your the find the the nccs Lan-2, in 100 pray the not o the five ge of , and infor-

e, the conto, comthan es bee unesty's ience r_exor the

ng an , and You ose of nation

(as if what y recommendation for a division of the clergy lands—see the editorial observations from the "Christian Guardian," and the address to the King from the Wesleyan Methodists against the Rectories—examine closely the letter which you received on the 19th instant, from the Trustees of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, (and which I append to this,) and also the inaccuracies which I have pointed out in your table, and where are your arguments, your justification for the harsh epithets you have so unfeelingly bestowed on us? all gone ! scattered to the winds, and you stand unsupported by a single fact to give you countenance.

You may talk of grants to the Presbyterians, and of the " friendly anxiety of the Provincial authorities to do everything " possible for our accommolation," and you may continue to write about lots and burying ground set apart for purposes that nobody ever heard of but yourself-all this you may do; but it cannot remove from the minds of the Scottish and Irish Presbyterians of Canada the neglect and contempt our respectful applications have in many instances received, chiefly through your instrumentality, as is generally believed. Nor can the respectable Presbyterian inhabitants of Toronto, and others, who joined them in a petition to Sir P. Maitland, for a grant of land for a burial ground, cease to remember how that respectful application was treated, and how they were forced to purchase a few acres for which they paid $\pounds 75$, whilst you had no difficulty, not long ago, in procuring a grant of 15 acres, near the catholic church, for a similar object, as I am informed.

In your table, No. 2, you say, "The answer to the following applications by the Governor in council was," 'that in the pre-'sent state of the elergy reserve question, the council do not think 'it advisable to recommend any further appropriations.' I hope the council felt equally scrupulous with regard to your application; indeed I have no reason to suppose they did not, other than the assertion you made to the elergy of your archdeaconry, on the 13th September, that "twenty or twenty-two thousand "acres were attached to 57 Rectories," when contrasted with your second letter to me, dated the 23d November, in which you state that 27,169 acres had been so appropriated.

Although you have furnished matter for much more extensive investigation and exposure than I find it convenient to make,