

to be searched for them, to let them see—that they ought to have known otherwise—that their probationer did not fulfil his appointment. Yet after being instructed to be more faithful in looking after their trust, is it not a serious reflection that the Governor of the Island had to report to the proper authorities at home the notorious conduct of this person, while under their control,—while a due regard to their duty might have avoided that necessity. The late valuable accession to that Presbytery leads us to entertain hopes of better things in future.

Your correspondent, moreover, boasts “very largely” of the congregations there being so independent. I am truly glad to know that they are in a flourishing condition. But ought it not to be remembered with gratitude, that it was the efforts of former members of Presbytery that raised the congregations to their present state of efficiency, and prepared comfortable manses for the reception of their successors. This ought, of itself, to mitigate the zeal of the accuser, who groundlessly brings an accusation against “members who do not now belong to the Presbytery.” I am sure no genuine “Islander” can sympathize with his diligence.

Now, Mr. Editor, permit me to say that I am surprised that you should give place to such insinuations in the *Record*, from correspondents, without signature or proof, or any conceivable good in view. I am sure it must be quite opposed to your own better judgment—seeing that the *Record* is conducted with so much prudence and ability in other respects. There is surely sufficient reason for rejecting such communications, when the writer has not the honesty to give his own signature. Certainly the Church *Record* is not the place for them. Who ever heard, before this, of an accusation directed against a minister of our Church appearing in her accredited *Record* without the sanction of a Church Court?

This is not the first time I have had reason to complain. A very unfair and extra-judicial reproof is aimed at me and my congregation in the August number of the *Record*, by a very officious person. I shall direct attention to it in a future number. Were it not for such repeated attacks, I should not take time to reply. I find little time and less inclination to notice such communications; but having been so unfairly dealt with, I trust you will see it but second-hand justice to admit my defence. Had these officious persons exercised better zeal within their own sphere, they would find less time to interfere with others;—and for no other reason, that I can imagine, unless that I endeavor to build up our Church, to the utmost of my ability, in strict accordance with her constitution.

I am, very faithfully, yours,

ALEXANDER MCKAY.

We regret extremely that any thing should

have appeared in the *Record*, calculated to give a moment's annoyance to Mr. McKay or any member of our Church. With regard to the statement about the Island Presbytery we know literally nothing of the circumstances alluded to. We thought however, at the time our Correspondent's notice of that Presbytery objectionable, and intended to draw our pen through the paragraph alluding to “vagaries,” but somehow it escaped our notice till beyond recall. For our part, if we understand the matter properly, we do not think that there was any thing connected with the Students deserving of blame to any party, and least of all to Mr. McKay, who prompted by the highest feelings, very properly brought the case to the notice of the Presbytery, for the purpose of securing for them a little aid. That this aid was not extended at the time, was owing, if we mistake not, to a fact not very creditable to us as a Church, viz., that the Treasurer's exchequer was empty. It is a little hard perhaps for an editor, to be made responsible for every thing written by a Correspondent,—and equally difficult to find out and reject at all times, what may be calculated to convey an erroneous impression. To obviate this in part, some papers invariably head their Correspondence column with “We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by Correspondents.” We scarcely think this obviates the difficulty, and besides we consider it not the least important part of an editor's duty to exclude all improper, or injudicious matter even from Correspondents. Perhaps the plan said to have been adopted by the wife of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, would answer better. That excellent Lady, shortly after her husband's settlement, found herself being made the unwilling confidential depository of the foibles and failings of Mrs. This and Miss So-and-So all over the parish. “Now mind you,” said Mrs. C. in her pleasant decisive way to her fair friends, “whatever you say about Mrs. — I'll tell her,” and the consequence was, the confidential communications ceased. As a general rule all the articles in the *Record* are without the author's name, and we believe are thus calculated to have on the whole a better effect, than if the opposite plan were followed, but it would perhaps impose a wholesome restraint—(of course we speak in general terms) were the writer to know, that in case his statement or any part of it gave offense, he would be handed over to the offended party, to defend himself in *propria persona*. It is our earnest desire to keep the *Record* free altogether from individual allusions, even in the remotest manner, when calculated to give pain. They serve no purpose but a mischievous one, though we daresay often made with no such intention.

With regard to the letter of “Islander,” Mr. McKay seems to think it not impossible that it may have been written or inspired by a