

of the executive government, they have been impowered to lay rapacious hands on large and valuable portions of the property, and when we, whose rightful claims have been admitted by the highest authorities, enter a caveat against these proceedings, the Doctor fancies he discovers hostile movements, and cries out robbery and spoliation. Now, we humbly trust that few of his clerical audience sympathize with him in these groundless imaginings. We know well that a very large number of the members of the Episcopal communion will read his jeremiad without dropping a tear. They are acquainted with the Archdeacon's monomania on the Clergy Reserves, and while it is natural to think that they wish his hallucinations were less avaricious, and that they verged a little more in favor of the just rights of their fellow-subjects of other denominations, they will not fail to support him in his endeavors to obtain for the Church of England whatever else may be rightfully entitled to. We do not regard such movements, on their part, as hostile to our church. Why should the Doctor, with a blind and peevish logic, conclude that similar movements on our part, and for our own rights, are designed in hostility towards the Church of England? Verily, we think that such a conclusion cannot be reached without much bad temper as well as bad logic.

We waive, for the present, all remarks on the Doctor's opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown in 1819, and the inviolability of the rights of the Rectors to their endowments, because it is not likely that any opinion of his, or ours, will influence the righteous adjudication of that question. We lay it, however, before our readers :

"Before dismissing this subject, you will expect me to notice the recent decision of the Crown Lawyers respecting the Rectories. I forbear making any remarks on the extraordinary case submitted to them at the instance of the Colonial Department, before the Scotch agent, the honorable William Morris, reached London; because that Department contained all the documents necessary to have enabled the Secretary of State to have made out the case full and complete;—but this I will observe, that the case decided upon confirms the Rectories in the strongest possible manner, for it declares them illegal in the absence of certain instructions, a double set of which, one to President Smith in 1818 and another to Sir Peregrine Maitland in 1825, besides a strong admonition from Lord Ripon in 1832, are in the possession of this government, and far more than sustain Sir John Colborne in the course he pursued. Nay, these instructions have not yet been abrogated or withdrawn, and would enable the present Provincial Government, if so disposed, to constitute and endow Rectories through the whole Province; and this power will remain till they are formally withdrawn, nor could any constitutional authority disturb them. You need not, therefore, my brethren, be under any apprehension in regard to the Rectories already established, but rather devoutly pray that five hundred more may be constituted before these instructions which are still in force can be recalled."

The present Law Officers of the Crown have disposed of Lord Ripon's despatch in 1832, and have decided that it contains no authority for the establishment of rectories. How they shall dispose of the instructions given to President Smith nineteen years ago, and to Sir Peregrine Maitland twelve years ago, remains to be seen. We shall abide the result patiently. Meanwhile it seems impossible to read Lord Glenelg's despatch to Sir F. Head on this subject, and yet imagine that the whole case was not fairly brought before the crown lawyers. It is not to be imagined that even these obsolete documents were overlooked; and persuaded as we are, that this whole transaction was a hasty and desperate act of a party, who rushed into it at the moment they saw themselves about to be stripped of power, and were reckless of the consequences to their successors and the country, we fervently hope, that Her Majesty's government will make it appear that all her servants are responsible for the right exercise of their power to the last moment of their holding it; and that it will not be her policy to perpetuate rights unjustly acquired, although her faithful servants may have trenched them round with all the formalities of law.

This allusion to the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown evidently seems to have stirred up anew the Archdeacon's bile against the Presbyterians. Witness the following paragraphs :

"Disappointed, or rather, as it would seem, enraged, that the Colonial Legislature would not lend itself to the destruction of the Rectories, the Presbyterian congregations were again urged to have recourse to agitation. Public meetings were again held and Delegates appointed to meet in Convention, that an appeal might be made from the Provincial Authorities to the Imperial Government. The resolutions and petition to the late king, adopted by the Delegates, are such that, if carried out in their full spirit, would not merely destroy the Church of England as an Establishment, but even make its toleration or that of any other denomination in the Colony more than doubtful, and clothe the Kirk with all the powers and immunities which it possesses in Scotland. For the petition prays that all Sessions and Presbyteries, which are in connexion with the Church of Scotland, shall be constituted bodies corporate, to the effect of holding lands, buildings, and other property for Ecclesiastical and other purposes, and that effect shall be given to their judgments and proceedings in matters spiritual, in the same manner as is done in the Mother Country. It must be confessed that this is sufficiently bold, and not likely to be readily granted; but it evinces a most striking infatuation when put in contrast with the other portion of the prayer, which, in effect, seeks the destruction of the church of the Empire.

"The petition farther prays that all the disabilities under which the Scotch Presbyterians labour in the Colony may be removed; but, as I am unable to discover any such disabilities, I must pass on to the argument attempted to be derived in their favour from the Act of Union between England and Scotland. Such an attempt is feeble, and cannot fail to excite the smile