

half-pay, and a place on the roll of the ancient naval veterans of the British flag, "the Admirals of the Yellow." I was kindly allowed a sight of the names in this memorial, and I now exhibit an analysis of it, for whose general accuracy I think I can vouch:—

ANALYSIS OF MEMORIAL.

Number of names, excluding the six concurrents.....	43
Of whom, heads of families.....	26
There are of communicants.....	47

In the list there appear the names of nine or ten young men, in the employ of Messrs. Pyper, Campbell, Leask, Henderson, Polley, and Laidlaw. Mr. and Mrs. Henning are not members of Knox's Church, although they occasionally occupy a seat there. Among the memorialists there are many ties of family and commercial relationship.

Of the six "concurring, Messrs. Peter Brown, Hugh Miller, and Samuel McLaine are connected with the George Street congregation. Mr. John Laidlaw and Mr. Robert Maitland were formerly of Knox's Church, and have not as yet joined any other; and Mr. Gordon Brown has lately joined, I am told, the Church of England. They all, however, adhered at one time to Knox's Church, and they form an aggregate of ten or twelve communicants.

My impression is, on the whole, that not one-half of those respectable persons, whose names are at the memorial, have any well-defined or strongly-felt desire to leave my ministry.

If the lengthened examination which six days have witnessed has been in any one instance gratifying to me, it has been in this, that it has brought out some pleasing illustrations of good done by my feeble instrumentality, of which I was not aware; and that it has rallied around me in greater strength than ever heretofore, the affectionate attachments of pious and intelligent hearers.

With regard to financial concerns, we are not bad at all, and I trust we shall soon be better. Mr. Leask has furnished me with written evidence quite sufficient to prove this, however difficult it may be to make it tally with his appearance here, in company with the extrusionists, this day. His balance sheet for 1854-55 shews an excess of £104 7s. 3d. in expenditure above the receipts; and how does he account for it? First, by stating that the sum of £94 6s., standing in the column of "annual expenditure," went to payments on the "building account;" and secondly, that £109 4s. of seat-rents was unpaid. I told him at the time, that had he given