

matter of so much importance could engage the attention of the Colonial Council without his direct and special sanction."

Whence then proceeded the authority? On this head Mr. Morris puts the following searching queries.

"1st. If the instructions sent out in 1818 are in force still, and you have said so, how did it happen that fresh ones were necessary in the reign of George the 4th, i. e. in the year 1825, for the act does not speak of a 'doubleset'?"

2d. If I am right in my conjecture, that the instructions received in 1818, during the reign of His Majesty Geo. 3d, lost their power and authority at his death, and made it necessary to send a fresh 'set' in the next reign, in 1825, would not they also become powerless in 1830, when George the Fourth died?"

3d. If either or both were in force, as you triumphantly declare, tell me why it was that the Executive Council established and endowed the 57 Rectories without the aid of these old documents.

4th. If the Rectories were not established without the authority of the instructions sent out in the years 1818 and 1825, how is it that the Order in Council of the 15th January, 1836, makes no mention of them, but rests solely on the paper from Lord Ripon, which you call an admonition, for justification of the proceeding?

5th. And lastly, if that 'admonition' was ample authority for what the council did, please inform me why it is now necessary to revert to the old instructions?"

We have looked in vain and so shall look for any thing like a satisfactory answer to these interrogatories. The whole burden of the absurd attempt clearly lies in the majority of the Executive Council.

In conclusion, I am fully convinced that the Rectories must go down. Why should they stand?—Are they to be upheld as a part of a dominant church?—a forerunner of an actual division of Canada into parishes?—a raising up unto rule over it, Rectors, Archdeacons and Bishops? and a portioning out among them of a seventh part of its territory?—Surely no one is so utterly bereft of judgment as to maintain this! What remains? If not in right of belonging to a dominant church by what right can they be held? Assuredly not as a portion of the lands allotted to the simple support of Protestantism. The apportionment of the lands in the manner that might be conceived most expedient for that purpose was, at the very time these were erected given over to the provincial legislature and could not therefore be interfered with by others. To make the matter plain, suppose that the hypothetical but otherwise exactly parallel case of an actual attempt to establish a house of Lords among us had taken place. Those making it would of course soon have found out that they had been guilty of a folly, and would have drawn back as fast as possible. But suppose that in the

first fervour of their zeal they had endowed the presumed hereditary wisdom of Canada with a portion of the Crown Reserves. The question would arise if such an endowment would be valid. On the simple grounds of right it is plain it would not; for if the office of hereditary legislator be void, then must the perquisites of the office be void too. But, to draw the parallel closer, suppose that, at the time we speak of, the disposal of the lands thus deeded away to an infant nobility, had been placed in the hands of commissioners for the purpose of apportioning them among other claimants—among some, we shall say claiming them for purposes of internal improvement, others for those of education, and, farther, that those pretending to give them to the titled personages they attempted to create, had received no valid authority so to bestow them. Must not the grant and the title in this case be done away with? would it, in such a case, avail any thing to urge in favor of the Lordships, Why seek to annul them, they do no harm? We don't want to make a Canadian like an English Lord, a real ruler. It is we assure you a name, and nothing but a name." We should answer—"If it be so—if he is to have none of the duties and responsibilities—why bestow on him the territorial rights." That is not a *vox et preterea nihil*, that has force to carry off thousands of our choicest acres. Practise not on us a sort of legerdemain which we will not tolerate."

In like manner we ask, are the Rectors real Rectors, real rulers of parishes—do they really hold all rights profits and emoluments, thereunto belonging, as fully and amply, and on the same terms and conditions, and liable to the performance of the same duties, as the incumbent of a parsonage or Rectory in England!—If you contend for this we shall know how to meet you. But it is said. "Oh no! We claim no rights of the sort, we say not that other duties fall to our share than those discharged by other christian ministers around." How then, we further ask, if you are not real Rectors, do you conceive yourselves entitled to hold the emoluments of Rectors? Some one, echoing perchance what the Archdeacon says, pretends to hold it a pithy question, "What signify 27,000 acres in Canada?" Not much we reply as to the loss sustained, but very much as to the mode in which it is sustained. It is not the actual amount of wrong inflicted, but the infliction of wrong, that should stir a freeman. When Britons forget this truth, they forget the principles for which their sires contending ennoble themselves and their posterity.

There is no reason why the Rectories should