a voice or a vote on the occasion (*hear, hear*). Such treatment might do for young Turks, but not for the free-born sons of Albion. He therefore moved the first resolution—"That natural equality and common justice render it not only expedient, but indispensible, that schoolboys should enjoy the right of electing their own masters."

The Rep. of Harrow seconded the resolution. In his opinion they had borne their injuries till they could bear them no more. Owing to the supineness which accompanied the tyranny of their masters, vrey disgraceful scenes had recently taken place at the seminary which he patronised; and it was only by coming to the determination proposed by the honorable boy from Eton that they could prevent the recurrence of similar evils.

The Rep. of Rugby cordially agreed with what had fallen from the preceding speakers. The only flogging he would allow would not be such as was imposed by usurping ushers; but such as independent boys might inflict on one another.

The Rep. of King's College, Somerset House, observed, that though they had lately parted with their Head on the most friendly terms, and accepted another of acknowledged worth and ability, he was nevertheless inclined to go the entire animal embraced in the resolution and in the summons which had brought him thither. He deemed it consistent with the purest conservatism that no one should be instructed against his will, or in any manner inconsistent with his feelings of self-respect and discretion for self-government. All the world were now contending for the right of electing their rulers or teachers. In the state politic, universal suffrage was claimed; in the presbyterian church, parochial voting without external patronage; in Walbrook, open vestry; in the city of London, every resident scavenger; in Ireland, every bog-trotter; and so on throughout every social sphere; and were they alone, the rising boys of England, to be denied this privilege?—forbid it their spirit, forbid it their dignity (*great applause*).

The Rep. of London University entirely concurred with his honorable companion (if he would allow him to call him so) of King's College. Even the casual poor lads in workhouses rebelled against the cruel imposition of self-appointed or man-appointed taskmasters; and nothing could be more unbecoming the high station of schoolboys than to submit to that which workhouse children spurned (*cheers*).

The delegate from Hoxton, though a dissenter, and ready to dissent from almost every thing, could not conscientiously dissent from the important proceedings of this day (*hear*). He was all for Election; and considered the non-Elected to be the doomed outcasts of humanity, who ought neither to exercise power, nor even be allowed coal and candle.

The member for Winchester begged to direct the attention to a fact which had not been alluded to, but which he thought to be of vast weight in this discussion. He referred to an ancient custom, according to which on one day in the year the boys of most seminaries took the rule into their own hands, ejected the masters, and had glorious fun; and he appealed to all who had ever taken a share in these stirring proceedings, to declare if they were not among the most joyous days of their lives. The hour for breaking up of the full-grown confederacy which had so cruelly enchained them had now arrived, and he foresaw that these chains would be snapped for ever by an unanimous vote on this illustrious occasion (*great cheering*).

A Big Boy from the body of the hall wished to be informed if another meeting might not with propriety and effect be convened, at which the young ladies of the principal boarding schools in the vicinity of the metropolis should be invited to take part?

A Little Boy from St. Paul's School thought this unnecessary. It might provoke a collision between the upper and lower forms; and in his opinion it was enough that Young England should assert itself through the indomitable force of its male classes.

Many other orators addressed the chair, and touched upon sundry topics connected with the main question; but our report has extended to sufficient length to shew the *animus* of the whole,

The chairman, in conclusion, remarked, that it had been *figuratively* said "the schoolmaster was abroad;" but the gist of the present meeting would be to send him *literally* on his travels With the teachers of their own choice, and under their own influence and protection, they might go on easily and happily. Birches might be used where they were more wanted, in sweeping the mud-loaded streets of London; and canes might grace their hands as they walked about these cleansed, instead of being unnaturally applied to other purposes. On these points, as well as on the principal resolution, he trusted they would be unanimous.

All the resolutions being put were carried by acclamation; a committee of Eton, Hoxton, King's College, London University, Reading, and the Little Boy of St. Paul's, appointed to carry the same into effect.; and thanks having been given to the president *nemine contradicente*, and suitably acknowledged, the meeting broke up hastily, as many of the members were engaged to go to the pantomimes.

Punch.

A few evenings since, Punch was privately and confidentially informed by Sir George, that a dissolution of Council would shortly take place, and that among other things it would be highly expedient to start some clever and influential person in opposition to the present member for Auckland and St. Vincent. Punch, being desirous of supporting the Government like a loyal subject as he is, told His Excellency that he would turn the matter over in his mind and communicate with some of the leading men in those counties. The following elegant and interesting correspondence was the result:

No. 1.

PUNCH TO PADDY FLANNAGIN, ESQ., J.P., &c., &c. &c.

My Dear Sir—Our mutual friend, Sir George, has requested me to say, that it is quite impossible to allow the present Council to proceed to business with so bad a member in it as Lowe; and that consequently, early in August he will dissolve. Now, although there will be a vacancy among the nominees, which His Excellency would be most happy to fill with so desirable a person as yourself; yet, it would afford him much more pleasure to see you in as a representative; although, if you prefer it, the nomineeship is at your disposal. Under these circumstances, I trust, that unless like Cincinnatus of old, you prefer following the plough to engaging in the troublesome and thankless—though honorable task of making and mending the laws, you will lose no time in canvassing the Constituency in your district. To a person of your stamp, I have not the least doubt public duty will be considered of more consequence than private convenience, and as you are already no mean adept in the art of making and mending the breeches of the people, between which, and the making and mending of their laws there is much less difference than is generally supposed, I am satisfied, than on the Treasury benches, you will feel quite as much at home as ever you did while sitting cross-legged on your own shop-board. Let me know by return of Post, whether the Governor may count on you as a candidate or not.

Yours, truly,
PUNCH.

No. 2.

PADDY FLANNAGIN, ESQ., J.P. &c., &c., &c., TO PUNCH.

Arrah My dere Frind, you doant Say so. You doant Mane to inseeniate that its afther making a Nomeenee of myself, Sur George wud be—that is, if I doant cum in a Reprisintitiv. Betwixt ourselves Misthur Punch, I have iviry dispusishun to sarve Sur George, and would not have any objecshun to oppose Lowe, but ye percaive that to a man of my yeres, the throuble of a contist wud be very Grate, and if is Hexcillincy wud allow me to recommind a frind of mine as the reprisintitiv I wud take the nomeeneeship myself without any furthur bothur. Minshin this to Sur George, and by the same Tokin, ye can tell him, that since he Made me a Magisthrate I have made the Whol Disthrict of Broulee as quite as Mise. My rivirince to is Hexcillincy and Misthur Plunkitt, not forgetting the Honerabble Rogir Therry, Esq., and long life to Him and All is relashuns.

From yours, thruly,
PADDE FLANNAGIN.

P.S.—I did not remimber to say, that the gintleman I mane to recommind is my frind Misther Councillor Coyle. I inclose him a note, which ye will obleege me by dhropping in the Poast for him.

P. F.

No. 3.

[*Being the enclosure above referred to in the Postscript to No.* 2.]

PADDY FLANNAGIN, ESQUIRE. J.P., &c., &c., TO JOHN COYLE, ESQUIRE, CITY COUNCILLOR, &c., &c., &c.

My Dere Coil—This Cums to ye hopping to find Yes All in Good Helth, as it laves us at this prisint riting. There is No Nuse in this qarther just now, Excipt that yestherday morning I sintinced a fellow to be exposed Twenty Four hours in the Shtocks, for telling myself That I was not a Gintleman, and I orthured another out of the Disthrict, for spaking against Dan and the Resethent Judge of Fort Phillip. But what I want particularle to say to ye is this—that Misthur Punch has written to me to say that the Council is to be Dissolved, and to requist sum rite man like Myself, to place Myself in Nominashun for this Countee, or if I doant like that to Hoffer me a Nomineeship. I have axcepted the latthur, and have ritten to recommind yerself as the reprisintitiv. If ye are so Inclined, will you rite to Misthur Punch on the Subject.

Your's, thruly,
PADDE FLANNAGIN,
Justis of Pace,
An cethera.

No. 4.

JOHN COYLE, ESQ., CITY COUNCILLOR, &c., &c., &c., TO PUNCH.

My Dear Sir—My friend Flannagin, the Magistrate of Broulee, has intimated to me that Sir George Gipps is desirous that, as soon as a dissolution of Council takes place, I should start as a candidate for Auckland and St. Vincent, in opposition to Mr. Lowe. I beg, sir, that you will assure his Excellency that I will at once proceed to canvass, but on condition that his Excellency will first put me in the Commission of the Peace. It is not that I think the mere being a magistrate would in any way add to my respectability, but it would look as if the Government placed some confidence in me. Between ourselves, it was my intention to oppose Mr. Lowe the last time, but I thought it likely that Flannigan would have come into the field. As Flannagin, however, is going into the Council as a nominee, I can have now no objection to start, and perhaps you would oblige me by writing to his Excellency to say so—but don't forget the Commission of the Peace.

Yours truly,
JOHN COYLE,
City Councillor, &c., &c., &c.

No. 5.

PUNCH TO JOHN COYLE, ESQ., CITY COUNCILLOR, &c., &c., &c,

My Dear Coyle—I feel great pleasure in informing you that Sir George Gipps is very thankful to you, for the readiness you have evinced to assist him in his present troubles. I mentioned the matter of the Commission to him, and he told me that he should at once make you a Justice, but that he thought it would look better to wait until November next, when you will be elected Alderman; as, if he were to make you a magistrate now, other members of the City Council, equally eligible with yourself, might feel affronted.

Believe me to be,
Yours faithfully,
PUNCH.

No. 6.

JOHN SMITH TO PUNCH.

Sir—I have this instant been informed, that it is the intention of the Governor, at your instance, to make a fellow, named Flannagin, (who has crept, God knows how, into the Commission of the Peace), one of his nominees in the Legislative Council. The man was a tailor some years ago, in Sydney, and can scarcely write his own name; but that is not a matter of much moment to the public, as, at all events, his vote will be as sure, and his eloquence as forcible as that of the rest of his fellow-nominees, I have further been informed that one Coyle, a member of the City Council, intends, also at your instance, to start for Auckland and St. Vincent at the next general election, in opposition to Mr. Lowe. What your notions about the propriety of this step may be I do not know, nor do I care; but there is one piece of advice which I would request you to give your friend Coyle, and that is, before he ventures into the County of St. Vincent as a candidate, to stitch a bale of wool to the seat of his breeches, for most assuredly he will be kicked out of the district for his impertinence.

Yours, &c.,
JOHN SMITH.

EXTRACT.

Herr rev'rend Doctors of divinity,
Outpour their wrath *in Christian charity*—
Such long protracted, controversial scolding—
'Twixt Bishop B———n and *arch*-Bishop P———g.
Just view my grandmother, *the Herald's* pages,
Cramm'd with the dogmas of these rev'rend sages.
The public must digest surfeit polemic,
Which my old grandmother treats as endemic:
And mixes up a dose of complex scope,
To purge us from the thraldom of the Pope;
While pamphleteers burn with religious zeal—
And rant, and scribble for the public weal.
Thank heav'n, no more of ordeal do we boast,
A Papist, or a Protestant to roast—
Else in this acrid, sanctimonious ire
The germ is laid to kindle up a fire.
No, great and good men wisely have decreed,
That no one is to suffer for his creed.
Strange then, such cant cantancerous should be—
'Twixt rev'rend Tweedle dum and Tweedle-dee.

Original Correspondence.

EMANCIPATE THE CLERGY! EMANCIPATE THE PEOPLE!

[CONCLUDED.]

We have seen, in the two former articles on this subject, that the absolute and irresponsible authority which the Catholic and Anglo-Catholic Bishops of this Colony exercise over their respective bodies of clergy—these clergy being, at the same time, maintained from the public funds without our consent—is dangerous in the extreme to the civil and political liberty of the Colony—is altogether incompatible with public freedom. We have also seen that, in the case of the Anglo-Catholic Bishop, this authority is also dangerous in the extreme to our common Protestantism, as exhibited and taught in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; the religious system which Bishop Broughton and his clergy are endeavouring to palm upon this Colony being, in the opinion of the late Rev. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, (one of the greatest and best men the Church of England has produced during the present century,) nothing less than the rankest Popery in disguise!

The remedy we have suggested for these intolerable evils is a very simple but a very effectual one—it is to repeal the General Church Act of the Colony, to do away with the Parliamentary reservation of £30,000 per annum *for the support of religion*, as it is termed, but in more correct language, for the support and extension either of open or of disguised Popery, and to throw the Colonial clergy of all denominations on the Christian affections and sympathies of their people.

This change of system in regard to the mode of supporting the clergy, would lead, we have also seen, to a great constitutional change in the government of the colonial Episcopal Church—a change most desirable in itself on other grounds, but, in our opinion, not to be hoped for or expected in any other way. It would immediately secure to every congregation the right to elect its own pastor; it would also secure to every congregation the right to be represented by a lay-delegate chosen from amongst themselves, in the Bishop's court, to vote on all matters of Church government, on equal terms with the clergy, as is the case in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; and it would secure to the members of that court, clerical and layic combined, the right to choose their own Bishop, without asking either her Majesty's or the Governor's leave. No doubt a Bishop chosen in this way would have little chance of being nominated by the Crown, as a member of either Council, and thereby rendering such signal service as we have seen rendered by a certain Bishop to a *Tartar** Governor in passing his *New Squatting Regulations*, (for deriving his support, as he would in that case do, exclusively and directly from the people; a Bishop chosen by the people would scarcely venture on such pranks, even although admitted to the Executive Council) but we suspect the Colony could get on sufficiently well without clerical men in either Council, and to *stop the supplies* would be a most effectual means of arriving at such a consummation, whether desirable or not. But such a measure would be a death blow to Puseyism, or Protestant Popery; for, God be praised! although the Bishop and his clergy are well nigh rotten to the very core in that respect, the people are still sound and decidedly opposed to all their Anglo-Catholic and semi-Popish nonsense. Now, we are of opinion, that to obtain such freedom for the clergy and people of the Church of England in this Colony, as would thus be secured, and to raise up an effectual barrier against the progress and prevalence of Puseyism, would infinitely more than counterbalance any mere temporary inconvenience that might arise from throwing the clergy at once upon the people. For, let it be remembered that it is from the people in reality that the clergy get their salaries at present, although indirectly and *without their consent*, the government having nothing to give them, but what is the people's. It is a mere change of arrangement, in short, that we propose, for we have no wish that the clergy, as a body, should get less than they do get, but only that what they get they should get willingly, the people becoming their own paymasters for the future.

Apropos! as to the benefits likely to result from an infusion of lay agency into the government of the Colonial Episcopal Church, we shall quote one other passage from our old friend Dr. Arnold. It is as follows:—

"It seems to me that a great point might be gained by urging the restoration of the order of deacons, which has been long, *quoad* the reality, dead. In large towns many worthy men might be found able and willing to undertake the office out of mere love, if it were understood to be not necessarily a step to the Presbyterical order, nor at all incompatible with lay callings. You would get an immense gain by a great extension of the Church—by a softening down that pestilential distinction between clergy and laity, which is so closely linked with the Priestcraft system."—*Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*, vol II. 147.

Dr. Arnold, however, by no means stands alone in thus standing up for the necessity of lay representation in the Church of England, such as has been already attained, without being at all supposed to be "a step to the Presbyterical order," in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. The "only daily journal," alas! not "in these Colonies," but "in this Middle District" (for Mr. Fawkner, of Melbourne, has actually commenced publishing the *Port Phillip Patriot* daily) has recently presented us with a petition addressed by the laity of the Church of England, to the Archbishop of Canterbury on this very subject. It has been signed, among numerous others, by the following distinguished laymen, viz.:—The Duke of Sutherland, the Earl of Denbigh, the Earl of Gainsborough, Viscount Sandon, M.P., Viscount Morpeth, Lord Calthorpe, Lord Rayleigh, Lord Teignmouth, Lord Bloomfield, Lord Francis Egerton, M.P., Lord Henry Cholmondeley, Lord

* By the way, the modern and proper mode of writing this word is Tatar, and not Tartar. The Tatar people became known for the first time to the ancient Romans in the decline of their empire, a great part of which they overran and ruined; and to make them odious the Romans threw in the letter R into the name to associate them with the word *Tartarus*, their own word for the infernal regions. The famous Tatar chief, Attila, the Scourge of God, was a perfect Sir George Gipps to the poor Romans.

Ashley, M.P., Lord Robert Grosvenor, M.P., Lord Howard, M.P., Hon. W. Cowper, M.P., Hon. Mr. Ashley, Hon. F. Calthorpe, Hon. Colonel Upton, Hon. Joceline W. Percy, Hon. Captain Waldgrave, Sir Thomas Baring, Sir Harry Verney M.P., Sir John Kennaway, Sir W. R. Farquhar, Sir T. Lawley, Mr. J. C. Colquhoun, M.P., Mr. R. M. Milnes, M.P., &c. Those who desire to do so, may see the petition at length in "the only daily journal in the Sydney district," but the most prominent feature of it is the strong and decided opinion of the petitioners that *provision must be made for a more systematic employment of laymen in the exercise of functions which do not belong exclusively to the clergy.* These are almost the very words of Dr. Arnold, whom we are tempted to quote, to the same effect, once more.—

"It does seem to me that the reforms required in our Liturgy and service are so obvious, and so little affect the system itself, that their long omission is doubly blameable. But more remains behind, and of far greater difficulty, to make the Church at once popular and dignified—*to give the people their just share in its government, without introducing a democratical spirit*—to give the clergy a thorough sympathy with their flocks, without altogether lowering their rank and tone."—*Ibid*, II. 378.

Now Bishop Broughton and his clergy are not opposed to the idea of lay agency of a certain kind. Provided the laity will confine their service or agency to the mere collection of funds, and act merely as the Nethinims of the ancient Jewish temple service—*alias*, the porters, the hewers of wood, and the drawers of water to the priests and Levites—Bishop Broughton and his clergy will be graciously pleased to accept of as much lay agency as you please, and will even constitute such agents a Church of England Lay Association with Mr. Charles Cowper, M.C., *Chief* of the Nethinims, and Mr. Charles Lowe, Mr. Metcalfe, and Mr. Dillon, *Deputy* Chiefs of the Nethinims of Sydney, and Mr. Suttor, M.C., Chief of the Nethinims of Bathurst! But we trust the lay members of the Church of England in this Colony will have more spirit than to submit to such degradation; we trust they will tell Bishop Broughton and his clergy that until they are permitted to participate in the *government* of their church, like the laity of the primitive church, they will have nothing to do with it. Mr. Charles Cowper, and Mr. Suttor, who, as natives of the Colony, have been pretty well accustomed both to the yoke and the saddle in various ways, may doubtless permit the Bishop and his clergy to put bullock yokes upon *their* necks, and saddles upon their backs, to ride them to Rome if they please, and Mr. Charles Lowe, Mr. Metcalfe, and Mr. Dillon, the illustrious Nethinim triumvirate of Sydney, may be delighted to see "how well they go" in harness;" but the lay members of the Church of England throughout the Colony, if they tender either their civil or their religious liberty, and especially if they have any esteem and affection for the Protestant religion, will have nothing to do with the insulting mockery of such a Lay Association. No; *real*

Britons never will be slaves,

especially to the Priests and Levites of Bishop Broughton's clerical corps.

A few words to prove that the measure we propose would be *safe* to the Church of England in this Colony, and *just* to the public of all communions, and we shall bring this series of ecclesiastico-political articles to a close.

The Colonial history of England, therefore, affords us a remarkable proof of the vastly preferable nature of such a system as we propose for the Church of England in this Colony, in comparison with the system of having the clergy supported exclusively by the State. About two hundred years ago, two English colonies were formed almost simultaneously on the coast of America, the one exclusively by Cavaliers or Episcopalians, the other exclusively by Roundheads, or Puritans of the Congregational or Independent order. The former of these colonies was named Virginia, and had an exclusive Episcopalian establishment from the first, which did not even admit of *toleration*, or allow a Dissenter of any communion to officiate in the Colony till about the year 1745, or exactly a century ago. The latter was called Connecticut, and had also an exclusive religious establishment, of the Congregational or Independent order, which the few Episcopalians in the Colony were taxed to support without reaping any benefit from it, and which was managed with such exclusiveness that Baptists were banished from its territory, while two of the people called Quakers were actually hanged for the mere crime of being Dissenters from the Colonial Establishment! The respectable denomination called Congregationalists or Independents, are doubtless fond of giving out that the voluntary system, the system of supporting the clergy without assistance of any kind from the State, was their exclusive invention or discovery in modern times, and that as a body of professed Christians they had uniformly refused State support. They forget, however, that not a few of their very best men accepted such support during the only period in which they could ever have obtained it in English history, that is during the Commonwealth; but, what is much more to the point, they forget also that they not only took State support in the form of an exclusive establishment in America, but kept it for two centuries, and only gave it up when they were forced to do so within the last thirty years. In short, there is no Church or denomination that ought to give itself airs in this matter—they have all taken State support in their turn, and of preciously little real benefit has it been to any of them in any case, as the one we are referring to will show.

To return, then, to the old colonies of Virginia, with its exclusive Episcopal Establishment, and Connecticut, with its exclusive Congregational Establishment—Dissenters of various communions began to insinuate themselves into Virginia about a century ago, notwithstanding the efforts of the Established clergy and magistrates to exclude them; while Episcopalians, who were Dissenters in Connecticut, began to form a separate denomination in that Colony somewhat earlier; for the Government officers, who were uniformly sent out from England, as is still the practice here, with their friends and retainers, were generally of the King's Church, and had no liking to the colonial Congregational Establishment. There was no General Church Act in Connecticut, neither was there any possibllity of making the Establishment Episcopalian; but the members of that communion had influence enough at home to get an order in Council passed to exempt them from the payment of the Colonial Church Tax to support the Congregational clergy. This, then, was all that the members of the Church of England ever had to work upon in Connecticut—in a Puritan Colony, with a Congregational or Independent Established Church! But what is their state now in that country as compared with their state in Virginia, where they had an exclusive Establishment for upwards of a century and a half? Why, the result presents us with one of the most wonderful and most instructive facts that history presents, for in the year 1840, there were in Virginia, with a population of 1,239,797, only 73 Protestant Episcopal Churches, or one for every 16,997 of the entire population; whereas in Connecticut, with a population of 310,015, there were 71 Protestant Episcopal Churches, or one for every 4366 of the entire population. In short, so withering and blasting was its own exclusive Establishment for two entire centuries to the Congregational Church in Connecticut, that the Episcopal Church, although depending upon the Voluntary System, prevailed and prospered under its shadow; and so withering and blasting, on the other hand, was its own exclusive Establishment for upwards of a century and a half to the Episcopal Church in Virginia, that it has literally almost disappeared, and been swallowed up by the other communions of that territory, that had all along been on the Voluntary System! This is "a fact," as Sam Slick would say, and if you're of the strongest, we repeat it, and the most instructive that history presents. Now, in the face of such a fact, will any man pretend to tell us that the Protestant Episcopal Church would suffer any real or permanent loss from having all state support withdrawn from it here? On the contrary, such a consummation would be the greatest possible benefit to that Church in every respect. As to the other communions receiving Government support under the General Church Act, we have already shewn that they would all, most probably, take it very easily—with the exception, perhaps, of the Presbyterians, some of whose ministers might, perhaps, have to turn soldiers or settlers, not being quite the thing for the Voluntary system. By the way, this was the case with some of the Virginian Episcopalian clergy at the Revolution in America—some of them, not relishing the Voluntary System, became tobacco-planters, *while others actually took commissions and served in General Washington's army during the war of Independence!* This is another "fact," well authenticated; to which we shall add a third, as illustrative of the public spirit which Episcopalian laity exhibit under the Voluntary System. One of the Protestant Episcopal clergy of Connecticut—who, by the way, had a salary or allowance from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in England—continued to read the prayer for old King George the Third, *after* the proclamation of Independence by the American Congress. His congregation winked at it the first Sabbath, and also the second, but the good man persisting in reading the prayer, after he had been warned not to do so, the third Sabbath certain of his congregation marched up to the reading desk, lifted him gently out of it, and walking him to the church door, put him out and then locked it and put the key in their pocket, till they got a minister who could distinguish between the parsons that were, and the parsons that *had been.*

A writer in last Saturday's ATLAS, who signs himself *Old England*, expresses his abhorrence of the System we have been advocating in the following language:—"I confess I utterly abhor that voluntary principle which your correspondent advocates; nor can I believe that such opinions can be those of any true and faithful member of our mother-church. I have witnessed enough of voluntaryism in the United States of America to be aware that the community there, with few exceptions, may be divided into two classes—those whom the priest leads by the nose, from their timid superstitious constitution, into all the depths of the most grovelling fanaticism; and those who, having strength of mind to resist the potency of such words as fire, brimstone, raw head, and bloody bones, arrive gradually at the very cheap conclusion of possessing no religion at all. In such a country of superficial infidels and ignorant fanatics, the priest has no chance of getting a moderate livelihood except by a course of humbug, which leads eventually to his absolute control over the fools and old women. Priestcraft, truly, is difficult to get rid of in any country, but heaven preserve us from ever being a priest-ridden community; and I know, from actual observation, nothing so likely to lead to this misfortune as our adoption of the voluntary system."

Now we have every reason to believe that this writer never was in America, for the testimony given by far more competent witnesses respecting the state of society and the influence of religion in that country is totally different. M. De Tocqueville, himself a Roman Catholic, was one of a deputation sent out a few years ago by the French Government to make enquiries into the state of society in all respects in the United States of America, and his work entitled "Democracy in America," has been universally allowed in Europe to be the ablest, the most accurate, and the best delineation of the American system in all its bearings, as well as of the state of society in that country, that has ever been given to the European world. Of course we must know a great deal more than we do of "Old England" before we can receive his anonymous newspaper testimony as a set-off against M. de Tocqueville's. What then does the latter of these authorities say of religion and its influence under the Voluntary System in America? Why, what follows for example:

"There are certain populations in Europe whose unbelief is only equalled by their ignorance and their debasement, whilst in America, one of the freest and most enlightened nations in the world fulfils all the outward duties of religion with fervor."

"Upon my arrival in the United States, the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention, and the longer I stayed there, the more did I perceive the great political consequences resulting from this state of things, to which I was unaccustomed. In France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom pursuing courses diametrically opposed to each other; but in America I found that they were intimately united, and that they reigned in common over the same country. My desire to discover the causes of this phenomenon increased from day to day. In order to satisfy it, *I questioned the members of all the religious sects;* and I more especially sought the society of the clergy, who are the depositaries of the different persuasions, and who are more especially interested in their duration. As a member of the Roman Catholic Church, I was more particularly brought into contact with several of its priests, with whom I became intimately acquainted. To each of these men I expressed my astonishment, and I explained my doubts; I found that they differed upon matters of detail alone, and that *they mainly attributed the peaceful dominion of religion in this country to the separation of Church and State. I do not hesitate to affirm that during my stay in America, I did not meet with a single individual, whether of the clergy or of the laity, who was not of the same opinion upon this point.*"

"As long as religion is sustained by those feelings, propensities and passions, which are found to occur under the same forms at all the different periods of history, it may defy the efforts of time, or at least it can only be destroyed by another religion. But when religion clings to the interests of the world, it becomes almost as fragile a thing as the powers of earth. It is the only one of them all which can hope for immortality, but if it be connected with their ephemeral authority, it shares their fortunes, and may fall with those transient passions which supported them for a day. The alliance which religion contracts with political powers must needs be onerous to itself; since it does not require their assistance to live, and by giving them its assistance it may be exposed to decay."

"In America religion is the road to knowledge, and *the observance of the Divine laws leads man to civil freedom.*"

In Europe, Christianity has been intimately united to the powers of the earth. Those powers are now in decay, and it is, as it were, buried under their ruins. The living body of religion has been bound down to the dead corpse of superannuated polity; cut but the bonds which restrain it, and that which is alive will rise once more."—*De Tocqueville, passim.*

Such are the opinions of the mort enlightened European who has ever delineated American society and American institutions from the life, and they surely deserve infinitely more credit than those of an anonymous writer in a colonial newspaper, who has evidently a purpose to serve, and who, we have every reason to believe, never was in America at all. That M. de Tocqueville was in the right when he stated that all the clergy of all denominations in America approved of and applauded the entire separation of Church and State, we can confirm from a case in point in reference to the Protestant Episcopal Church in that country. Within the last twenty years, the late Bishop Hobart, of New York, one of the most eminent members and ministers of that Church, was travelling in Europe for his health; during his absence from America he was allowed at the rate of £1400 a year by his people that he might not lose caste even among English Bishops; and his uniform testimony to these Bishops was, that "their Church would never attain its proper place and influence in society till it was entirely separated from the State." Of course such an opinion, especially from such a quarter, was not likely to be relished by their Lordships of Durham, and Exeter, and London; but the fact at all events is certain, that Bishop Hobart was one of the most decided Voluntaries in America.

Old England goes on to say, in reference to the Voluntary System—"No, this system, as your correspondent seems to assert, may suit the oily-faced Jesuit and Presbyterian. They are used to humbug their flocks; but the English clergyman is an educated gentleman, who, having no necessity for such arts, is taught to despise them. He is not dependent for existence on his hearers, and can afford to let their intellect be as free from the trammels of superstition as is his own. He is, or ought to be, not so poor as to be unable to assist the needy of his flock, nor so rich as to be incapable of comprehending their wants. Indeed, I cannot conceive a situation more morally dignified than that of a beneficed clergyman in England."

We know that if it is the main object of any church to make its people intelligent, moral and religious, there is no part of the British empire in which this object has been attained more effectually than in Scotland, where Presbyterians have the country almost exclusively to themselves; while on the contrary, there is no part of the British empire, not even Ireland itself, where the population is lower in the scale in all these particulars than in those midland counties of England, which the Church of England has hitherto had almost exclusively to itself. But we have just as little reason to attach any credit to the representations of this writer in regard to the Church of England and its clergy as in regard to the people and religion of America. We have confronted him in the one case with De Tocqueville; we shall confront him in the other with our old friend Dr. Arnold, in whose able hands we shall leave him as a *mauvais sujet* to be dealt with *secundum artem;* i. e. to be whipped soundly like other bad boys.

"Our Church," says Dr. Arnold, "bears, and has ever borne, the mark of her birth; *the child of regal and aristocratical selfishness and unprincipled tyranny*, she has never dared to speak boldly to the great, but has contented herself with lecturing the poor." *Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*, II. 371. *Lecturing*, it is to be observed, means *scolding* and not *preaching* here.

"It is vain to deny that the Church of England clergy have politically been a party in the country, from Elizabeth's time downwards, and *a party opposed to the cause, which in the main has been the cause of improvement.*"—I. 372.

"All theory, and all experience shew, that if a system goes on long unreformed, it is not then reformed, but destroyed. And so, I believe, it will be with our Aristocracy and our Church; because I fear that neither will be wise in time."—II. 186.

This "destruction," as far as relates to the political constitution of the Church of England, cannot be far off now. It has got a prodigious acceleration to its onward and resistless march in the recent "disruption" in Scotland, which happened about the time of Dr. Arnold's death, and which may well be regarded as the death-warrant of the Church of England, as a politico-ecclesiastical establishment. Sir Robert Peel knows well, that it was decidedly the most impolitic, absurd, and calamitous measure of his administration to allow a million of the "Presbyterians of Scotland, with five hundred of their ablest clergy, to leave their national Church when a single word from him might have prevented it, and to be embodied as *a grand antagonistic power to all Religious Establishments* in Britain. As a specimen of the nature and extent of this new power, as well as of the *perferendum ingenium Scotorum*, and the wondrous efficiency of the Voluntary System, we have only to observe that this body, the Free Church in Scotland, raised upwards of half a million sterling for ecclesiastical purposes last year. When, we ask, has "the child of regal Aristocratical selfishness and unprincipled tyranny," (to use the phraseology of Dr. Arnold) ever done anything so splendid as this?

But whether it is safe or not for the Church of England in this Colony, to be left to the voluntary system, or in other words, whether it is safe or not for the Protestant Episcopal clergy to be supported exclusively by their own people, it is a matter of unquestionable justice to the rest of the Colony that they should. The Church of England has no vested rights and interests in this Colony beyond those created under the General Church Act, allotting her her proper share of the Parliamentary plunder of £30,000 per annum. Let that plunder cease to be taken from us, as it ought unquestionably, and let the Colonial Act which authorises the division of the spoil to be repealed, as it must sooner or later, and the rights and interests of the Church of England will thenceforth be limited to her church-edifices, her minister's dwellings, her burying-grounds, and her schools. She will, doubtless, still have an interest in the warm affections of her children, and a right to their loyalty and love—*if she deserves them;* but other rights and interests she can have none. In England the case is very different: *there* these are not only vested rights and interests of a more substantial kind, but it is also acknowledged to be a maxim of government that it is the duty of the State to support *the Truth;* which truth is declared by Act of Parliament to be the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. But there is no such maxim of government here. On the contrary, it is fixed and settled, as a fundamental principle of government in this Colony, that all religions are alike here—that Archbishop Polding's *Roman* Catholicism is just as good as the *Anglo*-Catholicism of Bishop Broughton, and that the Presbyterianism of Dr. Lang, or the Methodism of Mr. McKenny, is just as good as the *real Popery* of either. Now, in such circumstances, what right can the State have, nay, what feasible pretext can it have, to take any one man's money to support the religion of any other? Since truth and error, light and darkness, are all one to the Colonial Treasury, what right can the State have to interfere any further in the matter? Why does it not leave the parties to settle it entirely themselves? Why does it not apply its available funds to objects of which it *does* know something, since it does not even pretend to know anything of this?

But the State, it may be said, deals equally with all, and makes all share alike. This, however, is a fallacy in more ways than one. For instance, there are Dr. Lang, Dr. Ross, Mr. Saunders, and their respective congregations—all numerous and influential, we believe—who neither ask nor receive anything from the State.