

The instrument, thus approved, placed the province absolutely under the control of the British Parliament. On acquiring land, whether by inheritance, purchase, or grant from the Crown, every landlord had to declare his allegiance to the King in his Parliament. There was to be, of course, a governor and a council, but no elective assembly for the time being. This omission was obviously intended as a means of forestalling any disposition of the people to republicanism. There was, however, to be a middle branch of the legislature, of which the members were to be appointed by the Crown for life, but also subject to suspension or removal by royal authority. These legislators might have conferred upon them titles, emoluments, or both. The traditions of aristocracy were to be further secured by the granting of lands in large tracts, thus providing at once for great landlords and a tenantry. The Church of England was to be the established church, and the governor, the highest judge in the ecclesiastical court, with the additional function of filling all benefices. The power of ordination was to be vested in a vicar-general, the way being thus opened for a bishop. The establishment of schools was left wholly unprovided for.* Such was the constitution of New Ireland, the purpose of which, according to that thorough-going loyalist, the Reverend William Walter, was by its "liberality" to show to the American Provinces "the great advantages of being a portion of the Empire and living under the protection of the British Government."† That these advantages remained untested in-so-far as New Ireland was concerned was primarily due to Attorney General Wedderburn, who held that the territorial possessions of Massachusetts extended to the western boundary of Nova Scotia, and that the charters of both provinces precluded a new one from being interposed between them.‡

Although this opinion prevailed, the plan does not seem to have been abandoned by its originators, for in the winter

*Coll. Me. Hist. Soc., Series II, V. I, 395, 396; Bancroft, Hist. of the U. S., X, 368.

†Raymond, Hist. of the River St. John, 291 (first Edition).

‡Coll. Me. Hist. Soc., Series II, V. I, 396; Batchelder, John Nutting, 87.