

portant duties. Our observations will be confined entirely to the statements and charges, in which the interests of the Presbyterian Church and the reputation and character of its ministers are involved.

Having got over many singular and queer things in the address, we reached the following :—

“ There lies before me a religious analysis of the members of the present House of Assembly which appeared in one of our most respectable journals, and which has never been contradicted, in which I find thirty six out of sixty-two, the whole number of Representatives, given to the Church of England, while five only are assigned to the Church of Scotland. Now were we to take these members as indicating the relative proportion of the two Churches, it would not I apprehend be found very far from the truth. It is admitted that the same journal gives four members to Presbyterians not of the Church of Scotland, and therefore the Presbyterian denomination taken generally counts nine or ten Representatives; but the Kirk repudiates the other Presbyterians, and cannot therefore take credit for any more than their own five, or I believe from a recent vacancy, six Representatives.”

This passage evidently shows that Dr. Strachan's skill in the science of ecclesiastical statistics—so celebrated since the appearance of his famous ecclesiastical chart in 1826, deservedly excites very high admiration. It is manifest, and many will doubtless be gratified by the discovery, that age has in no degree impaired his faculty of collecting singular premises, and drawing very extraordinary conclusions from them. We shrewdly opine that there is not another learned person in Canada, save and except the Doctor's self, that could have ventured to publish any thing half so profound as this. That the numbers of a religious sect in any district in Upper Canada is to be inferred from the religious denomination to which its representatives in the House of Assembly may belong, is a conceit so far beyond what any ordinary man would form, that we are absolutely ecstasied with its out of the way originality, and yet its framer, conscious of his own vigorous grasp, and plainly familiar with the magnificent, without any apparent disturbance of thought, complacently avers—“ it would not I apprehend be found very far from the truth.” We do not happen to know much of the religious profession or character of many of our Assembly men. Could we be convinced that a true ecclesiastical census might be deduced from this knowledge, we should covet an opportunity of catechising them separately on their religious creeds; albeit we have some fears that several of them would ill brook to be “targed tightly” on this point. But seeing, as we judge, that the ecclesiastical census of the people, cannot be inferred from the ecclesiastical census of the House of Assembly, unless it be at the same

time ascertained, that the latter carried their election solely in consequence of their attachment to some particular creed, we do not feel much concerned about the uncontradicted statements of respectable journals, or even though the fact rested on much better authority. It will however, we believe, be seldom found that religious profession enters as an element in the judgment of electors choosing their representatives. We have visited the polling booths, looked upon the candidates at a safe distance, heard them occasionally adventure on a speech, narrowly observed the freemen rumbuling up to support their favorite, and we never could discover that religion was there exerting the slightest influence. Mayhap however we were not enough sharp-sighted, and Doctor Strachan after all may be right; but let us not be pronounced captious, should we desiderate more proof than he has furnished in his address.

Upon what authority we may ask does the Venerable Archdeacon assert that “the Kirk repudiates the other Presbyterians?” As lovers of truth we do not like to read these loose assertions made by one who should be not less a lover of truth than ourselves. A very little inquiry might have convinced the writer of the address that the assertion which he has here hazarded is without even the thinnest shadow of a reason. It is known to all who have given any attention to the proceedings of the Synod (and no man should presume to say any thing about them who has not given them a little attention) that they have been laboring for several years, and are still zealously laboring to promote the unity of the Presbyterian body on principles as charitable as they are enlightened. Our efforts moreover have been attended with some measure of success. Several of the ablest ministers of the United Synod, together with their flocks, have been admitted into our fellowship; and had it not been for the machinations of our enemies that success had been greater: toward this object our prayers and exertions are earnestly directed and the Venerable Doctor in his haste and antipathy asserts what is not true when he says “the Kirk repudiates the other Presbyterians.”

The following paragraph displays in a manner not less striking, the Doctor's statistical science:—

“ There are other grounds of approximating to a just estimate of our relative members. The first settlers in the Province being U. E. Loyalists were principally numbers of the Church of England, and since that period the number of Emigrants from the United Kingdom has doubtless borne a proportion to the various religious denominations of the parent State. Now of the twenty-four millions which the three