



A

**LETTER**

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

**THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL, K. G.**

FIRST LORD COMMISSIONER OF THE TREASURY.

RELATIVE TO

THE RIGHTS OF THE

*CHURCH OF SCOTLAND*

IN

**BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.**

FROM

**A PROTESTANT OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND**

**KINGSTON, U. C.**

1826.



A LETTER

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

*THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL, K. G.*

*&c. &c. &c.*

---

MY LORD,

The rights of the Church of Scotland, in the British Provinces of North America, are of such importance to a large proportion of His Majesty's loyal subjects, have been so long neglected, and are now so strongly opposed by the Clergy of the Church of England, that I trust your Lordship will allow me to submit, for the serious consideration of your Lordship, and of His Majesty's Government, a statement of the reasons on which the claim to these rights is founded.

By the 31st of his late Majesty, the seventh part of Canada is reserved for the support and maintenance of a Protestant Clergy; and the Clergy of the Church of England have claimed, and obtained, the management, and whole profits, of this magnificent appropriation.

They style themselves "The Protestant Clergy," as if they were the only Protestant Clergy;—their Church "The Established Church of the Mother Country," as if it were the only Established Church of the Mother Country; and they class with Protestant Dissenters their Brethren of the Church of Scotland.

These positions are not supported by facts and fair induction, but by colours of reasoning, adduced with boldness and art.

The term "Protestant" was first applied to Christians in the beginning of the 16th Century ; and the Protestant Church contains every denomination of Christians who protest against Popery. It is one of the three Professions into which Christianity is now divided. The others are the Greek Church, and the Church of Rome.

In Robertson's History of Charles the Fifth, the following account is given of the original application of the term "*Protestant*" to Christians.

"At the Diet of Spires on the 15th Day of March, 1529, a Decree was made prohibiting any innovation in Religion, and particularly from abolishing the Mass.

"The ELECTOR OF SAXONY,  
,, LANDGRAVE OF HESSE,  
,, DUKES OF LUNENBURGH,  
,, PRINCE OF ANHALT, and  
,, DEPUTIES OF 14 IMPERIAL CITIES,

entered a solemn protest against this Decree as unjust and impious. On that account they were distinguished by the name of "Protestants," an appellation which hath since become better known, and more honorable by its being applied indiscriminately to all the Sects, of whatever denomination, which have revolted from the Roman Church."

With this meaning the term "Protestant" is uniformly applied, not only by Historians, but by British Legislatures in their Acts of Parliament, as will appear from the following extracts, in which are also clearly shewn the respective and equal rights of the Scots and English Churches.

In the Act for securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government of Scotland, (and which is a fundamental article of the Union, and inserted in that Act,) the Religion of the Church of

Scotland is uniformly called “the Protestant Religion.”

‘ And it being reasonable and necessary that the true *Protestant Religion*, as presently professed within this Kingdom, with the worship, discipline, and government, of this Church, should be effectually and unalterably secured: therefore, her Majesty, with advice and consent of the said Estates of Parliament, doth hereby establish and confirm the said true *Protestant Religion*, and the worship, discipline, and government, of this Church, to continue without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations; and more especially her Majesty, with advice and consent aforesaid, ratifies, approves, and for ever confirms, the fifth Act of the first Parliament of King William and Queen Mary, intituled, Act ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling *Presbyterian Church Government*; with all other Acts of Parliament relating thereto, in prosecution of the declaration of the Estates of this Kingdom, containing the claim of right, bearing date the eleventh of April, one thousand six hundred and eighty-nine: And her Majesty, with advice and consent aforesaid, expressly provides and declares, that the foresaid true *Protestant Religion*, contained in the above-mentioned Confession of Faith, with the form and purity of worship presently in use within this Church, and its *Presbyterian Church Government and Discipline*, (that is to say,) the government of the Church by *Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, and General Assemblies*, all established by the foresaid Acts of Parliament, pursuant to the claim of right shall remain and continue unalterable, and that the said *Presbyterian Government* shall be the only government of the Church within the Kingdom of Scotland.’

‘ And lastly, that after the decease of her present Majesty, (whom God long preserve,) the Sove-

‘ reign succeeding to her in the Royal Government  
 ‘ of the Kingdom of Great Britain, shall in all time  
 ‘ coming at his or her accession to the Crown, swear  
 ‘ and subscribe that they shall inviolably maintain  
 ‘ and preserve the foresaid settlement of *the true*  
 ‘ *Protestant Religion* with the government, wor-  
 ‘ ship, discipline, right, and privileges, of this Church,  
 ‘ as above established by the Laws of this Kingdom,  
 ‘ in prosecution of the claim of right.’—*Act of Union,*  
*Art. 25. ch. 2.*

In the Act passed by the English Parliament for securing the Church of England, the expression “*true Protestant Religion professed and established by Law in the Church of England,*” occurs once; and the expression “Church of England,” occurs five times. In both Acts the term “Protestant” is applied to the *Religion*, not to the *Church Government*. The expression Protestant Church does not occur in either Act of security, nor in the Act of Union; nor could occur, for *both Churches are Protestant*, both *Religions are Protestant*. But their forms of Church Government differ widely. The one is Presbyterian; the other Episcopal. Both are established in Great Britain; both are established Religions of the Mother Country; the one, of Scotland; the other, of England.

Having shewn the meaning of the term Protestant, and proved that, in the phraseology of British Acts of Parliament, the Clergy of the Religion established in Scotland are as truly *Protestant Clergy*, as the Clergy of the Religion established in England, I shall proceed to examine the authority by which the Clergy of the Religion established in England claim the whole of the profits accruing from the Clergy Reserves in this Country.

They found their claim on the Provisions of the Quebec Act, the 31st of his late Majesty.

I shall prove that the Quebec Act does not authorize the Clergy of the Religion established in Eng-

land to engross the whole profits of the Clergy Reserves ;—that the Clergy of the Religion established in Scotland have an equally good claim to part of that munificent appropriation ; and that depriving them of that right, privilege, and advantage, is an infraction of the articles of the Act of Union of Scotland and England.

The clauses of the 31st of his late Majesty, which relate to the Clergy, are in number eight, viz—the 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, 41st, and 42d.

Clause 35th recites His Majesty's instructions to Sir Guy Carleton, Sir Frederick Haldeman, and Lord Dorchester, secures to the Clergy of the Church of Rome their accustomed dues and rights from those professing the Roman Catholic Religion ; and appropriates the tythes paid by Protestants to the support of a *Protestant Clergy*.

In this clause the expression "*Protestant Religion*" occurs once ; the expression " Protestant Clergy" twice ; but the expression " Clergy of the Church of England," or " of the Church of Scotland," or " of the Established Church," of either Kingdom, or of Great Britain, or of the Mother Country, does not occur.

Therefore, on this clause, the Clergy of the Religion established in England cannot build their claim to an exclusive provision for themselves, nor to any provision to which the Clergy of the Religion established in Scotland have not an equally valid claim.

Clause 36th recites His Majesty's Message to Parliament, and enacts—That His Majesty may authorize the Governor to make allotments of Lands for the support of a *Protestant Clergy* in each Province, and that the Land so allotted and appropriated shall be equal in value to the seventh part of the Land granted.

In this clause the expression " for the support and maintenance of a *Protestant Clergy*," occurs three



times ; but the expressions " Clergy of the Church of England," or " of the Church of Scotland," or " of the Established Church," of either Kingdom, or of Great Britain, or of the Mother Country, does not occur. And, therefore, the Clergy of the Church of England cannot build their exclusive claim to the Clergy Reserves on this clause of the Quebec Act, nor to any part of the Reserves in preference to their Brethren, the Clergy of the Religion established in Scotland.

Article 37th being brief, I shall quote it in the words of the Act.

" And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That all and every the rents, profits, or emoluments, which may at any time arise from such Lands so appropriated as aforesaid, shall be applicable solely to the *maintenance and support of a Protestant Clergy*, within the Province in which the same shall be situated, and to no other use or purpose whatever."

Surely it is impossible to found on this clause any claim in favour of the Religion established in England, to the exclusion of their Brethren of the Religion established in Scotland.

Clause 36th reserves a seventh part of the land in Canada for the support and maintenance of a Protestant Clergy. Clause 37th appropriates the profits arising from the Land so reserved to the *sole* purpose of maintaining and *supporting a Protestant Clergy*. No preference is given in either clause to the Church of England ; no exclusion is mentioned of the Church of Scotland. Neither are named ; yet by inference, both must be intended, for they are both supported by Government in Great Britain, and they are the only Sects of the Protestant Religion supported there by Government.

Methodists and Independents are Protestants : but they are not supported by the Government of

Great Britain, and therefore cannot claim on the same grounds as the Clergy of the Church of Scotland; or of the Church of England. But, although, it is evident that the provisions of clauses 36, and 37, give no exclusive claim to the Clergy of either of the Established Churches of the Mother Country, yet it may not be without use to refer to the debates in the House of Commons, touching the part of the Act relative to the Clergy, as giving some assistance in explaining the intention of Parliament.

*House of Commons, Friday, 8th April, 1791.—*

“Mr. Fox said, by the Protestant Clergy he supposed to be understood not only the Clergy of the Church of England, but all descriptions of Protestants. He totally disapproved of the clause which enacts, “That whenever the King shall make grants of Lands, one-seventh part of those Lands shall be appropriated to the Protestant Clergy.” He had two objections to these regulations, both of them in his opinion of great weight. In all grants of Land made in that Country to Catholics, and a majority of the inhabitants were of that persuasion, one-seventh part of those grants was to be appropriated to the Protestant Clergy, although they might not have any cure of souls, or any congregations to instruct. One-tenth part of the produce of this country was assigned, and this, perhaps, was more than one-seventh of the Land. He wished to deprive no Clergyman of his just rights; but in settling a new constitution, and laying down new principles, to enact that the Clergy should have one-seventh of all grants, he must confess appeared to him an absurd doctrine. If they were all of the Church of England, this would not reconcile him to the measure. It might be asked, why should they not have as much as the Church of England? In this country we had that which some condemned, and others praised: we had a kind of shew, but still a proportion must be observed. The

greatest part of these Protestant Clergy were not of the Church of England; they were chiefly what are called Protestant dissenters in this country, consequently the Kirk is included in the intention of the provision. They were, therefore, going to give to dissenters one-seventh part of all the Lands in the Province. Was this the proportion, either in Scotland, or in any other country, where those religious principles were professed? It was not the proportion either in Scotland, or in any other ecclesiastical country in Europe. We were, therefore, by this Bill, making a sort of provision for the Protestant Clergy of Canada, which was unknown to them in every part of Europe; a provision, in his apprehension, which would rather tend to corrupt than to benefit them. The regulations were likewise in part obscure; because, after it had stated that one-seventh of the Land should always be set aside for the Protestant Clergy, it did not state how it should be applied."

In regard to the term "Dissenters," applied by Mr. Fox to the Clergy of the Church of Scotland resident in England, it is to be observed that in the same sense precisely the Clergy of the Church of England are dissenters in Scotland.

*House of Commons, 12th May, 1791.*—"Mr. Fox still censured the whole plan, and reminded the House that Mr. Dundas had two evenings since boasted that the security of the Kirk of Scotland was its being erected on the rock of poverty: according to the professions of the Bill, Mr. Fox said, even the Clergy of the Kirk would have larger incomes in Canada than in Scotland.

"Mr. Dundas gave an historical detail of the mode of proceeding, by which the Clergy in Scotland were supported. The fund out of which they were paid, he said, was created in the last century; when the whole tithes of Scotland, as they then stood, were sold, and the money they produced vested for

the purpose. There were, he said, about 900 parishes in Scotland, and their Clergy had, he believed, one with another, between eighty and ninety pounds a year; and when their income, from circumstances, was too small, it was made up to a certain amount to such individuals whose pittance was too scanty, by the Assembly of the Kirk, who managed the fund. He lamented, that in consequence of an error in the original proceeding, viz: the vesting the sum which the sale of the tithes had produced in a fund, instead of laying it out in the purchase of Land, and dividing that Land so purchased into allotments for the Clergy, the latter was not sufficiently provided for. Had the plan he had stated been adopted, the land would have risen in value in proportion to its improvement as other Land had, and the incumbents would consequently have had the benefit of its increased production."

From these remarks by Mr. Dundas, it is probable that clauses 36, and 37, were written by himself, and it is not supposable that he could neglect the Clergy of his native Country.

But it is clear that the intention of clauses 35, 36, and 37, is to provide for a Protestant Clergy, using the term "*Protestant*," in a general sense, to include the Church of Scotland, as well as the Church of England; for clause 38th CHANGES *the general term Protestant, for the particular expression Church of England*, and enacts that His Majesty may authorize the Governor, with the advice of the Executive Council, to erect Parsonages, or Rectories, according to the Church of England, and endow them as he shall judge to be expedient, under the then existing circumstances of the Townships or Parishes. He is empowered to endow the Rector of a Parish with so much or such part of the Clergy Reserves as may be expedient, by an instrument under the great Seal of each Province.

This clause has not been acted upon in Upper

Canada. Portions of the Clergy Reserves are not set apart to particular Rectories. The Episcopal Clergymen are not paid in the way provided for by this clause of the Act. They are paid partly by the Society for the propagation of Religion, in foreign parts, and partly from the profits of the whole of the Clergy Reserves, given to the Episcopal Clergy—not by the Quebec Act, but in contradiction to its spirit and letter, and in direct contradiction of the articles of the Union of Scotland and England.

The 39th clause enables the Governor to present Ministers of the Church of England to the Parsonages or Rectories; and this clause has not been acted on. Those who have assumed the title of Rector in this Country, have neither been *presented, instituted, nor inducted*, as provided by this Act. They are Episcopal Missionaries, and *only* Episcopal Missionaries.

The 40th clause provides that the presentation to Parsonages, or Rectories, and the enjoyment of them shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Nova Scotia, or other person or persons, appointed by His Majesty, according to the laws and canons of the Church of England.

These three are the only clauses in the Quebec Act that make particular provision for Episcopacy. There is not in these clauses any enactment excluding the Clergy of the Church of Scotland from part of the profits of the Clergy Reserves.

Clauses 35, 36, and 37, provide generally for the Protestant Religion, in contradistinction to the Religion of the Church of Rome, leaving the particular mode of apportionment to the Colonial Legislature, and British Legislature, or to the British Legislature alone.

Clauses 38th, 39th, 40th, enable the Governor, and Executive Council, without any reference to either Legislature, to erect and endow Parsonages of the Church of England; and in so far as the endowment

of Parsonages is provided for, that provision has not been acted upon. Each Minister has not received his particular allotment of Land.

Had the Act meant the establishment of the church of England exclusively in Canada, the expression "church of England" would have been used in clauses 35, 36, and 37, and not the general expression, "Protestant Religion." But these clauses provide generally for "the *Protestant Religion*," leaving the details to future enactments.

Clauses 38, 39, and 40, relate particularly to the Church of England, and particularise it by the designation of "Church of England." This change of expression in the clauses shew that the framers of the Act knew the meaning of the language they used, and did not apply the term "Protestant" as synonymous with the term "Episcopal."

Clause 41st shows this contradistinction in the clearest light. It *recapitulates the contradistinction* between the *general* and *particular provision*, in language more clearly expressed, and not admitting a double meaning.

Protestant Clergy generally	{	<p>XLI. <i>Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the several provisions hereinbefore contained, respecting the allotment and appropriation of Lands for the support of a Protestant Clergy within the said Provinces, and also respecting the constituting, erecting, and endowing, Parsonages, or Rectories, within the said Provinces, and also respecting the presentation of Incumbents or Ministers to the same, and also respecting the manner in which such Incumbents or Ministers shall hold and enjoy the same, shall be subject to be varied or repealed by any express provisions for that purpose, contained in any Act or Acts which may be passed by the Legislative</i></p>
Episcopal Clergy, particular- ly.	{	<p>The Leg- islature of Canada <i>may</i> alter this allot- ment of land, and grant the whole of it to the</p>

Church of  
Scotland. } Council and Assembly of the said Provinces respectively, and assented to by His Majesty, His Heirs, or Successors, under the restriction hereinafter provided

The 42d clause in the same clear manner contradistinguishes the *Protestant Religion* from the particular sect of Protestants called Episcopalians, and evidently contemplates making Legislative provision in Canada for more than that one sect. Any Act for that purpose must be laid before both Houses of the British Parliament, and if within thirty days either House shall address His Majesty, His Heirs, or Successors, to withhold his or their assent from such Act or Acts, it shall not be lawful for His Majesty, His Heirs or Successors, to signify his or their assent to such Act or Acts.

I have now remarked upon all the clauses of the Quebec Act that relate to the Clergy, and have proved that the Clergy of the Church of England are not exclusively entitled by that Act to the whole profits arising from the Clergy Reserves. That was the position I undertook to prove. If the proof have proceeded farther, and shewn that they are not established in this Country according to the letter of the Quebec Act, each Rectory not having assigned to it a particular portion of land, and are therefore not an Established Clergy in Canada, much less the Established Clergy, to the exclusion of the Church of Scotland, they must blame themselves for exciting this discussion by their greediness and intolerance.

I shall now attempt to shew that the Clergy of the Religion established in Scotland have a legal birthright claim to part of the profits arising from the Clergy Reserves in Canada. The proof of this position will not detain me long. It only requires the quotation of two articles of the Act of Union of England and Scotland.

“ARTICLE 1.—That the two Kingdoms of Eng-

“ land and Scotland shall upon the first day of May,  
“ which shall be in the Year one thousand seven  
“ hundred and seven, and for ever after, be united  
“ into one Kingdom by the Name of Great-Britain ;  
“ and that the Ensigns Armorial of the said United  
“ Kingdom be such as her Majesty shall appoint,  
“ and the Crosses of St. George and St. Andrew be  
“ conjoined in such manner as Her Majesty shall  
“ think fit, and used in all Flags, Banners, Stan-  
“ dards, and Ensigns, both at sea and land.”

“ ARTICLE 4.—That all the subjects of the United  
“ Kingdom of Great Britain shall, from and after  
“ the Union, have full freedom and intercourse  
“ of trade and navigation to and from any port or  
“ place within the said United Kingdom, and the do-  
“ minions and plantations thereunto belonging ; and  
“ that there be a communication of all other rights,  
“ privileges, and advantages, which do or may be-  
“ long to the subjects of either Kingdom ; except  
“ where it is otherwise expressly agreed in these  
“ Articles.”

Canada was conquered in 1759, not by England,  
not by Scotland, but by Great Britain ; and there-  
fore, any right, privilege and advantage, enjoyed by  
the Clergy of the Religion established in England  
ought equally to belong to the Clergy of the Religi-  
on established in Scotland, as clearly as that the  
mariners of Greenock and Glasgow have an equal  
right with the mariners of Liverpool and London, to  
navigate in the St. Lawrence and Ontario.

Why our Legislators born north of the Tweed,  
and especially why the Clergy of the Church of  
Scotland, have hitherto silently allowed the rights,  
privileges, and advantages, of their Church, secu-  
red to them as a birth-right by the valour and virtue  
of their fathers, to be taken from them in the North  
American Colonies, by art and influence, is not ea-  
sily conjectured.

Are my countrymen unacquainted that there are



rights, privileges, and advantages, which their National Church ought to possess in the British Provinces of North America? Let them read and understand the Quebec Act and the Act of Union of Scotland and England.

Are my countrymen unacquainted with the value of these rights, privileges, and advantages, to themselves and the nation? A portion of the profits arising from the allotment of the seventh part of the Lands in Canada would plant Ministers and Schoolmasters of the Church of Scotland in every township in these Colonies, and a University in Kingston or Montréal. And what have these effected in Scotland since 1688? They have changed the Scottish peasantry from being poor, ignorant, idle and wicked, to be comfortable, enlightended, industrious, and moral; and would to certainty produce the same effects in Canada.

Episcopacy *alone* can never produce these results. For the genius of Episcopacy is in opposition to the genius of the people. However Episcopalians, occupying the principal places of trust, power, and emolument under Government, may send home inflated statements, and by address and influence deceive the British Government and people, truth will at last prevail.

Are my countrymen unacquainted with the numbers attached to the Church of Scotland who reside in British North America, and consequently with the expediency of their obtaining from His Majesty's Government the rights of their National Church? Surely it is obvious that while two families have equal rights to a patrimony, the decision which gives the whole to one of them cannot be just. And the injustice will be more remarkable if the favoured family is the least numerous. Yet this decision, *mutatis mutandis*, has, in effect, been given and acted upon in these Provinces. The members of the Church of England, the least numerous family, re-

ceive, in the Canadas alone not less than £12,000 Sterling Annually, from the Parent State ; while the Members of the Church of Scotland, the most numerous family, with two inconsiderable exceptions, receive nothing. And as part of the funds for paying the Clergy of the Church of England in this country is taken from the Revenue of the British Empire, the Members of the Church of Scotland pay not only the whole stipend given to their own Clergy, but part of the stipend given to the Clergy of the Church of England. Thus they are first deprived of their birth-right patrimony, then taxed from their hard earnings to support the rich family by whom they have been deprived of it.

That the Members of the Church of Scotland, resident in the North American Provinces, are more numerous than the Members of the Church of England, is generally admitted ; but the verified numbers of each I have not been able to procure. The following statement, relative to Upper Canada, I have good authority for believing to be correct.

The number of Communicants of the Church of *Scotland* in *KINGSTON* last year was 114, and in one congregation of the Church of Scotland in *Glengary* was 500.

In *Bellville*, the professors of the Church of England, and who attend Church two or three times a year, are about 50, in a population of 600 ; and the communicants last year were 16. On Good Friday the Clergyman preached to a congregation of nine, one of whom came to hire a pew, and three were Presbyterians.

In *Bath* the number that attends the Church of England fluctuates from 30 to 60. Of these many are not Episcopalians. And last year only 15 persons partook of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

It is stated that Methodism prevails among the people ; and that Episcopacy, which made no progress when not opposed, is now unable to withstand

the assaults of Sectarians, supported by the favor of the people.

In many of the Districts of Upper Canada, the professors of the Church of England are believed not to constitute one-twelfth of the population. In them all, the proportion in favor of the Church of Scotland is believed to be much greater ; and might be increased by an active and pious Ministry, making proselytes of neutrals,—fixing those who waver between Episcopacy and fanaticism, and recalling to the Church of their forefathers many who have joined Sectarians, because Ministers of the Church of Scotland were not placed in their vicinity.

For these reasons I hope it will appear obvious that it is not only justice, but the soundest policy, that Government should afford the Members of the Church of Scotland in these Provinces, the benefits of a religious instruction, according to the rites of their national Church—and that it is neither justice nor sound policy that Government should afford exclusive support to Episcopacy in these Provinces.

Or, finally, are my countrymen unacquainted with the means they should employ for obtaining the rights of the Church of Scotland in British North America?

Two methods present themselves ; an application to the local Legislatures, or an application to the Imperial Government.

The first method appears liable to insuperable objections, at least in Upper Canada.

1.—Because the Legislature of Upper Canada either do not understand, or disregard, the rights of the Church of Scotland. They have enacted, for example, that a Clergyman of the Church of Scotland must appear before *six Canadian Magistrates*, and *pay 5s.* for an authority to celebrate Matrimony, and then only to certain of his own community, or congregation ; as if the regularly ordained Clergyman of our national Church required any authority from a local Legislature to celebrate Marriage in a

Colony conquered by Britain since the Union of Scotland and England.

2.—Because the Members of the Legislative Council all being Episcopalians, and a leading one among them a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church, who was formerly a Presbyterian, but now employs his influence and pen against the Church of his native Country, it is not probable that any enactment giving the Church of Scotland an equality with the Church of England would pass through their house. And such was the opinion entertained by the House of Assembly, when, in 1824, with a knowledge and liberality that does them honour, they laid the claims of the Church of Scotland at the foot of the Throne.

3.—Because the Legislatures of these Provinces have no power to abrogate the national rights of the Church of Scotland, but probably would assume it when legislating on the subject.

4.—Because it would be unworthy of the Church of Scotland that her rights should be declared and defined by any authority, except that of the Imperial Parliament.

It is, therefore, an application to the Imperial Government that must be made for an enactment of the Imperial Parliament, DECLARING the rights of the Church of Scotland in Canada. And to obtain such enactment through the influence of your Lordship, is the object of this Letter. And my hopes are sanguine that this object will be obtained while your Lordship is Prime Minister of Britain—not on account of the representations in this Letter, but of the strength of the claims, and on account of the talent and enlightened liberality which, at present, beyond all previous periods, characterise the measures of the British Government.

The claims of the Church of Scotland to the same encouragement as the Church of England in the British Provinces of North America, are founded on justice, and the Act of Union of Scotland and Eng-

land ; and your Lordship is not a Lauderdale, an Aberdeen, or a Perth, to propagate Episcopacy, by persecuting Presbyterians, nor to suffer an Arch Bishop Sharp to influence your Lordship's Counsels.

I have the honor to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's

Most Obedient,

Most humble Servant,

A PROTESTANT OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

*Kingston, Upper Canada, 1st June, 1826.*

