

them, may perhaps be admitted as some extenuation by those who know how to make a just allowance for human frailty. We must not omit to notice however an unfairness of representation, of which indeed there are numerous instances in this address, in which the Clergy and members of our Church are likened to voluntaries and other enemies of Church establishments in Britain. This is a pitiful shift; for every reader of penetration must detect the disingenuousness. Need we declare to our readers that the matter before us has nothing to do with the question of Church establishments? We object to the creation of Rectories, not because we are voluntaries, but because in the circumstances of the case the measure in our view was partial, unjust, an infringement of the equal rights belonging to us as connected with one of the established national churches.

It seems to us impossible to read the following paragraph without discerning in it a low cunning very unworthy of the reputation and office of him who penned it.

"In passing from the petitions against the Rectories by the Clergy and members of the Scotch church, I may be allowed, as an act of justice, to contrast their anxiety for the destruction of our church in the colony with the mildness which characterizes the petition of the united Synod of the Presbyterian church in Upper Canada not in connection with the church of Scotland. In urging their claim to share in the Reserves, this respectable body truly states that they were the first organized Presbyterian Institution in the Province; that they have suffered as many privations as any of their fellow christian labourers, and yield not, in loyalty to the Queen and attachment to the British Constitution, to any body of professing christians in the colony; and in conclusion pray that, in any distribution of the Reserves, they may be included as well as the Church of Scotland."

We have not seen the petition referred to and we are strongly inclined to distrust the summaries of such documents by the writer of this address. Is the destruction of "our church," in the colony identical with the destruction of the Rectories? We hope not—we would not wish any true church of Christ to rest on so insecure a foundation. Doctor Strachan has no authority for saying that the clergy and members of the Scotch church ever sought to injure or compass the destruction of his church. The vindication of our own claim, it being a just one, ought not to be regarded as a wish to deprive the church of England of any benefit to which she is legally entitled. The commendation here bestowed upon the United Synod, of which by the way the commendator can know but little, for the body is very materially changed since it was honored with an invitation to his table—may or may not be merited; but we utterly refuse, and we are pretty certain the members of the

United Synod will as heartily as ourselves refuse to admit the Archdeacon of Toronto to sit as arbiter on our comparative usefulness. Although he were better entitled than he is to judge between us, it is impossible that he can know much about "the question of desert." High as his station has been for some years past—overlooking as he imagined all the interests of the Province, political and religious, he cannot without the grossest presumption, affirm that the Presbyterians of Upper Canada are more indebted for religious instruction to the ministers of the United Synod than they have as yet been to those of the church of Scotland. This is really advancing beyond the spiritual affairs of his own church, and an intermeddling with the affairs of other churches which in the temper of the present times, nothing but the most astute hardihood would venture on. Which of us, the Episcopal church inclusive, have most advanced the religious instruction of the province; it belongs not to any one to affirm. This will by and by be determined by the Lord of all, and it would be well were this solemn consideration to stir each up to the faithful performance of their own duty, rather than to an invidious comparison of the fidelity and success of their fellow christians respecting which they must be very incompetent judges. It may suit the Doctor's purpose to attempt to awaken by his censure or commendation feelings of rivalry between the two bodies of Presbyterians. But in this, as in many other things, his counsels will be turned into foolishness.

We have no doubt the author of this address imagined he had hit off a very pungent accusation when he affirmed, of the ministers of the Church of Scotland, "whatever moral influence the latter may exercise in their respective congregations, it is a lamentable fact that they are chiefly known to the public as expert agitators against our church." But then the sentence has not the pungency of truth. It lacks the keen edge of a just rebuke.—If in any thing the Presbyterian ministers deserve to be called "expert agitators," it is not against "our church," as the Doctor in his simplicity opines, but in vindication of their own claims; and truly they very little deserve to be called expert, even in this more important matter, else their affairs would have stood in a very different position at the present hour. It is amusing to observe with what undiscerning querulousness the venerable dignitary imagines every movement on our part to be an act of hostility to his church. His party lay claim to the whole ecclesiastical property in the province, and though the question has long been *sub lite*, by the impolitic partiality