

subjugation to the church from whose preceding usurpations over us we were looking for escape.

No wonder that we felt that foul wrong had some how been put on us. No wonder that we rose in one body—we had been unworthy of enjoying the rights of men had we now sat still. We did rise—and we rose to bestir ourselves. I need not dwell on details with you, Mr. Editor, and your readers.—First the blustering and then the quailing—of the English church, I was going to say but I were doing it wrong so to speak of a party, a small party in it. Mr. Hagerman's insolence and our magnanimity—our deputation of Mr. Morris and the authority to abolish the rectories, the Archdeacon's letters and Mr. Morris's reply of right claim some attention.

The Archdeacon's letters may I think be characterised as irritating but powerless. They are the former for they are made up of irritating ingredients. Bad names, bad motives applied to his adversaries, in support of his own cause,—facts, that turn out to be no facts, reasonings that recur to those who have attended throughout to the controversy, as the ghosts of arguments, long since *done to death*.

Of the bad names, I have given some, and will not repeat them—of bad motives, the worst of motives, his page is full. I take up a number of the church at random; page 111, comes to my eye, "no assistance avails any thing unless it be at our expense," "the robbery and spoilation of our church," "to trample it in the dust." I have gone over half a column and stop in charity,—worse would meet me if I went on. For facts disproved the reader must deliberately compare his assertions and Mr. Morris's proofs—then—if he has not done so before, he will hold up his hands in astonishment. As for arguments—I would ask any one, who has attended to the subject, if a single clearer view of the controversy, or one new principle to guide him through it, has rewarded his perusal of those singular epistles.

I need not tell the readers of the Christian Examiner how well the task that devolved on Mr. Morris has been discharged. They have read the "Reply" with the attention it deserves. They have marked with what clearness the arguments of the Archdeacon are refuted, with what force his assertions are met and borne down by the weight of fact: How thoroughly, throughout, a plain tale distinctly told has served to put him down. Nor I think can it have escaped them, how well a peculiar difficulty that met Mr. Morris has been overcome. The uncontrollable zeal of the venerable dignitary, and honorable colleague, with whom

it fell to the lot of our delegate to contend, had carried him, as we have seen, through all bounds, even through the decencies, that the laws of controversial writing itself have imposed, which, however straitened an adversary may be for weapons, forbid the wanton use of a large portion of the explosives that on this occasion crowd the columns of "THE CHURCH." Whoever has tried it will acknowledge the difficulty of picking out from an untangible envelope of this sort the amount of seeming argumentation that lies within, without being fevered by the act. This is what Mr. Morris has succeeded in doing. Without the least of irritability evinced he proceeds on steadily, turning aside every thing of the sort as extraneous to the main points at issue, and not easy rightly to be handled in the relative situation of the parties, and brings back the question to the test of undeniable facts, and plain deduction. The publication of the letters has at least had one happy effect. We can without hesitation refer any one who would judge of the merits of the controversy, even the most prejudiced church of England man, to them and to the Reply without any fear of the conclusion to which he will come.

And in what a situation is his opponent thus placed. How can Dr. Strachan lie down in peace under the consciousness of having wrongfully attempted to fasten on our delegate terms the most disgraceful—under the consciousness that he has been proved to have solemnly given as weighty truths what are the reverse, and with the conviction that these proceedings are under the deliberate scrutiny of honorable men on both sides the Atlantic.

I should abuse your pages were I to fill them with matter which has already engaged the attention of your readers. I will therefore only venture to bring before them one or two of the points treated of in Mr. Morris's reply, that have not immediate connection with the course of my argument. I have said that every man in Canada, unless those in the immediate secret, was astounded at the establishment of the Rectories. So it appears was the Home Government. With regard to the measure Lord Glenelg thus addresses Sir F. B. Head:

"You are aware that your despatch of the 17th December, 1836, contained the first official intimation which ever reached me of the Rectories having been either established or endowed. The fact had been asserted in Parliament, but I was not only officially un-informed, but really ignorant that it had occurred." "I say he might well express his surprise at the report which reached the government, aware as he was, that no authority to his knowledge had been forwarded to Canada for that purpose; and little dreaming that a