

CHAPTER XXI.

Clergy of the province, 1760-1806.

From 1763 to 1766, and probably before and after these years, there were four chaplains with the troops: MM. Ogilvie, Bennett, Bethune and John Brooke. The Reverends John Doty and — Stuart, were school-masters in Montreal (1766) and acted as ministers of the gospel, but had no charge of souls.

Léger-Jean-Baptiste-Noël Veyssières, a Recollet, who had given up his gown, went to England in 1767, without any recommendation from the governor, but managed to be admitted as a minister of the Anglican Church, and, on the 1st February, 1768, was appointed by the King, with two others, for the missions of Canada at a salary of £200 per annum. David-François de Montmollin was assigned to Quebec—he spoke no English. David Chabrand de Lisle went to Montreal, or perhaps was there already, for, in 1766, he acted as chaplain of the garrison of that place. Vessyières returned to Three Rivers, where he had been before as a Recollet.

The Recollet Church at Three Rivers was used solely by the Anglicans from 1760 to 1820, when the Methodists began to meet there also and continued until 1840, when they erected the first Protestant church in that place.

The Protestants of Montreal, in 1766, used the Recollet church, corner of Notre Dame and Recollet Streets, alternately with the Catholics. When they left to occupy a place of their own they made a present of tapers for the altar and wine for mass to the Recollet friars.*

Carleton write in 1768 that the Protestants in Quebec had the use of two churches in common with the Roman Catholics and another one altogether in their own hands. Mr. Montmollin applied for the church of the Jesuits, but it had been transformed into a military store since 1759, and

*F. J. Audet: *Royal Society*, 1900, I. p. 133-142.

in 1767 handed back to the Jesuits, who were putting it in a state of repair at great cost. Mr. Montmollin asked also to be permitted to levy tithes like the Roman Catholic clergy—that could not be done neither. There was a scheme for the rebuilding of the Cathedral, burned during the siege, by means of a grand lottery and a subscription in the United Kingdom, but the governor said that the Protestants had already the enjoyment of more churches than they could occupy.

In 1784, the pastors were distributed as follows: Anglicans, Quebec: Montmollin, Toosey; Montreal: De Lisle, Tunstall; Trois-Rivières: Veysières; Sorel: Doty. Presbyterians, Quebec: Henry, Sparks; Montreal: Somerville.

The Reverend Philip Toosey, was assistant of M. de Montmollin in Quebec, from 1785 to 1794, when he succeeded him. He devoted part of his time to colonization with good results.

It was the Reverend John Doty who established the mission at Sorel and he resided there until 1803 when he retired from the ministry. He had the honour to build the first Protestant church in the province. The consecration of the same took place on Christmas Day, 1785, and the name of Christ Church was given to it. M. Doty died at Three Rivers 23rd November, 1841, aged 96 years, leaving a well-deserved reputation for learning and urbanity.

The mission of St. Armand was opened in 1787 by the Reverend James Tunstall. In November, 1799, the Reverend R. L. Short was appointed as a missionary there and left the following year to go to Three Rivers.

On the 5th of August, 1789, the "first Episcopal conference of the Protestant church" was held in the Recollets' Church, Quebec.

The diocese of Nova Scotia, created by George III. in 1787 was governed by Bishop Charles Inglis, who visited Quebec in 1789 and exercised his jurisdiction there with full right and authority. During his stay in that town he occupied the Recollet church as a place of worship.

The constitution of 1791 provided for the support of a Protestant clergy by allotting some of the waste lands as "clergy reserves," that is to say the seventh part of all such lands which may be granted afterwards for colonization—but this was in favour of the "established church" only; and

the Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., soon objected to it. After sixty years of constant remonstrance and political agitation, the bill of 1854 handed over the administration of that revenue to the municipalities.

In 1792, the Anglicans of Montreal applied for permission to incorporate Christ Church congregation and to erect a building for their use, but that church was burned in 1803, together with several residences, the prison and the Catholic college. A new church was begun, in 1805, on the site of the old French gaol, Notre Dame Street, near St. Lambert Hill, but appears not to have been finished until 1814, if not later. The cost was over £4,700. It was burned down in 1856. Bishop Fulford then erected the present Cathedral on St. Catherine Street, which was completed in 1859.

The Anglican diocese of Quebec was created on the 28th of June, 1793, and the Most Reverend Jacob Mountain, selected as Bishop, sailed the next month for Canada. The name of his wife was Elizabeth Kentish. Of their four sons, the youngest took service in the army and became aide de camp to the Queen; the three others entered holy orders; one of them was the third Bishop of Quebec.

Until the arrival of the Bishop there was no kind of ecclesiastical organization in the province, and men like Vessyières, de Lisle, Montmollin, were not good examples of a religious vocation. It was William Pitt who made the choice of the Reverend Jacob Mountain, on the advice of the famous Dr. Tomline, Bishop of Lincoln. It was not before 1800 that Bishop Mountain succeeded in putting the affairs of the diocese in something like order, and then, with the help of the Duke of Portland, colonial minister, he brought things into a settled condition.

The construction of the Anglican Cathedral of Quebec was commenced in 1799 and finished in six years at a cost of £17,000 sterling.

A grant of land was made in 1803 to the congregation of the Church of Scotland in the City of Quebec, for building a church on a site forming part of the Jesuit College grounds.

Here is a list of the Protestant clergy in 1800: Bishop Jacob Mountain; Reverends Jehosaphat Mountain, archdeacon and rector of Three Rivers; Salter Jehosaphat Mountain, rector of Quebec; James Tunstall, Montreal; John Doty, Sorel; R. L. Short, St. Armand; MM. Montmollin

and Veyssières had retired. The Reverend Alexander Sparks, Presbyterian, resided at Quebec; M. James Somerville in Montreal.

The Church of St. Gabriel, the oldest in Montreal, corner of St. James and St. Gabriel Streets, belonged to the Presbyterians, and was used also by the Anglican community, who had no other place of worship in that town at the time.

The Reverend Jehosaphat Mountain was appointed assistant of M. Veyssières at Three Rivers in October, 1794, and when the latter died, in 1800, he succeeded him, but at the end of the same year the Reverend R. L. Short took the position, which he filled for nearly thirty years.

On a first application dated November, 1802, the members of the Scotch Church, resident in Quebec, did not obtain the grant of the site they wished to get for the building of a church, but in 1808 they were given 66 x 56 feet, north of St. Anne Street. Their pastor, the Reverend Alexander Sparks, died in March, 1819.

The first Methodist church at Montreal was erected in 1808.

The colonial secretary, the Duke of Portland, wrote in 1799 authorizing the building of a Metropolitan Church at Quebec, on the site of the late Church of the Recollets, burned in 1796, and a grant towards its support of £400 sterling annually, having no doubt that the inhabitants would contribute to the extent of their means, etc. The policy of the British government was to place the Church of England on the footing of the established church in Canada, to which, it was hoped, all the Protestant inhabitants would adhere. The building was completed in 1804.

The rectors of Quebec and Three Rivers received a salary of £200 each without any extra allowance; the rector of Montreal the same amount with £80 from the parish; of Sorel, £100 with £50 from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and the evening lecturer at Quebec, £100.

In 1812 the clergy of the established church was composed of the Right Reverend Jacob Mountain Lord Bishop of Quebec; at Quebec: the Reverend S. J. Mountain, chaplain and secretary to the Lord Bishop, and rector of the church of that place; the Reverend G. J. Mountain, evening lecturer and domestic chaplain to the Lord Bishop; at Montreal: the Reverend Dr. Mountain, official of Lower Canada and rector of Christ's

Church; at Three Rivers: the Reverend Mr. Short, rector; at Sorel: the Reverend Mr. Jackson, rector of Christ's Church and chaplain to the Lord Bishop; at Missisqui Bay: the Honourable and Reverend Mr. Stewart, rector of St. Armand and chaplain to the Lord Bishop; the Reverend Mr. Cotton, rector of Dunham.

Clergy of the Church of Scotland at Quebec: Mr. Alexander Sparks; at Montreal: Mr. Somerville.

Before proceeding further it is well to mention here the heads of the Catholic church in the province. Mgr. Briand had selected the Reverend Louis-Philippe Mariaudeau d'Esgris for his co-adjutor, in 1770; then, in 1784, having resigned as Bishop of Quebec, Mr. d'Esgris succeeded him. At the death of the latter, in 1788, Mgr. Jean-François Hubert took the seat, which he occupied until 1797 and was succeeded by Mgr. Pierre Denaut, who appointed Mgr. Joseph-Octave Plessis as his co-adjutor, in 1800. Mgr. Plessis lived in Quebec whilst Mgr. Denaut remained at Longueuil, where he had been curé for seventeen years.

The state of religion,* so far as Protestants were concerned, was not satisfactory. The first Anglican Bishop complained frequently and bitterly of the treatment accorded to the Church of England. In his letter of the 6th of June, 1803, he draws a comparison between the position of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England in Lower Canada, in which he says: "Compared with the respectable establishments, the substantial revenues and the extensive powers and privileges of the Church of Rome, the Church of England sinks into a mere tolerated sect; possessing at the present moment, not one shilling of revenue which it can properly call its own; without laws to control the conduct of its own members, or even to regulate the ordinary proceedings of vestries and churchwardens; without any provisions for organizing or conducting the necessary proceedings of an ecclesiastical court or power to enforce their execution. And what is worst of all, and what cannot but alarm and afflict the mind of every serious and reflecting man, without a body of clergy, either by their number sufficient for the exigencies of the state, or by any acknowledged right, or legitimate authority, capable of maintaining their own usefulness

*Taken from *Canadian Archives*, 1892, XXVII., 17-30.

or supporting the dignity of a church establishment. . . . In both provinces the majority of His Majesty's subjects are dissenters; and of these there is a great variety of sects. I speak not my own opinion only, but that of many of the best informed persons in both provinces, when I say that an effectual and respectable establishment of the Church of England would go far to unite the whole body of dissenters within its pale. . . . Respectable and useful ministers of our church will not easily be induced to spend their lives in the wilds of this country without any prospect of ever going to such more convenient and more honourable stations as their labours and virtues may be found to deserve. . . . The superintendent of the Church of Rome (for such I understand to be his legitimate and proper appellation) is in the actual enjoyment of all the power and privileges of the most plenary episcopal authority, under which he visits not this province only, and that of Upper Canada, but the provinces also of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is under the immediate sanction of the Pope's bull that he and his co-adjutor enter upon the exercise of their episcopal functions. He selects, as I understand, without any license from His Majesty's representative, or any reference to him, whomsoever he thinks proper for holy orders and the care of souls. He disposes absolutely, if I am not misinformed, of the whole patronage of his extensive diocese; and since the settlement of the French emigrant priests in this province he has come forward with decision not only to assume himself in the public prints the title of "Bishop of Quebec," but to add the splendid style of "Monseigneur Sa Grandeur le révérendissime et illustrissime." His co-adjutor wears the habit, and assumes the rank of a bishop and likewise receives the title of Monseigneur. Books in the English as well as in the French language, inculcating the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome, are publicly advertised, under his authority "for the use of the diocese of Quebec." I am far from wishing that the Roman Catholic clergy should be deprived of any of their privileges so liberally conceded to them for the free exercise of their worship, or of any reasonable indulgence that they enjoy; I would rather (if it were permitted) express a wish that the superintendent's allowance from government were better suited to His Majesty's distinguished bounty. But if in addition to his extraordinary

power and influence, he is permitted to continue this high style of dignity, it is natural to ask what becomes of the establishment of the Church of England? If the Roman Bishop be recognized as the "Bishop of Quebec," what becomes of *that* diocese which His Majesty has solemnly created, and of the Bishop whom he has been graciously pleased to appoint thereto? To authorize the establishment of two Bishops of the same diocese, of different religious persuasions would be a solecism in ecclesiastical polity, which I believe never took place in the Christian world; to attempt the union of different churches with the state would be, I hardly conceive, an experiment in the science of government not less dangerous than novel. . . . Unless both the positive and relative situation of the Church of England, in this country, be speedily and radically changed, all reasonable hope of maintaining the establishment of that church, will in my judgment be irrevocably lost."*

Sir Robert Shore Milnes in transmitting this communication to Lord Hobart, colonial secretary, adds the following information: "1st. Upon a moderate estimate, the settlers in the new townships may be put at from eleven to fifteen thousand, and when it is considered that there are at the present moment thirteen hundred thousand acres of land actually under patent, and that probably near two millions more will soon be added, it must be evident that at no very distant period the Protestants in this province will outnumber the Papists. 2nd. I have carefully examined the *Quebec Gazette* from the end of the year 1793 and I do not find any instance in which the Bishops themselves have assumed these titles, before the publication of the co-adjutor's sermon, in January, 1799. In June, 1794, indeed, Mr. Gragé, a Frenchman, giving an account of the death of Mr. Brian 'ancien évêque de Québec,' a Frenchman also (died 25th of June, 1794), in the *Gazette*, styles him 'l'illustrissime et révérendissime Père en Dieu'; and Mr. Desjardins, a French emigré, upon the death (17th October, 1797) of Mr. Hubert, does the same thing. 3rd. But I am speaking of the open assumption of these titles, and the style of the diocese by the Bishops themselves. Of French books advertised by authority 'à l'usage du diocèse de Québec,' I find no instance before September, 1800, nor of English books

**Canadian Archives*, 1892, p. 20.

'for the use of the diocese of Quebec,' before November in the same year. Up to July, 1796, their style was 'pour l'usage des Congréganistes'; in February, 1800, simply 'avec approbation.' The *Gazette* of 15th April, 1802 will exhibit specimens of the style now in use: 'Approbation de Sa Grandeur l'Evêque de Québec. . . . Approbation de Monseigneur l'illustrissime et révérendissime Pierre Denaut, évêque de Québec. . . . Le Processionnal Romain, à l'usage du diocèse de Québec.'

The reply of Lord Hobart, dated 9th January, 1804, states that: "It has not been judged expedient, under present circumstances, to recommend that any question should be agitated which might tend to excite differences between the heads of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, and it is, therefore, extremely desirable that you should point out to the two Bishops the propriety of abstaining from any act that might have the effect of producing mutual uneasiness, or of creating any irritation in the minds of the clergy or the persons professing religions which they respectively superintend. It will be highly proper that you should signify to the Catholic Bishop the impropriety of his assuming new titles, or the exercise of any additional powers; and it would be right that you should intimate to him that, although no express orders have been issued upon the subject, it is expected that if any such have been recently taken up, that they should not be persevered in. The French emigrant priests should also be reminded that their residence in Canada is only upon sufferance, and it is, therefore, the more incumbent upon them to observe the utmost circumspection in their proceedings, as they must be aware the indulgence with which they have been treated by the British government is liable to be withdrawn if they should render themselves undeserving of it by anything questionable in their conduct."

Subsequently a conversation took place between Jonathan Sewell, Attorney-General, and Mr. Plessis, co-adjutor, in April, 1805, as follows:

Plessis.—I have lately spoken to the Governor respecting the present situation of our church, and he has referred me to you on the subject.

Sewell.—The Governor has given me permission to explain my own private sentiments on the subject to you; and what I think you may ask, I will answer candidly. But before we proceed, let me observe that the

object is of the last importance to your church, and (I admit also) important to the government. It is highly necessary for you to have the means of protecting your church, and for the government to have a good understanding with the ministers of a church it has acknowledged by the Quebec Act, and at the same time to have them under its control. Let me also remark that the government having permitted the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion ought, I think, to avow its officers, but not, however, at the expense of the King's rights or of the established church. You cannot expect, nor ever obtain, anything that is inconsistent with the rights of the Crown, nor can the government ever allow you what it denies to the Church of England.

Plessis.—Your position may be correct. The Governor thinks the Bishops should act under the King's commission and I see no objection to it.

Sewell.—My principle is this, I would not interfere with you in concerns purely spiritual, but in all that is temporal or mixed, I would subject you to the King's authority. There are difficulties, I know, on both sides; on one hand, the Crown will never consent to your emancipation from its power, nor will it ever give you more than the rights of the Church of England, which has grown with the constitution, and whose power, restrained as it is, is highly serviceable to the general interests of the state; on the other hand, your Bishop would be loth to abandon what he conceives to be his right, I mean particularly the nomination to curés; yet that he must do, for no such power is vested in the Bishops of England, and if permitted would be highly dangerous.

Plessis.—You said *conceives* to be his right; why so?

Sewell.—The statute of the 1st of Elizabeth, chap. 1, made for the dominions which the Crown then had, or might thereafter acquire, explains what I mean. But I shall not conceal my opinion, it is that the Bishop has no power, and I shall be happy to show you the grounds of this opinion at a future day, should anything arise out of this conversation.

Plessis.—I know the 1st of Elizabeth, but I confess I did not know that it was extended to the dominions which the Crown might thereafter acquire.

Sewell.—It certainly is. It was made at the time when England had most reason to be dissatisfied with the Roman Catholic religion, immedi-

ately after the death of Mary. It provided for the emancipation of all English subjects from the Papal power in all times and places.

Plessis.—Had Mary followed the advice of Cardinal Pole, the statute never would have been passed; she would not have been disgraced herself and her religion by her cruelties.

Sewell.—Whether he influenced her or not, Mary's conduct tended to establish the Reformation most firmly, and happily to blend the church and state of England as they are at present.

Plessis.—How are rectors (curés) appointed in England?

Sewell.—Where the King is patron, and he is of all livings not in the possession of individuals, by title, he presents to the Bishop, who, if there be no legal cause of refusal, inducts the clerk presented. If there be cause, he certifies that cause to the King, and if the King is satisfied he presents another, but if not, a writ issues to the Bishop requiring him to certify his cause of refusal into the King's courts, who try the merits of the refusal and declare it good or bad according to law; on this footing I would place your church.

Plessis.—The King then would become the collator to every benefice. The King of France was to consistorial offices, but not to curés.

Sewell.—He was to many curés, but not to all, because many of his subjects, lay as well as ecclesiastical persons, were the patrons.

Plessis.—The Bishop ought not to be obliged to certify his cause of refusal. In France, where the patron was a layman, he was bound to present five clerks successively before the Bishop was obliged to give any reason for refusing them. When the sixth was presented, he was bound to assign the cause of his refusal. If the patron was an ecclesiastic, he showed cause on the presentation of the third.

Sewell.—Neither of these rules extended to the King. I think I can show you that to your satisfaction. It would not be decent to refuse the presentation of the sovereign without cause, nor ought a Bishop ever to be ashamed of assigning the reason of his refusal in any case.

Plessis.—Presentation by the Crown agrees with the tenets of the Church of England, but not with ours. It would be against our spiritual duty. Bishops in France have always presented to the livings in their

dioceses—in the late concordat between the sovereign Pontiff and Bonaparte, their right to present is recognized.

Sewell.—As to Bonaparte and the Pope I will say nothing—except that the former (thank God) is no example to us. But I formally deny that it is contrary to your duty to receive a presentation from the Crown. It was the daily practice in France with respect not only to the Crown, but even to private patrons of all description. I am no Catholic, but my professional duty has led me to weigh well this objection according to your own principles. My answer is very short: The Bishop ordains in the first instance, which qualifies the character for the living: the prelate and not the Crown makes the priest; the Crown selects only from your own priesthood the person whom it thinks fit for the appointment, and if there be no cause of repeal the Bishop invests him with everything necessary to enable him to perform the functions of his curé. The reciprocal selection of the person by the Bishop in the first instance for the priesthood and of the Crown for the living in the second instance preserves a just balance between both.

Plessis.—In our church some orders qualify the individual to say mass, others to confess, others are formal.

Sewell.—I beg leave to interrupt you. When the Crown presents a person not admitted to orders sufficient for the appointment to which he is nominated, the Bishop has legal cause to refuse.

Plessis.—If the King presents in all cases, the Bishop will never have a chance of advancing a faithful pastor.

Sewell.—The Bishop once acknowledged, the head of his department will be that in fact. You know the attention that ever has been and ever will be paid to the heads of departments in our government. The Bishop's representation to the Government in such a case would secure the promotion of the person he wished to promote.

Plessis.—Your Bishop has certainly greater power. The *Gazette* lately informed us that he had presented Mr. Rudd to a living at William Henry.

Sewell.—The *Gazette* is certainly the King's paper, and its contents generally to be relied on, and that in this instance is the case. Mr. Rudd has been appointed to William Henry, but it was the Governor, and not

the Bishop, who presented him. Be assured that all livings in the Church of England in this province are in the King's gift.

Plessis.—Governors do not always pay attention to the recommendations which they receive. I remember Chief Justice Osgoode complained bitterly that Mr. Perrault had been appointed prothonotary of the King's Bench, contrary to his recommendation.

Sewell.—Mr. Osgoode's complaint confirms what I say. The conduct observed towards him was an exception to the general rule, and therefore he complained.

Plessis.—Our general church government is aristocratic, but the government of a Bishop is monarchical. He has the power of enacting *Règlements* which must be obeyed. You will not probably admit this position.

Sewell.—The power of a Bishop extends to a forcing by his *Règlements* the general principles of government adopted by the church. He cannot legislate, he can only enforce obedience to what is already enacted, to the canons and to the municipal laws of the country.

Plessis.—That is true, but our canons are different, materially different from yours.

Sewell.—I cannot admit that. It was enacted in the reign of our Henry the VIIIth that the canons then in force and not repugnant to the principles of the Reformation should continue in force until a review of them should be made, which never has been accomplished, so that the Church of England is now governed by the canons in force prior to the Reformation, which form the greater and most essential part of the canons which govern the Church of Rome.

Plessis.—You state incorrectly; your church, for instance, does not acknowledge the canons enacted by the Council of Trent.

Sewell.—The Gallican Church certain does not.

Plessis.—Yet the canons of the Council of Trent certainly were in force in France.

Sewell.—Yes, the greater part, but that was because the Kings of France enacted them in their ordinances. On this head, you cannot suffer, for those ordinances are at this moment component parts of the municipal law of Canada.

Plessis.—I once saw in the hands of Mr. Ryland (the governor's secretary) the King's instructions, in which it is said that no priest shall be removed from his curé, unless he has been previously convicted, in some of His Majesty's courts, of felony. There may be many instances, in which a priest ought to be removed, who has not been guilty of felony. The difficulties would be less if the Bishop had a jurisdiction over his clergy, an "officialité" which, perhaps, never would be granted.

Sewell.—I have already requested you to understand that in all I say I speak my own private sentiments and no more. With this remark I have no hesitation to say that the government ought in policy to give the Bishop a jurisdiction over his clergy, subject always to the controlling power of the King's Bench, and to the operation of the writs of prohibition and appeal. The court of the Bishops in England are subject to the King's Bench.

Plessis.—If the writ of prohibition is similar to the "Appel comme d'Abus" in France, not a shadow of authority will remain in the Bishop. Every act of a Bishop was ultimately held in France abuse of his authority and constantly set aside in the Parliaments.

Sewell.—The writ of prohibition is very different from the "Appel comme d'Abus." By that all questions were re-examined as well in fact as in law. The writ of prohibition is a prerogative writ issued out of the King's Bench to prevent the ecclesiastical and other inferior courts from proceeding in causes instituted before them in which they have no jurisdiction or in which they proceed contrary to law. To what court the appeal should be is a subject for consideration.

Plessis.—You know that all curés at present are removable at the pleasure of the Bishop. In the first establishment of this colony it was otherwise, but afterwards upon establishment of the Seminary of Quebec, Monseigneur de Laval got it fixed as it is at present. If the King presents, the curé ought to be removable at the Bishop's pleasure.

Sewell.—I think very different. The spirit of the colonial institution grants every office during pleasure nominally, but that pleasure is well known to continue during good behaviour, and a rector in England is removable only for cause. It seems expedient to me that a curé should know his parishoners well and consider himself as fixed among them. In times of

difficulty a curé long resident with his flock can guide them better than a new comer. Mutual confidence is not the result of a short and transitory acquaintance; and without that nothing effectual can be done by the pastor at such a moment. I will tell you also frankly that curés dependent upon the will of the Bishop, would be little subject to the control of the government. If this was the case, the situation of the curé would not be enviable, nor could you expect that the better class of people would educate their sons for the church. Your court of the Bishop would be perfectly unnecessary and the presentation of the Crown an idle ceremony, if the Bishop could afterwards remove when he pleased.

Plessis.—The situation of a curé under such restriction would be better then, than the situation of the Bishops of Canada at present. For myself, I have enough, I am in a cure which gives me all I want, but Bishop Denaut is in poverty, holding a living and active as a parish priest, in direct contradiction of the canons.

Sewell.—My mind upon that subject is completely made up. The government recognizes your religion and making its officers officers of the Crown, should provide for them as for all others. The Bishop should have enough to enable him to live in a splendour suited to his rank, and the coadjutor a salary in proportion.

Plessis.—I do not want to see the Bishop in splendour, but I wish to see him above want. I do not wish to see him in the legislative or executive council, but as an ecclesiastic only, entitled to the rank which is due to him in society.

Sewell.—When I said splendour, I qualified the expression by calling it “a splendour suited to his rank.” I mean by that, that his income should be that of a gentleman, and equal to a proper expenditure. There is in fact no such thing as splendour in Canada.

Plessis.—We mean the same thing. But there is a great delicacy in this matter. If the Bishop was salaried and relinquished the right of nominating the curés, the public would not hesitate to say that he had sold his church.

Sewell.—To stop the public clamour is a useless attempt. If matters of state were to be staid for fear of popular abuse, government would be

able to do but very little; the governed but seldom approve. In this instance, if the matter is viewed as it ought to be viewed, the world must be satisfied that, instead of relinquishing a right you have in fact none to relinquish, you abandon the shadow and receive the substance; surely, this is sufficient answer to any vulgar declamation against a Bishop who makes terms highly advantageous to his church and must be satisfactory to himself.

Plessis.—I don't know; it is his affair.

Sewell.—There is one idea which I wish to suggest. If you ever mean to place the officers of your church upon any footing, this is the moment. The present Lieutenant-Governor is a gentleman of most liberal principles, he has been long enough in the country to know all that relates to it, is well disposed to serve you, and is on the point of going to England where this matter must be settled.

Plessis.—I am well aware of all this. Whatever is to be done must be done now.

Sewell.—If I say what I ought not to say, you will excuse me, but I feel convinced that if you forego this opportunity, it will never return. It is to your interest to avail yourself of the present moment, and make the best terms you can.

Plessis.—You cannot say anything which can either hurt or offend me. I consider this a free conversation on both sides, for effecting a very important subject, which, without an unreserved communication, can never be effected.

Sewell.—I will not take up any more of your time at this moment.

Plessis.—I am much obliged by the time you have bestowed on me. Something must be done, and though we may differ in the detail, I think we shall not in the outline, and if we do differ we must be temperate, and in that case we shall ultimately agree. I am, however, a subordinate officer. I must first write to the Bishop, and when I know his sentiments I will wait upon you.

Sewell.—Do so, but pray keep in mind what I have said, that you never can obtain anything inconsistent with the prerogatives of the Crown, nor at all events any right that a Bishop of the Church of England does not possess.

In a petition signed "Pierre Denaut, Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church," dated 18th July, 1805, it is asked "that your petitioner and his successors be civilly recognized as Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church of Quebec and enjoy such prerogatives, rights and emoluments as Your Majesty shall graciously attach to that dignity." On the 27th of the same month Sir Robert transmitting the above documents to the home authorities says: "I flatter myself the petition will give an opening to the final settlement of those objects with regard to the Roman Catholic clergy which I have had in view for several years past. . . . I feel myself called upon in justice to Mr. Denaut to state to Your Lordship that I have found him uniformly candid and open in the course of several conversations we have had on this subject, and I believe there is no man more truly attached to the government than he is. Your Lordship will observe that in signing the enclosed petition to His Majesty, Mr. Denaut styles himself 'Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church,' and prays that he may be formally acknowledged as 'Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church of Quebec,' a title by which he is not acknowledged in the King's instructions to the Governor where he is only called superintendent of the Romish Church. But, though the title is not allowed by the instructions, it has always been used in courtesy, except in official letters from the Governor, and Monsieur Denaut, as well as his predecessors, has usually been addressed by the title of Monseigneur, not only by society in general, but also by the persons administrating the government."

Mgr. Denaut died on the 18th of January, 1806, and was succeeded by Mgr. Plessis, who took the prescribed oaths on the 27th of same month, Mr. Panet being appointed to the office of co-adjutor and taking the oaths on the 8th February following.