muzzled; but no ox, while treading out my corn, should eat out of my neighbour's stack. No man, while trimming my vine, should steal my neighbour's grapes. No labourer, working for hire, and entitled to hire, should do your work, and come to me for payment. A shepherd is entitled to milk from the flock he tends, but he has no authority in scripture, or any where else, for stealing his neighbour's milk. I might carry the illustration further, but I have said enough to exemplify the principle of voluntaryism, which is, that every man must be left to maintain his own religion. You maintain yours; I will maintain mine; of the manner in which you and I discharge our duty, God alone is to be judge. The scriptures tell us that those who serve at the altar shall live by the altar; and voluntaryism in no way abrogates the command. [Time expired.]

Rev. G. BELL—I have been exceedingly anxious to find out what is meant by the voluntary principle. It seems to me, that the definition usually given to it is this: That a minister is to be supported by the voluntary contributions of those to whom he ministers. If that be not a correct view of the nature of voluntaryism, I should like to know what it is. There has been a good deal said by the reverend speaker who has just sat down, to the effect that it is customary to build up a man of straw and call it voluntaryism, and then knock it down. It possibly may be so, but at the same time it must be remembered that it is equally so to build up a man of straw, call it the establishment principle, and then to knock it down also. It is my firm conviction that a state support of religion must be voluntary, just as much as the support of religion by individuals. And I maintain that it must be voluntary because a state never would give such support to religion against its will. It must be a voluntary expression of the ruling power, whatever that may be. In the case before us, there must be an expression of the will of the people of Great Britain through their representatives in the Imperial Parliament. The distinction must still be noticed, that what is voluntary is not thereby necessarily optional, and that the legal support of the christian church is not thereby necessarily a compulsory one. The great principle, as it appears to me, is, that the gospel is to be extended, and that one of the means to be used in that extension, is the furnishing of pecuniary resources. Without this, no institution, however spiritual, can advance in this world. There must be pecuniary resources. Now it appears to me that the great principle which regulates the conduct of an individual under the influence of the gospel, also regulates the conduct of a state. Where the spirit of God acts on the soul, in a full degree, it will cause the person to give himself—soul, body, moneys, lands—to the service of God, in whatever way his conscience may dictate. I maintain that if it be the duty—as it certainly is—of the individual christian to devote himself and all that he possesses, on the altar of his God, whenever he is brought to a knowledge of the

truth as it is in Jesus—it is equally the bounden duty of a community, and therefore the state is bound to use its resources for the same purpose. I do not enlarge on this, as it is not immediately before us. It is not on account of any want of faith, that we disclaim the sufficiency of the voluntary principle. It is not from want of faith on our part, in the power of religion upon the minds of the christians belonging to those sections of the church which we represent, that we declare to cast ourselves wholly upon the voluntary principle; for I am fully convinced that the section of the church to which I belong would be as liberal in its contributions as any other section of the church in the world. Still I maintain that, efficient as the voluntary principle may be for maintaining the church under some circumstances, and in some parts of the world, it is not sufficient for evangelizing the whole world—for doing the great work which the church, as a whole, is bound to do. There are some places—in cities, and in some counties—where the voluntary principle is exceedingly efficient. I have no doubt that some think that Scotland is a country where the voluntary principle has been exceedingly efficient. We say it has been so, because Scotland was first taught by the establishment principle. We have heard reference to the Apostle going forth and taking nothing from the Gentiles. Is not that the same principle on which the Church of Christ still acts—on which the missionary now goes forth? If the remarks of the last speaker have the slightest force against any endowments, they have equal force against all endowments. If the christian minister must repudiate endowments by the state, he must repudiate endowments provided by a society—both having this one great purpose—the spreading of the gospel throughout the world. I maintain that the voluntary principle is not sufficient, because there are many circumstances in which a minister cannot be supported by the voluntary contributions of his flock. In the first instance, he has no flock—perhaps for years, he will have no flock that can do it, whatever their will may be. It has been said, “Give us enough of the voluntary principle, and we’ll do what you require.” Certainly, that is the point which I and my friends have all along been urging. We object to the voluntary principle, because there is not enough of it. It is just because there is not enough of it, that that which has been styled the voluntary principle, is in reality the involuntary principle. It is not because christians have voluntarily contributed what is required, but because they have been unwilling to do so, that a deficiency has been felt. Still, however, this does not come to the matter of principle, and it is to the great matter of principle to which I adhere; because it is by adherence to this principle that I maintain the truth, which I cannot and dare not repudiate. I cannot give up this principle without tearing the crown from the head of the Saviour, and that I will not do. Reference has been made to the early Christians, and the reputed spread of Christianity under their preaching. There is no question that in 40, christianity was extended to every province of the Roman empire, and even beyond it, but the whole land was not christianized, as has been already shown. Christianity was widely extended within a few years of the death of Christ. It was extended, but how? Not by the voluntary principle, as that principle is understood and acted upon by the christian church of the present day, but under the peculiar circumstances of the times, when the greater number of those in Judea who were brought to the faith, devoted their whole substance, sold their lands even, and gave them into the treasury of the Lord, and then went forth to preach the gospel. These were peculiar circumstances. They knew that the land would soon be ravaged and destroyed by the Roman army, and under these peculiar circumstances, they devoted the whole of their property to the service of the gospel. These, I say, were peculiar circumstances, that are not incumbent on the church of the present day. I have said already that the whole of a man’s property is to be devoted to God, but it is not in every instance to be employed in paying ministers, or sending missionaries: to a very great extent, this was the principle, although not now required. Still it was the principle acted on in the primitive church, and this, so far as human instrumentalities were concerned, was the great secret, through means of which the gospel made such rapid progress. But observe, this was a peculiar case, which does not apply to the whole history of the church, in every age. It was intended to show the vital power of christianity;

and that vital power was manifested in a striking degree in the effects which resulted from it. But we are not to suppose, although it pleased the Lord thus to show the vital power of christianity, in the first instance, that the great principle for which we have contended was to remain in abeyance. I mean the principle of the supremacy of Christ, and the subserviency of nations, of governments, and of every thing that belongs to man, when brought into the church, to the great end of maintaining and spreading the gospel. It was not necessary that the same circumstances should continue throughout the entire history of the world. There was no complaint of want of funds amongst the primitive christians, for the reason I have explained. Mention has been made of the proper amount of salary that a minister should receive, and three times the average income of the members of his congregation has been named as that amount. In many instances, probably, a great deal less than that would be considered a suitable maintenance, but this, I consider, has nothing to do with the question before us. The question is, whether the voluntary principle has Christ's express sanction as the principle on which the pecuniary support of his church should rest, and whether it has proved adequate to all the necessities that have occurred. There is no doubt that Christ requires that men should give their souls, and bodies, and moneys, and every thing else, to his service; but no statement has been adduced from scripture to show that Christ gave his express sanction to this voluntary principle, as the exclusive principle for the pecuniary support of the church. No scriptural statement has been adduced that bears directly on this point. I will again mention one necessity which exists, and that is the necessity of extending the church to heathen lands—where the voluntary principle (always keeping in view the distinction I have made) is not sufficient for the maintenance and furtherance of the gospel. Taking the voluntary principle in the view which I hold to be sound—that governments and individuals are under law to Christ, and bound to contribute of their substance for the furtherance of his gospel—and then I would admit most cheerfully that it is sufficient. But as I presume that this is not the principle upheld on the other side, it does seem to me that there is something wanting in that voluntary principle to which they refer. Reference was made in the forenoon to America, and without going back to that part of our discussion, I would state most distinctly that I do not consider America a fair field for affording satisfactory testimony concerning the voluntary principle. There has not been sufficient time to test it. Moreover, it ought to be directly borne in mind that America did not start on the voluntary principle; and extensive state endowments of churches still exist there. The endowment of a single church in New York is greater than all the clergy reserves of Canada. Another fact is to be remembered, that throughout a great number, if not all the states of the American union, there are additional funds which are partly employed in the teaching of religion. That I consider is most distinctly an endowment of religion. Another fact stated by Baird in his work on "Religion in America," is, that a very great number of Congregational churches in the New England States are state churches, upheld as such by the law; contributions being levied by law for the support of those churches. Now keeping these things in view, how can America be pointed to as a field where the voluntary principle has had free scope? There is certainly a great deal of voluntary service rendered to the cause of the gospel in the United States, but I do not admit that that is the only means upon which the gospel there depends for pecuniary support. I think I must have been mistaken on one occasion, if I were understood to say that churches could do perfectly well without establishments. [Time expired.]

Rev. W. GILMORE—In reference to the subject of tithes, I again state that there were no civil exactions under the former economy. Mr. Cronyn has endeavored to prove, that in primitive times there was an insufficiency in the voluntary principle because a bishop, laboring in a place, did not convert all the people that were there.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I referred to Moshiem, to show that at the commencement of the fourth century, there were "an incredible number of persons who adhered to the worship of the gods."

Rev. W. GILMORE—All I intended to say was, that an endowment could have done no more than send a Bishop there to labor, and that this was done by the voluntary principle. The historical fact proves no more. Again, it has been represented, that the voluntary principle had made comparatively little progress in the world, as far down as the time of Constantine. I referred to Pliny, whose statement has not been touched. I quote from memory, but I think he says, when writing to Trajan—"The christian religion has entered the cities, the villages, the towns, and the hamlets; the very temples are forsaken, and there are no more sacrifices," or, "the sacrifices are not now purchased as they were formerly,"—I forget which. This was in 107 or 110. Here we see, then, that at that time, and in that part of the country, the voluntary principle had done wonders. And did not Tertullian, in his "Apology" say—"Were we to refer from your empire, we should leave a mighty chasm in the midst of you?"—showing that the voluntary principle had indeed done wonders at that time. The rev. gentleman who spoke last seems to be at a loss as to what we mean by the voluntary principle. We mean this—that a man may give all his property, if he choose, or whatever proportion he pleases, to the support of the gospel; only he is not forced to do so. We do not think that that contribution must be confined to the church in which he is a member, but that it may be extended to others. Our friend seems to be at a very great loss to understand how a man can possibly give beyond the limits of the church where he labors. Now the Apostle says—"Let them who are taught communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." That was said of an individual, teaching in a particular congregation; and in that particular congregation, the taught are to communicate with him of all good things—that is for his temporal support. Then the Apostle says further, when writing to the Phillippians,—“Now, ye Phillippians, know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me, as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity.” Now here are the Phillippians, not only contributing to the support of the individual laboring amongst them, but sending help to the Apostle when far from them—all on the voluntary principle. And now as to the voluntary principle in modern times. It must be remembered that it labored under a paralysis for a thousand years, and even now, when the voluntaries are greatly enfeebled, and only exerting themselves up into health, voluntaryism has done, and is doing wonders. And what but the compulsory system kept us under this paralysis? For about 200 or 300 years we began to quiver with life, and to see, however dimly, the light; and our forefathers, in striving to gain the full degree of life and health, were often incarcerated in prisons, and hunted by dragoons, at the instance of the established church. Still they went on—still the voluntary principle struggled and lived. Look at its operation among the non-conformists in England at the present day. Do we not find that the supplies of the dissenting churches in England overtake the half of the population? Look again at the Methodists, when they came forth, and threw themselves on the voluntary principle: did it not work wonders in spreading their religion? Look still more recently at the time when the rev. Doctor before us, (Dr. Burns,) and his colleagues followed the example. True, they have scarcely shaken the paralysis off so completely as we have done, but still what have they accomplished? The Free Church of Scotland now furnishes a minister for every 938 hearers. There are 657,255 individuals connected with the Free Church, and they have 700 ministers; making the division 938 for each of their congregations. Reference has been made to Baird, and on this point I beg to correct the last speaker. There has been no endowment in any of the States since 1831. The last endowment was withdrawn then. At that time, in four States, there was a minister on the average, to every 925 individuals. Again, in Scotland, in 1835, there was a minister to every 1340 people, while in the United States there was one to every 1050. Again, taking the newer States further west, which have been always represented as ill supplied, (and ill-supplied because the voluntary principle only was made to bear on them)—Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Alabama, Mississippi,

Missouri, and others—there was a minister to every 1316 people. It is plain, then, that the United States, with nothing but the voluntary principle to rely upon was better supplied spiritually, than Scotland, where a state church exists. I find a statement on this subject in Reed and Matheson's "Narrative."

"In Vermont and New Hampshire, there were not only state enactments, but provisions of land in favor of the same and similar objects. Each Township had an annual grant of 300 acres. This estate was to benefit equally four parties: the church—the school—the society for promoting christian knowledge—and the first minister. The first minister was deemed a proprietor; and he could will away his portion to his family or friends. It was, in fact, a *bonus* to induce a person to encounter the first difficulty of settling; and it usually attracted the least worthy to the spot. The one-fourth originally meant for the permanent uses of the church, with its other privileges, remained, and the church languished in the midst of its indulgencies. It is remarkable that the 'desolations' of these districts, which a Scotch writer has magnified, to illustrate the inefficiency of the voluntary principle, are the very desolations which were created by the compulsory and state methods on which I am adverting."

[Time expired.]

Rev. B. CRONYN—I shall supply what the rev. gentleman said I omitted on the former occasion. He said I did not prove that there was any compulsion to be employed concerning the tithes under the law.

Rev. W. GILMORE—By the civil magistrate.

Rev. B. CRONYN—By the hand of the executioner. Will that answer as well? Though certainly he was not a very civil magistrate. However, we know that offerings were to be presented to the temple—were to be brought in order that the priests might have their portion. I will read to you the law concerning this as it is given in Leviticus, c. 17: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them this is the thing which the Lord hath commanded, saying, what man soever there be of the House of Israel that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation to offer an offering unto the Lord, blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people." One chief reason why they were thus enjoined to bring all beasts to the temple, was that the priest had a particular portion of every victim as his share, on which to live. The priests were to live by the altar. The last gentleman said, that there were free will offerings, but, in fact, they were the offerings which they were commanded to make. And mark! when a person did not bring the victim to the altar, which he had slain elsewhere, and thus robbed the priesthood the blood was to be upon him, and he was cut off from the land. It is the same command as existed in reference to the Sabbath. Those who broke it were to be stoned with stones, till they died. That is a compulsory enactment, clearly stating, that when they refused to bring their offering to the altar, that the priests might have their portion of it, they were to be punished, even with death. Coming back to the subject more immediately before us, I may say that I am in possession of a few statistics with reference to the voluntary system, and I am somewhat surprisèd at the statistics that have been read. I can't account for them—they are so exceedingly different from what I have furnished myself with from various parties. But before proceeding to this point, we must consider that there are two things that go under the name of voluntarism, in the minds of different people. There is what the great and learned Dr. Chalmers called "free trade in religion," and there is the voluntary principle. The free trade system is that which these gentlemen appear to advocate—that is, to let the demand regulate the supply. That is, when ungodly men demand religion, we'll give it, not till then. When a man whose carnal mind is enmity against God, demands religion, we'll bring it to him! Dr. Chalmers has well denounced this system, and I would recommend those gentlemen to study what he says on the subject. The volun-

tary principle again, is that which includes endowments—voluntary gifts. There is no church in the world that has given voluntary endowments equal to the Church of England. There are the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts, with £100,000 a year, and the Christian Knowledge Society, with the same income—both contributed altogether by the church, and I believe that nine-tenths of the funds of the Bible Society are contributed by churchmen; the Church Missionary Society is supported altogether by them; and the London Missionary Society derives large sums from the same source. We do not disclaim voluntaryism, then, but we take it as supplementary to our system. In this country we have no tithes by compulsion. No man is here obliged to pay for another man's religion. A pious King, in the exercise of that right which he assuredly possessed, recommended his parliament to give a certain grant. The parliament, representing the people of England—made that grant; and it is that grant which we wish to have retained. Let us not go so wide from the mark, then, as to talk about tithes in Ireland, the massacre at Rathcomac, and so forth, Let us keep to facts, and I will read you what was said by the late Dr. Dwight, an American Presbyterian, who ought to be considered a good authority:

“Further, the rapid decrease in the number of ministers, compared with the population, is shewn. In 1753, in New England, there was one minister for every 628 persons. In 1806, in the United States, there was not one well-educated minister to 6,000 souls. But in many cases where churches formerly existed, they are no longer to be found. The members are dispersed, the records gone—not a vestige of the church to be found.” “It is quite clear the example of America can never be again quoted as a proof of the success of the voluntary system.”

Rev. Mr. GILMORE—What is the date of that?

Rev. B. CRONYN—1806. I will now give a statement of a later date. The American Tract Society, in their Report for 1833, say: “It is estimated by those who have the best means of judging, that not far from five millions of our population are now unblessed with the means of grace.” The American Tract Society surely knew what they were writing about. Yet this is their statement in 1833. You read statistics of 1835. There must have been tremendous energy manifested by the voluntary system in these two years! The Bishop of Ohio, has, however, made statements which bear out those which I have read. Now these are statistics which we have from good sources with regard to the voluntary system in the States. Can we say that it is an efficient system? that it is competent to cover the whole land with the ministrations of the gospel? It is most sadly deficient. As to the free trade in religion—the principle that the demand is to regulate the supply—we know that it will never bring the gospel to those who most stand in need of it. The man who desires the gospel has made a great step towards obtaining the blessings of it. The man who has made this first step, can only be considered as doing so under the influence of God's Holy Spirit; but the man who desires it not—who has no knowledge of Christ, and cares not for him—should have the gospel brought to him, and its obligations pressed upon him. The free trade system cannot do it. With all your energy—and we give you credit for great energy and perseverance—it is impossible that under the free trade system, the ministrations of religion can be extended to those who have most need of it. It is for the poor of the land that the state should interfere. The rich can obtain for themselves the ministrations of the gospel. But the poor of the land should have the gospel preached to them, and we say that the state should provide the means of bringing home the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to every man and heart in the country.

Rev. J. GILMORE I may be allowed to say that the authorities for my statistics are Dr. Baird, Baptist; Noel, and Reid and Matheson.

Rev. J. GONDREY—I would suggest that it is highly desirable that there should be an extension of time on this proposition, in order that the voluntary system

may be thoroughly discussed. All of us must have felt that the subject is yet far from being exhausted.

REV. F. EVANS—Our number, you see, is limited, while our opponents are much more numerous. Besides, Mr. Bettridge and Mr. Cronyn are unwell.

REV. B. CRONYN—Tomorrow, if we are physically able, we will endeavor to oblige you.

[An adjournment then took place until the following morning at nine o'clock; the Doxology having been previously sung by the meeting.]

E R R A T A .

From foot of Page 54 go to top of Page 58.

“ “ “ 57 “ “ “ 59.

“ “ “ 58 go back to Page 55.

S E C O N D D A Y .

The proceedings were commenced at half past nine o'clock, with prayer by the Rev. F. Evans, and Rev. Mr. Gilmore.

Rev. Dr. BURNS said—There is a matter which I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and the meeting, in regard to the time allotted to each speaker. In the discussion of yesterday, it was a matter of comparatively small moment, because the time was principally occupied with reasoning and argument. But to-day, on the first and second points of discussion, a great part of it must be occupied in examining and reading documents, and commenting upon them. Now, twenty minutes are really too little for an opening speech, which from the nature of the subjects, would require a pretty full review of each topic; and I therefore submit that it is highly desirable that we should have an hour each.

Rev. F. EVANS—I am quite aware of the inconvenience which in some measure attends the restrictions as to time which have been agreed upon, but on balancing the whole affair, I think there is a decided preponderance of reason in favor of short time, especially when we consider that our proceedings are to be reported and extensively circulated. People will not read lengthy pamphlets and documents; and though an addition of ten minutes to the time of each speaker might inconvenience us very little now, it would be found greatly to diminish the chances of a very wide circulation of what is said. We have documents to read as well as the other party, but we do not therefore ask for any addition to our time.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Both parties are equally interested in having justice done to the documents; and to run through them, post haste, in order to bring them within twenty minutes, is murdering the argument. I again, propose, Mr. Chairman, that you give us half an hour to open a proposition, and allow ten minutes to reply.

CHAIRMAN—Such a proceeding requires the consent of all parties. There is one compromise of which you can avail yourself, and that is to take the twenty minutes and the ten minutes together, instead of on two occasions.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—I decline accepting that, unless it be agreed to by all.

CHAIRMAN—We must proceed then, as usual. The proposition which is next to be maintained on the voluntary side, is as follows:

4—That the term "Protestant Clergy," used in the Imperial Statute of 1791, must have been used in contradistinction to Roman Catholic, and not intended to be restricted in its application to the Clergy of the English Church. That the term "Protestant Clergy," being intended to exclude Roman Catholics only, the settlement made by 3 and 4 V. c., was an act of injustice, and so far from being a compromise, was a fraud upon those who were not assenting parties to the arrangement.

Rev. J. ROAF. I maintain the proposition which has now been read. In doing so, I will, in the first place, offer a few reasons for the opinion, that the phrase "Protestant clergy" used in the Imperial Statute of 1791, was not intended to apply exclusively to the Church of England, but was intended to be used in contradistinction to Roman Catholic. I will just refer to the words of the act which is now before me. In it we find that there are clauses which relate to the reservation of lands for the support of a protestant clergy; there are clauses further on, relating to the establishment of Rectories, and the appointment of rectors. In these two cases, there is a studied difference in the phraseology employed with

regard to the parties interested. When the Reserves are spoken of, the phrase is uniformly "Protestant clergy." When the Rectories are referred to, it is requisite to name a particular class of men to be appointed as rectors. Then, there is no generality at all—there is a specific appellation given; a particular class are selected, and they are the "Clergy of the Church of England." Upon that fact I found an argument that there was intended to be a difference of idea conveyed by the phrases which have been thus studiously changed. With regard to the expression, "a protestant clergy," the idea is not to be taken which has been propagated by friends of the gentlemen opposite—that the Legislature of England could refer only to the established clergy of England, or, as they are frequently termed, the established clergy of the Empire. Then the natural and proper phraseology would have been, "the Clergy." If only the ministers belonging to the Church of England were in the eye of the Legislature and the law, the clergy, they would have been spoken of as "the clergy." If, instead of that, the term "protestant clergy" was used, it implied an admission that there was another clergy than the protestant—there was the Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic priesthood, therefore, constituted a clergy in the view of the Legislature. For instance, if when I came to Simcoe, I had heard a gentleman spoken of as "the protestant rector," I should have understood that there was a Roman Catholic rector. You never hear of "a protestant rector," because it is understood that there is but one rector. The word protestant is never introduced. If there had been the idea of a Roman Catholic rector, as well as the Protestant rector, then the phrase would have been introduced to designate one party from the other. The Legislature in 1791 said, "a Protestant Clergy," by that admitting that there was a Roman Catholic Clergy. When they speak of Protestant Clergy, what did they say? Not "the Protestant Clergy," but "a Protestant Clergy." They used an indefinite article for an indefinite thing. Had only one clergy been intended, they would have said "the Protestant Clergy," but they said, "a Protestant Clergy"—thus showing that there were several bodies of clergy. When, afterwards, it is necessary to be more specific, in regard to the class whom the Governors are to appoint to the Rectories the Legislature immediately designate a particular class—the Clergy of the Church of England. Now as to the ground on which I base the proposition. I found it, in the first place, upon the opinion that the phrase "Protestant Clergy" was not intended to apply to any one class of Clergy, but was intended to leave open room for the appropriation of the Reserves to any who might come afterwards, in the view of the Legislature, under that description. I found it, in the second place, upon the fact that this view of the case has been drawn by the most eminent men in England; and to the opinions of some of them I will now refer. Writing in the name and in behalf of his Majesty, the Secretary of State, Lord Glenelg thus wrote to Sir Francis Bond Head, on the 5th Dec., 1835:

"It is not difficult to perceive the reasons which induced Parliament, in 1791, to connect with a reservation of land for ecclesiastical purposes, the special delegation to the Council and Assembly of the right to vary that provision by any bill, which being reserved for the signification of his Majesty's pleasure, should be communicated to both Houses of parliament, for six weeks before that decision was pronounced. Remembering, it should seem, how fertile a source of controversy ecclesiastical endowments had supplied throughout a large part of the christian world, and how impossible it was to foretell with precision what might be the prevailing opinions and feelings of the Canadians on this subject, at a future period, Parliament at once secured the means of making a systematic provision for a protestant clergy, and took full precaution against the eventual inaptitude of that system to the more advanced stages of a society then in its infant state, and of which no human foresight could divine the more mature and settled judgment."

Lord Glenelg here says deliberately, that it was intended to make a reserve of lands, but afterwards to select the parties to whom those lands could be given;

These are extracts from the opinion of the Judges of England—the highest authorities on a point of law in the world. Referring to this opinion, Lord John Russell thus spoke in the House of Commons, on the 6th July, 1840:

“The proposition is founded on the opinion of the Judges, given in the other House of Parliament, with respect to the clergy reserves. That opinion recognizes the right on the part of the Church of England, and also recognizes the right on the part of the Church of Scotland, to shares in those reserves; and by words which I need not quote, virtually admits the terms, “Christians of other denominations,” as entitling them likewise to share according to the Act of Parliament of 1791, in the proceeds of such reserves.”

So much for authority from these parties. I take other ground. I shall advance this opinion—that there is among the various bodies of Protestant ministers no one class of gentlemen so little entitled to the phrase “Protestant clergy,” as those of that church to which our brethren on the opposite side belong. I do not mean to rest upon a similarity between that church and the church of Rome, which does not belong to any of us. I rest upon this fact, that it is the common argument in behalf of the Church of England, that they acquire, the validity of their orders, and the efficacy of their sacraments, through the Church of Rome.

REV. W. BETTRIDGE.—This is rather beside the question. We are not now discussing the doctrine of Apostolic succession.

MR. J. ROAF—I am not saying a word about Apostolic succession. I am saying that the argument which the bulk of these gentlemen—Bishops and others—use is, that their church has claims against us all (whom they call dissenters,) because they got the validity of their orders through the Church of Rome. Not only so, but what is their rule? A Presbyterian Clergyman who becomes connected with the Church of England must be re-ordained—his present ordination goes for nothing. But let a Roman Catholic priest be converted, and he is not re-ordained—His present ordination is held to be valid. Is not there affiliation there? Is that protestation? Does that church protest against the other? It does not. There is no protest about it. It is no argument on behalf of the Church of England that they are a reformed Catholic Church—not a Protestant Church. I deny that the Church of England does protest against the essential principles of the Church of Rome. They depend upon them—their orders come through them—the validity of their sacraments comes through them. Therefore, if there be a class of clergy that is not a Protestant clergy, that is the class. There is another part of my proposition. It is that “The settlement made by 3 & 4 Vic. was an act of gross injustice, and so far from being a compromise, was a fraud upon those sects who were not assenting parties to the arrangement.” If these gentlemen were not the Protestant clergy, and they took all the clergy reserves themselves, from 1791 to 1840, they defrauded all other denominations of their share. As honest men, then, they ought to pay it back; for they took it under the pretence of being the “Protestant clergy.” I deny that the settlement was a compromise. A compromise of what? They never had the clergy reserves in their hands. They were never entitled to them. These were reserves not grants. A provided property, kept in hand for a given use or a given party, is not made a vested right. That wonderful book, the Bible, has a passage that bears on this. Two individuals in the first christian times, adopted the then general course of devoting or dedicating the bulk of their property to religion. They afterwards faltered in their purpose and what then was their position? An Apostle said to them, “While it remained was it not thine own, and after it was sold, was it not in thine power?” They sinned in the matter by lying, and not by robbery or sacrilege. So while the Clergy reserves remained, were they not the government’s own? and when they were sold, were they not still in their power? The government have these reserves in their hands, and hold them against a day when they may be wanted. Talk about vested rights in the case, and about making a compromise! Where was the vested right? They had no deed for them. If I were to sell you a lot

of land, and were to put into the deed that I might "vary or repeal it" when I liked, what would it be worth? who would give anything for such a title?" Yet that was the kind of deed which these gentlemen got: a deed by which the donors might "vary or repeal" that very act when they pleased. We, then, are at perfect liberty to vary or repeal that act now. Hear what Lord Goderich said to Sir J. Colborne, Nov. 21, 1831:

"It is sufficient to repeat that his Majesty's government have advised the abandonment of the reserves, for the simple reason that after 40 years, they have been found not to answer the expectations entertained at the time the system was established, but have entailed a heavy burden upon the Province, without producing any corresponding advantage."

This was said by the very party that gave the reserves. Not only so, but a draft of a bill was actually sent out by Lord Goderich to Sir John Colborne, in 1831, for adoption by the Legislature of this Province. In this bill it was provided—

"That all the lands heretofore appropriated within the Province for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy, now remaining unsold, shall be, and the same are hereby declared to be vested in his Majesty, his heirs, successors, &c., as of his and their original estate, absolutely discharged from all trust for or for the benefit of a Protestant clergy, and of and from all and every the claims and demands of such clergy upon and in respect of the same."

The very party that is said to have given these reserves, actually proposed that in this country we should pass an act conveying them back. Did the Imperial government conceive that these gentlemen have a vested right? By no means. Vested means realized, in distinction from contingent or uncertain, and who therefore can say, that the clergy of the Church of England have anything like a vested right? Again—there was no compromise in the settlement for this reason—we were not there to compromise with them. The people of Canada had been protesting against the whole system, and they sent home an Act for the purpose of effecting an arrangement; but the Archbishop and the Bishops of the Church of England proposed a new arrangement, mainly in favor of themselves; and this is what we are asked to call a compromise! Why, if there is to be a settlement, both parties ought to be there. There was only one party there, however, and they obtained the existing settlement, which they call a final settlement; just as though an Act of Parliament passed in any session, could be final. We know that acts of parliament are final only till they are done away with. They are final till the next year, when the Legislature may reverse them. That is the finality of acts of parliament, and that is the only finality that is in this so-called settlement. I maintain that there is no final settlement where there is wrong. Providence forbids any final settlement where there is injustice. There is wrong, because in the first place, these gentlemen had all the reserves to themselves; and because under the settlement of 1840, a large portion still remains in their hands, while it is proposed to divide a shred amongst us. We come in for a part under the settlement of 1840, but all that was given before that, is kept by these two favored churches. No—we have no interest in these reserves. They had acquired an interest in them before that period. We have no right, according to this settlement, but that of humbly petitioning the Governor General or Mr. Baldwin, or Mr. Hincks, and asking that a small modicum may be given to us. The proposition says rightly then, that the settlement "was a fraud upon those sects who were not assenting parties to the arrangement."

Rev. W. BERRIDGE—Before I proceed with my observations, I beg to express my deep regret that this proposition was ever assented to, because I think that any discussion upon the provisions of the Act of Parliament of 1791, after the act of 1840, had passed. Such a discussion can only tend at best to excite unpleasant feelings, and to give rise to not very courteous expressions. As to what the gentleman who has just sat down has said with respect to the protestantism of

the Church of England, I can leave it to the decision of history; only asking where his church would have been without the Protestant Church of England? I'll say no more on that point, but will proceed, and do so with great and unfeigned regret—to notice the right of the Church of England, antecedent to the Act of 1840. To those members of the Church of Scotland or of other denominations, who may be here, I must again repeat my unfeigned regret that this has been made a matter of public discussion. I am forced on to the ground, but being here, will of course occupy it. We have to say, whether the statute of 1791, had reference exclusively to the Church of England. I say it had, and shall endeavor to prove my position by referring to documents which now exist, and which had their existence at the period immediately connected with that when his act was passed. I suppose it will be admitted that persons who lived at the time—ministers of state—and those who were the framers of this act—may be considered the persons most likely to understand the entire object and character of it. I will at once refer to these documents, premising that I got many of them myself when in England, several years ago, from the papers of Governor Simcoe, the first Governor of Upper Canada, and in whose time the act of 1791 was passed. Governor Simcoe, writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dec. 30, 1790, pointed out the necessity of “giving due support to that church establishment”—that is, the Established Church of England—which he considered “necessary to promote the national religion.” In this letter, he regarded “the establishment of episcopacy in Upper Canada” as “absolutely necessary in any extensive colony which this country means to preserve.” Writing to Mr. Secretary Dundas, June 2, 1791, Governor Simcoe again said:

I hold it to be indispensably necessary that a Bishop should be immediately established in Upper Canada.” “At this very moment we see Episcopacy happily introduced, and introducing, into all the United States; nor in Parliament in the Canada bill, have we seen any exception taken to the episcopal function, but to the admission of the Bishop to a seat in the Legislative Council, which, it is to be hoped, while there is an establishment, the wisdom of this country will always insist upon.”

Again, Governor Simcoe said:

In regard to the Episcopal Establishment, it is impossible for me to be more anxious that such an arrangement should take place, than I have uniformly shown myself to be, and that I firmly believe the present to be the critical moment in which that system so interwoven and connected with the monarchical foundation of our government may be productive of the most permanent and extensive benefits in preserving the connection between Great Britain and her Colonies.”

Again, Mr. Secretary Dundas, writing to Lord Dorchester, 16th September, 1791, said

As there does not, at present, appear to be sufficient provision for the support of the Protestant clergy, either in Upper Canada or Lower Canada, the collection of tithes has, under the act of the present year, been suffered to continue. But your Lordship will understand that it is not wished to continue this burden longer than is necessary for the competent provision of the clergy. If, therefore, the proprietors of lands, liable to the payment of tithes, shall be induced to concur with your Lordship's recommendation, in providing a sufficient fund for clearing the reserved lands, and for building parsonage houses on the several parsonages, which may be endowed under the Act of the last session of Parliament, and at the same time provide an intermediate fund for the maintenance of the clergy, during the period that will be required for the purpose of so clearing these reserved lands, the obligation of tithes may then cease.”

Governor Simcoe, in a letter to Mr. Bond, (our Charge d'Affaires at Washington,) May 7th, 1792, said:

because it could not at that period be decided what could be the prevalent opinions and feelings of the Canadians, and because it was foreseen that there would be here, as elsewhere, strife occasioned by ecclesiastical endowments.—The idea is most broadly put forth, that no individual class of clergy were intended as the “Protestant clergy,” for whom the reserves were set apart. I will go a little further. When this question of the reserves arose in Canada, it was on the petition of the Niagara Presbyterian Congregation to share in the reserves. That was referred home, and the Attorney and Solicitor General were requested to say whether the Scotch clergy could come under the description, “Protestant clergy.” They said, “Upon the statute book, the Church of Scotland is mentioned as “Protestant clergy.” Now on the statute book of Canada, not only the English clergy, but the clergy of other Protestant denominations are recognized. In the marriage Act, for instance, there is a long list of sects, the clergy of whom are recognized by law; and the same occurs in several other acts. Here, then, are “Protestant clergy” in the sense of the law. These “Protestant clergy,” upon the principle laid down by the Attorney and Solicitor General, are entitled to seek part of the clergy reserves. When the act of 1839 1840 was referred home from this country, it went to the House of Lords, by whom a reference was made to the Judges to ascertain who were meant by the term “Protestant clergy” to see whether, as has been repeatedly asserted, the term comprehended only one class, and that the class who subscribe to the 39 articles of the Church of England. On the 4th May, 1840, the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, delivered the unanimous opinion of the Judges on the question, as follows:

“My Lords—On the part of her Majesty’s Judges, I have the honor to represent “to your Lordships, that the Judges of England, with the exception of Lord Denman and Lord Abinger, have met together in Serjeant’s Inn, for the purpose of taking into consideration the several questions which your Lordships have been pleased to propose to us; and that after discussion upon the subject, and deliberation, we have agreed unanimously upon the answers to be returned to those several questions, as follows:

“In answer to the first question, we are all of opinion that the words, “a Protestant clergy,” in the statute 31, Geo. III, cap. 83, are large enough to include and that they do include, other clergy than those of the Church of England and Protestant Bishops, priests and deacons who have received episcopal ordination.

“For those words which are first to be met with in the statute 14, Geo. III, cap. 83, (recited in the act now under consideration) appear to us, both in their natural force and meaning, and still more from the context of the clauses in which they are found, to be there used to designate and intend a clergy opposed in doctrine and discipline to the Church of Rome, and rather to aim at the encouragement of the Protestant religion, in opposition to the Romish Church, than to point exclusively to the Clergy of the Church of England. And when your Lordships desire the Judges to state if any other clergy are included, what other? We answer that it appears to us that the clergy of the Established Church of Scotland do constitute an instance of such other Protestant clergy.

“And although in answering your Lordship’s question, we specify no other church than the Protestant Church of Scotland, we do not thereby intend that besides that church, the ministers of other churches may not be included under the term “Protestant Clergy.” At the same time, as we do not find in the statute book the acknowledgment by the Legislature of any other clergy answering that description, and as we are not furnished by your Lordships with any information as to the doctrine or description of any other denominations of Protestants to which the statute of the 31, Geo. III, can by possibility apply we are unable to specify any other to your Lordships, as falling within the statute.”

"I take the opportunity of transmitting the late Act of Parliament by which Upper Canada has been severed from the Lower Province, and which may be considered as the Magna Charta under which that colony will immediately be admitted to all the privileges that Englishmen enjoy, and be confederated and united, and earnestly pray and believe, for ever with Great Britain."

In the same letter, referring to this Act, (31, Geo. III, he said :

"It is to be observed that the British Parliament, (in the 42nd clause) while it secures, beyond the possibility of any Provincial interference, the protection and endowment which the civil compact of the British Constitution affords to the Established Church, and that in a manner the least burthensome to the subject, by the King's benevolence in the allotment of lands for that purpose, at the same time that it effectually provides for the security of the natural rights of Christians to worship God in their own way, by reserving to itself the sole power of giving legal authority to any acts which may respect or interfere with such mode of worship."

In November of the same year, Governor Simcoe wrote to Mr. Secretary Dundas :

"I need not, I am sure, Sir, observe that the best security that all just government has for its existence, is founded on the morality of the people, and that such morality has no true basis but when based upon religious principles; it is, therefore, that I have always been extremely anxious, both from political as well as more worthy motives, that the Church of England should be essentially established in Upper Canada; and I must be permitted to say, Sir, that I have received the greatest-satisfaction from your expression, that you did not think that government complete without a Protestant Bishop. As I conceived such an institution necessary to the support of the experiment that is now making, whether the British Government cannot support itself by its own superiority in this distant part of the world, I beg Sir, to observe to you that the sources from whence a Protestant clergy shall arise, seems totally to be prevented by the want of the episcopal function in this Province."

In the same letter he said :

"The state of poverty in which they [the settlers] must, for some time remain after their emigration, will naturally prevent them from the possibility of supporting their ministers by public subscriptions; in the meanwhile, the government has in its power immediately to provide for any Protestant clergyman, in the separate townships, by giving them a reasonable landed property in perpetuity for himself and family, and entrusting with the care of that seventh which is to be reserved for the Protestant Clergy. Under these circumstances, it is probable that the sons of respectable settlers would offer themselves for ordination, and though they might not, in the first instance, have the learning of the European clergy, their habits and morals might as essentially promote the interest of the community. It is by these means, Sir, that the influence of the Protestant clergy may extend and increase with the rapid growth and value of those lands which are reserved for their maintenance, and which, without a due attention being paid in this respect, will naturally be considered, by the people at large, as detrimental to the colony, and may, at no very distant period of time, become a temptation to those who shall be hostile to the Union of Upper Canada with Great Britain."

The Duke of Portland wrote to the Bishop of Quebec, 14th November, 1794, as follows :—

"I am very sorry to observe that the dearness of the necessaries of life in Upper Canada, seem to require a greater income than would certainly otherwise be necessary for an incumbent. At the same time, there cannot be a shadow of a doubt, relative to the construction of the Canada act, which annexes to rectories

and parsonages erected under the same, the enjoyment of all the rights, profits, and emoluments belonging to a parsonage and rectory in England, which must necessarily include tythes. Under these circumstances, it is unnecessary for me to add anything further than that, with the existing provisions made by the above mentioned act, for the Church of England in both the Canadas, I trust a small temporary salary from government, with such allowance as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel may be induced to grant, would be sufficient for the comfortable maintenance of such incumbents as it may be requisite to send from hence for the due performance of the ecclesiastical duties of the Province of Upper Canada, in the case above specified."

Two more extracts, and I have done; for my time will not allow me to read other extracts which I had marked. This is from Governor Simcoe to the Duke of Portland, and bears date, June 20th, 1796:—

"By the Attorney General's opinion, it seems probable that the Bishop, or his Commissary, can license ministers who dissent from the Church of England, to perform marriages. If this opinion can be acted upon, I shall endeavour to counteract the union of the Dissenters, by separately enjoining their several pastors to take out licenses. In the meantime, I hope your Grace will take the subject into your serious consideration, and give such directions as may seem expedient, before the meeting of the next Provincial Parliament. I have foreseen this event; and on the probability of an improper association against the national church, did I state my ideas of the propriety of establishing, so fast as possible, clergymen of the Church of England throughout the Province. It is obvious that the next claim of the Dissenters would be a partition of the seventh set apart for the national clergy."

Now, lastly, the Duke of Portland to Governor Simcoe, June 22nd, 1796:—

"Alter what I have urged to you in my despatch of ———, upon the subject of a suitable provision being made by the colony for the maintenance of its own clergy, it is scarcely necessary for me to remind you that the allowances given by the government of this country must only be considered to be temporary, and as aids and inducements to the several parishes to devise some means of providing for their own clergy, until such times as the church lands shall become sufficiently productive for that purpose; but as it has been determined to abandon every idea of any payment in the nature of tithes, I cannot too often repeat to you, that it appears to me of the most extreme importance, that no time should be lost in fixing upon some mode of securing a suitable maintenance for the officiating clergy of the Province."

Now, I think no doubt can really exist after the reading of these documents, which are official and genuine. I am not repining at the change which has taken place, for I am a member and a minister of the Church of England, whose glory it is to be obedient to the laws. I do not murmur at the provisions of the act of 1840. I am contented with it. It is said that we grasp at everything; but I really do not see how men who have given up two thirds of a thing can be said to be grasping because they wish to keep the remaining third, which is their own. It would be very difficult to convince me that the documents from which I have read these passages are not sufficient to satisfy any unprejudiced mind, that the persons most nearly interested in the affair when it has commenced, did not believe that the Reserves were intended for the Church of England, and the Church of England alone. But the opinions of the law officers of the crown are against us, we are told. We are not at all afraid even on this point. I am willing to admit that they said that the clergy of the Church of Scotland might be partakers of these endowments. But then, at the same time, it must be remembered that these great men declared that they did not extend to the dissenting ministers, "since we think that the term 'Protestant Clergy' can apply only to the Protestant clergy recognized and established by law." I repeat, I would not deprive you of one iota of the lands, but I ask you to allow us to have possession of our share of the lands, undisturbed. A

word now in regard to the Rectories ; and on this point I beg to state the opinion of the Attorney General East. "Sir," said he, "if your authorities in the church had not been asleep when they ought to have been awake, they would have had 500 rectories, not 50." I have a patent of my own, signed, sealed, and delivered ; and I went to several of the crown officers last year, when Mr. Price was bringing in his bill. I went to Attorney General Lafontaine, and a very nice, gentlemanly man he is. "Is this the sort of thing you folks are going to dabble in?" I asked. He looked at it, and replied—"Simply absurd, the very idea : as well, Sir, might you come to take away from me my property in Montreal." This is in perfect accordance with what the same learned gentleman has declared this year in the House. I went to several other members, and repeated my question to them, and here was not a man who had not the courage to say, "That is too closely like a vested right to be touched : we'll never meddle with it." I have given you the opinion of the law officers of the crown on the subject of the Reserves. But we are reminded that there was a certain committee which sat in the House of Commons ; and we are willing to admit that that committee conceived that these clergy reserves must be extended to the members of other denominations. Well now, I think that have so far established the fact that these lands were designed, I think, exclusively for the Church of England, according to the terms of the letter itself. But we are willing to admit the interpretation of the law officers of the crown. We are willing to go with the committee of the House of Commons, and with the twelve judges. I think, however, that no attempt will be made to assert that any injustice has been done, at all events by the Church of England. I am sorry to find gentlemen on the other side saying (I would not willingly say, just to catch a little passing applause) that the Church of England has committed any injustice or fraud. These are hard terms, and by no means courteous. You shall not hear any such terms from my mouth.—
Time expired.]

Rev. Jas. RICHARDSON—Before I enter into the subject, I take the liberty of observing that I do not stand here—and I think I may say the same of my brethren around me—to plead for a division of these reserves, that we may come in for a slice. We repudiate that. But we plead for what we believe to be the wishes of the country, repeatedly and strongly expressed, not only in public meetings and the public papers, but by the representative bodies of the province, and in their legislative capacity. We have no hostility in this movement to the Church of England, or any other church, as a church. And I speak for myself when I say that rather than see the reserves divided, and participated in by the different religious bodies in the country. I would wish to see them all in the hands of one church, and if I were to make a choice it would be the Church of England.

Rev. W. BETTIDGE—Thank you.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—Perhaps you think me very kind ; but I should give it as I have said, on the principle that the kind mother would keep the sugar plums from her children. I think that the Church of England is accustomed to these plums, and their retention is not likely to be so troublesome to that church, as they would be if given to other churches not accustomed to such diet. Having made this remark, I will now proceed to the question. My predecessor who introduced the proposition has marked on the difference observable in the statute 31, Geo. III., between the phrases "protestant clergy," and "clergy of the Church of England." I will pass over that ; but in the same act there is something else worthy of our attention. The act itself expressly re-recognized other protestant clergymen than those of the Church of England, by providing for the exclusion from 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 mode of worship." These are designated persons in holy orders, and thereby distinguished as clergy. The phraseology of the act goes a great way towards explaining the meaning of it. My learned and reverend friend has just cited documents that passed between governors and ministers of state at home, and are gone largely into the expression of views interchanged between these gentlemen.

But if he had a volume from them, it would not at all alter the meaning of an act of parliament. We must refer for the meaning of act, to the act itself. If it be found dubious in its clauses, then we must refer to the opinions of those who took part in the framing of it; and happily I am provided with a quotation or two relative to the views of those who assisted in framing the act. What, I would ask, is the face of a reference to the opinion of a governor or minister of state, who expresses himself very desirous—no doubt conscientiously—to see the Church of England availing herself of all these reserves? It is very natural that he should wish to see that. But instead of relying upon his wishes and desires, I prefer to take the design of his Majesty, Geo: III., and of the ministers and statesmen of that day, in reference to the setting apart one-seventh of the lands of the province as these reserves. The first opinion is that of the Hon. C. J. Fox, who, we know, was a leader in opposition to Mr. Pitt, but was familiar with all the public discussions of that day. He said, "By the term protestant clergy he supposed to be understood, not only the clergy of the Church of England, but all descriptions of protestants." The venerable Earl of Harrowby said in the House of Lords, June 26, 1828—

"He would not have said a word upon the subject of the petition presented by the noble lord (Haddington), had not a reference been made to the opinion of Lord Grenville; but as such reference had been made, he felt himself called upon to state that he had repeated conversations with that noble Lord (Grenville), upon the subject and he (Lord G.) had not only expressed his opinion so, but had requested him (the Earl of Harrowby,) if any opportunity should offer, to state that both his own and Mr. Pitt's decision was, that the provisions of the 31, Geo. III., were not intended for the exclusive support of the Church of England but for the maintenance generally of the protestant church."

This is to the point, if you please; for we must remember that the Earl of Harrowby was a brother-in-law of Mr. Pitt. The next opinion to which I shall refer is that of Lord Viscount Sandon. Lord Sandon had stated something in the debate in the House of Lords, and on a report of it reaching Dr. Strachan, he took the liberty, in an address in the Legislative Council on the subject, to question the correctness of the reported speech of Lord Sandon. The Committee of the House of Commons subsequently met, and took an opportunity to draw from Lord Sandon an explanation of what were the sentiments which he had expressed in the House of Commons. Speaking of what Lord Grenville told him, Lord Sandon said—

"I understood him to say that the distinction of a protestant clergy, which is frequently repeated in the act of 1791, was meant to provide for any clergy that was not Roman Catholic; at the same time leaving it to the Governor and Executive Council of the Province to provide in future how that should be distributed."

The documents which our Rev. friend read all relate to this distribution of the reserves—to the appropriation of them to the rectories, and providing for the locating of the clergymen; not to the reserves as reserves, but to their appropriation. We admit that his Majesty has authorized by that act, 31, Geo. III., to instruct the Governor, or Lieut. Governor, to establish rectories, and to take any or all these reserves to and on those rectories. But that is quite distinct from the object intended in making the reservation. The reserves is one thing—the appropriation of that reserves is another, there is another part of the resolution which deserves a passing notice. It is a very unpleasant one. I did not like it when it was put into my hand. I do not like to accuse gentlemen or parties—and especially I do not like to accuse churches—of gross injustice and fraud. I would not say that the Church of England was guilty of gross injustice and fraud in any part of this transaction, and much less would I say that any gentleman present would encourage injustice and fraud. But in what respect can the act of Parliament under which the appropriation is now made, be said to be an act of injustice and fraud? First, it is unequal in its provisions; the Church of England receiving two thirds of the lands that had been previously sold, and two-sixths of those that were then unsold; while the church of Scotland received one-third of those that were formerly sold, previous to the passing

of the act, and one-sixth of subsequently sold, or that remained unsold. Thus the Church of England the Church of Scotland received the whole of the lands that were sold previous to the passing of the act, and we are informed (though I cannot warrant the accuracy of the statement) that they amounted to nearly one-half of the original reservation; while two-sixths and one-sixth go to the same churches in the distribution of the unsold reserves; and the residue is to be applied for by other churches. It provides also for the payment of stipends previously charged to the casual and territorial revenue, and among those stipends we find the Roman Catholics sharing in the provision for protestants. I am surprised that the gentlemen are not opposed to the present act inasmuch as the law previously setting apart these reserves, provided that they were for the protestant church; and yet the Roman Catholic Church shares—and shares largely in them. What is the amount which the Roman Catholic church has received from the Clergy Reserve funds from the beginning? From public documents which I hold in my hand, we learn that the Roman Catholics received up to 1848, no less than £1537 11s from the reserve; and since then they have received £3,333 6s 8d; making together upwards of £4,870, now is that not a violation (to use no stronger word) of public faith? Lord Grenville and the statesmen of that day could never have dreamed that a part of the one seventh of the lands of Upper Canada, set apart for a protestant clergy, would ever be appropriated to the Roman Catholic church. It is a fraud on those who participate, and more so on those whose principles forbid participation. I know that a good deal has been said about our consciences and their consciences, but I want to appeal to the conscience of the people. Our reverend opponents will, I presume, bow to the law, founded on the rights of conscience. Should it appear,—as I think it may be made to appear,—that the conscience of this country has been repeatedly expressed in favour of the alienation of these reserves from the churches, and their appropriation to education, then I maintain that any law which violates this conscience is not a just law. I say that the conscience of the people of this country has been so expressed, repeatedly, and I am not afraid to appeal to it again; and I repeat that any act that is the violation of the conscience of even a large majority of the people, is not a fair act. But in the next place, the law is not right because by making the distinction that I have noticed, it makes a distinction between her Majesty's subjects, they are all under equal allegiance, and they should all share equally in the benefits derivable from any public property. Public property? Here comes the question back again. Was it not the right of the crown again to dispose of the property thus? to give or withhold these lands? So far from this being the case, his Majesty was not at liberty to reserve these lands, until he got permission from the Imperial Parliament. This is plain from the words used in the preamble of 31 Geo. III. cap. 31.

“And whereas his Majesty has been graciously pleased by message to both Houses of Parliament to express his royal desire to be enabled to make permanent appropriation of lands in said province for the support and maintenance of a protestant clergy &c.”

My time is out, but there is a great deal more to be said on this point. [TIME EXPIRED.]

REV. B. CROFTON.—There are a few more matters to be disposed of, which have been introduced by the last speaker and the gentlemen who opened the debate on this proposition. The last speaker has alluded to the act of the Legislature in giving a portion of the Clergy Reserve fund to the Roman Catholics; and if I understood him right, he spoke as though it were the act of parliament which did that. The act of Parliament does no such thing.

REV. J. RICHARDSON.—I said no such thing. You will recollect that there was a charge on the casual and territorial revenue, previous to the passing of the present act appropriating the reserves. The Roman Catholics had a share in that charge; and the act provides that these charges on the casual and territorial revenue should be first met by an appropriation from the reserves. Therefore, the Roman Catholics share in the reserves.

REV. B. CROFTON.—If the irregular proceeding (I will use no harsher term) of devoting what was intended for the Protestant Clergy, has been done by those in power, assuredly the responsibility rests on them, not upon us. With regard to what the gentlemen has said concerning the oft-expressed wishes of the legislature of this colony: he surely cannot say that the wishes of the legislature have been often expressed with reference to the change of the late act, commonly called the imperial act. On the contrary, for ten years, there was not a sound heard in the country concerning it, from the legislature. There might have been here and there throughout the country, a voice heard from an individual, not from the community generally, and especially from the legislature, whereas no expression of dissatisfaction with the appropriation made by that act, and therefore, what the gentleman has said about the repeated wishes of the legislature falls to the ground. It is not the case that the legislature have repeated often their wish that the appropriation made by the imperial act should be changed. He has referred to the way in which the clergy reserves were set apart originally. King George the 3rd wished to have it in his power to make provision for a protestant clergy, and how did he proceed? The revenue of the crown was at his disposal, and he might have done it. But he did not proceed in that way. He went, rather, in the most solemn and constitutional way that our laws are acquainted with, to the Parliament of England, and parliament bestowed the Clergy Reserves. This gentleman says, however, that the Parliament of England had no right to do it. He says it was public property, and that parliament had no right to give it away. But the Parliament of England has given away more than that—a great deal, in this country. Have not thousands and tens of thousands of acres been given to the U. E. Loyalists—by an act of the British Legislature or even without an act of the British Legislature, and who wishes to interfere to take back the lands? Assuredly no one. But when the parliament of England, in response to a message from the crown, solemnly set apart a portion of undoubted property of England for a particular purpose, we say that parliament had a right to do it; we say parliament was exercising a right; and when these or any other gentlemen come forward and say, “you are trying to maintain a wrong,” because we wish to maintain what the Parliament of England did, did solemnly, freely, and unanimously—they take up a position which is not borne out by the facts of the case. And now with reference to the matter in hand. There was passed in the Legislature of the Province of Canada a bill which I will read, and which received the royal assent on the 20th Feb., 1823.

“An act relative to the right of Titles within this Province.

“Whereas notwithstanding his Majesty has been graciously pleased to reserve, for the support of a protestant clergy in this province, one-seventh of all lands granted therein, doubts have been suggested that the title of the produce of land might still be legally demanded by the incumbent duly instituted, or rector of any parish; which doubt it is important to the well-doing of this colony to remove; be it enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and Assembly of the Province of Upper Canada, constituted and assembled by virtue of, and under the authority of an act passed in the parliament of Great Britain, entitled, “An act to repeal certain parts of an act passed in the fourteenth year of his Majesty's reign, entitled ‘An act for making more effectual provision for the government of the province of Quebec, in North America, and to make further provision for the government of the said province,’ and by the authority of the same, That no titles shall be claimed, demanded, or received by any ecclesiastical parson, rector, or vicar, of the protestant church within this province, any law, custom, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Now why was this act of the legislature introduced? Because it was thought that the law would entitle rectors and vicars duly inducted in this country, to tithes in this country. It was thought by some persons of legal knowledge that they had a legal claim to tithes, and in order to set that claim at rest for ever, this act was passed. Now I remember the saying of a legal gentleman,—a man eminent at the bar of this country—when speaking of this subject, although he joined with those who sought the

alienation of those reserves: "There is no question in my mind," he said, "but that originally the Reserves were intended solely and exclusively for the Church of England." Remember, we do not stand up for that now. We are now anxious that the law should stand as it is, and whatever these gentlemen may say on the subject—whatever hard language they may use, I trust we shall not follow such an example. We wish most fully—we desire most earnestly, to carry out the requirements of that law, and we should wish at least that half of the whole may be applied as now. No matter whether the Reserves have been, or are to be sold. The meaning and intention of the Imperial Act was to give half of the whole to the Governor for the purpose of the religious instruction of the country.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON,—Half of the Reserves unsold?

Rev. B. CRONYN.—Yes, half of the Reserves unsold! and I should wish to see an act passed, or some understanding arrived at, whereby these gentlemen would be released from what appears to be a very irksome duty on their part in making application for their share. Let it be paid over to those whom they may appoint. I know that I have to make application for the small pittance I receive out of the Clergy Reserve Fund, and I do not think that I am degraded by doing it. I have to come every six months to the Receiver General, and there present in duplicate, or triplicate, certain documents, and then I receive it; and I do not think I am at all disgraced thereby.

Rev. Mr. ORMSTON,—You claim! we don't—we ask.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—I would like to see such an arrangement that you could claim—you ought to be so placed that you could. Again: the first speaker attempted to draw a nice distinction between the definite and indefinite article; but I do think that that is rather fine drawing for an act of parliament; we know very well that it is not by such means that acts of parliament are to be interpreted. We know, however, that we have the opinions of persons who were engaged in the framing of this act, who were in the Government at home and here—such as the Duke of Portland and Governor Simcoe; they are the highest authorities on this point; and as long as their authorities stand, so long the cause we advocate is invulnerable. Gentlemen opposite may bring documents of after date if they choose, but they cannot be placed in juxtaposition with the documents which my Rev. Brother has brought forward. From those documents, it is clear that the statute intended that there should be provision for the Clergy of the Church of England. I now come to another point. I do not intend either to wound the feelings of any one, or in the slightest degree to offend, by what I am going to say; but I think it necessary to say that I am sorry that any thing has been introduced that can cause even a ripple upon the surface of our proceedings. Yesterday, we had a day I shall remember for ever with pleasure, and I trust that this day, too, will close in the same way. But I am compelled to say, in reference to what has been based on the words "protestant clergy," that the law of England recognizes no clergy in England but the clergy of the Church of England; and I can prove it by a case with which some of the Rev. gentlemen may be acquainted. A short time since, a child was presented to be interred at the graveyard of a church in England. The clergyman refused to inter the child on the ground that it had not been baptised. I am not standing up for the clergyman that done this; I am not saying that he showed good taste, or right feeling, or sound judgment in the matter: I am only stating the fact, for I should be very sorry to advocate such action or principles. He refused, as I have said, and the matter was brought before a legal tribunal of the country, where it was decided that the clergyman should be punished for not interring the child, because it had received lay baptism—had been baptised by a dissenting minister. The law did not recognize the clerical character of the person who baptised it; but it recognized lay baptism—the baptism of a layman, and therefore the clergyman was bound to inter the child, inasmuch as the canon of the church recognizes lay baptism. That sets the matter at rest. We consider that is not regular, but that it is valid in a layman to baptise. I agree with the great

Hooker on this point; but at any rate the case I have stated shows that baptism by a dissenting minister in England, is lay baptism, and sets at rest all the arguments of the Rev. gentlemen with regard to it. The terms of the act do not specify that dissenting ministers are to rank as protestant clergy; they do not contain one word about dissenting ministers. This could not be done in England. Were the legislature to do it, they would stultify themselves—they would ignore the laws. I do not appear here to justify or plead for those laws.

REV. M. ORMSTON.—Help us to abolish them, then.

REV. B. CROMBIE.—One of the gentlemen spoke concerning the appropriation of the fund to Roman Catholics. Is it right, or wise, or good, in these gentlemen, because a portion is given to Roman Catholics, to try to pull down the Reserves altogether, and to devote them to secular purposes? Let us all unite to change that which is wrong. If it be good that Christ's gospel should be preached in the land, and if means must be supplied for preaching that gospel; if, as I firmly believe, the most efficient means can be provided through the instrumentality of the state, and, in this country, through an endowment that does not take from any man—which does not send me into a man's vineyard to steal his grapes, or into any man's farmyard to milk his cows, but which gives to every man who is employed in the work of evangelizing the country, and teaching the religion of Jesus Christ, a small portion to aid and assist him in the performance of that work; and if into this good thing abuses have been introduced, let us unite to do away with them—not to destroy the whole thing. Let us be reformers, not destructives. Let us reform what is wrong, but in the doing of this, let us not seek to destroy that which is good and right. That is my feeling; of course these gentlemen do not agree with me in it. The reverend gentleman who commenced quoted an act sent from the Imperial Parliament—drafted out in order that we might go right here in reference to these things; and yet he said we have no vested right. Now put these two things together: there was no vested right whatsoever—we had no claim to these Reserves—and yet it was necessary that the law officers at home, and the Parliament at home, should draft a bill—doing what? Legislating and giving these away. There they stood, and we had no right in them (we are told); and yet the legislature had to interfere. That proceeding most clearly establishes this, that the Parliament and the Crown law-officers considered that the Reserves belonged to somebody—that somebody had a claim to them; and moreover this—that until that claim was done away, there was no opening for the Parliament at home or here to interfere concerning them. It defeats his whole argument on that ground. It is said we have given up no inheritance. That gentleman has given up an inheritance at the bar by going into the ministry. It is clear from his legal skill in handling acts of Parliament, that he has given up a very ample inheritance, and I say he ought to receive something for it. But I repeat that the very fact which he adduced answers his argument with regard to vested right. Some one had the right, otherwise that right would not have been voted away by any act of parliament. Now I am very sorry that there should be discussion on this question. I firmly believe in my conscience that the clergy of the Church of England were intended by the act of 1791. I am willing to forego that. I was glad, for the sake of peace, that an arrangement had been effected. I thought the thing was settled, and for ten years I looked upon it as matter that I should never need to think of again. I thought that we should receive our own in peace, and really was under the impression that those gentlemen, or some of them, were receiving their portion from year to year; but of course I am deceived in that.

[Time expired.]

REV. J. ROSE.—It has been hinted that there was something uncourteous on my part in what I said respecting fraud in the existing arrangements. Allow me to distinguish between individuals and proceedings. I do not impute wrong to those gentlemen; I have not the pleasure of knowing an incident of their lives, but I have seen enough of them here to know that they are gentlemen as well as scholars, and I would not impute to them dishonorable actions. I have not done so. There is

nothing in the proposition which can be held to be dishonourable to them individually. The proposition is that "the settlement made by 3 and 4 Vict. was an act of gross injustice." I think it is, and I think, further, that on these occasions we should speak out distinctly, especially as the gentleman who opened the debate yesterday declared that one object of the discussion was to bring these statements side by side. I do not state behind their backs what I do not state here. I look on the arrangement as a very wrongful one—as very tyrannical and very fraudulent—as a very great curse to this province—as the source of agitation, a stop to missionary exertion to a great extent, and as a means of dissension. Canada will never be prosperous while this system continues. I hope that if I do not see the end of it, my children will, for I am desirous of getting the system abolished. At the same time I would receive courtesies from these gentlemen very gratefully, and reciprocate them promptly and cordially. Allusion has been made to the opinion which the Attorney and Solicitor General gave on the reference of the Niagara petition to them, in which they said that dissenters could not be included, because there are no dissenters recognized as protestant clergy in the statute books of England. But in the statute books of this province, we do stand as a protestant clergy. The sects are not mentioned in England as a protestant clergy—they are merely tolerated; but we are here recognized, certain powers are given to us by statute, and we come in under the general description, protestant clergy. The extracts which the gentleman opposite read were extracts, not from what took place in parliament or in the presence of the judges, but from the correspondence of partisans of one particular church—friends of that church, trying to promote it. Besides, much of the correspondence was written after the passing of the act of parliament, and have nothing to do with the explanation of its meaning. The meaning has been declared by the judges—the highest authorities—as well as by colonial secretaries (two or three), and by law officers whose opinions have been given. Mr. Bettridge referred to tithes in Canada, in lieu of which it is said, the reserves were instituted. It is perfectly manifest—that Mr. Bettridge got into the mistake which runs through all his extracts from what Mr. DeBlaquiere got published: not one touches the question. The tithes in Canada do not relate to the protestant clergy. When this country was conquered, it was enacted that tithes should not be paid by protestants to the Roman Catholic priesthood, as they would have had to do if there had been no special enactment. To relieve protestants, it was enacted that they should not pay. Tithes were given to government, not to the clergy of the Church of England: not one of them touched the tithes. The tithes went by law into the hands of the Receiver General of the province at Quebec, who was to hold them against a time when an appropriation was to be made. That was the case with regard to the tithes at Quebec. Dr. Strachan afterwards got an act passed to declare that there was no such right as a right to tithes, in existence, and that popular opinion thereon was involved. Surely, no inference is to be drawn from that in favor of the clergy previously having a right to these tithes. We have been told the opinion of Mr. Lafontaine and others on the subject of the rectories. Now I beg to state that I believe there is no equity lawyer in Toronto, who will affirm that any rectory patent which they have seen is worth anything. They are invalid in point of law.

Rev. F. EVANS—Order.

Rev. J. ROAF—I repeat, in point of law these patents are utterly invalid. They institute a rectory, and then say that certain lands shall belong to that rectory. They endow the rectory, which is the thing. They don't—as they ought to have done—endow Mr. Bettridge and his successors. There can be no vested property except in the individual. There must be a person to receive property. They have assigned lands to a thing, which cannot hold lands in the eye of the law. It is the general opinion of the equity lawyers in Toronto, therefore, that in that respect—apart from all other considerations—the deeds appointing these rectors are invalid. We were told by Mr. Cronyn that the responsibility of the act giving some of these reserves to Roman Catholics, rests upon the parliament, not upon us. I beg to state that the measure was strongly recommended by Dr. Strachan, and Dr. Strachan represents the clergy of the Church of England in this province. He is what the title

is to a book—he indicates the whole. We have been told that not a voice has been heard against the reserves for ten years. Why? was there not the rebellion?

Rev. F. EVANS.—There has been no rebellion within the last 10 years.

Rev. J. ROAF.—A *lapsus lingua* that's all. The rebellion occurred in 1837-8, and the imperial act passed in 1840. In the interim, we had Lord Sydenham and Lord Durham trying to put the province straight, and Lord Sydenham sent home the act which occasioned the passing of the existing one. There was agitation on the question at that time. After 1840, the question was put off till responsible government was established, which it was expected would put a stop to the tyrannical proceedings by which the Legislative Council had baffled the wishes of the people. We have been looking for the alienation of the reserves ever since we got responsible government; at last, becoming impatient, we began to stir the question; and finally our leaders recognized the influence of the pressure from without. Unquestionably, the parliament of England had a legal right to set apart the reserves—just as a conqueror, having got possession of a country by force, has a right to do what he pleases. Parliament could have said, Canada shall be a desert, if they liked. They had power but this is not the right of a government. The right of a government is to be a "terror to evil doers" and "praise to them that do well"—in other words, to administer the resources and affairs of a country for the benefit of all. Blackstone, in his Commentaries, says—

"If an uninhabited country be discovered and planted by English subjects, all English laws then in being, which are the birthright of every subject, are immediately there in force. But this must be understood with very many and very great restrictions. Such colonists carry with them only so much of the English law as is applicable to their own situation, and the condition of an infant colony; such, for instance, as the general rules of inheritance and of protection from personal injuries. The artificial requirements and distinctions incident to the prosperity of a great and commercial people, the laws of police and revenue (such especially as are enforced by penalties,) the mode of maintenance for the established clergy, the jurisdiction of spiritual courts, and a multitude of other provisions, are neither necessary nor convenient for them, and therefore are not in force."

This great writer here says, most truly, that government have no right to put upon us by force any one mode of faith for all time. If they had a right to do it at one time, they have no right now. Are we to be ruled by the dead? Are we to be controlled by past ages? There are rights of a legal nature to which I would peacefully submit, but in which I could not acquiesce. I do not dispute the right of the British government to give two and a half millions of acres in Canada to a particular church or churches. A legal right they have, but no moral right—the right to deal with slaves, but no such right as I recognize. [Time expired.]

Rev. W. BERRIDGE.—We come now to the compromise, with respect to which I will simply read that which Lord John Russell expressed in the House of Commons preparatory to the passing of the existing act. In asking leave to bring in the bill, May 23, 1840, his lordship said, "of course, if these propositions should be adopted, the whole matter might be considered as finally settled." On the second reading, his lordship said, "It was thought desirable to settle the question in such a manner as to promote the religious instruction of the people, and procure the permanent settlement of the dispute." There, then, was the compromise; and as far as we were concerned, all we had to do was acquiesce in it. If there has been any injustice or fraud perpetrated, it has not been by the Church of England, nor by the individual members of that church. It comes with rather an ill grace from gentlemen who have been waiting, as they say, for responsible government (and I as willingly yield to responsible government as they do, for I am a lover of law, and a lover of representative government); I say it comes with very ill grace from constitutional advocates of the representative system, when they say that representatives of the people, sitting in parliament, commit gross injustice and fraud. These were done, if done at all, by representative—or responsible government.

Rev. J. ROAF.—In England.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—But was confirmed here.

Rev. J. ROAF.—Oh dear, no !

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—At all events, we are obliged to bend to the law. Besides, it is but fair to imagine that the imperial senators are as likely to do that which is right as the provincial ones. As far as I understand the whole matter, I think it rests on the distribution—the arrangement,—and it is in reference to this I presume that our friends opposite believe some great injustice has been perpetrated. Now what is the population? I recollect myself recommending to Lord Glenelg and the authorities at home, the very principle upon which the distinction was made, and in that recommendation I certainly did not act quite in accordance with the views of some of those whose opinion I might have attended to. But I felt that this question had been a most grievous bone of contention amongst us, and I expressed myself distinctly to the effect that I would rather there should be no clergy reserves than that there should be disunion. I therefore recommended at the time that some such division should take place as was actually made. And now to the figures. Taking the last census as our basis, it appears that the United Church of England and Ireland (speaking in round numbers) now has 171,000 members. We have taken a third of the whole of those lands which remained unsold. It would seem that the whole protestant inhabitants of this country amount to 537,000. If you divide these, you will find at once that if we had one real third, we ought to have 179,000, instead of 171,000; but I suppose you will not be so sharp with us as that. With respect to the Church of Scotland, we must speak before the unhappy division took place. That church had one one-sixth of the whole of the unsold lands, at present, the Free Presbyterian Church and the Church of Scotland number 134,000 members. Looking at this aggregate, the Church of Scotland would not have had its share in having only the one-sixth. Add the members of the Church of Scotland (including Free Church) and of the Church of England together, and we have 305,000—being considerably more than half of the whole population. Those who dissent from the churches of England and Scotland amount to 232,000, now they get half of the reserves, and we—the Church of England and the Church of Scotland—amounting to 305,000, only get the other half. That does not seem a very unjust or a very fraudulent arrangement. If it were necessary to alter that arrangement, I should be one of the first to say, let us go to parliament. But it would be most unhappy for us to be going to strive on the floor of parliament. I should be very sorry to be discussing this subject perpetually; I would rather meet fraternally, to discuss questions which I trust all of us think more highly of. I trust we meet fraternally even now, for although we say a few tart things, I hope and feel that they are only on the lip not in the heart. I wish our friends had omitted the terms gross injustice and fraud from the proposition because it must be admitted that according to what was law then, in the opinion of the highest legal authorities there was no injustice in the settlement. There must be a right before there can be fraud. If I take from you, there is fraud, because what I take is yours. But according to the law officers of the crown in 1818, those gentlemen had no right whatever. I don't say whether or not you ought to have had any right. But I do say that at present you have half of the reserves then unsold; and gladly would I go with you to parliament that you might be able to dispose of your share according to the wishes of your denominations; and I should like also to have the privilege of also getting our share into our hands. Whatever may have been the case in by gone times, I concede that by the act of 1840 you have as clear and undoubted a right to your share of the lands as we have to ours, and under this consideration I cannot see a reason for any further contest. Although the right of conscience has been often spoken of by one of our reverend friends, yet I still think there is conscience; and if any of our friends would like to receive their share in some other manner or shape, I'll go with you to ask for the change. We do not want to wrong any man. If you don't like to have your share for religion, take it for education. Still I say, if your conscience refuses to allow you to receive this in the way which the Imperial Parliament has sanctioned,

do allow us to act upon our own conscience in the exercise of our own right. Do not say that in availing ourselves of the provisions of the imperial statute, we are committing an act of gross injustice or fraud. I have already shown that in taking the one-third we are taking no more than we are entitled to, in proportion to the population. We have heard something about the conscience of the people. I contend that the conscience of the majority has nothing to do with the conscience of the minority. Do you wish to force our consciences? Let the members of the Church of England act as they please in what concerns only themselves, refuse your share, if your conscience cannot take it. But let it not be said that because you claim to be—perhaps are—the majority, the Church of England shall be compelled to give up her rightful portion, and we poor rectors be forced to go without our £100 a year.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—I claim the right to explain.

CHAIRMAN—It can only be allowed by mutual consent.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—The last gentleman has reflected on me by saying I made light of his conscience. I disavow it. I have a high respect for the consciences of these gentlemen, and for the church they represent.

CHAIRMAN—We are bound by particular rules, agreed upon previously, and we cannot now deviate from them.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—I am not going to argue the point, I only wish to explain my own meaning.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—I disclaim any personal reference. You said frequently that the majority have declared against any establishment, and you desired to appeal to the public conscience.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—I was shown yesterday that governments have consciences.

CHAIRMAN—We will proceed with the next proposition on the voluntary side which is as follows—

5—That the 57 Rectories were established in violation of the public faith, contrary to the instructions of the Imperial Government, and at variance with the oft-expressed wishes of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Upper-Canada.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Reference has been made to conscience, and opinions have been given from side to side. It is a delicate subject but I shall venture to give a third opinion. The two national Churches rely upon a support from the state; other denominations refuse to receive any relief from the Clergy Reserve fund, and some of them allege that they do so from conscientious principles. My opinion therefore is, that it is not right on either side to make allusion to the conscience of the other. I rise to support the proposition which has just been read, and it will have been seen that the subject that falls to me is very closely connected with the one that was last discussed; and in consequence of that close connection, references have been more or less pointedly made to it, and the field which I intended to occupy has been limited. I do not regret that. I think that some of the principles that have been brought forward, as well as the facts which have been stated, may with great advantage be kept in mind, as enabling parties to judge of the rectory question. For my part, I have always viewed the rectory question as by far the most important of the two—important as the other unquestionably is. The rectory question is important in this view—that it always has appeared to me to be decisive of the claims of a dominant hierarchy in this country. The setting up of rectories, always with territorial bounds and glebe lands—much of the lands so appropriated being very valuable, and the whole forming part of the Clergy Reserves—has gone far to set up what we would call an establishment in this country. And in reference to the history of the matter, allow me to remind you that the movement in regard to the rectories bears date 15th January, 1836. I at once acknowledge with the friends who have spoken before me, that authority was given for this by the same deeds that granted the reserves. I mean the constitution act of 1791. There is no question of that. But it is a well known and a very important fact that from 1791 up to 1836, no movement whatever was made in order to carry out that provision of

the act. I consider this an important fact—that the whole matter of rectories was left in abeyance for the long period of forty-five years. This would have been unimportant had the question regarding the Reserves lain in abeyance also; but during that period—during the greater half of it, indeed—most important proceedings took place in regard to the Reserves. The opinion of the Crown lawyers in London had been taken by Lord Bathurst in regard to the right of the different protestant denominations. The petition of the Church of Scotland, in 1821, had formed the subject of very full discussion both in England and Canada. Mr. Morris's ten resolutions on the subject, in 1823, had passed. The petition of the Clergy of the Church of England had gone home, asking for power to sell a portion of the lands in order that the proceeds might be appropriated to the endowment of a bishopric, the endowment of archdeacons, the endowment of the clergy, and the education of the people in the principles of the Church of England. That was in 1828. Then, in 1828, the great committee of the House of Commons was appointed, whose report is one of the most valuable documents to which appeal can be made. During the whole of that period not a word was said about rectories. Not until January, 1836, as I have already said, was the first movement made, in regard to rectories in this country. I will now read the minute in Council authorizing the establishment of rectories in Upper Canada, with an extract from the confidential dispatch on which the Council acted. I don't know how many form the Executive Council, but on this memorable occasion, the number present was not very large. Those present were, the Hon. Peter Robinson, Presiding Councillor, George H. Markland, and Joseph Wells; and their minute, which bears date, Friday, 15th June, 1836, is as follows:—

“To His Excellency Sir John Colborne, K. C. B., Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Upper Canada, Major-General commanding His Majesty's Forces therein, &c., &c., &c.

“May it please Your Excellency—

“Pursuant to the views of Lord Goderich, shewn by his Despatch of the 5th April, 1832, in which he concurs with your Excellency, and expresses his desire ‘that a moderate portion of land should be assigned in each Township or Parish for insuring the future comfort, if not the complete maintenance, of the rectors,’ the Council caused the necessary steps to be taken, for the purpose of setting apart lots in each township throughout the Province.

“Much delay has been caused by their anxiety to avoid interfering with persons who might have acknowledged claims to any of the Reserves to be selected, either for lease or purchase.

“A difficulty in completing what his Lordship most appropriately calls ‘this salutary work,’ was also, caused by the Crown Officers not concurring in the form to be used in the instrument by which the endowment is to be confirmed, which left the Council to decide as to the mode to be adopted for that purpose.

“These obstacles have been surmounted, and it is respectfully recommended that no time be lost in authorizing the Attorney General to prepare the necessary instruments to secure to the incumbents named in the annexed schedules, and their successors, the lots of land there enumerated as having been respectively set apart for glebes.

“All which is respectfully submitted.”

Here is an extract from Lord Goderich's confidential Dispatch to Sir J. Colborne, dated 5th April, 1832, on which these gentlemen, in the plenitude of their wisdom, are acting:—

“And I am happy to find that your practical views, founded upon personal knowledge and experience, are so coincident with those which upon a mere speculative view I had been led to entertain. I quite concur with you in thinking that the greatest benefit to the Church of England would be derived from applying a portion at least of the funds under the control of the Executive Government, in

the building of rectories and churches ; and I would add, in preparing, as far as may be, for profitable occupation, that moderate portion of land which you propose to assign in each township or parish, for ensuring the future comfort, if not the complete maintenance, of the rectors. With this view, it appears to me that it would be desirable to make a beginning in this salutary work."

This, then, is the authority on which the rectories were established. I complain that for forty-five years, when the whole subject was under most hearty and zealous discussion—when the whole colony, and Britain, and both Houses of Parliament, were deeply and diligently occupied with the great subject of the Clergy Reserves, in its entire view—not a word was said in reference to the rectories until this time. It is proper to remind you that there were rectories before this time in Canada. There were at least three rectories from a very early period, and others had been added ; but these rectories were more nominal than real. They did not imply any act of the government, or any distinct appropriation of glebe lands. They belonged to another constitution than that which now exists ; and altho' Lord Goderich alludes to the building of rectories, it does not amount to the carrying out of the principle laid down in 1791, which principle is, by a recommendation of a majority in Council, solemnly given ; and the conditions on which these rectories shall be founded, being duly stated to the Governor, he is then entitled to take steps to carry out the act. I would remind you of what happened. We would have expected that such an important resolution as that of constituting rectories would have been immediately communicated to the Home Government by the then Governor. Mark that four years elapsed between the despatch of Lord Goderich, in 1832, and the proceedings of the Council in 1836. During that time, not a word is uttered as to any proposal in regard to that matter having been brought before the Council. It is plain, then, that this confidential despatch never would have been brought out, had not the legality of the thing been challenged. When was this communicated to the Home Government ? You will be surprised when I tell you that while the deed passed in January, 1836, no communication was made to the then Secretary of the Colonies, touching this, for at least eleven months ; and I now call your attention to the instructions which the Colonial Secretary had been giving in the meantime for the guidance of the then Governor, namely, Sir Francis Head. In the meantime Lord Glenelg sent this paper, part of which has been read by Mr. Roaf, and the remainder of which I will now read, being that part which has reference to the anticipated conflict of opinion, as it is called. This paper does throw light on the view entertained by the Government of Britain in regard to the right of varying and repealing. Lord Glenelg says (immediately after the passages which have already been read) :—

"In the controversy, therefore, respecting ecclesiastical endowments, which at present divides the Canadian Legislature, I find no unexpected element of agitation, the discovery of which demands a departure from the fixed principles of the constitution, but merely the fulfilment of the anticipations of Parliament in 1791 in the exhibition of that conflict of opinion for which the statute of that year may be said to have made a deliberate preparation. In referring the subject to the future Canadian Legislature, the authors of the constitutional act must be supposed to have contemplated the crisis at which we have now arrived—the era of warm and protracted debate, which in a free government may be said to be a necessary precursor to the settlement of any great principle of national policy. We must not have recourse to an extreme remedy merely to avoid the embarrassment which is the present though temporary result of our own deliberate legislation."

Lord Glenelg objected, therefore, to the withdrawing from the Canadian to the British Legislature the question respecting the Clergy Reserves. That, he says, "would be an infringement on that cardinal principle of Colonial government which forbids parliamentary interference," except in reference to a well established and evident necessity. Another despatch is also given, according to which it appears that very important changes had taken place in respect to public opinion in England in the meantime, and the consequence was, that when a communication was made

to Lord Glenelg, in regard to these rectories, he sent this answer. It is very important, and, as I have said, is in reply to the announcement regarding the rectories:—

DOWNING STREET, 6th July, 1837.

“ You are aware that your despatch of the 17th December, 1836, contained the first official intimation which ever reached me, of the rectories having been either established or endowed.”

Have we not a right to complain at the great delay which took place between the action on the part of the Provincial Government, and the communication to the Home Government, most deeply interested as they were? This was “the first official information,” Lord Glenelg says, which ever reached him. He goes on to say:—

“ The fact had been asserted in Parliament, but I was not only officially uninformd, but really ignorant that it had occurred. I therefore requested you to supply me with the necessary information, and until it reached me, in the month of February last, I was entirely destitute of all authentic intelligence as to what had really been done.”

This is a singular state of things for any country. But Lord Glenelg knew how to oil the razor, for he proceeds thus:—

“ You will not, I trust, even for a moment suppose that I refer in the spirit of censure or complaint to the silence of the Provincial government on this occasion. It admits of an obvious explanation. The creation and endowment of the rectories was almost the last act of Sir John Colborne’s administration, and at that time you were actually on your way from New York to Toronto. Your predecessor probably assumed that the proceeding would be reported by you, he having at least, as it may well be imagined, scarcely leisure enough for the discharge of his many indispensable and urgent public duties. On the other hand, it is impossible not to respect the feelings which indisposed you to enter on the subject.”

New mark! These are the feelings suggested or indicated by Lord Glenelg as having indisposed Sir F. B. Head from interfering on the subject:—

“ Regretting the measure itself, as creating a new embarrassment in your path, at that time beset by difficulties of no ordinary kind, and naturally regarding it as irremediable, you preferred to contend with the obstacle silently, rather than to avail yourself of it either as an apology in the event of failure, or as enhancing your own merit in the event of success. To this generous solicitude for the credit of your immediate predecessor, I have always attributed your omission to report his proceedings with regard to the rectories; and I fully admit that, with the opinion which you entertained, and could scarcely have failed to entertain, as to the validity of the act itself, the motives for making it the subject of correspondence were but few and of no great weight. Although for the reasons to be subsequently stated, I am compelled to think that the creation and endowment of the rectories were not lawful or valid measures, yet it would be most foreign to my real intention, if I should be supposed to cast any doubt on the propriety of Sir John Colborne’s conduct in reference to them. That distinguished officer has given too many proofs of his devoted zeal for His Majesty’s service, and for the good of the King’s subjects, to permit the admission of even a surmise injurious to his public spirit on this or any other occasion; and although I may differ from him in opinion as to the expediency of establishing the rectories, especially at the moment chosen for that purpose, yet I am convinced that Sir John Colborne would, as readily as any other man, acknowledge that opposite views of the public interest upon any particular question may be entertained by men engaged in the same branch of His Majesty’s service, without derogating in the slightest degree from their mutual esteem and confidence. Indeed, in proportion to the strength of those feelings, will usually be the freedom with which such opposite views are avowed and discussed.”

[Time expired—extract not completed.]

REV. F. EVANS—I was rebuked this morning for imposing an undue share of work on my valued brethren, whose cases furnish an illustration of the old notion, that the man who is willing to labour, always has plenty to do. At any rate, I have reason to be satisfied with the arrangement; and I have the consolation of knowing that if I appear to have shirked hard work, I have only imitated at a humble distance the example of Lord Glenelg, who, it is said, was not very fond of toil, and occasionally dozed when he should have been industriously employed. It is apparent from what we have just heard, that somebody once took a doze instead of attending to the proceedings of the Province. Before entering on this head, however, let me go for a moment to the proposition before us. Although there has been a good deal of latitude in the discussion, I hope the gentlemen are not latitudinarian in a more important sense. It is asserted that the fifty-seven rectories were established in violation of public faith. Dr. Burns had twenty minutes to prove this, and although I dare say he made the most of his time, it is quite plain that he has not touched the real question. The proposition might have been written in Hindostanee or Chinese, for all that Dr. Burns has said concerning it. It is my duty, however, to refute the proposition. What do we mean by public faith? I will be very brief on this point. I will suppose that it means authority constituted by the law of the land. That is my definition of public faith; and I therefore deny that the fifty-seven rectories were established in violation of the public faith. I will now read a few passages from the Act 31, Geo. III., c. 31, under which the reserves were appropriated:—

“Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That it shall and may be lawful for His Majesty, his heirs and successors, to authorize the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of each of the said Provinces respectively, or the person administering the government therein, to make, from and out of the lands of the Crown within such Provinces, such allotment and appropriation of lands, for the support and maintenance of a protestant clergy within the same, as may bear a due proportion to the amount of such lands within the same as have at any time been granted by or under the authority of His Majesty, and that whenever any grant of lands within either of the said Provinces shall hereafter be made, by or under the authority of His Majesty, his heirs or successors, there shall at the same time be made, in respect of the same, a proportionable allotment and appropriation of lands for the above mentioned purpose, within the township or parish to which such lands so to be granted shall appertain or be annexed, or as nearly adjacent thereto as circumstances will admit.”

Again:—

“And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That it shall and may be lawful for His Majesty, his heirs or successors, to authorize the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of each of the said Provinces respectively, or the person administering the Government therein, from time to time with the advice of such Executive Council as shall have been appointed by His Majesty, his heirs or successors, within such Province, for the affairs thereof, to constitute and erect, within every township or parish which now is or hereafter may be formed, constituted or erected, within such Province, one or more parsonage or rectory, or parsonages or rectories, according to the establishment of the Church of England; and from time to time, by an instrument under the great seal of such Province, to endow every such parsonage or rectory with so much or such a part of the lands so allotted and appropriated as aforesaid, in respect of any lands within such township or parish which shall have been granted subsequent to the commencement of this act, or of such lands as may have been allotted and appropriated for the same purpose, by or in virtue of any instruction which may be given by His Majesty, in respect of any lands granted by His Majesty before the commencement of this act, as such Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or person administering the government, shall, with the advice of the said Executive Council, judge to be expedient under the then existing circumstances of such township or parish.”

It is evident from this, that if he had chosen, the Governor—by and with the advice

of his Council—might in one township, or in all the townships, have endowed rectories with every acre of the clergy reserves in the Province; and gentlemen opposite might then have searched in vain for the remainder. Much stress has been laid on the terms varying or repealing, but they appear to me to have mainly rested upon the question of the manner in which the lands should be applied, and the manner in which incumbents or ministers should hold and enjoy the same; and not in any way to affect the appropriation of the lands for the support of a protestant clergy. It would appear that by a subsequent provision, the Legislature of the Province might have passed a bill, varying that appropriation, provided it lay six weeks on the table of the houses of Parliament at home. That was never done; but in 1840, the Parliament passed the bill which is now the law. Now I will address myself to Dr. Burns' remarks. First, with respect to a dominant hierarchy. I deny the possibility of the granting of certain portions of land having anything whatever to do with the establishment of a dominant hierarchy. The very thing which prevented the endowment of rectories long before they were endowed, was the difficulty which arose from the circumstance, that the government of this country did not choose to give any authority to rectors out of their own church-yard, and out of their own congregation. That was the great obstacle for a length of time, and that was why the government did not choose to do anything which might appear to render the Church of England in this Province a dominant Church. They granted them lands, as other denominations might hold lands if they could get them; they granted them in the same manner that they granted lands in Fee Simple to any other person. How, then, can you prove that by establishing rectories, they established a dominant church? Some years ago, a member of the Church of England gave 600 acres of land, in the township of Bayham; I allude to the late Mr. Burwell, who erected the rectory of Port Burwell, which will probably be worth £10,000 some day. That gentleman endowed a church and rectory there. Does Dr. Burns mean to say, that by endowing that rectory, Mr. Burwell made the rector dominant, except over these 600 acres of land? Does Dr. Burns desire to take away that endowment, or does he not? If gentlemen opposite desire this, let them take away everything we have, no matter by whom given. One course would be quite as justifiable as the other. But again, I ask, does the endowment of a Rectory make us a dominant church? Why a church is about to be built at Port Dover; within the precincts of that church, I shall in a certain sense be dominant, but shall I therefore be dominant in Port Dover? Gentlemen will have a hard task who undertake to prove such a position. It has been said that when first the subject of Rectories arose, there was a great outcry against their illegality; and Mr. Roaf has remarked that equity lawyers have pronounced the patents invalid, because they were granted to a thing, not to an individual. I now hold one of these patents in my hand, and it is in strict accordance with the terms of the Act of Parliament of 1891. Let equity lawyers say what they please. I come now to the authority on which the patents were granted. Lord Glenelg, in a letter to Mr. Bettridge, stated that the rectories were illegal. He said—

“On the subject of the erection and endowment of the rectories, Lord Glenelg infers from your letter, that you have misapprehended the nature of the objection raised to that measure by the Law Officers of the Crown. It has no reference to the terms of the patents, but to the power of the Lieutenant Governor to issue such patents at all. Consequently there is no possible amendment of those instruments which would obviate the difficulty.”

Lord Glenelg's opinion was, that there was no power to issue these patents at all. The opinion of Mr. Roaf's equity lawyers was, merely that the instruments were incorrect; but that opinion is evidently not worth a fig. I have already referred to the act under which Sir John Colborne erected these Rectories, and I think I have shown that he had power to do so. That law gave to him power “to constitute and erect, within every township or parish which now is or hereafter may be formed, constituted, or erected, within such Province, one or more parsonage or rectory, or parsonages or rectories, according to the establishment

of the Church of England." This seems to be decisive. But let us suppose that Sir John Colborne overstepped his authority, and acted without instructions from them—what then? Was he ever impeached for such a violation of his public duty as Lieutenant Governor of this Province? Is the mistake or fault of a public functionary to be visited upon himself, or upon others? Suppose for a moment that there was a flaw in the manner in which the act was carried out—that Sir John Colborne made a mistake in issuing the patents—are we to suffer? Are the patents to be wrested from us? Should not Sir John Colborne be impeached, rather, for a violation of public duty? But I deny that he committed either a fault or mistake. I maintain, on the contrary, that in all he did in this matter, he acted in conformity with law. I will now read the letter addressed by Lord Bathurst to Mr. President Smith.

Downing Street, April 2nd, 1818.

"SIR,—The Bishop of Quebec has frequently brought under my consideration the advantages which would result to the interests of the Church of England, in the Province under your government, from the legal establishment of parishes or rectories, in conformity with the provision contained in 31. George III, c. 31.

"As I entirely concur with his Lordship in the propriety of adopting a measure calculated to give to the Protestant Church in the Canadas, the support which it was in the contemplation of the Parliament of this country to afford it, I have not failed to submit his Lordship's representation to the Prince Regent, and I have received His Royal Highness's commands to instruct you to take the necessary legal measures for constituting and erecting rectories and parishes in every township within the Province under your government; and you will also take care that it be distinctly understood that the constitution of parishes and rectories can give no claim whatever to any incumbent to receive tithes of the land within the limits of his parish—all claims of that nature having been effectually annulled by the provision for the support of a Protestant Clergy, made in the 31st of the King, and by the law passed by the Legislature of the Province in 1816. The endowment of the several rectories with these portions of the Clergy Reserves will be necessarily a matter of future consideration; and until the more general settlement and cultivation of the Province shall have taken place, I consider it advisable that the management of the several Reserves should—as is the case in the Lower Province—be vested in a corporate body, or continue, as at present, under the control of the Lieutenant Governor and Executive Council.

"I have the honor to be, &c.,

(Signed)

Bathurst.

"Mr. President Smith."

Here is another letter from Lord Bathurst:

Downing Street, July 22, 1826.

"SIR,—I have received his Majesty's commands to direct that you do, from time to time, with the advice of the Executive Council, for the affairs of the Province of Upper Canada, constitute and erect within every township or parish which now is, or hereafter may be, formed and constituted or erected, within the said Province, one or more parsonages or rectories, according to the establishment of the Church of England, and that you do from time to time, by an instrument under the great seal of the said Province, endow every such parsonage or rectory with so much or such part of the land so allotted or appropriated as aforesaid, in respect of any lands within each township or parish which shall have been granted subsequently to the commencement of a certain act of the Parliament of Great Britain, passed in the 31st year of the reign of His late Majesty, King George III, entitled, 'An Act to repeal certain parts of an Act passed in the 14th year of His Majesty's reign, an Act for making more effectual provision for the government of the Province of Quebec in North America, and to make further provision for the government of the said

Province, or of such lands as may be allotted and appropriated for the same purpose, by or in virtue, of any instruction which may have been given by his said late Majesty, before the commencement of the said Act, as you shall, with the advice of the said Executive Council, judge to be expedient under the existing circumstances of such township or parish.

“ You shall also present to every such parsonage or rectory, an incumbent or minister of the Church of England, who shall have been duly ordained according to the rites of said Church; and supply from time to time such vacancies as may happen therein.

“ I have the honor, &c.,

(Signed)

Bathurst.

“ Major-General Sir Peregrine Maitland, K. C. B., &c.”

Surely this is authority enough to satisfy anybody. But, it is said, both the rectories and the present appropriation of the Clergy Reserves are at variance with the oft-expressed wishes of the Legislative Assembly. In reply, I have only to refer to the record of the proceedings of that body three or four years ago, when the Church of England asked to be allowed to take her share of the Reserves into her own hands. I wish they had got it. Well, on that occasion a report was presented, stating that the Committee to whom the application had been referred, considered that the question was altogether settled, and that it would be wrong to disturb the settlement any further. I will merely add, that the last two instances in which the opinions of the Legislature have been recorded, are in the very teeth of my friend, Dr. Burns.

Rev. Dr. Burns—I have partially given the authority on which I ground the charge, that there was something like a breach of public faith in the establishment of these Rectories, and I now resume the extracts from the Despatch of Lord Glenelg to Sir Francis Bond Head. Lord Glenelg said:

“ On receiving your Despatch of the 17th Dec., it appeared to me very questionable, whether any adequate legal authority existed for the creation and endowment of the Rectories. I did not indeed perceive any possible ground for disputing the right of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to proceed to that measure, if previously sanctioned by the King; but on referring to the commissions of Lord Aylmer and Gosford to the general instructions accompanying them; to the correspondence between this department and the Provincial government, and to the minutes of the Executive Council of the 15th January, 1833, it appears to me that no such sanction had ever been given. The grounds of this opinion you will learn from the accompanying copy of the communication which I thought it necessary to address to the King's Advocate, and to the Attorney, and Solicitor General.

“ The Law Officers of the Crown received that reference on the 12th April, and reported to me their answer on the 8th ult. The delay is readily accounted for by the great importance of the question, and by the anxiety of His Majesty's legal advisers to offer no immature judgment on such an occasion. I enclose for your information a copy of their report. You will find that they declare their opinion to be, that the erection and endowment of the fifty-seven Rectories by Sir John Colborne, are not valid and lawful acts.”

Six months before the date of the document on which the Provincial Council proceeded in setting up these Rectories, Lord Goderich, (Lord Ripon) addressed a Despatch, in which the Provincial Legislature were invited to exert their power to vary or repeal, and were expressly recommended to repeal those clauses of the act which relate to the endowment of Rectories. The act requires a specific Despatch—a specific deed of the King in Council, authorizing the Lieutenant Governor to grant and endow the Rectories. But Lord Goderich's Despatch of April, 1832, which forms the basis on which the Executive Council established the Rectories, was marked confidential: and it would therefore appear to be impossible that Lord Goderich could have designed to convey to the Lieutenant Governor the King's sanction for neutralizing the repeal

which his Lordship had recommended a few months previously. This circumstance clearly indicates to my mind, that the Executive Council put a forced and an erroneous construction upon Lord Goderich's Despatch. I will now read the principal portion of the message which Sir John Colborne sent to the Assembly of Upper Canada :

" His Majesty has with no less anxiety considered how far such an appropriation of territory is conducive, either to the temporal welfare of the ministers of religion in this Province, or to their spiritual influence. Bound no less by his personal feelings, than by the sacred obligations of that station to which Providence has called him, to watch over the interests of all the Protestant churches within his dominions, his Majesty could never consent to abandon those interests with a view to any objects of temporary and apparent expediency.

It has therefore been with peculiar satisfaction, that in the result of his enquiries into this subject, his Majesty has found that the changes sought for by so large a proportion of the inhabitants of this Province, may be carried into effect without sacrificing the just claims of the churches of England and Scotland. The waste lands which have been set apart as a provision for the clergy of those venerable bodies, have hitherto yielded no disposable revenue. The period at which they might reasonably be expected to become more productive is still remote. His Majesty has solid grounds for entertaining the hope that, before the arrival of that period, it may be found practicable to afford the clergy of those churches, such a reasonable and moderate provision as may be necessary for enabling them properly to discharge their sacred functions."

The changes sought for by so large a proportion of the people, in reference to the Clergy Reserves, " may be carried into effect," his Majesty found, without injury to the church. What were these sought-for changes? To appropriate the Reserves to secular education, or other general purposes. Sir J. Colborne concludes thus :

" His Majesty, therefore, invites the house of Assembly of Upper Canada, to consider how the powers given to the Provincial Legislature by the constitutional act, to vary or repeal this part of its provisions, can be called into exercise most advantageously, for the spiritual and temporal interests of his Majesty's faithful subjects in this Province."

This was sent in January, 1832. In another Dispatch to which Lord Glenelg refers, the same view was exhibited. In the face of all this, the confidential Dispatch came out, within three months, and upon it the Executive Council proceeded. Our friends refer to the other Dispatch, dated, Downing Street, 22nd July, 1825. The Hon. Peter Robinson, and those who sat with him in the Council, never dreamed of going back to this Dispatch, until they found that action on the confidential Dispatch was no longer tenable. When that discovery was made, a search was instituted, and these two documents were brought to light. In the meantime what was done? Lord Glenelg submitted the whole matter to the law advisers of the Crown, whose opinion—dated, 8th June, 1837—was as follows:—

" We are of opinion that the Lieutenant-governor, with the advice of the Executive Council, could not lawfully constitute and erect or endow any parsonage or rectory within the Province, without the further signification of his Majesty's pleasure.

" Secondly—we are of opinion that Lord Ripon's Dispatch of the 5th of April, 1832, cannot be regarded as signifying his Majesty's pleasure for the erection of parsonages, or for the endowment of them, or for either of those purposes.

" Thirdly—we are of opinion, that the erection and the endowment of the fifty-seven rectories, by Sir John Colborne, are not valid and lawful acts."

This was the first opinion; but it is proper to notice that Lord Bathurst's Dispatch to Sir P. Maitland, eleven years before, was never acted upon, nor attempted to be acted upon; Sir Peregrine had been withdrawn; the throne had been vacated, and a new government was in existence. A new Dispatch was essentially,

necessary. A very great change in public opinion had already taken place during these eleven years—a change quite sufficient to render a distinct renewal of authority necessary. What is still more remarkable is, that various statements and communications had in the meantime been made by the government at home to the government here, indicating this change of sentiment. Lord Goderich, writing to Sir J. Colborne, 8th November, 1832, said—

“With respect to the charge of shewing an undue preference to preachers of religion belonging to the established churches of this country, it is so utterly at variance with the whole course of policy which it has been the object of any Dispatches to yourself to prescribe, that I cannot pause to repel it in any formal manner.”

So jealous was the government in those days of interfering with the rights of the people here, that they expressly prohibited any attempt to invest literary or religious corporations with peculiar privileges, without the sentiments of the Legislature of the Province being ascertained. In view of this, I would submit that the erection of rectories must be held as invalid. Lord Glenelg, however, felt it his duty to submit these newly-discovered Dispatches to the same eminent council, whose second opinion was given on the 24th January, 1833. It was thus:—

“We are of opinion: 1, That the Lieutenant-governor, with the advice of the Executive Council, could lawfully constitute and erect or endow any parsonage or rectory, within the Province, without the further signification of his Majesty's pleasure. 2, We are of opinion that Lord Ripon's Dispatch of the 5th April 1832, cannot be regarded as signifying his Majesty's pleasure, for the erection of parsonages, or for the endowment of them, or for either of those purposes. 3, We are of opinion that the erection or endowment of fifty-seven rectories, by Sir John Colborne, are valid and lawful acts. We are of opinion that the rectors of the parishes so erected and endowed, have the same ecclesiastical authority within their respective limits, as are vested in the rectors of a parish in England.”

This was signed by J. Dodgson, J. Campbell, R. M. Rolfe—the same council who but a few months before had given an opinion directly contrary to this. With all respect to these eminent men, I prefer to stick to their first opinion. Sometimes we appeal from men intemperate to men sober. I would do so in this case. Their first thoughts were best—better than their second ones. And on the ground which these gentlemen themselves assumed, I say we are bound to maintain that the whole of the rectory patents are invalid. The will of the people may regulate deeds of the Council, and whatever may be the value even of a Royal patent, there is a power felt and indicated by the country, or Province, which can vary or repeal such a patent. Although, therefore, I believe that the eminent lawyers whose opinions I have quoted, were a good deal influenced by a feeling of delicacy—particularly as the question had to do with a female Sovereign, who had just ascended the throne—I feel convinced that if their second opinion were now brought before the Judges in England, *de novo*, it would be found to have been pronounced on imperfect and *ex parte* information. [Time expired.]

Rev. F. EVANS.—Dr. Burns says he will have Philip when tipsy.—I'll have Philip when sober. A woman once went before Philip of Macedon for a decision which he gave: “I'll appeal,” she said. “To whom dare you appeal?” demanded the tyrant. “From Philip intoxicated to Philip sober,” was the reply. Dr. Burns says in effect, that he will appeal from Philip sober to Philip intoxicated.

Rev. Dr. BURNS.—He was sober first.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Let us lay bantering aside, and come to fact and argument. We are told that because the Governor General received a confidential Dispatch and because this was acted upon by the Executive Council, there was a violation of public faith. That is new doctrine, and seems to me to be altogether untenable. Again: it is a mistake to say there are fifty-seven rectories. I wish there were so many. Can any gentleman say exactly how many have been endowed?

Ren. Dr. BURNS.—First there were forty-four; and to those additions have been made.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Not one, I am sorry to say. Now let me recur to what has been said about Lord Bathurst's Dispatch being forgotten; and not acted upon for eleven years. The difficulty arose out of this circumstance—that Sir P. Maitland wished to endow rectories, and a strong effort was made to have these—not rectories, but—parishes. The object was, not only that a certain portion of land should be granted for the glebes, but that, along with this, a territorial boundary should be granted. To this, certain individuals objected. Strong objections were particularly made by Sir J. Colborne, who felt that it was his duty to consult public opinion, and he knew that the course proposed would give great offence to the people of the Province; although, if it had been adopted, I don't see how it could have been got over. The arrangement would have stood as well in law, as the rectories stand now. But Sir J. Colborne thought that it ought not to be adopted, notwithstanding the contrary opinions of several members of his Council. He would not yield, neither would these members of the Council; and they went on in this way, discussing the subject, for several years. Ultimately, and lastly, before Sir J. Colborne left the Province, the parties agreed, and I think wisely, because I am decidedly of opinion that if Sir J. Colborne had not endowed these rectories, it was not at all likely Sir F. B. Head would have done so. Sir John Colborne's act was in the nick of time. But we had been in possession of these lands several years. In 1831, I was in possession of all the land I hold as rectorial—every acre of it. It was set apart as a glebe; and so it was with respect to all other parishes. I had a provisional lease, leaving to me those very lands for a term of 21 years, with the proviso that whenever his Majesty should see fit to appoint or endow a rectory within the said township of Woodhouse, the Rev. F. Evans, or any other person holding that lease, should immediately relinquish the same, in order to its being applied to the endowment of the rectory. So that although Sir J. Colborne carried out the point of law, the deed was, in point of fact, done several years before. This shows that although the command of Lord Bathurst was not carried into effect until the time when the rectories were constituted, the *animus*—the intention—remained with the government; the intention being to endow rectories when that end could be properly accomplished. At last, it was accomplished. This, then, is the whole head and front of our offence. This is what we have done. First of all, we accepted the lands, and were told that by and by we should be endowed. By and by we were endowed, and we hold the endowment to this day. Yet we are told, forsooth, that the thing was done contrary to public faith, and at variance with the express wish of the Legislative assembly! Now a large proportion of the people of this Province are members of the Church of England. They number, at a rough guess, 171,000; some say they amount to 200,000. This is a large proportion—say one-third—of the whole population. Is the opinion of this one-third to be entirely ignored, merely because they are the minority? Is this the principle of the British Constitution, or that which is to be acted upon here? We know there is a party called Clear Grits. They, I believe, are a minority; but they have nevertheless a public opinion, which is attended to by a great many persons. What would they think of the doctrine that their opinion should have no weight, because they are a minority? It will and ought to have weight; and surely you will not deny the same to the members of the Church of England, numerous as I have shown them to be. In England, the minority—the “opposition,” as they are termed—form a recognized ingredient in the constitution; and is the principle to be discarded in this portion of the British Empire? Is no regard to be paid to the wishes or wants of one-third of the whole population? We have not arrived at that point yet, I hope. Now, with respect to taking away the Reserves altogether: They were granted to us because we were to have no tithes. But, you say, you will alienate them from the Churches of England and Scotland. Well, what have you to get, to give us in exchange? Let the government, if desirous of this change, come forward with a proposal to give us an equivalent, in consid-

eration of surrendering the Reserves. We are willing again to come to terms, if you will give us an equivalent. Are we to have tithes back again? I'd rather not. What then are we to rely upon?

Rev. Dr. BURNS.—The affections of your people.

Rev. F. EVANS.—We can secure them without any aid from government. We are under no compact with government in respect of that. And while fully appreciating the affections of our people, we may with perfect propriety ask, what arrangement is the Government prepared to enter into, if we surrender the Reserves? we hold them by a safe tenure. It does not affect our right to tell us that Secretaries of State have contradicted themselves, or that Attorney Generals have stultified their own decisions, we know all this, and cannot pretend to help it; we know further, however, that a constitutionally-appointed pension has been granted to us, and we believe there is no power which can justly deprive us of it. [Time expired.]

Rev. J. RICHARDSON.—The first remark I shall make is this—That the Despatch from Lord Glenelg and Lord Ripon, read by Dr. Burns, in my opinion annul the previous despatches of Lord Bathurst in 1825 and 1818. Upon these despatches these gentlemen profess to ground the legal right of the Governor to endow these rectories. Observe, that the Executive Council—whose minute has been read—when they advised the Governor to establish the Rectories, referred, not to the despatches of Lord Bathurst at all, but to the despatch of Lord Goderich. Now what is that despatch? I will read some extracts that will show clearly that his Lordship advised Sir J. Colborne to provide for the salaries of the two Archdeacons of York and Kingston out of a certain sum of money, which is mentioned as having accumulated from the Revenues of the Province: he found that he had £4000 surplus money after paying the Archdeacons,—this £4000 coming out of the Casual and Territorial Revenue. It is in reference to this £4000 that Lord Goderich directs Sir J. Colborne to provide for parishes, &c, The despatch from which I read is dated 6th April, 1833.

“There will be abundant means of meeting all the demands for salaries, including the two Archdeacons, for which I had intended to provide. A question therefore naturally arises as to the most advantageous mode of disposing of the £4000 to be taken out of the Casual and Territorial Revenue, which had been destined to this particular service, which will no longer be required for that purpose.—I have considered with great attention the observations contained in your private letter of February 16th, and the propositions which result from them; and I am happy to find that your practical views, founded upon personal knowledge and experience, are so coincident with those upon a mere speculative view I had been led to entertain.”

His Lordship went on to say—

“£4000 in the whole will be disposable; and I willingly leave it to your discretion to decide as to the proportionate distribution of that sum. I am well aware that in the execution of this duty, you will have to steer a difficult course, and that it will require no small tact to determine by what practical means these important objects can be best attained.”

Again—

“It cannot be forgotten that the condition of society in such a country as Upper Canada presents difficulties in the pursuits of this object which are very serious, and that a state of religious peace is above all things essential in establishing in the minds of the people the efficacy of religious principles.”

Were not my time so limited, I would read the whole despatch. The use I make of it is this—that the authority upon which Sir J. Colborne's Executive Council grounded the establishment of those Rectories was drawn, not upon the previous despatches of Lord Bathurst (and certainly they must have known that

those despatches existed), but from this letter or despatch of Lord Goderich, which I maintain, gave them no authority. He says he advises the Governor to appropriate a part of that £4000 from the Casual and Territorial Revenue to aid this work, and then, that it might be advisable to appropriate a certain moderate portion of land for increasing the comfort of Rectors. Now here is the point.—The Governor proceeded either on the despatches of Lord Bathurst or on this despatch. It appears that he proceeded on this despatch; and what does Lord Glenelg say in relation to this subject? There had been doubts as to the legality—or rather as to the regularity—of the establishment of these Rectories. Lord Glenelg in a despatch to Sir George Arthur, dated 26th December, 1837, said:—

“How far the view originally taken by the law officers of the Crown may be altered when they shall have maturely considered the subject, &c.”

Again—

“Although the endowment of the Rectories in the year 1836 did not take place with the previous concurrence or knowledge of the present ministers of the Crown, yet, as they appear to have been made at least under a presumed authority from the Secretary of State, and as considerable time has now elapsed since the parties were put in possession of the lands, I should regret to be compelled to disturb that settlement, or to dispossess the Clergy of the Church of England of the lands which have been assigned for their maintenance.”

I think a minister of the Crown need not apprehend being called upon to disturb the settlement, if he had not power. But Lord Glenelg felt that he had a power which he might be called on to exercise, but he would regret the occasion after the Rectories had been so long established. The Rectors had been so long in possession of their lands, that he did not like the idea of being called on to disturb them. Now that is clearly an admission that he might have been compelled to dispossess them. His Lordship added:—

“Should the legal right now appear to the law officers of the Crown to be indefeasible, no practical question will of course remain for the decision of the government.”

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—Just so.

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—I was aware that gentleman opposite would catch that. But it so happens that we have the law officers of the crown *versus* the law officers of the crown, and it remains to be seen which opinion is right and which wrong. What are the terms of our proposition? “That the fifty-seven rectories were established in violation of the public faith.” Now in a previous despatch from Lord Goderich to Sir J. Colborne, dated November 8, 1832, the following passages occur—

“With respect to the charge of showing an undue preference to the teachers of religion belonging to the established church of this country, it is so utterly at variance with the whole course of policy which it has been the object of my Despatches to yourself to prescribe, that I cannot pause to repel it in any formal manner.”

“His Majesty has studiously abstained from the exercise of his undoubted prerogative of endowing literary or religious corporations, until he should obtain the advice of the representatives of the Canadian people for his guidance in that respect.”

From this and other Despatches which I have not time to refer to (but which may be referred to by any who hear me, as they are in the official communications.) The people of this country, were led to believe that it was the intention of his Majesty and Government not to appropriate these reserves, without the knowledge and consent of the people of Canada, expressed through their constituted authorities in parliament; and that expectation was so strong that when it was announced that these rectories had been established, the circumstance excited (we may say) a burst of indignation from different parties. I shall refer to some expressions in regard to

it. The first is an extract from the *Christian Guardian*, expressive of the sentiments of the body it represents, then under the editorial management of the Rev. Ephraim Evans. Mr. Evans was a man so thoroughly loyal in feeling and so strong in his attachment to constituted authority, that the expression of opinion which I am about to quote must have been dragged from him. On the 6th April, 1836, he said—

“ We have learned with extreme regret, that His Excellency Sir John Colborne has thought proper, during the latter part of his administration of the affairs of this province, to take a step which we are confident, will meet with the strongest disapprobation of nineteen-twentieths of its inhabitants, and which will have a greater tendency to create discontent than any other act of his administration. We allude to the establishment of rectories, to the number of forty-four, each with an endowment of from 105 to 800 acres of Clergy Reserves, some including valuable Town lots, as will be seen by the Schedule which we publish to-day. The value of the endowments is not so much the subject of animadversion, as the principle involved in the act itself,—a principle directly opposed to the known wishes of the country, and, in our opinion directly at variance with its religious interests. After the repeated expression of the opinions of his Majesty’s subjects in this colony, against the establishment of any church with exclusive rights and privileges—opinions expressed time after time in the addresses from the popular branch of the Legislature, in which all parties have been nearly unanimous, and in numerous signed petitions to his Majesty’s government and the Imperial Parliament, supported by Christians of every denomination, including a very respectable portion of the members of the Church of England—we had been led to entertain a hope almost amounting to certainty, that no attempt would be made to force upon this Country an established religion.”

We’ll now come a little nearer home to some gentlemen present. Here is an extract from the *Niagara Christian Examiner*, edited by the Rev. Mr. Magill, of the established Church of Scotland, who, after having stated the ill-judged act of establishing the rectories, observed—

“ Such is the act of the government, and such are the pretensions of its high church favorites. Can it be deemed surprising that public apprehension has been awakened?—that public indignation is roused?—that constitutional resistance is resolved upon?—that all who wish the peace and prosperity of the country declare their deliberate judgment that this rash and surreptitious act must be cancelled—this root of bitterness must be drawn out even to its minutest fibres, and cast into the sea of oblivion.”

“ Year after year, at least during the last decade, the general sentiment of this colony has been uttered in no unequivocal form, that no church invested with exclusive privileges derived from the state, is adapted to the condition of society among us. It cannot be doubted, that this is the deliberate conviction of nine-tenths of the colonists. Except among a few ambitious magnates of the Church of England, we never hear a contrary sentiment breathed. Equal rights on equal conditions, is the general cry, and although several assemblymen of the present House have chosen to misinterpret the public voice, and to advocate a different principle, we doubt not that on their next appearance before their constituents, they will be taught that this is not the age, nor this the country, in which the grand principle of equal rights can be departed from with impunity.” [Time expired.]

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—We are much obliged to the last Rev. gentleman for giving us the opinions of Mr. Magill and Mr. Ryerson. Do you know the opinion of the rector of Woodstock, whose opinion is as good as that of either?

Rev. J. RICHARDSON—Not Mr. Ryerson, but Mr. Ephraim Evans.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—I knew and had a high respect for Mr. Evans, with regard to Mr. Magill, I am somewhat surprised that he should have taken advantage of the opposition to the Church of England at that time, for I have before me a long list of

endowments of the Church of Scotland, made previous to these rectories in Kingston, in Belleville, Perth, Dundas, Toronto, and other places. That seems rather odd, and even my friend Mr. Donald McKenzie, of the Free Kirk of Scotland, is in possession of 200 acres of land, which he obtained before leaving the Church of Scotland. He has it in Zorra. He and I have lived neighbours seventeen years, and I hope he will live there seventeen years longer; but, as I have said, although a minister of the Free Kirk, he enjoys 200 acres of land. There are two and a half millions of acres, and all this great grievance (of course, apart from the principle of the thing) is, that the Church of England has got—how much do you think? why about 27,000 acres.

Rev. W. ORMSTON—How many had she sold before 1840?

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—We are now on the rectories, and do not try to get me off my text. The delay that was occasioned in these endowments have already been partially stated by Mr. Evans; but as I had a little finger in the pie, I can state to you that a deputation of members of the Church of England from the west, went to Sir J. Colborne, with an earnest request. This was at the latter end of 1834, or in the beginning of 1835; and our request was that he would proceed to carry out the constitutional act, under the authority which he possessed. Sir J. Colborne knew the contents of Lord Bathurst's Despatch very well. I and three others formed the deputation, and we pressed the subject on him; and had he not been thwarted in his Council by those who were not friends of the Church of England, there can be no question that we should have had—as Mr. Lafontaine says we ought to have had—500 rectories instead of fifty. With respect to the Despatch from Lord Goderich in 1832, which I believe was confidential—are we to suppose that it superseded—or implied forgetfulness—of the official, public Despatch from Lord Bathurst in 1825! If we are, it is a new doctrine, recollect, it is not merely from Lord Bathurst that the Despatch came, for he wrote by the express command of his Majesty in Council assembled, and he said that these rectories were to be established. And yet because Lord Goderich wrote a private Despatch, gentlemen would have it go before the other. There can be very little question as to the validity of the two. The public, at all events, will be enabled to judge. But we are arguing to very little purpose. I think that gentlemen opposite have not met the difficulty in their case. There it stands, great as ever. In an appeal made last year (I think) to the Crown authorities in this colony, with respect to the validity of these patents (and I had two or three with me). Mr. Lafontaine remarked, "It has been broadly asserted that there has been collusion in the obtaining of these patents, but thus far I have found no proof of it. Of course, if collusion be detected, the patents will be *ipso facto* invalid; but since I have had the honour of holding office here, I can assure you we have looked rather sharply after the business, and yet we have found no flaw—no collusion—that can shake your rectories." Her Majesty's ministers in this province cannot be suspected of being over favorable to the Church of England, and yet their chief man thus declared to me that, after the most careful search, they had been unable to find anything that could invalidate the title, or shake the foundation of our rectories. After such an expression of opinion, I went home very well satisfied. But still we poor rectors have pretty hard lives to lead, in consequence of the hostile feeling with which we have to contend. I am greatly pleased to find that a different spirit animates the gentlemen opposite, and I trust that when this discussion is over, they will tell their congregations that we rectors are not such bad bodies after all. I am sorry to say that the spirit which prevails at Woodstock is extremely inimical toward us—not to me personally, but to me as a rector of the Church of England, at Woodstock, we have a lot of five acres, deeded some 25 years ago, for the purpose of erecting thereon a church and parsonage. It was given to the late Bishop of Quebec, but under the Church Temporalities act is vested in me and my Church-wardens. A church had been built by private subscription. A rectory had been built which is now tumbling down, and I believe I shall have to flee to my people to build me a rectory on the five acres. Well, we have put a fence round these five acres, and we have got a crop on the ground; but

there are certain persons who declare that they won't let us have the five acres at all—and the fence is nearly pulled down, and the crop—which would at all events have been advantageous to me—is well nigh destroyed. I do not complain about the loss of the 500 bushels of oats which might be there, but I dislike the spirit which prompts these proceedings; it is not kind—it is not christian. These five acres, be it remembered, were government reserves, not clergy reserves. The Free Kirk, at this present time, has got from the government five acres on the very same plot for a church yard; we allow them to keep it, and I hope their dead will rest in peace there. The Methodists have got three or four acres, and hold them in peace. The established church of Scotland and other denominations have received similar grants. But the poor rector of Woodstock can't hold five acres, although I have held them by patent from the crown for 25 years. I may appear to smile while I speak of this matter, but my smile has sorrow at its bottom. For surely this is not the proper way to act. What you do, do constitutionally, and without violence, until you can dispossess the rector of Woodstock—and constitutionally dispossess him—let him live peaceably amongst you; do not go sneaking by night to harrass and destroy his private property. Do not come and attack him rudely because he preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ in a church different from your own. I hold my patent from the crown, and until that patent be declared invalid, allow me in peace to enjoy the results of my labours. If the parliament or the crown declares that I am wrong, I will yield, and shall try to yield with the grace of a christian. I trust I shall have grace to do it. You shall hear no complaint from my mouth. We have lost two-thirds of the Reserves, and if it be the will of the nation that we shall loose the other I will bow respectfully to the law. There shall be no agitation on our part, because we believe that the powers that be are ordained of God. Unhappy will be that period, because we shall be warped greatly in the humble efforts we are making to carry to our own people the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. I know that the thought that we are an established church, rankles in the breasts of many. They think we are, or seem to be, a little above others, I feel nothing of that kind. Two gentlemen are here from Woodstock, and let them be asked as to any efforts I make to obtain the dominancy which has been spoken of. They are before me, and I ask them whether William Bettridge, rector of Woodstock ever exercised any dominancy over the faith of any man. Seventeen years have I been there, and I have never intruded myself into the house of any man uncalled; but I have gone to visit those of any other denominations who desired to have my ministerial services. I have gone to them, but I have never attempted to proselytise. I defy any man to say that I ever took advantage of moments like that. I have another duty to discharge—to lead them to Christ: that was my duty, and I confined myself to it. Sometimes I have acted in cases of this nature in the absence of the parties own minister. For instance, in the absence of Mr. Ball, minister of the Free Kirk, I was sent to attend a member of his congregation. I did attend, but immediately the minister returned I said I had done so and so, and I expressed a hope that he would do so in my absence. I have attended several members of the Church of Scotland. One of these individuals about a fortnight before her death, expressed a wish that I should visit her, but I said, "not without Mr. Ball's permission." I wrote to Mr. Ball, and he immediately replied, "Do go—I entreat you to go." I went three or four times, and at her own request she was buried by me. She was a sainted woman. Well, did I ever take advantage of my visits to turn her from her faith? No. I knew she was on the right foundation, and would be right at the last day. We are not, then, a dominant church; and I am sure that the gentlemen opposite have too much liberal feeling to base their opposition to the Church of England on the supposition that we are dominant, or affect anything like dominancy. The laws of the land would not permit this dominancy, and my own feelings would not permit it. Into no man's house do I go unless sent for except to the houses of members of my own congregation. But, on the other hand, I am rather averse to other ministers going unasked into my congregation. *Nemo me impune lacessit.* Do not try to trench on me. We have plenty to do in our several vocations: let us attend to our own people. These are

truths we are ready to declare, and we do them openly before the world. If any individual here can say that we have trenched on the private rights or feelings of any man, we will stand accused before God and the country of falsehood. Our friend from the east (Mr. Ormston,) who was pleased to pay a compliment to the west, let fall one little expression which I did not like. It was this—that we are afraid to state matters; it would not do to state them—it would not be quite right he said. Now I reply in the words of the Bard of Avon, on whose waters I was born—

“I dare do and say all that becomes a man—
Who dare do more is none.”

Wherever we may be, you will not find the Rector of Woodstock giving offence to any man. But if an expression of my opinion be required, on a matter connected with public morals, whether it be before twenty or five thousand, you shall have it, without fear, favor, or reward. [Time expired.]

Rev. F. EVANS—I think we need not occupy time with a discussion of the next proposition on the list. Parliament being omnipotent, in a political sense, I decline to take up the fifth proposition on my side, and I agree to the truth of the sixth proposition as laid down by gentlemen on the other side.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM—If our friends do not wish to discuss the proposition which they have laid before the public, we do not think it right to bow to their dictation with regard to laying aside ours. A defined understanding on the matter is before the public. We shall discuss our sixth proposition, let them do what they please with theirs.

Rev. W. ORMSTON—Although I was anxious to say something on this subject, I must confess that it seems strange to discuss a question which is conceded. If the worthy Rector of Woodhouse will add “without manifest injustice” to our proposition, and then say that he concedes it, I shall be satisfied.

Rev. F. EVANS—“The Imperial and Provincial Parliaments have power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves.”

Rev. W. ORMSTON—Without any injustice.

Rev. F. EVANS—Oh, no! That is not in your proposition.

Rev. W. ORMSTON—You undertook to show that to do this would be “manifest injustice.” We can't say that.

Rev. F. EVANS—We have nothing to bring forward but what has already been brought forward. You bring forward a statement, which, as it stands, we admit.—Why debate it then?

Rev. Dr. BURNS—Neither of our friends appears to take that solemn view of the magnitude of the principle involved in this proposition, that they ought to do. We have not discussed it at all. We have discussed the question in regard to the term “protestant clergy”—we have discussed the claims of the Church of England, in reference to an act of Parliament—but there is still this important question, Is it right, is it legal, for the government to alienate to secular purposes what was solemnly set apart for the support of religion? I presume all our friends are not prepared to acknowledge that. There is still another important consideration, which is to explain the expression in the act, to the effect that these lands shall “be applied solely to the maintenance” of a protestant clergy, “and to no other use or purpose whatever.” I think these are two very important points, and there is a third, namely, as to the meaning of the phrase “vary or repeal.” In the Bishop's charge, it is expressly said that the expression applies only to an alteration of the mode of appropriating, not to the grand principle of taking away the lands from religious, and applying them to secular, purposes.

[An adjournment for half an hour now took place. At the expiration of that time, the proceedings were resumed.]

Rev. Dr. BURNS—There is a matter bearing on the discussion of this morning,

which I am anxious to have explained. In a list of the rectories, and the sums appropriated to them, which I find in one of Mr. Mackenzie's letters in the *Examiner*, £310 is set down as the amount paid to Mr. Bettridge, of Woodstock.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—£100 a year is what I get. I know nothing of what may be said in any letter in the *Examiner*.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—The matter should be explained.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I receive £170 a year. I am described in this letter as in the receipt of £400.

Rev. F. EVANS—And here am I described as the Rev. Francis Evans, Rector of Simcoe, with a pension of £400 a year. Oh, I wish I had it!

Rev. W. ORMSTON—I see that the statement is of two years—1849 and 1850—so that it may be correct.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE—Instead of discussing this matter, which is quite irregular, let us go on with business.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I was not prepared to enter upon the discussion of this proposition. Indeed, it was not in the list of propositions furnished to me, but as the gentlemen on the other side, who had furnished it to Mr. Evans, wish it to be discussed, we—being desirous of complying with their wishes in everything lawful and honest—will indulge them. The proposition which we are invited to discuss is this—

“That the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments have power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to any secular purpose that is adapted to promote the general welfare of the Province, such as the secular education of the whole people.”

I suppose that this contains all that the reverend gentlemen opposite wish to affirm on this particular subject. On the other hand, we maintain that the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments have not the power to do this. But I must explain when I say they have not the power. Power may be considered under two different aspects. A man may have power to do that which he has no right to do. Nero, the tyrant, had the power to cut off the heads of his subjects, and illuminate the city of Rome with fires around the christians whom he murdered, but he had not a right to do it. We must, therefore, make a distinction between right and power. A man may have power to do, and he may do, a thing which in itself is wrong—what in the sight of God, and according to the rules of eternal right and justice, he had not in reality the power to do. Taking that view of power, I am ready to maintain that the Imperial Parliament, and the Provincial Parliament, have not the power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves. They may do it, if they like, but in doing it they do injustice—in doing it they do wrong, and thereby lower themselves in the estimation of every well-thinking man. That is my view concerning the matter. A word with reference to Parliament. Parliament has often been called “the collective wisdom of a nation.” We know it ought to be so. But it ought to be more than that. It ought to reflect the principles of a nation—the honorable principles, I mean; it ought to reflect the moral feelings of a nation; and if a Parliament does not do that, most assuredly it will come to disgrace with all those in the community who think aright, and who are governed by right principles. I would say to the reverend gentlemen on the other side that they may devoutly pray Parliament to do what they now ask, and Parliament, yielding to the pressure from without, may do it; but if our Parliament were composed of men of high-toned feeling, and high moral and christian principle, they would resign—every man of them, sooner than do that which wo'd be wrong. But when I look at some late additions which have been made to the present Parliament—when I look at the manner in which the colony has been disgraced in this respect—I feel that if Parliament were composed altogether of such materials, the pressure from without might lead it to do anything, whether right or wrong. There would, indeed, be a greater chance of Parliament doing wrong than of doing right. But is it right of reverend gentlemen—of those who teach from their pulpits that men should be just,

honest, upright in their dealings—should do to others as they wish to be done unto; is it right of them, I ask, to labour to produce a pressure which shall force Parliament to do that which is unjust?—to induce Parliament to do to others what they would not wish to have done unto themselves? Let us now proceed to the justice of the question. It has been represented by gentlemen on the other side, up to the present moment, that those parties who have been in possession of the Clergy Reserves, have no right to them. At all events, what we have received, and what we hold, has been received, and is held under an act of Parliament, and under the direct sanction of the government of the country. We have been reported even to the House of Commons as receiving it, though that report is not altogether accurate and true; and no one has gainsaid our right to receive it. Therefore, on all hands it must be acknowledged that we have a right to receive it—that there is justice in the claim which we make from time to time on the Receiver General of the Province, for a certain portion of the Clergy Reserves. That being the case, can it be said that it is justice—that it is right—that it is doing to others as we should wish men to do to us—for Parliament to use a power with which it is invested, to inflict this wrong? Most assuredly it cannot. This is my view of the matter. The proposition of the other gentlemen is, that they have the power to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to any secular purpose whatsoever—any secular purpose adapted to promote the general welfare of the people; and the secular education of the people is instanced as such a purpose. Suppose the Clergy Reserves were taken away—suppose the wrong is done—suppose those who have laboured for years in this country, and with whom a covenant was made that they should receive this while they laboured, were to have this wrong inflicted upon them; still the question remains, to what use would the Reserves be appropriated? To anything that will promote the general welfare of the Province, we are told. We know that religion would promote it: are they to be devoted to that? We know that agricultural societies have promoted it: are they to receive the proceeds of the reserves? No. The purpose is given to which the reserves would be appropriated, above all others: it is the secular education of the whole people. Mark! There is not to be a spice of religion in the education given by these funds; if there be, the whole fabric falls to the ground. But under the existing educational system, you cannot apply the reserves to educational purposes, without teaching religion. Under the present common school system of this country, there is one favored class, who have their own schools, and in these they always have religion. They always have had, and always will have, religion taught in their schools, and they get separate schools for the purpose. I allude to the Roman Catholics. You want to take the reserves from us. Some of you complain that we are not protestant enough, though I believe we are truly protestant as any of you. You want to take the reserves from us, I say, and give them, in part, at least, to Roman Catholics, to teach Roman Catholic doctrines in schools. We are not protestant enough, and yet you want to teach downright popery with the reserves, in schools. It must come to that, if your views be carried out. You may say, "We'll have the school system changed." Aye, but get the laws first. A gentleman told us that the people have been fretting and foaming for years past in regard to the Reserves, and that it is time that the law should be changed: I should like to know how long you expect to have to fret and foam before you will get the existing educational law changed. It will be impossible to get a majority of the House of Assembly—Roman Catholic members—to consent that their schools shall be united with ours, and that religion shall not be taught in them. The thing is utterly impossible; and, therefore, if you take away from the protestant clergy what they are now receiving, and devote it to education, a portion of it must of necessity go into the hands of those who will teach—not the whole of Dens' Theology, for that is too long, but—extracts from Dens' Theology. That is what you want to do, and that is what you call for the general benefit of the community! If that would be for their benefit, I don't know what would be called injurious. I look around, and see Canada rising, and advancing, and improving in every way. I have been twenty years in the country, and a most gratifying and

unprecedented improvement has taken place in all parts—though certainly in some more than in others. But will what these gentlemen propose advance the general interests of the country? Will it advance those interests which have prospered notwithstanding the “blighting effects” of all these reserves and rectories, which have been hanging over the country like an incubus for so many years—according to the shewing of these gentlemen? Will it tend to the general improvement of the country. Will it tend to foster a right feeling among the people?—to promote christianity—true and spiritual christianity—and proper principles, amongst our population? Most assuredly it will not. I believe that should it be carried out, it will be the greatest evil that has ever been inflicted upon the country. I do not think it will be carried out. I cannot bring myself to think that such a measure will be adopted. Nay, I think that when it came near the point of being carried, some of those gentlemen who stand on the other side, and who speak in a kind and friendly tone to us (though occasionally a little bit of irony appears which makes us doubt the compliments they bestow upon us) would begin to doubt whether they were doing right; they would begin to tremble within themselves, and say, “Perhaps, after all, it is not so bad that the Church of Scotland and the Church of England should have a portion of the reserves, and that other protestant denominations should be aided and assisted.” These gentlemen say that every kind of endowment must be an injury—a blot—that every man who avails himself of endowments to propagate the gospel, must give up his independence—and that, of course, his influence and usefulness must be thereby impaired. Now this we must all know is not the case. We know that even in this country individuals are supported and sustained in the discharge of their spiritual duties by individuals at home. I know an individual at home who sustains three or four travelling missionaries, out of his own funds, and funds which his immediate friends contribute, in order that they may perform the work of evangelizing this country. Well, these men do not forfeit their independence by receiving this assistance, which enables them to go forth and proclaim the gospel to their fellow men. I know a society in England, which is supported by funds bequeathed in a former day—that society being made up of individuals who are mixed, and of different denominations: they support an individual to preach to the pagans of this country—an individual who, it turns out, is of a different protestant denomination. One gentleman now present—the Rev. A Nellis, Missionary to the Mohawk Indians, at Brantford, is sustained in his labours there by a New England company, and is liberally supported. If I am told aright, the same company support another gentleman who is present, and who ministers to the pagans in another part of the country. Now I would ask, what is the average amount of the income of these two ministers? Do they receive more from the New England society than three times the average income of their hearers? As one of these gentlemen laid down this as the rule which should regulate the payment of ministers, I say that if he receive more, he ought to send it back. But he comes here to combat endowments.

Rev. Mr. GILMORE—That is not an endowment.

Rev. B. CRONYN—I should like to know what it is then. It was bequeathed and is administered by an incorporated company: they sustain a protestant Missionary one place, and a minister of the Church of England in another. That is what the parliament and people of Canada are asked by the Imperial act to do—or rather what is done by that act, because of the divisions amongst the people, and of the difference of opinion which prevail. Therefore, the Imperial act says “we shall sustain all protestant denominations while they discharge the offices of the ministry in the country, and give them something to assist them in performing this work of faith and labour of love amongst the people.” It is as unrighteous to take from a mixed company—such as the new England Company—and to live on the means furnished by them, while we discharge the duties of the ministry, as it is to take a portion of the magnificent grant afforded by the crown, and made over to us by act of Parliament. It would be unrighteous in the government at home (though they have the power, if we view power in the abstract) to

take the funds of the New England Society, and leave our friend Mr. Gilmore without the means of support while he laboured among the Indians.

Rev. Mr. GILMORE.—Am I allowed to reply?

Rev. B. CHRONYN.—I will say, then, it would be wrong for the Government to take from Mr. Nellis the means by which he is supported while he labours among the Indians. We know the government have the power to do this, but they will not interfere. We know that some time ago, an act was passed to regulate bequests, endowments, and religious funds; and I believe that this company was brought under the operation of this act, so as to have some investigation into the way in which its funds were distributed. If our funds have been, or are being, misappropriated, let them be investigated into, and appropriated aright—let accounts of the management be laid before parliament every year—but do not take them away from us, merely because you have the power to do so. I am persuaded that the people of this country, when they think seriously of the matter—when not under the influence of an agitation which I deplore, and which I am bound to say is an unchristian agitation, (for in my heart I believe it is,) will not ask parliament to do an unjust thing. If such a thing be done, the character of parliament will be gone: it will at once lose the high sanction which it has and ought to have, in the estimation of the people. Let public opinion once be turned against parliament, and you do irreparable injury to the country, you convert the highest boon of British subjects—a constitution based on representation—into the greatest curse, instead of the greatest blessing. It is a blessing to the country now—a blessing under which we have prospered. But is it known that the honour of the parliament of England is unimpeached? Grant that it is the scene of much strife and contention, and that many of its members do not come up to the standard of high christian principle and morality; still, as a whole, there is not such a body of men to be found on the face of the world. They are men who, as a whole, are above doing any thing that is in itself wrong and unjust. And I hope that in this infant country—a country which boasts that it has a transcript of the British constitution, that it is like unto England, and would be like England in all things. There will be found a full measure of morality, honour, truth and fidelity in our parliament, and that it will exhibit a determination to uphold the right, and to protect everything like a just claim, or a vested right, under the law of the land; notwithstanding that there may be found in it members who, alas! would disgrace any body professedly christian. [Time expired.]

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—In replying to the Rev. gentleman who has just sat down, on the question which is now before us, I wish to notice and expose one or two false positions which he has assumed. The first to which I would advert is that of confounding state endowments with the contributions of christian liberality. There is a wide distinction between the Clergy Reserves, and the funds under the control of the new England Company. The funds of this company, from which brother Gilmore and brother Nellis receive their large salaries, have been furnished by voluntary contributions; and there is an evident fallacy in any attempt to compare such voluntary funds, with a compulsory state enactment. Having disposed of this, I will now refer to the circumstances immediately connected with the proposition under discussion, as it refers to the parliaments of England and Canada. The Rev. gentleman admits that there is a power in the Imperial Parliament and in the Provincial Parliament to legislate on the property called Clergy Reserves. But these parliaments must either legislate according to his rule or act wrongfully. I contend that the power of either the Imperial or Provincial Parliament is not dependent upon the private opinion of the Rectors of London. In matters of fact I will now deal. The first fact to which I advert proving the supreme power of the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments to legislate concerning the Clergy Reserves, is the decision of Her Majesty Queen Victoria—the Lord bless her!—and her Privy Council, which has been communicated to us in Canada, intimating that they have power to deal with the subject and that they are willing to transfer that power to our parliament in due season

This is a fact upon which I lay some stress. I appeal next to the publicly declared opinions of Attorney Generals Baldwin and Lafontaine, both of whom have affirmed that the parliament has power to legislate on this subject. If they are right, the Rector of London is wrong. Whether the Rector or the Attorney Generals know most of law, it is not for me to determine. But the circumstances connected with the two individuals named, lead me to think that principle has been in operation with both of them. Mr. Baldwin is a zealous, pious and an upright Churchman, and he wants his church to have all the privileges which it can consistently have; but he declares, as a man of principle, that the final disposal of the Clergy Reserves is vested in the two parliaments. Mr. Lafontaine is a Catholic, very intimate with the priests, much attached to State endowments, and therefore under a certain bias; yet he has declared that it is still open to the parliament to legislate on the subject. Now here I put down the staff of fact, except that staff of fact be moved, our position is impregnable. It is a matter of complete demonstration by facts. I refer as a confirmation of this, to the act of 1791, which we call the constitutional act, the clauses of which give a power to repeal or alter the regulations relative to the Reserves, to the appointment of Rectors, or to the property connected with Rectories. If these clauses have not been repealed—and it is not pretended that they have—they alone are conclusive as to the power and right of our parliament to interfere, and regulate according to the principles of justice, the apportionment and application of the Reserves. I appeal to this audience whether these are not plain, demonstrative truths, that the position we have assumed is the correct one, namely, that it is left to the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments finally to settle and to regulate all the concerns connected with that vast property which has for so many years been monopolised by the Clergy of one church, and the proceeds of which are now given principally to the Clergy of two favoured churches. I ask, what justice is there in giving the principal part of the proceeds of the Clergy Reserves to the Churches of England and Scotland? Are they more virtuous than other denominations? Have they laboured more diligently for good? Have they set better examples before the people? none of these questions can be answered in the affirmative; and therefore we say that in the present state of things there is a violation of justice which calls for the intervention of parliament. The power of the Imperial and Provincial Parliaments will necessarily be called forth in relation to this valuable property, because a certain portion of it is now used and dealt with in a manner which is not consistent with the principles of public justice and of general equity. I refer now to my brother from London, who managed to get an act passed through the Provincial Parliament for the sale of his glebe there. I ask him whether \$2,500 were not realized by the sale of that glebe? When a transaction of this nature is seen to take place openly—when public property (according to the views I hold of public property) is thus made a matter of speculative sale, to feed the grasping avarice of those who claim credit for great disinterestedness; I say, when this is the case, it is time for parliament.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Order, order. There was an express understanding that personalities of this nature should not be indulged in. We might have assailed individuals if we had chosen, and charged them with doing that which is not right, but we have refrained from every thing of the kind. What Mr. Winterbotham now speaks of is entirely foreign to the subject. The transaction in question was perfectly regular, and has been most fully explained, but this is not the place to speak of it. The subject is not before the chair; and I request that what Mr. Winterbotham has said may be expunged from the report. It is most improper to drag in the transfer of property at London, and to accuse gentlemen of gasping avariciousness, and I know not what beside.

CHAIRMAN.—Nothing personal ought to be allowed, and so far, the Rev. gentleman is out of order. Systems are to be attacked, not individuals.

Rev. Mr. WINTERBOTHAM.—Did not Mr. Cronyn specially and personally drag in the affairs of Mr. Gilmore and Mr. Nellis?

Rev. F. EVANS.—He did not charge them with the slightest impropriety.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—I bow to the chair. The circumstances of the sale of the London Rectory glebe land is well known to the public.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—I ask leave to explain.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—I don't impute dishonesty to the Rev. gentleman.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Speculative, grasping, avaricious—but not dishonest!

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—Mr. Cronyn has certainly a right to explain.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—If he has a right to explain, I have a right to defend what I say. But I will pass from this subject. Another reason why the two parliaments have the power—and ought to be called upon to exercise the power—to alter the appropriation of the Reserves is, that their present distribution is exerting a very dangerous influence upon the opinions of public men in this country. Amongst the arguments which were brought forward in this place yesterday, in vindication of State endowments, and the power of states to endow Christian Churches was this, that under the old Testament law, the man who did not bring his sacrifice to the altar, and give to the priests of the Jews their proportionate part, was to be stoned to death. Now if this principle is to be introduced into Canada, in support of State endowments, it is time for us to look about. I think that we have cause for thankfulness in the fact that the Imperial and Provincial parliaments have the power and the right to destroy a system which is thus corrupting the minds of godly men; for certainly that is a corrupting system which induces men to plead for stoning to death, in connection with the advocacy of state endowments. It was not only in regard to the non-delivery of the priests' share of the sacrifice that this extraordinary doctrine was avowed yesterday. The stoning to death of the Sabbath breaker was also referred to, in the same connection. We will not have this in Canada, because it is a cruel law; and we will call upon Parliament to abolish a system which so far perverts the minds of men as to lead them to contend for these horrible penalties. Was not the drunkard, under the Jewish laws, to be taken away from the camp and stoned? What are we to think of a system which causes men to go back to these terrible penalties, to show that state endowments may be permitted and fostered? Instead of stoning the poor drunkard to death, let us try to reform him; and let us do all we can to pull down a system which can only desire support from such references as these. Away with it! That the power of the two parliaments to legislate on the Clergy Reserves should be insisted upon, and exercised, will appear from another view of things. We all know that loyalty to the Queen and to the parliament is one of the first virtues that ought to exist in a community; but from what passed in this place yesterday, I am afraid that the loyalty of certain individuals is being rather shaken by the system of state endowments, as it exists here. All of us, I dare say, heard some Rev. gentlemen say yesterday, in very bold language, that they would defy the power of the Queen and of the parliament to interfere with them. Now, I contend that an act of Parliament is in existence which binds the very persons who made this avowal, to obey the Queen and Parliament in all matters which were made subjects of debate yesterday. The law of the case was laid down in the reign of Henry VIII, when it was enacted that His Majesty was, and always had been "the supreme head on earth of the Church of England," and had a "full power to exercise all manner of jurisdiction, commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction," and that "Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons," had no manner of jurisdiction but by and of his Majesty. Now this is the right which the Queen possesses to this day, under the act of supremacy; and I say, therefore, that to disavow a willingness to submit to the act of supremacy—so far as the Church of England is concerned—is to endanger the loyal feelings of men; and that those who have taken the oath of supremacy, and have bound themselves to recognize the Queen as the head of the church, ought not to be corrupted, and tempted to discard this solemn obligation, by any consideration arising out of

state endowments. They ought to adhere to the doctrine of supremacy—of obedience to the Queen in all ecclesiastical matters; and the fact that they deny their duty in this respect, and literally defy the Queen, is one striking evidence of the iniquity of the system of state endowments, and of the need that exists for the exercise of the power which I say is possessed by the two parliaments. [Time expired.]

Rev. G. BELL.—I confess it is rather a difficult matter to speak on this subject at all. To discuss a constitutional question of this kind, as to what is the power of the Imperial and the Provincial parliaments may probably be considered as belonging more properly to persons in the legal profession, and of high standing. But there is, at the same time, a certain view which can be taken of it in which it is open to be discussed by every person and it is in that view, I conceive, that it is now before us. The word power having been already sufficiently explained I need not further go into that consideration, except to mention that I consider there is strictly a difference between power and right. If we take the word power in its physical sense, of course all must acknowledge that parliament has the power of alienating these Reserves. But I deny most emphatically that any parliament, or any other power on earth has the right to take away these Rectories, and alienate them to any other than religious purposes. I know that this turns upon the title by which these Reserves are held; and I maintain most distinctly that the title is Letter—that is to say, if national faith is to be observed—than a patent would be. The case, as it appears to me, is a counterpart of this. If a man owes me a certain sum of money, and gives me a bill for it, and afterwards repudiates that bill, I say he is dishonest; but if I do not require a bill, but, trusting in his honesty, take his word simply for it, and then, after all, he refuses to repay me, I say would be acting more basely, and far more unworthily than if he merely repudiated a bill. The act of parliament granting these reserves, was a pledge of faith—not only the public faith, but the religious faith of a religious kingdom—a pledge that these reserves should be appropriated to a specific purpose, from which they cannot rightly be alienated. What, then, is the justice of this case? It has been asserted to-day that the Imperial Act of 1840 was an act of great injustice; while on this side it was maintained that there was no injustice, because it did not force the consciences of the other party. Now we see in the case before us, that if these reserves were alienated, there would be a manifest injustice in forcing the consciences of the minority. I question the propriety of speaking of the friends of the reserves as the minority; since the examination of the census taken previous to the passing of that act, as well as of the census last taken, will show that the churches of England and Scotland numbered 57 per cent. of the whole of the protestant denominations of the country—of course excluding Roman Catholics, and those who belong to no denomination. These two churches, I say, constituted very considerably more than half of the whole Protestant population. But how is the conscience of the province, spoken of to-day, to be brought to bear? It is the conscience of Roman Catholics and of infidels—those belonging to no denomination of christians—which is to be considered by the legislature in favour of the withdrawal from various denominations of the Church of Christ, of that which has been solemnly given, and which the strongest power on earth is pledged to maintain for the use of these churches. Why are these two churches specially mentioned in the bill, and all others passed by? Is that unfair? I say this has been done for a very obvious reason—because these two churches were churches established by law in part of Great Britain—because they were established in England and Scotland. For this reason they are properly mentioned in the bill; although these which are not established, may just as properly come in and receive a share of the funds of the Clergy Reserves, in a proportion equal to their respective numbers. I will not enter particularly into one point to which considerable force has been attached—namely, that the whole proceeds of the reserves were to be appropriated to these two churches. I know not what the whole fund will amount to in the end, but I think there is very good reason for supposing that as these two

Rev. F. EVANS.—He did not charge them with the slightest impropriety.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—I bow to the chair. The circumstances of the sale of the London Rectory glebe land is well known to the public.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—I ask leave to explain.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—I don't impute dishonesty to the Rev. gentleman.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Speculative, grasping, avaricious—but not dishonest!

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—Mr. Cronyn has certainly a right to explain.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—If he has a right to explain, I have a right to defend what I say. But I will pass from this subject. Another reason why the two parliaments have the power—and ought to be called upon to exercise the power—to alter the appropriation of the Reserves is, that their present distribution is exerting a very dangerous influence upon the opinions of public men in this country. Amongst the arguments which were brought forward in this place yesterday, in vindication of State endowments, and the power of states to endow Christian Churches was this, that under the old Testament law, the man who did not bring his sacrifice to the altar, and give to the priests of the Jews their proportionate part, was to be stoned to death. Now if this principle is to be introduced into Canada, in support of State endowments, it is time for us to look about. I think that we have cause for thankfulness in the fact that the Imperial and Provincial parliaments have the power and the right to destroy a system which is thus corrupting the minds of godly men; for certainly that is a corrupting system which induces men to plead for stoning to death, in connection with the advocacy of state endowments. It was not only in regard to the non-delivery of the priests' share of the sacrifice that this extraordinary doctrine was avowed yesterday. The stoning to death of the Sabbath breaker was also referred to, in the same connection. We will not have this in Canada, because it is a cruel law; and we will call upon Parliament to abolish a system which so far perverts the minds of men as to lead them to contend for these horrible penalties.—Was not the drunkard, under the Jewish laws, to be taken away from the camp and stoned? What are we to think of a system which causes men to go back to these terrible penalties, to show that state endowments may be permitted and fostered? Instead of stoning the poor drunkard to death, let us try to reform him; and let us do all we can to pull down a system which can only desire support from such references as these. Away with it! That the power of the two parliaments to legislate on the Clergy Reserves should be insisted upon, and exercised, will appear from another view of things. We all know that loyalty to the Queen and to the parliament is one of the first virtues that ought to exist in a community; but from what passed in this place yesterday, I am afraid that the loyalty of certain individuals is being rather shaken by the system of state endowments, as it exists here. All of us, I dare say, heard some Rev. gentlemen say yesterday, in very bold language, that they would defy the power of the Queen and of the parliament to interfere with them. Now, I contend that an act of Parliament is in existence which binds the very persons who made this avowal, to obey the Queen and Parliament in all matters which were made subjects of debate yesterday. The law of the case was laid down in the reign of Henry VIII, when it was enacted that His Majesty was, and always had been "the supreme head on earth of the Church of England," and had a "full power to exercise all manner of jurisdiction, commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction," and that "Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons," had no manner of jurisdiction but by and of his Majesty. Now this is the right which the Queen possesses to this day, under the act of supremacy; and I say, therefore, that to disavow a willingness to submit to the act of supremacy—so far as the Church of England is concerned—is to endanger the loyal feelings of men; and that those who have taken the oath of supremacy, and have bound themselves to recognize the Queen as the head of the church, ought not to be corrupted, and tempted to discard this solemn obligation, by any consideration arising out of

state endowments. They ought to adhere to the doctrine of supremacy—of obedience to the Queen in all ecclesiastical matters; and the fact that they deny their duty in this respect, and literally defy the Queen, is one striking evidence of the iniquity of the system of state endowments, and of the need that exists for the exercise of the power which I say is possessed by the two parliaments. [Time expired.]

Rev. G. BELL.—I confess it is rather a difficult matter to speak on this subject at all. To discuss a constitutional question of this kind, as to what is the power of the Imperial and the Provincial parliaments may probably be considered as belonging more properly to persons in the legal profession, and of high standing. But there is, at the same time, a certain view which can be taken of it in which it is open to be discussed by every person and it is in that view, I conceive, that it is now before us. The word power having been already sufficiently explained I need not further go into that consideration, except to mention that I consider there is strictly a difference between power and right. If we take the word power in its physical sense, of course all must acknowledge that parliament has the power of alienating these Reserves. But I deny most emphatically that any parliament, or any other power on earth has the right to take away these Rectories, and alienate them to any other than religious purposes. I know that this turns upon the title by which these Reserves are held; and I maintain most distinctly that the title is *Letter*—that is to say, if national faith is to be observed—than a patent would be. The case, as it appears to me, is a counterpart of this. If a man owes me a certain sum of money, and gives me a bill for it, and afterwards repudiates that bill, I say he is dishonest; but if I do not require a bill, but, trusting in his honesty, take his word simply for it, and then, after all, he refuses to repay me, I say would be acting more basely, and far more unworthily than if he merely repudiated a bill. The act of parliament granting these reserves, was a pledge of faith—not only the public faith, but the religious faith of a religious kingdom—a pledge that these reserves should be appropriated to a specific purpose, from which they cannot rightly be alienated. What, then, is the justice of this case? It has been asserted to-day that the Imperial Act of 1840 was an act of great injustice; while on this side it was maintained that there was no injustice, because it did not force the consciences of the other party. Now we see in the case before us, that if these reserves were alienated, there would be a manifest injustice in forcing the consciences of the minority. I question the propriety of speaking of the friends of the reserves as the minority; since the examination of the census taking previous to the passing of that act, as well as of the census last taken, will show that the churches of England and Scotland numbered 57 per cent. of the whole of the protestant denominations of the country—of course excluding Roman Catholics, and those who belong to no denomination. These two churches, I say, constituted very considerably more than half of the whole Protestant population. But how is the conscience of the province, spoken of to-day, to be brought to bear? It is the conscience of Roman Catholics and of infidels—those belonging to no denomination of christians—which is to be considered by the legislature in favour of the withdrawal from various denominations of the Church of Christ, of that which has been solemnly given, and which the strongest power on earth is pledged to maintain for the use of these churches. Why are these two churches specially mentioned in the bill, and all others passed by? Is that unfair? I say this has been done for a very obvious reason—because these two churches were churches established by law in part of Great Britain—because they were established in England and Scotland. For this reason they are properly mentioned in the bill; although these which are not established, may just as properly come in and receive a share of the funds of the Clergy Reserves, in a proportion equal to their respective numbers. I will not enter particularly into one point to which considerable force has been attached—namely, that the whole proceeds of the reserves were to be appropriated to these two churches. I know not what the whole fund will amount to in the end, but I think there is very good reason for supposing that as these two

churches constituted more than half, the proportion which they will receive will not in reality amount to anything more than their share—that is, when taken in comparison with the proportion of population which they have, as compared with the population of all the protestant denominations of the country. Apply the reserves to secular education, it is said. I would ask how is it possible to apply anything to mere secular education—that is, in the sense of completely excluding everything connected with religion. I say such a thing as simple secular education, apart from religion, is impossible. You may educate children, as too many are educated—you may withhold from them the gospel—but I can tell you, you cannot prevent Satan educating them, if you refuse to allow them to be educated in the principles of the gospel. And I would ask, is it becoming in a religious, a professedly christian country, to hand over our youthful minds and our children, to be educated by Satan?—to declare by law, that the christian religion shall not form a part, an element of their education? Perhaps it will be said, we are holding on to old notions—that the progressers of the age requires these changes. Yes, there is progress in nations, but the truth of the Bible is the same to-day as it was a thousand years ago, and as it will be a thousand years hence. The truth of the Bible is the same, and it (not as has been said, the opinion of the Rector of London) should be allowed to guide the parliament. I maintain that the opinions expressed, and the principles laid down in the word of God, form the only rule which the parliament is bound to obey; and they cannot refuse obedience without committing sin against God. We cannot hinder them from doing it. I may protest against it as an individual, but I cannot hinder them from doing that which is sinful. I do contend, however, that if our parliament, or the parliament of Great Britain, depart from the truth of the word of God, they are committing sin; and if they take away from the Church of England and the Church of Scotland that which has been solemnly given to them, they commit sin against the Head of those Churches, or rather the Head of the Church. A great deal has been said about the compulsory support of religion, but I submit that it is plainly absurd. I ask, where is it possible to find the compulsory support of religion in Canada? Who has ever been compelled here, to give a single farthing to the support of these churches which receive assistance from the Clergy Reserve Fund?

Rev. J. ROAF.—We all pay.

Rev. G. BELL.—You have never been compelled to pay a single farthing.—The reserves are not public property—they never belonged to the people of Canada, in the sense in which public property is generally understood. They were appropriated to their present uses, before there were, literally, what may be called the people of Canada, and while thus appropriated, it is evident that the parliament of Canada cannot interfere with them, without the sanction of the parliament at home. The recent message from the government at home states that they would seek the power of transferring them to the control of the parliament of Canada. They have to ask the Imperial Parliament to do this, but the Imperial parliament has not yet done it; and I have so much confidence in its morality and religious principle, that I believe it never will. If, then, the alienation take place at all, I believe it will be in opposition to the will of the parliament of Great Britain. Another assertion which I would distinctly deny, is, that there are two favoured churches, favoured by the act of 1840. The churches of England and Scotland are mentioned by name, for the reason which I have already explained; but the mention of their names does not give them any favour which is not extended to others. On the other hand, however, while I maintain that there is no favouritism shown to these churches, I do believe that there is in the minds of a certain class of the population of Canada, a very strong feeling against churches altogether: and I believe that while this feeling is entertained, there is a desire to proscribe certain churches, while others, placed in similar circumstances, are not to be proscribed. But is property given to a church, to be taken away merely because it is held by a church? Is a church more wicked than any other corporation? Why are all other corporations to be

allowed still to hold property? Why is every individual in the receipt of a grant from the crown, to continue to hold that property, while churches are to be denied this right? If it could be shown that members of churches are worse than other classes, or that churches themselves are worse than other corporations, there might be some apparent reason for the cause which is advocated, but until it be shown, there is no reason at all. There is one other subject on which I would say a word or two, and that is respecting the result. Suppose that all these difficulties be got over—suppose that the parliament of Great Britain gives the desired power, (which I don't believe will be the case) or suppose that the parliament of Canada takes the power in defiance of Great Britain, and alienates these reserves from the purposes for which they were granted, what will be the consequence? Why, all right of property will be thrown loose. I do not hold an inch of property by deed, and if this were to take place I should be glad I did not, because I think it would not be worth a straw. My reason for saying this is, that I consider the title to these reserves better than a deed. It rests on national faith, which ought to be superior to a mere expression of the executive in a deed. But suppose, as an ultimate result, that the church be deprived of her property, how would matters then stand? It is said that the church did without endowments in former ages, and may do so again; and that I readily believe. I believe that in whatever circumstances it pleases our Lord to place His church in this world, He will give His church grace to live and prosper, and to do her work under every change. If He calls on His church to labour in this world without state endowments or support,—nay, opposed and persecuted by states and kingdoms of the world—then He will give her grace to do His work. But if it pleases Him to bestow on her property, and to give her an opportunity of using property to His glory, He will hold her responsible for the use of that property; and she has no more right to give it up, than to give up any other privileges which her Lord has bestowed upon her. In whatever circumstances she may be placed, I trust that the Church of Christ will have grace to fulfill her great mission. If she be persecuted but not endowed, I trust it will be still the same. If she be endowed by the state, and her means of usefulness be thereby increased, she is bound to use those means in the service of her master, and is responsible to him for that use. [Time expired.]

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—There are two things in this resolution which strike me as worthy of notice:—first, the power of parliament to meddle with this property at all—which is met by the cry of “vested rights;” secondly, the application of these reserves to secular purposes, which leads our friends here to say something about sacrilege. Are the lands occupied by the church, which now derives benefit from them, the property of the members of that church? We think not. We believe that that property in reality belongs to the country, and the country therefore has a right to do what it chooses with it. Are any classes of public servants proprietors of the services whence their salaries flow? May not these recipients of the proceeds of the reserves justly be called servants of the state, hired to perform so much labour for a given remuneration? Are not judges salaried for the administration of justice?—kings for the execution of laws?—soldiers for the public defence?—and state-paid clergy for the religious instruction of the people? In each of the cases, whether the parties be paid in land or money, the state has a clear right to regulate their salaries—to increase them, to diminish them, or, if deemed desirable, to do away with them altogether. In an early period in the history of Europe, many sovereigns did pay their warriors with land. Now though the clergy of this country have certain land set apart as the source of, and security for, their pensions, while they are thus engaged by the state, it cannot be contended that they are the proprietors of these lands. These lands are not even held by them for their own personal benefit. All private property is thus held: The man who holds a title or deed, holds it for his own particular use. He may use his land or abuse it, as he pleases. But what is your covenant? you have not a deed for a foot of land in Canada, and I trust never will have,

although I may remark parenthetically, that according to what we have been told to-day, if ever we get a parliament of "high-toned principle"—that is, of every high churchmen—these gentlemen will get a patent deed for every acre of the reserves, and then of course they will be theirs. But in the meantime, I say, no individual clergyman ever has been the proprietor of a single foot of land, as a clergyman, unless he has a patent deed in his own name; and how, therefore, can any number of clergymen, in a corporate capacity, pretend to the proprietorship of this land? According to these gentlemen, corporations have bodies and souls. According to fact and common sense, corporations are creatures of parliament. The parliament of Great Britain, or even of Canada—though the latter has been somewhat vilified to-day, by one of our rectorial friends—can be omnipotent, if we are to believe these gentlemen. That is, parliament can not only create a corporate body, but can breathe into it a living soul. Horrible! Ordinary corporations have in direct view their own peculiar benefit, and hence they can sell their right to railway shares or bank stock; but I never heard rectors claim that they can bequeath the right to their rectories, to their children, or sell them to other parties. Again; the priesthood is a corporation—an endowed corporation—not endowed, however, for the individual good of its members, but for the common good and welfare of the country. That is the only reason why they are endowed, as indeed they admit. They are mere trustees for the time being, and in this capacity they are intrusted with the management of these lands, whence their salaries are drawn. Suppose, now, that a landlord, instead of a King, said to his factor, "you shall have the use of a certain farm gratis," and the factor occupied the farm; but bye-and-bye, the landlord might find that he did not need a factor—could the factor say he had a vested right in the farm which he had been permitted to occupy? Certainly not. By the same rule, no clergyman can have a vested right, individually, in any lands or salaries, however long they may have possessed them, or however laborious their duties. The right of private property is an essential element in society; but not to corporations. No corporate bodies can exist till parliament exists. They are creatures and may be modified, altered, or destroyed at the will of parliament. They are human affairs, and are as mutable and changeable as all other human affairs.—And we believe that these institutions—these corporations, civil and religious ought to be preserved just so long as they are beneficial, and no longer. They should be immediately amended when discovered to be inefficient, and utterly abolished when found to be injurious to the interests of the country. We are firmly persuaded that this particular corporation is exceedingly injurious to the well-being of Canada. So much for the vested rights. We cannot see any vested right, for vested, as I understand it, is opposed to contingent. They have never had anything beyond a contingent claim, and it is clear that it was never so ticklish as now. The day is not distant when the contingency will be removed, and the loss of the reserves be made matter of certainty. I say that in taking away these reserves we are conferring a boon on the church of England and the church of Scotland; for if they were but once untrammelled from these influences they would go on, increasing in usefulness, even in the midst of persecution, if any should arise. We were asked by Mr. Evans what we are willing to give to the Church of England in lieu of the reserves. What have we to give? Nothing. When did George III—a very pious king in their memory—have any land in Canada? I never heard that he had a single foot of land here, in which to have been buried, if he had wished to be brought so far. We do not hold the doctrine that any King or Queen, President or Emperor, owns the country in which we dwell. The monarch for the time being is only the head of that corporation which owns the whole of it, and which is responsible for the management of it. We do not mean, then, that the Church of England shall get anything instead of the reserves, except that which we claim for ourselves—religious freedom—the rights of conscience. Their conscience is a most peculiar one at present, for they complain of hardship because they cannot put their hands into my pocket,

or the public purse, and help themselves. We send men to Parliament to manage our property, and believing these reserves to be the property of the country, we want to tell them how to dispose of them. Now a word or two about this Parliament. We have learned a great deal about many things since we came here, and something about Parliament.—They are always supreme, it is admitted, yet there may happen to be manifest injustice. It was perfectly right in the legislature to give property to a church, but it will be exceedingly wrong—impiously wicked—horribly sacrilegious—if the same Parliament takes it away. Again: our friends say Parliament may take it away. We, too, say it may—we hope it will—I had almost said we have power to say it must; and I believe that an enlightened, but dissatisfied community, will say the same. I know that many enlightened churchmen say so. Our rectorial friends here confess that rather than be continually engaged in this turmoil, pleasant though it be, they would give the whole up. A noble and manly confession! But we are told it would be terrible to apply the proceeds of the reserves to secular purposes. We can't do that without educating Roman Catholics, one gentleman said; but I have not time to enter into that point. Suppose the proceeds were applied to railroads. We should prefer education, but if they cannot be applied to education without teaching Roman Catholicism (though I believe they can), then let them be applied to the construction of railroads or any other purpose. Who does not know that in many of the countries on the continent of Europe, ecclesiastical property has been alienated, again and again, and applied to secular purposes? Even in England, the property of the Roman Catholic church was alienated, and applied to the support of the present protestant establishment. Many benefices in the German States were applied to secular purposes. And when prelacy was dethroned in my native country, the lands were chiefly vested in the King, only a part being vested in the established Church of Scotland—one of whose ministers is found here, sitting at the feet of prelacy, and holding up the skirts of a system which has deluged his native heather with blood. Alas, my brother! alas, my brother! If the alienation of the reserves could be proved to be sacrilege, in the sense in which that word can be properly used, we would not be its advocates; but believing that the state is the proprietor of these lands, we say that the state has full power, and a perfect right, to appropriate them in any way which a majority of the people may determine. But "the public faith is pledged." When and where?—how and by whom? We have often heard of the public faith being pledged to many a foul job. If these gentlemen did really understand, when they engaged to discharge this work, that their salaries would not be meddled with, I for one say, let them enjoy them; but, remember, we have made no covenant with the unborn or the unordained. We do not want men who have laboured until grey hairs have grown, for the benefit of their country, to be turned out of their homes. That is not proposed. Let there be a generous treatment of all such cases, in order that individual hardship may not be inflicted. We say generous, not just. God forbid that justice should ever reach them! We will not weigh their claims in the scales of justice, but will rather extend christian liberality towards them. Something has been said, insinuatingly, about the encomiums on this side being ironical. We do not like to admit that, though it may be so on both sides. We can very well con-

ceive that if this general urbanity and kindness of manner were always manifested towards us, we should not have much reason to complain of illiberality. Our worthy friends, the rectors, disclaim dominancy, and in my soul I believe they are sincere. But in proof of the dominant spirit of the Church, I would refer to the *Church* newspaper, the organ of these churchmen, where we are styled "unreasoning sectarians," left beyond the pale of the church, to the uncovenanted mercies of God! Had these gentlemen to take an oath after they were ordained, before they could administer the rite of marriage? I—who was never aught else than loyal—had to go and take the oath of loyalty.

Rev. W. BETTRIDGE.—We have not that to do.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—No, but I had. There is an illustration of the degradation we speak of. There is the domitancy of which we complain. They insist that the consciences of the minority should be held sacred, and I agree with them; but let them not forget this principle in dealing with others. In all proper things, we will aid them, rather than injure them. Let them go on in the work of evangelizing the world, and we will help them, to the best of our ability. [Time expired.]

Rev. G. BELL.—There was a personal allusion to me in the last speech, which ought not to be reported; I allude to the charge against me of maintaining prelacy.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—I said, assisting in maintaining prelacy—holding up the skirts; that's all. I meant to state that I thought it strange that a descendant of those venerable sires of ours, who upheld the cross against the sword, should be found assisting in maintaining a system that once covered the Scottish heather with blood.

Rev. G. BELL.—It is a very severe charge, made against me personally.

CHAIRMAN.—It does not strike me that the observation can be considered personally offensive.

Rev. F. EVANS.—The system established by law in Canada has nothing in common with the English system, referred to by Mr. Ormston, as having produced such disastrous consequences.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—It is against a system, not against men, that we wage war. Do not, therefore, be so thin-skinned. The word "unchristian" has been thrown against us, but we did not complain. I am an agitator, I confess, and intend to be, while I live and have my being.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—I find some difficulty in following the two gentlemen who have just spoken on the opposite side. One of them I do not wish to follow, because he has led into paths in which I would not walk. The other I find a difficulty in following, because of the extreme rapidity with which he has combined and clustered many things together in his speech, which are extremely diverse in their nature. However I shall endeavor, in the short time allotted to me, to take a cursory view of the argument on the side advocated by the other gentlemen. In the first place, it is boldly asserted that there is the power—and not only the power, but the right—in the parliament, to do that which this resolution says they ought to do—that is, to take away the property which has been bestowed by the crown to the church. But I take it that the gentlemen who has just sat down has answered this in one part of his speech.

He said, "Did not the Parliament do right when they gave it? and will the same Parliament do wrong in taking it away?" I do not know how he or any man can prove that black is white, or that white is black. But he must be able to do it, on something like 'it, before he can prove that the Parliament which did right in giving the reserves, would do right in taking them away.

Rev. W. ORMSFON.—I do not believe they did right when they gave the reserves.

Rev. B. CROXYN.—The point of his argument was this: "We are told it would be wrong"—and he uttered it with great vehemence—"to take away this property, but yet parliament did quite right in giving it." In this, he of course implies that the parliament of Great Britain can do or undo, and yet be right whether it does or undoes: at least, so it appeared to me. The gentleman may perhaps be able to explain this to himself—to his own conscience, which appears to be very tender; but I think he certainly cannot explain it to the satisfaction of those present. With respect to the matter of conscience, of which he has spoken: he says that that must be a peculiar kind of conscience which would not make us feel that we were not permitted to put our hands into his pocket, and take away his property. Now I say that this is an unkind and unfair way of putting an argument to any public meeting: it is unfair to accuse us of being public robbers, just to give point to an argument in a popular assemblage, and to draw forth a little clap-trap applause. Altogether, we have been speaking a little more plainly to-day than we did yesterday. It is well that we should speak plainly; but I think that for persons to avail themselves of an opportunity of this kind to give utterance to bitter things, hastily and vehemently, is unworthy and unbecoming. We consented to enter into this discussion, with an expectation that we should discuss the various propositions calmly, clearly, and in a christian spirit. We were given to understand that there would be an absence of every thing that could excite, every thing that could irritate every thing that could annoy, every thing that could provoke personal ill will between the parties engaged. Such was the information which I received. If I had thought anything else, I should not have been one to promote or take part in these proceedings; because I believe that we are inflicting very great moral injury on the people, when we excite bad feeling, or stir up foul prejudices. I therefore deplore that anything of the kind was introduced. With reference to what was said personally of myself, that, I believe, is to be expunged from the report. I think it ought to be expunged, indeed, not only from the report of our proceedings, but from the memory of the person who gave utterance to it, who knows that a full explanation has been given on more occasions than one—who knows the whole circumstances of the case—and who, moreover, fully understands that not one solitary cent of the money paid over ever enriched me. He ought to know that; and yet he spoke to-day of "grasping" and "avaricious"—but yet exceedingly honest—conduct. I leave him to reconcile these things, which are contradictory to each other. I must again say, with regard to the gentleman who last spoke, that I found it exceedingly difficult to make notes of what he said, in consequence of his great rapidity. What he said, however, left this general impression on my mind—that he proceeded on the false assumption that

the property is the property of the public, and not of those parties to whom it was given; that it does not belong to the present holders by right, at all, although bestowed on them by act of parliament. He drew a distinction between public and private property—between corporate and individual property; but the law of our country makes no such distinction. Property is sacred in the eye of the law, of whatever kind it be. Take, for instance, the Canada Company. It is not a corporation, but a mere company of merchants. In what position would that company stand, if the doctrines of this gentleman were carried out? They got a very large quantity of land—nearly as much as the clergy reserves, or perhaps more; and they got it at a very low rate—for a mere bagatelle, in fact. They got it on the faith of the country, and they have been speculating in it ever since; some of it they have sold, but a large portion of it remains unsettled; and according to the doctrines of this gentleman, they have no right to it, at all. They paid for it, but, according to this new doctrine, they have abused their trust, and have no right to hold it. I cannot agree to any such principle. I remember hearing this very principle preached in the House of Assembly, but it was indignantly put down at that time, and the country has been silent about it ever since. I rejoice in it. Of course, that company obtained a great benefit—a great bargain—when they made the purchase of this land at so low a price; but I rejoice that their title has been secured to them, and that the rights of property have in their case been maintained by the law of the country. I think that our property—the clergy reserves—stands on the same footing. It was granted to us by an act of parliament. Gentlemen say that as long as we live, nothing will be done to deprive us of our privileges. We are much obliged for that. But we think there are generations yet to come who will want to have the ministrations of Christ's gospel amongst them—more especially the poor throughout the country; and we therefore feel that it is our bounden duty (as I have said before) to maintain, by every constitutional means in our power, this right, and not to part with this property, which, like all other gifts of God, has been committed to our trust. As trustees of it, it is our duty to use every constitutional means in order that it may be preserved to the sacred purpose for which it was given. I cannot help noticing that there appears to be a wounded pride in the minds of some of the gentlemen who have spoken to-day. The gentleman who last sat down instanced the *Church* newspaper, and quoted the expression “unreasoning sectarians,” from its columns. Well now, that is wounded pride, after all.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—We disclaim it.

Rev. B. CROFT.—That is wounded pride.

Rev. Dr. BURNS.—It is honest indignation.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—Oh, yes! we have a great deal of that, and we are proud of it.

Rev. J. WINTERBOTHAM.—Firstly let me allude to the matter of discourtesy which we have been charged with exhibiting towards the rectors of the Church of England. Now, I have no feeling of discourtesy or resentment, but a feeling of love towards them all, and I wish that they were delivered from the trammels of state churches. We, who plead for the secular appropriation of the clergy reserves, have been

charged with a desire to support the errors of the Catholic church. I deny the charge. We are not the supporters of the man of sin, but we are his public reprovers, whether in the Church of England or the Church of Rome. With regard to appropriating the clergy reserves to the purposes of general education, I say that there is everything in such a course that ought to command the attention and approval of a minister of God. We know that the interests of the rising generation, in this country, are vast indeed; they are deep—they are extensive; and every one ought to feel an earnest solicitude for the enlightenment of those who are to form our senators, our lawyers, our judges, and who will have to manage the great machinery of the varied public concerns of this nation. Yes, this nation! This nation, which in future years will stand high and eminent in the annals of the world, in the magnitude of its population, and in its political and religious influences. If our opponents had a patriotic feeling they would say, "We will give the clergy reserves to educate the people." If they had a wish to see Canada stand high in literature and general knowledge in future generations, they would say this; but have we discovered a spark from such a soul as this? Has there been an intimation that they would relinquish the income they possess, to educate the people in the solitary settlements of this country? I repeat, that if patriotism existed amongst them, it would lead the clergy of the Churches of England and Scotland to relinquish their unjust emoluments, to aid in the great work of educating the people, without respect to sect, or party, or name. The charge of aiding the dark system of the Catholic religion, comes with a bad grace from those who speak of courtesy. When have we done it? Where have we done it? How have we done it? In every place, and at every time, we have been ready to testify against the corruptions of the Romish Church; from generation to generation, and through the whole of our public lives, we have been pleading for the rights of all, and we have protested against the domination of that wicked system which is founded in darkness, and leads to cruelty. I must say that I think Mr. Cronyn's reference to the Canada Company, as an argument in support of the present appropriation of the clergy reserves, was far-fetched. Is not the concern of the Canada Company a fair concern of trade? Did they not give an equivalent—or at least, did they not give a price—for the lands they now possess, according to the demand that was made upon them? To cite this case, in vindication of the possession of public property, for which not a single farthing has been given, but from which a great number of guineas has been taken, is a logic I do not understand, and which I believe has sprung up from the fountain of selfishness. One argument which may be used in favour of the appropriation which we propose is, I think, unanswerable. It is this—that by appropriating the reserves to the education of the people, the benefit would be extended to the whole community. The Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Presbyterian, in all their varied divisions—all would have the advantages of the plan proposed. Let the Churches of England and Scotland abandon their unjust pretensions—let the rectories be given back to the people—and let the whole of the reserves be applied to general education; and then what a glorious state of affairs would be produced. There would be harmony instead of strife—union instead of animosity. The people would grow in intelli-

gence and morality. Religion would flourish. We should get higher salaries than £10 a year, and we should have the satisfaction of seeing the prevailing contention banished away. The parliament would meet in love; the Governor General would not be besieged at his door with solicitations for rectories. All would stand upon one general level: every valley would be exalted, and every mountain and hill made low; the crooked would be made straight, and the rough places plain; the glory of the Lord would be revealed, and all flesh would see it together. —[Time expired.]

Rev. W. RYERSON—I rise to introduce the next and last proposition, which is in these words—

“That the Clergy Reserves have proved a source of bitter contention to the various religious sects—diffused a blighting influence over the Churches which have participated of them—impeded missionary enterprise, and the general good of the province.”

If in rising to address you I should manifest a little trepidation, the very peculiar circumstances in which I am placed, the array of talent, eloquence and learning with which I am surrounded, and the very great importance of the subject before us, will, I trust, plead for me an ample apology; more especially as I am constitutionally exceedingly timid, and am not a skilful or an agreeable speaker on any occasion. I feel that this last circumstance is unfortunate, because all of us know, that the relish we may feel for any dish, very much depends upon the manner in which it is served up, my feelings are very different from those of my most esteemed and talented friend, who has so much delighted this assembly on one or two occasions, I am not glad that I am here I do not feel comfortable in the position in which I am placed. In the first place, I feel altogether inadequate to the duties that are expected of me. In the second place, I feel that the principles which I am called to maintain are directly averse to the principles entertained by gentlemen in this town whom, of all men in Canada, I most esteem and venerate—men to whom I am under very deep personal obligations, and therefore gentlemen whose feelings I would regard with the same sacred tenderness and concern than I would regard my own. However, on this as on all other occasions, duty is imperative; and if it is the opinion of my countrymen and of my fellow subjects, that I should either advocate this subject, agreeably to my own conscientious principles, or perform any other duty, however anxious or unpleasant, the voice of the people in that respect would always be the voice of god to me. The subject now before us is one of very serious and very grave importance; but before entering immediately on to it, there are a few observations that I must make on facts that have already transpired. In the first place, I cannot but feel highly gratified with the actual—and I will say, if you please, the redeeming—influence of public opinion, and of public sentiment, on the minds, conduct and feelings of respectable intelligent, and impartial men. Every individual must have been delighted with the dignified and gentlemanly conduct of the two reverend rectors of Woodstock and London. All, I say, must have been charmed with the urbanity of their manners, and the dignified seriousness which has marked all their conduct, from the commencement of this trying but most interesting discussion. But observers must be struck with the fact that some peculiar and constraining influence has produced this

salutary state of mind in these gentlemen, and has also produced a not unwholesome effect upon him who has been facetiously called the Title Page—I prefer to say, the Preface—of the church in this country. We have not been in the habit of experiencing the courtesy, urbanity, and kindness which have been manifested on this occasion. One of our good rectorial friends amused us this morning with an anecdote about Philip Topsy and Philip Sober; and that anecdote was made to have some application to us. Now these very courteous rectors appear to me something like a boa constrictor, after he has gorged a bullock: he is then quite harmless, and can be approached without the least danger; but when seeking for his prey, under the influence of hunger, he is a most formidable and dangerous creature indeed. There is the same difference between rectors hungry and rectors full. On all other occasions, they are much more agreeable companions and antagonists when they have got their portion and are full, than when hungry, and struggling and striving to obtain a meal. While, therefore, I cannot but admit and admire the very peculiar change that has taken place, I cannot but feel that it is in a great measure attributable to this well-known fact in natural history. A man may intrude in my domicile and farm, and I may insist on that man retiring; he becomes restive and contentious, and flogs me and drives me off, till he gets possession of half; and having carried his point, he forthwith becomes the best natured fellow in the world. I think I see a parallel between this and the urbanity of the rectors. I have but one thing more to advert to, for I am reminded of the paucity of time. It is, the very great change which the present state of affairs has produced on all of us. It will be recollected by every gentleman connected with this important controversy, that it commenced in 1819, in the application of the late Bishop of Quebec to the Imperial Government, (under the colonial administration of Earl Bathurst) for a charter of incorporation, to incorporate the clergy of the Church of England for the management of the Clergy Reserves. Up to that time, the Clergy of the Church of England had nothing more to do with the clergy reserves than any other individual, and they had no claim to them until that application for a charter was made. No sooner was that application made, than the body with whom my reverend friend before me (Mr. Bell) is connected, put in a claim for their share, and commenced a very warm agitation in favour of it. Of course, the Preface to the Church of England was not altogether good natured about this new born rival. Again and again, he stated that that agitation originated in the clamour of a disappointed party, who desired to get what did not belong to them. Every one knows the not-very-good-natured feelings which existed between these two reverend bodies, in their contention, which extended over a considerable number of years, and involved the display of a very large amount of pugnacity; for although the clergy and members of the Church of Scotland were rather in the minority, they sometimes became as pugnacious as the celebrated son in the Pickwick papers, who shook his fist at his father's back, when his father could not see him. In 1840, fortune favored them, and they obtained what they wanted. We know the story of the greedy lad, who, with his mouth full held both his hands up, and declared he was not half full yet. But the Church of Scotland had better manners, for she had scarcely swallowed her prize before it produced all the soothing effects of a good dose of anodyne; the soporific effects were immediate. The

clergy of that church went as quietly to sleep as a well rocked baby, and never awoke until yesterday, when they appeared anew in the person of my reverend friend (Mr. Bell). The interesting creature went to sleep in the chrysalis state, and now wakes up a perfect butterfly; so perfect that my friend must almost doubt his own identity. Having rubbed his eyes open after so long a sleep, he tells us that we are trying to deprive him of his rights, and that we would trample on a sister church, equal in purity to his own. Like all young converts, he is far more zealous than the fathers before him. I noticed yesterday, that when the reverend rector of Woodstock, with that gentleness, grace, and delicacy which mark all his statements, undertook to attack the voluntary principle, he commenced with a reference to the apostolic church; being a successor of the apostles, he did it as respectfully as possible; and finally he got as far as the time of that very good king Constantine, when he left us with a kind of awe. But when our younger brother jumped up, he went straight to the time of the Apostles, and referred to the magnanimous benevolence which distinguished the early converts—a benevolence which has elicited admiration from infidels.—He explained that the voluntary sacrifices of that period proceeded, not from strong principle, but from the fact that those who made them knew that the Roman army would take their property in a few days; and therefore they gave it away because they did not want it any longer.—That was painful to me; and I protest in the sight of God against such statements. But while I do protest against these statements of yesterday, I cannot but admire the increased zeal of the reverend gentleman to-day. The reverend rector, feeling the magnitude of the subject, spoke of the supremacy of parliament and the authority of the crown, with reverence, but with a degree of firmness and decision. But our friend of the Church of Scotland said that kings and queens and parliaments have no rightful power in the matter, and he defied them all. Now this agitation was led on in 1825, 1826, 1828, 1830, 1833, and 1835, by the Hon. W. Morris, who gave his vote in favour of education and of education alone. This is rather a remarkable fact, in connection with the course of our friend here, whose new born zeal against the appropriation of the reserves is so strong as to lead him to care neither for kings, councillors, parliaments, or public opinion. So much for the attitude of parties in this discussion. I now proceed to the subject more immediately before me. The first part of the proposition is, "That the clergy reserves have proved a source of bitter contention." This is true—literally and unhappily true. Not a single parliament from 1824 up to 1838, ever passed one session, without this subject being agitated, with the most anxious feeling. Let it be remembered that in every one of the sessions of 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1833, 1835, and 1836, there were resolutions or reports on the subject; and in some of them acts were passed to dispose of these reserves according to the wishes of the people. In every instance, these proceedings were neutralized, not by an upper house, but by a kind of ghost of an upper house, rererred to by Dr. Burns; many of whose members never read the acts which were sent up to them. All the efforts of the parliament were thus neutralized, and treated with contempt, by the shadow of a shade of a kind of departed ghost of an upper house. Most of you know what were the feelings which these proceedings engendered between the two branches of the legislature. You

know, too, what were the results on the feelings of the country, with regard to that House, which stood in the face of every improvement, and of every principle of enlarged, and liberal, and useful legislation—I speak of what was called the Legislative Council. Now here are the very earliest effects of these reserves. First, there was a continual collision between the two houses for all that long period; and, in the next place, this led to a most bitter—I was going to say, an unconquerable—opposition on the part of the House of Assembly and the country, against those who obstructed their views, and wilfully subverted the rights of the people. These, I say, were the first fruits of the clergy reserves. The voices of your members were raised with unaccountable unanimity for fourteen long years—so much so that when the very last vote was taken, with regard to this question, the Hon. John Robinson and all his minions in power could only muster a minority of four against thirty-six. While the struggle was thus going on in the legislature, what were the effects on the electors by whom that legislature was returned? Let the painful and the agitating history of your country in past years tell, the severity of the ordeal, and the travail, and the birth-pangs, that Canada went through in bringing forth the new born freedom which, by the blessing of God we enjoy at the present time. In the meantime, what were the effects with regard to the christian community? Here I must be allowed to speak plainly, but without any intention of giving offence to the most delicate or fastidious feelings. The effects in this direction were seen in a system of misrepresentation, of vilifying, and of disreputable comparisons between the church and other bodies of christians—all calculated to excite the most hostile and unpleasant feelings. The Preface to the Church of England was the very first to wake up to this subject, and to give expression to feelings anything but consoling to his fellow christians around him. He declared plainly that the religious teachers of all Upper Canada—excepting only the clergy of the Church of England, and a “very few respectable ministers” of the Church of Scotland—“come almost universally from the Republican States of America, where they gather their knowledge, and form their sentiments.” Considering this circumstance, the Preface said, “it is quite evident that if the Imperial Government does not immediately step forward with efficient help, the mass of the population will be nurtured and instructed in hostility to our parent church: nor will it be long till they imbibe opinions anything but favourable to the political institutions of England.” This was written in 1826. These sentiments were reiterated in the same language by the same individual, a few years afterwards. They were also reiterated in substance by the clergy of the Church of England, as well as by the Preface to that Clergy—Dr. Strachan. Again and again, they were repeated in still more offensive language, under the direction of that church, by the petitioners—said to be 6,000—who signed the petition to the King, which was carried to England by Dr. Strachan, but which was subsequently presented to the House of Lords in a way which, I think, is perfectly understood by our friends, the rectors. Among other things, the petitioners used this language in regard to their fellow christians and fellow subjects—

“We feel with deep concern the great injustice of the efforts now making to deprive us of this vested right; nor can we suppress our indignation when such efforts are made to work this injury upon your

"Majesty's dutiful subjects, who have done and suffered so much for their loyal acts and principles; chiefly by persons who have no comparative claim upon the British Crown, and who are either ignorant of, or insensible to, the fundamental principles of our glorious Constitution." Thus

And in another paragraph of the same petition, the opponents of the then appropriation of the reserves were styled "enemies of the prosperity of the British Crown." These hard words were used in reference to 20,000 of the best men of Canada, who had signed a counter petition. What were the feelings which these things excited. Ask that revered friend (pointing to Mr. Richardson). Rise, sir, (addressing that gentleman) and show that person, once perfect, but shattered, and broken, and mangled in the service of your country. Tell this audience whether, having fought in a British ship, under a British commander, you have forfeited all claims on the Crown, or whether you are insensible to the value of British institutions. Tell me, ye who say that the opponents of the reserves are enemies to the Crown, how many of those who received medals in honour of their valour and their services in the war with the United States, were members of that church, whose petitions say that they were "ignorant or insensible to the fundamental principles of our glorious Constitution." I have more than twenty extracts marked, all breathing the same disgraceful spirit and feeling. You must not tell me that that spirit is dead. Look week after week at the *Church* newspaper, which speaks the language of the Church, and reveals precisely the same *animus*. Again: further to show the baneful effects of the clergy reserves, I pledge myself to this assembly, to prove to any assembly of intelligent men, that this question, and the tyranny, and fraud, and insult connected with it, in the establishment of the rectories, brought about the rebellion. For that rebellion, you are indebted to this idolible wrong, which has pierced many a heart, and agonized many an honest spirit, from one extreme of our land to the other. Therefore I say, in language which I think cannot be confuted, that the clergy reserve question has been a prolific source of contention and strife, in the community and in the legislature, from the commencement of its history up to the present time. If that proposition has been established, my next may be very briefly disposed of—I allude to the blighting influence of these reserves "over the churches which have participated of them;" in other words, that the present and past appropriation of the reserves has not produced any good. In support of this, I will refer to a few facts which I think fully establish its truth; beginning with some statements by clergy of the Church of England with regard to its state in Canada, in 1837. Up to that time, if official reports are correct, that church had received from Great Britain, in various ways—by government grants, by aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, &c.—upwards of 600,000 dollars; while other denominations had not cost the British government one York sixpence. These facts staring us in the face, what were the relative positions of these churches at that time? I will refer to three of the leading districts of Upper Canada—the Home, the Gore, and the Niagara districts. First as to the Gore. The writer from whom I quote states that that district contained 43,920 souls, whose number was rapidly increasing; yet in the whole district, at that time, there were but four resident clergymen, and one travelling missionary. The

The Niagara district at the same time contained 32,996 souls: along the frontier townships, five clergymen were stationed, but in the interior containing 20,000 souls, none had been provided. In the Gore district, there was one travelling missionary. With regard to other districts, I may remark that there was no clergyman for fifty miles stretching along the coast of Lake Ontario, from Toronto to Darlington, containing 10,957 inhabitants. When the Society's Missionary passed through Newmarket to Holland Landing, in May, 1837, those townships, in the immediate neighbourhood of Toronto had received only one visit from a clergyman in the space of seven months. The Preface to the church in Toronto was not very zealous then. In the Core district, many settlers had had no opportunity of enjoying the Lord's Supper during a space of three years, before the visit of the society's agent, Mr. O'Neil. What was the state of other denominations, which had received no aid from the British government? In the Toronto district, there were at that time 4 or 5 Scotch clergymen, or churches; 3 or 4 Baptist clergymen; 9 itinerant Wesleyan clergymen, besides a large number of local preachers, 25 meeting-houses, and 100 meeting places, supplied by travelling and local preachers. In the Niagara district, there were 6 Baptist ministers, 9 congregationalists; 7 itinerant Wesleyans, and a number of local preachers, with 15 chapels, and upwards of 80 preaching places. In the Gore district, there were 3 or 4 Scotch ministers and churches, 4 independent ministers and churches, 10 Wesleyans and 24 chapels, besides Baptist ministers, and other means of Grace. Now contrast these two systems—one with all its treasures, the other without them. [Time expired.]

Rev. B. CRONYN—I rise with pleasure to reply to the gentleman who has just sat down, and I do so because of the admirable temper which he has displayed, although he has said many things which indeed sound hard to our ears, but which I trust I shall be able to rebut and disprove before I close. Before I commence my main argument, I would notice what he has said concerning the *Church* newspaper. Some gentlemen here, I presume—indeed I know—imagine that the *Church* newspaper is a Church organ. The *Church* newspaper is a speculation: it is no church organ, and never has been one. It is a vehicle of information, and is used as such, but it is no church organ, and the church is not at all responsible—nor do I, as an individual, hold myself in the slightest degree responsible—for anything in regard either to doctrine or spirit which that newspaper sends abroad. Let that go to the world. Amongst the many changes which have taken place in the rectors, that is not a change with me: it has been my opinion for years. With reference to this change in the rectors: the gentleman who has now sat down has declared that a great change has taken place in us; he says that we are now urbane, polite, gentlemanlike,—and he has said something even more flattering than that. Well, it is to be presumed that we were formerly not so. I am not willing to plead guilty to any intentional rudeness to any gentleman—either in recent days or in former days. If I have been guilty of any such conduct, either directly or indirectly, assuredly I am sorry for it, and will make the most ample apology and reparation which are in my power. But there is one remark which the gentleman made with regard to the change effected in the rectors, which, I think, goes some way to nullify part of his own argument. He says we have caused

great contention and strife. None of us deny that there has been great contention in Parliament, but we, do deny that we have been the cause of it. We do deny that we have sowed contention amongst the various sects. He has alluded to bitter contention between the churches of England and Scotland, and has facetiously described the concord which was finally produced between those churches, and which it would have been most desirable to see among all professing christians. I know, as he has said, that misrepresentation and vilification have been produced by the clergy reserves, but on which side have these misrepresentation and vilification been? There have been misrepresentation and vilification of the very worst kind, in order to excite passions, to nurture prejudice, and to perpetuate bad feeling in the minds of persons instructed concerning this subject, in the country. The gentleman has frequently referred to a person under a name which I do not like to repeat. It was not altogether courteous, and I do not like to use it after him. He spoke frequently of the Bishop of the Diocese.

Rev. W. RYERSON—I beg to disclaim all offensiveness in the word used. I merely referred to the Bishop as the Preface—as leader, or head, of the Church of England.

Rev. B. CROFTON—There can be no question that in the many agitating scenes in which the Bishop of Toronto has been engaged, in this country, (and he has now been here nearly half a century,) he may have at times given utterance to things which caused feelings on the minds of those concerning whom he spoke. That feeling ought not to prejudice them altogether against a system, or to influence them to set themselves in opposition to what is in itself right and just, and what has been proved to have a righteous tendency in regard to the general condition of the country. The gentleman spoke of the application made for a charter in 1819; he said that then, for the first time, an application was made in order to obtain a charter to incorporate the church corporation, to take care of the reserves, and he slipped in the assertion that they never had a claim to them before. Now to say that is a *non sequitur*. They asked for a charter to take care of them; but because there never was an incorporation to take care of them before, therefore they had no claim! Documents to the Governor (introduced yesterday), sent at the time when the constitutional act was passed, and a variety of concurrent testimony, show that there was always a claim made for the church of England—that that claim was always maintained—and that it was not first thought of 1819, when a charter was sought to take care of the reserves. These lands had suffered great damage throughout the country;—the property was going to waste because no one had any charge of it; and a charter was obtained in order that some one might exercise the necessary supervision and care. The gentleman has spoken of the large sums of money paid from England for the clergy here. They have come, however, from the church people at home—they are voluntary contributions—they are liberal gifts to ministers of the gospel throughout the colonies of the British empire. The British government contributed a very small portion—and that only for a very short time—to the funds of the Propagation Society. Its income now exceeds £94,000 a-year. There was a time when the Imperial Parliament gave £14,000 a-year to the society, but after a period that was withdrawn. The funds

of which this gentleman has spoken as having been contributed by that society were not contributed by the state, and were paid to men who made a bargain with the society when they left home. Many of them left preferment, connections, and families, and came to Canada—then a wilderness—to continue for the remainder of their days on a stipulated sum—small as it appeared to me, and small as it must appear to every one. £200 a-year was given to each person who came out; and in this way, the amount was paid to these individuals, who labored hard and long. Some of those who came out on these conditions under that society have only lately been called hence to another state of being. But it is said that up to the time of the Imperial act, very large amounts were received by the church, and that this corporation got large amounts. Now, it will surprise a great many to hear that up to a very recent period (I don't know exactly the date, but it was much later than the act), scarcely anything was forthcoming out of the reserves for the funds of the Church. There were very limited sales, as we know. Their very very small funds, and very large expenses; much larger expenses, indeed, than there ought to have been, considering that the whole amount contributed was very, very small. It is only recently that sales have been effected upon a large scale, and that any large amount has been contributed. When I came to this country, I came as a missionary to the Society for the propagation of the gospel, and as I was placed on their list to receive £200 sterling, per annum for my labours, while I remained in this country. Scarcely had I arrived in Canada, when, in consequence of the withdrawal of the grant by the Home Government, difficulties arose in this country, and 15 per cent was deducted from my salary. It was thus reduced to £170, which I have since received at the current rate of exchange, without any premium. This is my case, and it is the case of many others. Thus, then, the clergy have not been receiving out of the clergy reserve fund any large amount. The church has not been deriving the immense wealth which she has represented as receiving. They have been literally receiving nothing, or next to nothing, out of the Clergy Reserve Fund. When the arrangement was entered into by the government at home with the Gospel Propagation Society, in consequence of the withdrawal of the grant, the Government stipulated that the Clergy on the list of the Society should receive £170 per annum, out of the Clergy Reserve fund. I know there are gentlemen on the other side who came out to this country, and who had stipulated salaries from societies, just as I had. Perhaps they have them still—I don't object to them for it; and if those societies can make an arrangement with the Government here to pay them their salaries, instead of receiving them from home, in order that the societies might appropriate them to other colonies, I shall not find fault with it. That was the arrangement entered into by the Propagation Society. The colonies of Britain are extended, and are increasing in population; their religious wants are daily increasing; and the population of the new Colonies being mainly poor, they require to be supplied with the ministrations of religion. If left without these ministrations, most assuredly they must suffer, and a great injury must be inflicted on generations to come. That Society seeks to meet these wants, but it can only do it imperfectly and to a very small degree in comparison with what ought to be done—with what it is the bounden duty of the parent country to do. But to the

full extent of its ability, that society seeks to supply religious instruction and the means of grace; to the poor resident in the distant colonies of the empire. What the society has withdrawn from Canada has been applied to Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and elsewhere. But we do not murmur. If we had remained on the funds of that society, we might have been sure that British faith would have been kept with us far better than it has been: probably, there would not have been a withdrawal of a portion of our income, as has already taken place; nor would the whole of it have been jeopardized as it is at the present time. The gentleman who spoke last, alluded to Mr. Morris, who, he said, had always voted that the clergy reserve fund should be devoted to education. So far as I know anything of his history, Mr. Morris has been the strenuous advocate of the Church of Scotland in regard to the reserves: he was, I believe, the first to put forward the claim of that church, and he urged it to a successful issue; but I am not aware that he voted for the alienation of the reserves after he had struggled to obtain the claim of the Church of Scotland. I don't think that he has voted for their application to educational purposes. The assertion to the contrary sounds strange in my ears, because I knew that when I had the honour of a slight acquaintance with him, he was anxious that the portion belonging to the Church of Scotland should be devoted entirely to the religious uses of that Church. The gentleman has alluded to contention in Parliament, in proof of the proposition before us. But the reference is inconclusive. Parliament cannot properly be called a religious body, and "religious sects" are the words of the resolution. We know there has been great contention in Parliament; but I would ask: Did the Book of Grievances consist solely of the Clergy Reserves? We are told that the Clergy Reserves were the cause of the rebellion,—that the burnings, murders, and loss of life and property which took place on that occasion were caused by the Clergy Reserves. The whole Book of Grievances, consisting of upwards of ninety resolutions, were—we are told—nothing: the Clergy Reserves did all. I do not believe it: it is contrary to fact. There were other points which occupied a far more prominent position amongst the grievances put forward by the grievance-mongers of that day; other things, far more calculated to stir up the feelings of the people. And now, to serve a purpose, all these things are to be forgotten, and it is to be said that the Clergy Reserves and the Rectories—solely and entirely—armed man against man, and caused bloodshed and strife. I say that is not ingenuous: it is not borne out by fact. To prove this, the gentleman must show that all the other grievances were as nothing, and that they were so considered. We know, however, that McKenzie's Book of Grievances put prominently forward other grievances, which were the subjects of harangues at the hustings, which filled all the newspapers throughout the country, which excited the bad passions of the people and ultimately led to the issue which we all so much deplore. The Reverend gentleman also alluded to the language used in some petition, of which I know nothing. I should be sorry to make use of such language concerning any man who had served his country and his king—who had stood forward, as every man ought to do, under the British flag, in any part of the world; I should be sorry to speak of such a man in a disrespectful way. I would rather grasp his hand as a brother, no matter what denomination he belongs to—no matter what name he called himself; I should hail him

as a fellow citizen—a fellow subject—who had done his duty under the glorious flag which we all so much love, and which I trust we shall maintain till death. I have never used such language as has been quoted, and I think it not right to burthen a discussion of this kind—which was to have been on principle—with exciting topics of that nature. As to the gentleman present, to whom such pointed reference was made, I may say that I honour him though I never saw him before: I honour him for what has been said of him, and sorry indeed should I be to think that I had by any means put my hand to a petition which spoke, slightly or disrespectfully of him, or others like him; and therefore all that the last speaker has said on this point falls to the ground. [Time expired.]

REV. DR. BURNS.—As allusion has been made to Mr. Morris, I may state that up to 1823 he always advocated the Church of Scotland. In that year he brought forward ten resolutions, concluding with an appeal in behalf of that Church. But in 1826 he was the mover of other ten resolutions, one of which referred to the determined hostility of the Episcopal Church to the claims of the other bodies, and another of which affirmed the desirableness of alienating the Reserves from the Church, and applying them to education. From that period downward, Mr. Morris held the views which have been ascribed to him by Mr. Ryerson, though he nevertheless continued a friend of the Church of Scotland.

REV. J. ROAF.—I presume we all feel that we are now approaching the close of our discussion, or collision. While I have entered into the spirit of the proceedings, have enjoyed the mental treasures that have been brought forth, and have felt very sensibly the urbanity and generosity, and the gentlemanly and christian feeling displayed by those opposed to us, I have all the way through been burthened with a feeling of regret that the Clergy Reserves have occasioned a meeting like this, in which we come together, not to strive to elicit truth with respect to some important point of belief, or of morals, or of action, but to contend on a question which involves a large amount of sectional animosity and ill feeling. I and my friends came here to help to wrest away what we think now endangers the interests of the community; and we are—though perhaps not intentionally—regarded as robbers, attempting to commit spoliation, if not sacrilege. These gentlemen think we desire to pull down their churches and to commit injustice. On the other hand, we feel that they keep hold that which the community are entitled to—that they have got their hands into the public treasury, and make up their deficiencies out of taxes levied on us—in fact, that proceeds of lands belonging to the country are taken and applied to maintain their system, against us. We have a sense of wrong, and our consciences are violated in this respect, as their consciences are violated by the efforts we make. Here are some of the results of the Clergy Reserves, and I think that they fully justify the proposition we are now considering, and by which we are reminded of the fact, that for the last twenty-six years Upper Canada has been in a state of agitation, in consequence of the manner in which these Reserves have been appropriated. What is the fact? are not the denominations separated here in a manner most painful; while in the United States, the same denominations exist, generally speaking, in a state of far greater amity. And why is there a difference? They hold the same principles there and here; but we here are estranged because of this political interference—

because of this matter of Clergy Reserves—because of the efforts of some to acquire public property, and to set it apart for ecclesiastical uses—because others feel that they are not put upon a level in this respect, and if they were, their consciences would prevent their taking any portion of such property. If certain denominations did not avail themselves of this inequality, and take these Reserves, they would not be separated from other evangelical denominations. The Free Church, when in the Church of Scotland, stood aloof from us; but no sooner did it get rid of this thick clay, as Isaiah calls it, than the Free Church became one of us. In Toronto, when we call a public meeting, we know who will come—we know that we shall have the presence of the denominations that do not touch the Reserves. Let a denomination once touch these Reserves, and they forthwith stand apart from us on temperance, anti-slavery, and all other great moral and social questions; whereas, they join us if they have not had anything to do with the Clergy Reserves. Such is the influence of this system. It has operated on churches in a similar manner—injuring and often convulsing them. I am sure that many around me can call to mind churches which were once great and useful, but which were torn in pieces by this circumstance. Not many months ago, a gentleman came to me and asked to take land to endow my own Church. Had I done so, what would have been the effect? Had I been suspected of being capable of doing it, a broad line would have been drawn between myself and other denominations. Fortunately I have got property which saved me from temptation, but many others are less fortunate; and I know that my brethren watch one another with more or less uneasiness, because of these infamous temptations that are held out to them. No sooner does the government list come out than we look to see what denominations are taking aid from the Reserves. Such, I repeat, are the injurious influence of the system. It has operated similarly through all the settlements of the country. Years ago, when hardy pioneers penetrated the recesses of the forest, they were followed by plain missionaries of the gospel, who sought to partake of their poverty, not of ease and comfort. Small churches were thus formed, and a great work accomplished. When settlements were formed, the influence of the Reserves enabled parties to come in and make a stand against these poor but good men. These new-comers had around them the weight of official consequence and importance; they established the official class of the neighbourhood; every respectable man that came there must belong to that narrow circle, or be beyond the reach of office. Many settlements in the country were rent in pieces by this circumstance. Those who disliked it, and complained of it, were charged with disaffection—with rebellion. I came to this country about the time of the rebellion, and the general opinion of all with whom I conversed was, that it was mainly owing to the Rectory and Reserve question (the Rectories had been established the year before.) I need not refer to the collisions that took place between the two Houses of Parliament. We know that the House of Representatives and the Legislative Council were at daggers drawing through a long series of questions, upon and in consequence of this question. The Legislative Council plainly negatived what the people, through the House of Assembly, had done; but never condescended to make any proposal of their own. Again: this proposition says that the Clergy Reserves have impeded missionary enterprise.—

Instead of gentlemen relying upon the law of love, they have been upheld by the government. Instead of cultivating missionary feeling, they have made the government a missionary Society. Missionary feeling has been stultified and checked. Instead of gentlemen being supported by the prayers and contributions of the bodies they represented, they have come dependent on the government; and thus has missionary feeling been strangled and thwarted. The system has gone on twenty-six years, and we now see as much heat and anger as were in existence prior to the settlement of 1840. One gentleman has said that that will be an unhappy period when these reserves shall be withdrawn from their present application. I think the contrary. The period when the spirit to which I have adverted shall be quenched, will not be an unhappy period. I hope the time will come when we shall be enabled to meet these gentlemen, not to strive to get from them their property, but to join with them in advancing matters of common interest, in relation to the evangelization of the country. Gentlemen ask us what the voluntary principle is. Ministers of the gospel are actually putting in doubt the efficacy of the law of love—the sufficiency of voluntary contributions for the support of God's cause. The belief that sufficient cannot be raised without compulsion; in defiance of the plain fact that the voluntary principle is the only one of which the New Testament speaks—the only law established by Jesus Christ. The time will come when these gentlemen will no longer ask, What is the voluntary principle?—when they will find in their own experience and observation, that that principle is sufficient to employ all the ministers that God's grace bestows on a church; for it is a fact—that there has been no community yet pointed out, in which the funds were not equal to the gifts that God has bestowed. It is true the funds may not be equal to the evangelization of the world; but neither are the talents and grace which the community possess equal to that task. We shall see a better state of things than this, but it will not be without agitation; and baneful as this agitation is, I confess I am ready to do anything I can to stir up the people to endeavour to get these churches to cease their reliance upon government, and to cast themselves on the people. I say I am ready to help the people to take away these blemishes, for they are not the Lord's—to take away these earthly provisions, which are so injurious to them, so wrongful to others, and so poisonous to politics and religion. It has been said that if the reserves were withdrawn, the Church of England could not be supported in the colony. Why, I believe that if they were withdrawn now, the Church of England would show an amount of activity which she has never yet shown in this colony. The experience of the Free Church of Scotland has proved this. She has brought forth wonders of energy and wealth since her separation from the state; and the Church of England would surely not do less. The brethren that were left behind by the Free Church will do as much, when the time of trial comes. Whatever help I can give shall be directed to cast these churches on their own resources, and the aid which God's providence may confer upon them; for is it not a fact that ill feeling is generated, and the improvement of the Province retarded, by these reserves? The last speaker told us very distinctly—but perhaps unintentionally—that the present system set colony against colony. He said he was sent out by a society at home, along with other missionaries, that the society had sent them out, got the government to support

them and that then, the funds which were to have come to this colony were given to other colonies; so that other colonies are receiving benefit at the expence of Canada, according to this system. Is not that an injurious act with regard to us as a colony, in comparison with, and in relation to others—colonies towards whom we would wish to feel true affection? I wish and hope that we may part from our brethren on the other side with a perfect understanding. They do not see how we can have conscientious scruples on this subject. I say that for the public property to be taken for the support of the religion of these gentlemen is wrong to us; and they would no doubt participate in the feeling if their property—or rather public property, in which they are interested—were taken and applied to sustain my religion. In that respect my conscience is violated by what is taken under this system. It is a gross wrong to take public property, and not to let Roman Catholics share in it. The Roman Catholics have a share in the government—they contribute their share of the taxes—and they have an interest in this property; and to take this property wholly from them, and apply it to Protestants alone, is a fraud and a wrong. The Roman Catholics are as much entitled to it as any of us, except as far as the wording of the acts of parliament goes. Abstract justice requires that they should share the reserves, as well as the Protestants. One other objection which I have to the existing system is, that it is a system of hypocrisy. Put up Episcopacy and knock down Presbyterianism—or pull down both, and put Methodism or Congregationalism in their places—and you have the merit of consistency, if of nothing else. But our present system is a system of public hypocrisy, because it treats all doctrines alike. The state regards all as equally convenient—the people think all equally true—the philosopher deems all equally false. That was said of the heathenism of the early ages, but I fear, it is equally true of our present system. It is vain to expect that you support religion, when you recognize all creeds, and build up one to counteract and destroy another. My time is expired, and I can therefore only repeat that I very much admire the spirit which has been shown here, and that I trust that we shall part with a perfect understanding of each other.

Rev. F. EVANS—We hear a good deal about the excitement and irritation which are alleged to prevail upon this subject. Now it must be remembered that a report of our proceedings will go forth to the community, and my hope is, that it will go into every house in the Province, and be read. It was with that desire that I courted this public discussion, and I do not regret it. I rejoice at it; and I feel satisfied that when this report goes abroad, it will be found that a large proportion of the people will read about a degree of excitement on this question which they have never felt. I know, indeed, that the feeling in regard to it is not nearly so strong in the remote parts of the country, or amongst the farmers generally, as it has been represented to be. Any such excitement exists only on the occasion of public meetings or of a general election, when men are under the influence and guidance of those whom I would call demagogues—using the term without any desire to throw odium upon parties alluded to. At such times, and on such occasions, demagogues labour hard to convince the people that they are suffering dreadfully under the influence of some grievance; but, notwithstanding

this circumstance, I declare that no response proceeds from the habitations of the land, to the assertion that the clergy reserve question produces irritation, or creates a sense of suffering from a grievance. Enough of this matter. Next, I wish to say that these gentlemen have only to make a beginning on their own side, and they will abate much of which they complain. They complain of jealousy and ill-feeling, and they declare that they watch one another to see whether any man amongst them takes a share of the clergy reserves. They say that these reserves ought to be wholly applied to the purposes of education, and that they will not take their share for any other purpose. Now let them go unitedly to the Provincial and Imperial Parliaments, and say, "Give us leave to surrender our part of the reserves for educational purposes: let our share go to this object; we are a magnanimous set of men—we do not want a sixpence of yours—we are willing to prove our liberality by surrendering what is ours for the public good—and we hope that the Churches of England and Scotland will some day do the same." Now what is there to prevent such a course as this? It is quite open to you—we cannot object to it—and by pursuing it you will show your sincerity in this matter.

Rev. Dr. BURNS—We are all willing.

Rev. F. EVANS.—Well, it is a bargain: do as you please with your share of the reserves, and get hold of the rest if you can. But, forsooth, the reserves have exercised "a blighting influence" over the churches! I can only say that there has been no blighting influence over the Church of England, in connection with the reserves, and I understand that the case is the same with regard to the Church of Scotland. The Church of England has been doing her work. We all admit the weakness of human agencies, and that as individuals we discharge our functions and duties with very great imperfection. I believe that we are sincere in the acknowledgment of this, and I am sure that other gentlemen feel the same. We would all say, "Enter not into judgment with us." Reference has been made by Mr. Ryerson to the state of the Church of England in 1837, but his statements on that head were entirely beside the question. Up to that period we had had nothing to do with the reserves. He says there were very few clergymen then. However that may have been, I am happy to state that there are now a great many more. In 1837, we numbered about 40 clergymen. We now number 150. In the Gore and Niagara districts, the number have been trebled, and in other districts the proportionate increase has been still greater. There are now, as I have said, 150 clergymen in the 22 districts. These facts are pretty plain proofs that the Church of England has not experienced very severely the blighting influences about which so much has been said. On the contrary, we have felt benefited by what we receive from the reserves, and from the Gospel Propagation Society; and we desire, sincerely and conscientiously to devote our energies to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the land. This is not only our desire, but the desire of the Church generally. Dissenting gentlemen ought to ask themselves a question. They say they feel the blighting influences that have been spoken of; but are they quite sure that we are to blame? May not they be to blame? Is the rector of Woodstock to blame, because persons pulled down his fences, and

destroyed his crop of oats? Let our friends consider this question, and answer it. We know that a spirit prevails in our corrupt hearts, which leads us to be dissatisfied with the apparent prosperity of others. We must not forget that there are such sins as envy, hatred, and uncharitableness. I do not presume to bring any charge of this kind against others; but I do say, let our friends, and let us, look at home, and try to do our duty, without watching others. Let us see if we cannot contrive to be zealous, devoted, faithful ministers of the gospel of Christ, notwithstanding this alleged "mighty incubus," and notwithstanding the fact that some of us do receive aid from the clergy reserves. Much has been said respecting the cordiality which exists amongst different denominations in the United States. Now I know that there is a little of the spirit of rivalry in that country. I know that even there, there are some desperately high churchmen, who are inclined to look down upon men of other denominations in a way which I for one am not disposed to do. But this is foreign to the question. It was asserted here to-day that the endowment of Trinity Church, New York, is worth all the clergy reserves, yet so far as I know, it has proved no source of contention among the various religious sects, and has diffused no blighting influences over the episcopal church itself. It has not impeded missionary enterprise, nor has it impeded or injured the general good of the United States, or of the State of New York. On the contrary, the corporation of Trinity Church, New York, is obliged to limit its wealth within a certain amount: they must not have an income beyond certain defined limits; and the consequence is, that they are perpetually doing acts of the greatest liberality, benevolence, and piety. They apply a large surplus for the dissemination of the gospel in various parts of the State, and I am told that they have three or four missionaries in Michigan. I may here state, perhaps, what was recently remarked to one of my reverend brethren by a gentleman who was an advocate of what is called annexation—though I hope and believe that that fever has now subsided. "Sir," said the gentleman I speak of, to my reverend brother, "you are standing in your own light when you discountenance annexation: you should encourage it, for if it were brought about, your endowments would be secured to your church forever." There can be no doubt, indeed, that in the United States, the course of legislation in regard to endowments is directly opposite to that which these gentlemen propose to enforce here. In the state of Vermont, an endowment granted to the Gospel Propagation Society was taken possession of by the state at the revolution, and was for many years supposed to be lost but the Gospel Propagation Society transferred the right to the Episcopal Church of Vermont, whose authorities appealed to the Supreme Court; and the consequence was that they got back an equivalent, which is now rapidly improving in value, and will shortly constitute a valuable endowment of the Episcopal Church of Vermont. The same took place in Maryland. The endowments of the Church of England in that State were confiscated at the revolution, but were afterwards sued for in the Supreme Court, and recovered. These statements are substantially correct, although for their perfect accuracy I cannot vouch. It is evident, then, that these much talked of "blighting influences" are not inherent in the system of endowments. They have no necessary relation to the question, and are coupled with it merely to suit the pur-

poses of the adversaries of the Clergy Reserves. With respect to the injury which is alleged has been sustained in this province in consequence of the endowment of the Clergy Reserves, I shall merely remark, that some years ago, when the lands of the province were considered to be of exceedingly little value, they were granted in immense quantities to almost everybody that asked for them. I was offered 1,200 acres of land when I first came, as a private grant from the crown—I thought they were of little value and would not have them, but I have since repented of my folly. At that time, I repeat, grants of public land were made to almost everybody who sought them, and if the reserves had not been set apart as they were, it is probable that the whole would have in this way fallen into private hands. Many of our most wealthy and respectable settlers, both churchmen and dissenters—conservatives and reformers—can bear testimony to the advantages which the system of reserves have conferred upon the community. Numbers of settlers in the Talbot district are now living in the enjoyment of farms which they purchased at \$2 or \$3 an acre, which are now worth \$40, but of which they never could have availed themselves, if those lands had not been reserved. I say, then, that, in many senses, and in many points of view, the country has been greatly benefitted by the existence of these reserves. [Time expired.]

Rev. Dr. BURNS here intimated that his engagements compelled him to retire, which he did after an expression of good feeling towards all parties.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—I regret that Dr. Burns has withdrawn for I find on my notes an allusion to the Free Church, made by Mr. Roaf. If I do not entirely misunderstand the principle of the Free Church, they maintain the right of the church to receive assistance from the state, and they also maintain the duty of the state to support the church. I know that Dr. Chalmers did this, and I know that his views on this subject were shared by many of those eminent men who withdrew from the Church of Scotland on the question of patronage. Mr. Roaf has said that we ought not, at this day, to ask what the voluntary principle is. We do not want to know for ourselves, but we want to know what gentlemen on the other side mean by it. I asked yesterday whether they mean what Dr. Chalmers called free trade in religion, or the bounty system, as he calls voluntaryism when properly interpreted. If the gentlemen mean free trade in religion, I would just read them a few words from the writings of Dr. Chalmers.

Rev. J. ROAF.—None of us holds such a principle.

Rev. W. ORMSTON.—In one sense we do, but not in the sense which Mr. Cronyn attaches to it.

Rev. B. CRONYN.—Well, I will read the extract at all events, Dr. Chalmers said—

'This is the good of an establishment. The people, instead of being left to go in quest of religious instruction, have by its means the instruction obtruded upon them. Generally speaking, they have not so much of desire or demand for the article, as that they shall themselves originate a movement towards it, and far less travel the whole distance, and make all the sacrifices necessary to obtain it. In the vast majority of instances, would neither the requisite trouble be taken, nor the requisite

expense be incurred. They have not enough of native appetite to create an effective demand for the food; and unlike to the corporal, the want of this food, instead of whetting the spiritual appetite, would only dull and deaden it the more. We have, therefore, no doubt, that, on the event of our establishment being swept away, and a mere system of free trade being substituted in its place. The moral effect would be tremendous. That which gave activity and healthful impulse to the commerce of our land, would be of withering effect upon its christianity. Let the machinery, if needful be acutated by the force and the fire of another principle—let all its rust and other unhingements be done away—let it be provided with more efficient workmen—and everything be done, so that it perform its evolutions more sweetly and yet more powerfully than before. But let it not be taken down. It never will be replaced by the spontaneous act, or kept in operation by the spontaneous habit, of the people. It may be better wrought at one time, and worse at another; but, even with all its corruptions, our establishment is a stay and a safeguard; and a helpless and headlong degeneracy, would ensue from the demolition of it.”

I think I may put Dr. Chalmers against the gentlemen who have gone before, and who discover such wonderful evils in establishments, and even in endowments. Dr. Chalmers was a clear-sighted man—as clear-sighted as they are; his mind could grasp everything as well as theirs. What I have read was not the production of his early days, but it was the matured and deliberate opinion at which he arrived after long years of experience in the church. I will read another short passage from the same writer, in his work on Political Economy.

“If the ecclesiastical establishments of our land shall be of the number which are destined to fall, and that because the temporalities which belong to them have been pronounced, by the oracles of our day, as an oppression and a burden on the general population, then instead of truth being their judge or their executioners, they shall have fallen at the hand of cunning and deceitful witnesses; They shall have perished in the midst of strong delusion, at the mandate and by the authority of a lie. Never, without the peculiar facilities and resources of such an institution, will there be a full supply of christian instruction in the land. A practical heathenism will spread itself over the rural provinces, and will deepen and accumulate more and more in our cities. Whatever the coming changes in the state of our society may be, there is none that would more fatally speed the disorganization and downfall of this great kingdom, than if the hand of violence was put forth on the rights and revenues of the Church of England. Even with the present distribution of the wealth, it will be found that the income of her higher as well as her humbler clergy has been vastly over-rated.”

It is a common trick to overstate the incomes of our clergy. Four millions have been spoken of, as received by the Church of England. We know from the best authority that no such amount is enjoyed. With all its riches, the average income of the Clergy in England is by no means large; it is very moderate indeed. Dr. Chalmers added—

“We cannot imagine a policy more ruinous than that which would impair the maintenance of a church that has long been illustrious for its

learning, and that promises now to be the dispenser of greater blessings to the people than at any former period of its history, by the undoubted increase of its virtue and piety."

Such is the testimony—such was the matured opinion—of the great Chalmers, writing it not for his own church—not for his own favorite—but for the Church of England; and I think that we may take sides with him. We may take side with those who have stood by him, and maintain it, without fear of any selfish or impure motives which may be attributed to us. We may stand by those men who have shown that when principle called them, they were able and willing to give up all endowments, in order that they might stand upon principle. This practice has existed in our own church, too. Our clergy have ever consistently maintained the endowments of the church, but when principle called for a sacrifice, they have been found ready to go to the stake. Cranmer was the main instrument of reformation in our church and he suffered at the stake. The very men who maintained endowments at the time when the liberties of church were invaded, and the interests of religion prevailed—I speak of the time of James—became non-jurors; and the Archbishop of Canterbury, with seven bishops, and a vast number of the clergy resigned their benefices, and retired into poverty. Let principle be at stake, and we of the Church of England will take our stand by principle; we will nail our colour to the mast; and we will prove that when principle and duty call, we will obey at any sacrifice and at any peril. I believe it is our solemn duty to stand by principle in this instance, to maintain those endowments with which, by the providence of God, our church is blessed, and to resist any efforts that may be made to deprive ourselves and posterity of them. I cannot reconcile to my conscience what we have heard from one gentleman, to whom land was offered for the endowment of his church. His church is not too rich—he does not say that it is; but he has private means, which enable him to do without endowments. But the man who comes after him may not have private means, and I say, therefore, that it was his duty to have availed himself of the offer which was made to him. He might have preached Christ crucified as faithfully as before; while his successor—who may have no private means—would have been placed by the endowment in a position of great usefulness—untrammelled by want and free from that dependence which the voluntary system must bring on those who adhere to it.

The discussion having now closed, the Chairman and Assessors left their seats, and Mr. Ford, Warden of the town, was called upon to assume the chair.

Rev. F. EVANS moved that the thanks of the meeting be tendered to Mr. Powell, and the two gentlemen who had assisted him, for the impartial and effective manner in which they had discharged the arduous duties they had devolved upon them during the two days proceedings.

Rev. J. GUNDRY seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The Doxology was sang, the benediction having been pronounced by Mr. Evans, the proceedings terminated.