

In 1791, when a constitution was given to Upper Canada on its separation from Lower Canada, the same act of the Imperial Parliament which made provision for a Lieutenant-Governor, a Legislative Council, and a House of Assembly, provided for a "Protestant Clergy," by setting apart for their maintenance one-seventh of the unceded lands within the Province. These lands unquestionably belonged to the Crown by right of conquest, and not to those who raise so great a clamour about them—ninety-nine out of every hundred of whom were either not born at the time, or, at least, were not on this side of the broad Atlantic. The country was then almost a wilderness, and the King and the other branches of the Imperial Parliament disposed of this portion of these lands in the same way as the grants of lands were made to that noble band of patriots known as the U. E. Loyalists, by which 200 acres were secured to each of them and to each of their children. If the right of the King and Parliament to make this reservation in favour of a "Protestant Clergy" is called in question, the right of the same powers to grant these lands to the U. E. Loyalists and their children may be *just as fairly questioned*.

The argument that the people of this country did not *consent* to this reservation, when there was but a handful of them settled in the country, is about as sound a one as would be the argument adduced by children against a disposition made by their father of his estate, of which he was the absolute master, *before they were born*, because they had not consented to it. From the warm attachment of the U. E. Loyalists to Great Britain and all her institutions, and from their hatred of everything republican and levelling, as shown in the heavy sacrifices they have made on account of these feelings, we may *fairly* conclude that had they been appealed to in regard to this act of the parent state, they would have heartily sanctioned it. At any rate, this reservation was considered no "grievance" for thirty years after it was made.

Some have argued that *because* deeds for the lands thus reserved for a "Protestant Clergy"