

all the world. As there appears to have been a good deal of useless and irrelevant discussion, with respect to the Letter and Chart, in which minor errors, and what might fairly enough pass for inadvertencies, have been largely commented upon, while its general spirit and character, in which lies the head and front of its offending, have, as we believe, never been fully exposed, we shall, in this Review, omitting all consideration of errors, and mistatements in reference to particular facts, (though these last are far from being so immaterial as he and his friends would have us believe,) give our attention chiefly to the capital offences of the production. We would observe, then, in the outset, that the true mode of estimating its demerits is, to inquire how far it is calculated to convey a correct idea or representation, according to the professed intention of its author, of the relative state of the different Protestant Communions in Upper Canada; and—which is particularly worthy to be noted, in order to comprehend fully the art and sagacity with which it has been framed to serve the purposes of its author—we beg any one to read it, and ask himself, what impressions it must inevitably make on all, who are not personally acquainted with the state of these provinces, and, therefore on the minds of his Majesty's Ministers, and of Members of Parliament. The true criterion of every representation is—does it tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Apply this test to Dr. Strachan's Ecclesiastical Chart of Upper Canada—for the correctness of which he vouches in his letter, and bases his statements on the solid foundation of personal knowledge—and you will then be able to see how exceedingly partial and how utterly fallacious it is.

In the selection of his criteria, we find that he has adopted only those which would serve to give to his own Church the appearance of a superiority over others, and has most carefully avoided all mention or notice of such as would have dispelled at once the illusion and unveiled the actual state of things. Now we would ask, how can truth be more fatally wounded, or how can the worse side be made more effectually to appear the better, than, by the artifice of stating only—what tends to the advantage of the former—and nothing, but what shall tend to the prejudice of the latter. If a man, in pleading his own cause, shall tell no truth that makes against himself—shall not tell the whole truth, but such part as shall seem favourable to his cause—and shall tell nothing in reference to his adversary but what must appear prejudicial—we ask “has truth not been violated by such treatment?”

In selecting the number of Churches and Clergymen, as the criterion of the relative state of the different religious denominations—if it was the Doctor's intention to represent the truth fairly and undisguisedly—we think he has been singularly misdirected—but if it was his object to make a representation in favor of the Church of England, he has shown great judgment and policy. He has stated enough to leave an impression on the minds of those to whom his Chart was