

A
LETTER

FROM

THE HON. AND VENERABLE DR. STRACHAN,

ARCHDEACON OF YORK, U. C.

TO

DR. LEE, D. D.

CONVENER OF A COMMITTEE

OF

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

PRINTED AT THE HERALD OFFICE,

KINGSTON, U. C.

1829.

LETTER, &c.

TO THE REV. JOHN LEE, D. D., CONVENER OF A COMMITTEE OF
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

York, Upper Canada, 28th October, 1829.

REV. SIR,

Although I saw much in your evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons both of a general and personal nature to condemn, it was nevertheless my wish to remain silent.—The agitation of the question of the Clergy Reserves has produced in this Country so much bitterness already that I was exceedingly unwilling to write any thing more on the subject, but the publication of your testimony in the newspapers of the Colony leaves me no discretion.—It is my own opinion as well as that of my friends that it is my duty to reply, not to Dr. Lee as an individual, but to the Convener of a Committee appointed by so distinguished and venerable a body as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Before looking at your evidence I was disposed to consider you in the character of an Agent speaking from a brief which had been put into your hands, and therefore not responsible for the truth of the facts which it contained; but I find you stepping out of your way to disprove my statements and returning a second time of your own accord for no other purpose, as it would seem, than to treat me with a discourtesy which I could not have anticipated from a Gentleman of your character and ability.

As this letter may be read by many who are ignorant of the subject in dispute, it is proper to premise that in 1791, when the Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada, His late Majesty was pleased to recommend an appropriation of land for the maintenance of a Protestant Clergy.—Till 1822 these lands were supposed to be intended exclusively for the maintenance of the Clergy of the Established Church, but in that year a claim to share in their proceeds was preferred by the Clergy of the Church of Scotland. This claim excited a controversy which was commenced by one of the Scotch Clergy residing in this Province.—It has continued ever since and been productive of much evil.

My wish has ever been to see a reasonable support given to the Clergy in Communion with the Church of Scotland in the Province of Upper Canada, because they belong to a Church which is established in one portion of the Empire, and both before and since the agitation of this question I have frequently advised them to make respectful representa-

tions to His Majesty's Government for assistance, leaving it to the Ministers to discover the source from which such aid might be taken.—In regard even to the Clergy Reserves I suggested to several of the Scotch Clergy that they should confine themselves to the making of representations at home, and that there we wou'd meet them.—For though I was of opinion that they had no legal claim, and was determined as a Member of the Church of England to oppose them by every honourable means in my power, I thought the matter might be conducted in the spirit of an amicable suit, and I deprecated the agitation of the question in the Colony where it could never be determined, but where it was sure to call up much wrath.—This course was not followed, and to the Scotch Clergy must undoubtedly be attributed all the evils which the discussion has produced.

In the mean time these lands, about which so much clamour has been raised, yielded little or no revenue.—His Majesty's Government was therefore advised to sell a portion of them in order to furnish means for the support of such a number of Protestant Clergy as the Provinces of Canada might require.—To effect this object a bill was brought into Parliament in the Session of 1827, by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Horton, which after much interruption and some modifications passed into a law, authorizing the sale of one fourth of the Clergy Reserves—the proceeds to be placed in the Public Funds, and the interest only to be expended by the Government agreeable to the provision of the 31st of George 3d Chap 31.

On the 14th May the clauses of the Bill came into discussion, & some opposition was made by Mr. Hume & two or three other Scotch Members, and assertions hazarded respecting the state of the Churches in Canada which the Under Secretary was not prepared to answer.—Having urged the propriety of the measure, I was called upon for information and I furnished it with a sincere conviction of its accuracy, in the form of a letter addressed to Mr. Horton.—It ought to be borne in mind that the facts were given from memory—that they were called for suddenly in reply to attacks made on the Church of England for which I could not have been prepared.—Being thus given for a public purpose, they were given in that public manner that there could be no danger of any error escaping detection.—For my opinions I am responsible to no one—I had no desire to conceal them, and they were therefore publicly and openly expressed.—No consideration could have prevailed upon me to deny or misstate them; but in applying them, every candid mind will feel that the general expressions used admit the existence of exceptions.

This letter (see note A.) appears to have given you much offence, because it refuted the statements which you had received from Canada, and which you had communicated with so much confidence to your friends in Parliament, if their assertions are to be credited. And instead of making you more cautious in sifting the information sent you from the Colonies, it seems only to have excited in your mind a desire to attack my character.—The appointment of the Committee on the civil Government of Canada presented a good opportunity for gratifying this desire, and you have embraced it with a zeal worthy of a more honourable cause.

Before proceeding to your evidence it is proper to remind you of the respective claims which the national Churches have on the sympathy and gratitude of the inhabitants of Upper Canada.

The Church of England has from the first settlement of the Province supported Missionaries for the religious instruction of the people.

The number of these Missionaries has been increased, as the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was enabled by its funds arising from subscriptions, donations and bequests, to support them.

Inadequate, I admit, were these exertions fully to supply the rapidly increasing wants of the Colony ; but the venerable Society laboured to the utmost of its power, and even spent part of its capital in multiplying its Clergy in the British North American Provinces.

In consequence of these meritorious efforts, many of the grown up inhabitants of the Province have been baptized and married, and a great proportion of the old buried, by Clergymen of the Church of England.

What during all this time has the Church of Scotland done? Nothing in comparison.—It is a fact, which cannot be contradicted, that there was only one regularly ordained Scotch Clergyman in this Province till 1818, a period of twenty-seven years. It is equally true that the only change at the beginning of 1827 was the division of this gentleman's congregation into four parts, besides one new congregation at Kingston—I freely admit that some division was necessary, as the congregation had greatly increased and was spread over a large tract of country—that, while the Province was poor and almost a dreary wilderness, no inquiry was made by the Kirk of Scotland respecting the spiritual wants of her people in Upper Canada, now said to be so many.—The Kirk of Scotland made no movement in favour of the settlers belonging to her communion for more than thirty years—nor till the wilderness was changed into fruitful fields and the principal difficulties and hardships of new settlements no longer existed—and, now that a movement has been made, it is not for the purpose of contributing, as the Church of England does, for the support of her Clergy, but it is for the purpose of urging a claim to a provision which the venerable Society must fairly have looked forward to in aid of her exertions.

You indeed say, (page 288) "I trust it will not be irregular to take this occasion to represent to the committee that it is very easy to account for the increasing number of clergymen of the Episcopal persuasion, as the encouragement they have received is much greater."

Is your eye evil, because we are good?—What prevented you from giving similar encouragement to the Members of your church in Canada?

The Venerable Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, established and supported by members of the church of England, has for several generations extended its charity to the destitute emigrants. It was the first Protestant Missionary Society in the world, and flourished more than a century before any other rose up, and is still the greatest that exists.—It supports Missionaries of the Established church in the Canadas—Nova Scotia—New Brunswick—Prince Edward's Island—Newfoundland and the Bermudas.—And although an annual donation in aid of its funds has been given by Parliament since 1814—yet the greater part of its expence is defrayed from the subscriptions, donations and bequests of individuals.—This institution has secured to the Colonies the privileges of public worship, the administration of the Sacraments and religious instruction.—And but for its benevolent exertions thousands, I may say millions, would have lived without God in the world—without the knowledge of Christ or spiritual food for their souls.

I mean not to depreciate the exertions of the Methodists.—They took the field much later, but in many of the Colonies they have laboured zealously and with great effect in the cause of Christianity.—I am placing in contrast the claims of the church of England and Scotland for the consideration of the people of the Colonies, and to these two churches I wish to confine myself.

While our church has, through her Society, done so much for her sons and daughters who have removed to the various Colonies of the Empire, your brother Clergyman Dr. Andrew Thompson shall tell you what your church has done.

“Episcopalians extend the wings of their protection and fostering care over their churches planted in distant lands; Dissenters of every name shew a consistent zeal to increase the number and prosperity of their churches, but who ever heard of one maternal act exercised by the church of Scotland over her tender brood if per chance they have strayed beyond the Tweed—She is indeed an unnatural mother &c.”
Having premised these truths I now proceed to your evidence, and first to those parts which appear to affect my statements.

In page 288 you say “the thing that I was most anxious to state is this, I find it represented in a speech published, I believe, by Dr. Strachan, that his letter to Mr. Horton was written hastily in consequence of having learned that some Members of the House of Commons had received letters from me stating that there were thirty organized congregations in Upper Canada in Communion with the Church of Scotland,” and then you proceed to state, that you wrote no letters to your friends in Parliament till after my letter to Mr. Horton had been published, and on this you seem to lay great stress. I might content myself with remarking, that with this assertion I have no sort of concern,—whether correct or not, is to me a matter of perfect indifference. For at best it forms not a real but only an apparent, contradiction of my statement.—I mentioned in my speech the substance of what was said to have taken place in the House of Commons on the evening of the 14th of May, as recorded in my journal of the 15th. Whether what was said there or what was stated to me was literally correct or not, is beyond my knowledge, but nevertheless I will examine your representation.—And first let us see what I actually did say in my speech to which you refer. “A new bill (page 14) was introduced on the 14th of May, and after some debate it was ordered to be printed.—On this evening one or two members from Scotland said that they were informed by Dr. Lee, one of the clerks of the General Assembly that there were thirty organized congregations in Upper Canada in communion with the Kirk of Scotland.”

You must perceive that there is a material difference between your quotation from my speech and what I really did say, if you will take the trouble to look at the copy in your possession—I do not state how the members got their information from you, whether verbally, by message, or by letters, for I knew nothing of the matter. nor did I at that time know the names of the Scotch members alluded to—but I was told that your name had been quoted as authority for mentioning the thirty congregations, and although you deny having written letters, you do not say that you had no communication with these members of Parliament.

You proceed to say that you wrote no letters till about a month after the publication of my letter to Mr. Horton, leaving it to be inferred (though you have not gone so far) that you had no sort of intercourse

on the subject of the Clergy Reserves with your Advocates in the House of Commons till the reading of my letter had raised your indignation.—But let us look a little farther how the matter stands as to time

My letter to Mr. Horton is dated the 16th of May—on the 22d it was ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, and on the 28th and not sooner was I able to procure one of the printed copies.—On the 26th of May you presented your report to the General Assembly on the Canada petition which contained the matter afterwards embodied in your memorial to His Majesty's Government.—In that document you admit that your communications with your Canadian correspondents had been frequent before this period.—How indeed could it be otherwise, as the committee of which you are Convener had been sitting for some years although you were not at first a member, and all its papers were before you.—Now if you had no communication on the subject of the Clergy Reserves with any of the Scotch members in the House of Commons till a month after you had seen my letter, which could not have been before the 28th of May, [for surely you could not in Edinburgh procure a copy sooner than I could in London,] you bring yourself to the 28th of June. Yet your letters were quoted, and parts of them as well as your memorial read in my hearing by Lord Binning on the 16th of June, when the bill came again under discussion, or twelve days before you wrote that nobleman according to your own shewing.—Here is a difficulty which I leave you to clear up.

Again, if before the 14th of May you had not, as convener of the Committee on the Canada Petition, put yourself in communication with your friends in Parliament, how was such conduct consistent with the duty which you had publicly undertaken?

The question of the Clergy Reserves came before the House of Commons on the 20th February, again on the 2nd March—on the 22d March—on the 4th May and on the 14th of May.—The measure had been almost three months in progress before my letter was written.—Is it credible that during all this time the Convener of the committee to which was entrusted the interests of the Church of Scotland in Canada did not directly or indirectly communicate with a single member of the House of Commons on a subject which they deemed so important? It is quite indifferent to me which alternative you choose.—In either case the words you complain of are equally correct, and their correctness depends, not upon what you assert, but upon what passed in the House of Commons on the 14th of May.

You complain of my letter and chart as being full of misrepresentations, and you say in page 288 that it is very material to establish that my statements have been hastily and inadvertently drawn up.—When you said this you had in your possession the chart appended to my speech upon which you comment, one particle of which chart has never been contradicted—not even by the committee of the House of Assembly of this Province to which it was delivered in evidence, and it demonstrates that the one accompanying my letter to Mr. Horton was unjust to the Church of England.—The chart of 1827, against which you cavil, states that there were in Upper Canada thirty Clergymen and thirty five Churches belonging to the church of England and that these Clergymen performed service and preached at fifty-eight places.—In 1828, only one year after, it appears by the second chart, against which a voice has never been raised, that there were thirty-nine Clergymen, forty-three churches and one hundred and two places at which those

Clergymen did duty, so that, in the short space of one year, our Church numbered nine additional Clergymen, eight new churches and forty-four new stations at which divine service was performed.—Had you been desirous of communicating the truth to the committee, you would have made use of the second chart instead of dwelling upon the supposed inaccuracy of the first, particularly as the latter was composed by me in the Province with the advantage of recent inquiry; so that for its accuracy I am justly responsible and if correct information was your object it was to that you ought in reason to have looked, when you had it before you.

In my letter to Mr. Horton, my object was to give as correct an account as I was able of the state of the two National Churches.—Any notice of other denominations was incidental, and to shew that even the Presbyterians, not of your Communion, greatly surpassed your people in numbers, I stated that there were four Clergymen and four congregations belonging to your Church—that one had lately died, and another had returned to Scotland.—In June 1826, nearly a year before the printing of my letter, I had made a similar statement to Lord Bathurst, mentioning the four Clergymen by name, who were at that time with their congregations. On my return to the Colony in September, 1827, I learned that the Rev. Mr. Connel had been placed over another fragment of the first congregation, and that Mr. Sheed, who was in Scotland when I wrote my letter, had arrived in Canada some months before me. You charge it as a crime that I was not endued with the second sight to find out in London, by whom the vacancies in your church had been filled up in Canada, and that two new appointments had been made. In regard to the Church of England I was still more unfortunate, in which many favourable alterations had taken place during my absence, but which, being unknown to me, I could not mention.—The difference in favour of the Church of England is greater now than it was when I was in London, and so it was in 1828, as you knew from my speech and chart of that year.—To these documents, which were published in Canada, you had not the candour to refer, but continued to harp upon my letter to Mr. Horton and chart of 1827, by which you led the committee into the belief that because six Clergymen belonged to your Church in 1828, the same number was in the Colony in the beginning of 1827.

Some slight mistakes crept into the Chart which I presented to Mr. Horton, all of which are appended in a note, (see note B.) and it will be found that neither singly nor taken together have they any material bearing upon the question, and that they were corrected in the new Chart published soon after my return to the Colony.

In February 1828 the state of the two Churches was as follows:

Clergymen of the Church of England	- - - - -	39
Clergymen of the Church of Scotland	- - - - -	6
Difference	- - - - -	33

Here I give you no credit for the other Presbyterian Ministers, who neither claimed nor were acknowledged to have any communion with you, until it was thought desirable to magnify your numbers in advancing a claim to the legal endowment of the Church of England, but I shall not hesitate a moment to reckon them as yours, when you receive them into the bosom of your Church.—Having thus disposed of your complaint and the amount of what you are pleased to call my misrepresentations, I am prepared to examine how your evidence stands in

point of correctness—and here my attention is first directed to the memorial of the Committee appointed by the General Assembly and signed by you as Chairman or Convener, because it is to be presumed that it was drawn up at leisure and with special care as to the truth of its allegations. “Your Memorialists (page 207) have reason to believe that “the Congregations in Upper Canada in communion with the Church “of Scotland have been represented as being few in number, when compared with the Congregations which avail themselves of the Ministrations of the Church of England. It cannot be denied that there are “in Upper Canada at least thirty Presbyterian Congregations professing “to adhere to the Doctrines and Worship of the Church of Scotland.— “Though the Presbyterian Ministers in the Province do not exceed “twenty in number, and though only five of this number have been ordained by Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland it is ascertained “that a great majority of the people are zealously attached by principle and education to the Established Church.”

If this paragraph be intended for information, nothing can be more confused or inconsequent—if to mislead, it has some merit. A little transposition and alteration will bring it near the truth, when read as follows :

Your Memorialists have reason to believe that the congregations in Upper Canada in communion with the Church of Scotland have been represented as being few in number, when compared with the Congregations which avail themselves of the ministrations of the Church of England, and this they cannot deny, as they have only five congregations and five Clergymen of their communion in that Province, but they claim twenty-five congregations and fifteen Clergymen besides, who profess to adhere to the doctrine and worship of the Church of Scotland, since we offered them the right hand of fellowship and a share of the Reserves.

At your voluntary examination on the 28th of June, you repeat your assertion respecting the thirty congregations but you add a very convenient qualification which was not perhaps thought of when you penned the Memorial. “But I did not state that they were organized or “that they had Ministers ordained by the Church of Scotland, but I “stated at the same time that only five or six had Ministers who were “ordained by the Church of Scotland.”

What is most intelligible in this passage is the clear admission that of these thirty congregations five or six at farthest were all that belonged to the Church of Scotland, and this agrees exactly with what I stated, & what the friends of that Church in Canada have been obliged to admit. But while you have thus disclosed the truth, in stating the relative numbers of the two denominations, another object is served in making this avowal to the committee, namely, to distinguish between the congregations & their Ministers. The passage implies that before you consider the congregations organized, they must be under Clergymen of your Church. To this conclusion I am forcibly led by the process that is said to be going on at Perth, in this Province, and which will soon be imitated in other places. It is well known that the Presbyterian congregations in Upper Canada, not of your Communion, would never have thought of making a public profession to adhere to the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of Scotland, had they not been induced by their own Clergy. Nor would their Clergy have advised such a measure, had they not look-

ed forward to a complete and cordial union with your Church, as the consequence of such profession.

Now I am ready to admit that such an union would be favorable to the interests of religion in this Province, because healing division is always beneficial, and that the Presbyterian Clergy, not in your Communion, may feel justified in the steps they have taken to bring about so great a good, but I fear that they will find themselves deceived, and that the congregations which they have collected with so much labour, and over which they preside with so much faithfulness, will in a few years be divided, and melt from under them. On the whole, in asserting that there are thirty congregations professing to adhere to the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of Scotland, it is manifest that an impression extremely fallacious is attempted to be made on the committee, as if this number already belonged to your Church, when as yet five or six only of the thirty are in your Communion. If this mode of grouping together all who generally adhere to the same religious principles is admitted, then may we claim all the Methodists, who are, as Mr. Alder says, a branch of the Church of England, both at home and abroad.—On the same ground we may claim the Lutherans, with whom the Church of England has ever been in Communion. Had we counted these denominations and said that our Communion embraced nine tenths of the population a great cry would have been raised against us. But you invite the Scotch Seceders, the Irish, Dutch and American Presbyterians to take part with you, while they form distinct congregations having Pastors not ordained by your Church, and you value yourselves accordingly and call it wise policy. Your Clergy in this country, if not by your direction yet without any expression of disapprobation on your part, write to the Presbyterian Ministers offering them the right hand of fellowship, and asking their assistance in support of the prayer of your petition. These gentlemen, hoping to be recognized by the Church of Scotland, readily accepted the invitation, and exerted themselves in good faith to procure signatures from their congregations, and collected money to pay for sending home an Agent. As they could not be ignorant of the fact, that it is not in the power even of the General Assembly to admit the Clergy of other denominations who call themselves Presbyterians into her communion, or to recognize their orders till the laws of the Church are altered—that the Church of Scotland cannot exercise authority over her own Clergyuen beyond the limits of Scotland or over Clergyuen not ordained by her own Courts, they must have trusted implicitly to your exertions in their favour. Your good offices they doubtless considered to be the certain consequence of the earnest solicitations of your Clergy of Montreal, which they must have seen, and of the regular Agent acting under instructions, which they must have read and approved. From all these things it is natural for them to look for a happy result. Now Sir, unless you are prepared to procure such an alteration in the constitution of your Church, as shall admit those Ministers into full communion, you ought to have undeceived them long ago—otherwise to invite them to make a common cause with you and to keep them ignorant, while they can be made useful, of your inability to fulfil your engagements, is highly reprehensible. As a stroke of policy, it has been exceedingly successful—they have bolstered up your cause—enabled you to deceive Government as to your numbers, and to produce more favorable attention to your demands. If you succeed, you may justly attribute it to their co-operation—and if the promis-

es made to them are redeemed, they will have no reason to repent of their seasonable junction with your friends. But of their admission into your Church I entertain strong doubts—I have examined your evidence with great care to see if it in any way sanctioned the promises that had been made to the Presbyterian Clergy not in your Communion, but instead of this I find you continually separating them from their congregations. Nor can I discover the smallest inclination on your part to realize their hopes. On the contrary you appear to take every possible advantage of a state of things, which the management of the Montreal Committee has created.

You assert in various places that the majority of the people attending the ministrations of these Gentlemen are anxious to have regular Clergy of your Church in their stead, and quote the congregation of Perth as an example. You say that no Presbyterian Clergy can claim under 31st Geo. 3 Chap. 31, but those of the Church of Scotland. That even the Presbyterian Clergy of the North of Ireland, many of whom it is well known are educated at the Scotch Universities, are not in Communion with the Church of Scotland.

You state in your Memorial “within the last six years (as appears from the report of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for the year 1821) the number of communicants at seventeen stations in Upper Canada, served by seventeen Missionaries, whose salaries amounted to £3,345, did not exceed 118. As a contrast with this admitted fact, it may be stated that in the year 1823, the Presbyterian congregation at Perth which began to be formed only five years ago (and which though not served at present by a Minister of the Church of Scotland, must by express stipulation, be so served in time to come) contained not fewer than 270 communicants.

On turning to the report of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts for 1821, from which you say that you have taken this admitted fact, I find that the Communicants which you assert amount only to 118, amount to 567, or more than three times the number. I likewise find that only ten of the seventeen Missionaries have given a return of the number of their Communicants. Had returns been made by the other seven in the same ratio, 256 must be added, making 623 instead of 118, that is almost six times as many as you confidently state to be the true number,—Such is the correctness of a grave document presented to His Majesty’s Government, signed by the convener of a committee appointed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland!

I was willing to believe that so great a departure from truth in a passage, professedly quoted from a printed abstract before you, must have arisen from inadvertency, but I find that in adding up the salaries only a trifling error of £30 is made, giving £3,345 instead of £3,375, while in the column of Communicants not one third is enumerated.

I have not yet done with this passage of your Memorial. You place in contrast with this manufactured quotation, the Communicants belonging to the Presbyterian congregation at Perth. This cannot be allowed—1st. because that congregation is not in communion with the Church of Scotland.—2nd. because the Rev. Mr. Bell, by whose labours this large Congregation has been collected, honestly admits that perhaps one third of this number belongs to the two Churches which have been formed in the neighbourhood, so that instead of 270 the number should have been 180. But I repeat that you have no right to count as belonging to you the various Presbyterian, or rather perhaps independent, congrega-

tions scattered up and down the Province, much less to hold up their Ministers as the pioneers of your Clergy.

On the subject of Communicants, it is proper to remark that they form no correct criterion for ascertaining the numbers of different denominations.—Among Episcopalians seldom more than one in twelve are calculated upon as regular Communicants. In the Church of Scotland, the proportion is said to be greater. In the Township of Drummond, in which the Town of Perth is situated, there are 836 Episcopalians and only 489 Presbyterians, and yet it is probable that Mr. Bell, the Presbyterian Clergyman has as many Communicants as Mr. Harris the Missionary. It is farther to be observed, that in the report of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the average number of communicants only is given who attend at any one time, and this is seldom half the number belonging to the congregations. For instance, between two and three hundred belong to the congregation at York, but the average of six dispensations, the number of times this holy rite is celebrated during the year, will not much exceed one hundred.—Moreover in the Scotch Churches the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is only celebrated once a year, and consequently all who are able attend, as they have not like our people frequent opportunities.

You say (Page 288) “we have also now this information with regard to two of the Districts which Dr. Strachan takes notice of as containing no Presbyterian congregations, Niagara and Gore, there are eight Presbyterian congregations in each, sixteen in all. Although Dr. Strachan does not admit one.”

It is in evidence before a Committee of the House of Assembly, composed of persons by no means friendly to the Church of England, that there were in these two Districts in 1828, when you were giving this evidence, four Clergymen not in Communion, and one in Communion with the Church of Scotland, who have one and some two congregations each, the remaining congregations are only to be found in your statement.

You state, (page 289,) “That according to the information the General Assembly have received a number of persons that have gone out as school masters, some of them being licensed preachers of the Church of Scotland, have been prevailed upon to become Episcopalians, and to receive orders.”

There is not a single Clergyman belonging to the Established Church in the Province that ever was, to my knowledge, a licentiate in the Church of Scotland, though there are some who have been licenced by other Presbyterian bodies.

“Dr. Strachan,” you continue, (page 289,) “was a Schoolmaster, and educated for the Church of Scotland, and the circumstance of his having gone over to the Church of England, so far as I can learn, has not at all tended to increase the number of proselytes among the Laity.”

Were all this true, I need not, as I have elsewhere said, be ashamed of doing what Archbishops Tillotson and Secker and Bishop Butler have done, and still less am I ashamed of the principles of my father, who descended from a family that has given two Bishops to the Scotch Episcopal Church. So far as this passage implies reproach, and a desire to injure my character, it only gives another example of the pernicious tendency of religious controversy which can descend to such littleness.—You need not be afraid that I will injure the Church that I have deliberately chosen, for it stands in evidence that my congregation is large—

that it increases rapidly, and in 1828, comprehended very nearly half the population of York and its immediate vicinity.

Once more.—In speaking of Mr. Sheed, (page 29,) you say, “A Chapel was built for him, and it is one of the Churches which Dr. Strachan, as I am assured, mentioned as one of the Established Churches.”

On this point I am happy to inform you that this Church belongs exclusively to us, and has been regularly conveyed to the Bishop of Quebec. It never was built for Mr. Sheed. It was first a free Church, and like all such became a subject of contention; at length the Episcopalians bought in the small portion which they had not subscribed.

I had proceeded thus far when a friend handed me a copy of your report to the General Assembly in 1828. Compared to this your evidence given a few days after it was presented before the Committee of the House of Commons, may be deemed extremely modest. The statements presented to your Church in this document, and which that Church has adopted from their confidence in your veracity, will appear incredible to the Inhabitants of Upper Canada; you say, “it is established beyond all question by these returns, that of the whole body of the inhabitants of this Province, supposed to average three hundred thousand at the least, and augmenting with great rapidity every year by new importations, one half at the lowest estimate, are decidedly attached to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Scotland.” To this it is quite sufficient to answer, that the population of Upper Canada, by the returns made to the Legislature, as appears from the Journals of the House of Assembly, has not yet reached two hundred thousand. (note c.)

I feel how disagreeable it is to pursue this disgusting examination any farther, but as you have voluntarily become the vehicle of the most unjust statements against the Church of England, and have proceeded systematically to depreciate her exertions, it is necessary to take some notice of the Gentlemen who were associated with you in the Agency. Restricting myself, as I have carefully done, to this Province, and leaving the misstatements which have been made by you and them respecting Lower Canada, to be noticed by the friends of the Church in that quarter, I shall quickly prove that their evidence is no more to be trusted to than yours.

Of the Rev. Mr. Leith's testimony, it may be sufficient to remark that he holds up the Eastern District, which contains four Presbyterian congregations, and as he says, two, but in fact, four congregations of Episcopalians, as a fair specimen for the whole Province, although he knew that in all the other ten Districts, several of them more populous than the Eastern, there were only two Clergymen belonging to the Church of Scotland, while there were thirty-five belonging to the Church of England, having several congregations each.

The same Reverend Gentleman asserts that the Presbyterians are to the Episcopalians as ten to one—and speaking of the Episcopalian congregation of Cornwall, where he resided four years, he avers that the hearers were only between thirty and forty in number, while he admits the communicants to average forty—thus giving a greater average of communicants than hearers—so much for the correctness and value of his testimony: the remainder is a violent repetition of parts of yours and Mr. Grant's evidence, and equally entitled to credit—With his violence I have nothing to do.

Mr. Grant, a Barrister, not particularly prominent in his profession,

residing at Montreal, was employed by the Petitioners of the Church of Scotland in the Canadas, to advance their claims to a share of the Clergy Reserves—In that character he was examined by the Committee of the House of Commons—What he stated on the subject is therefore worth as much as the speech of an Advocate generally, who is paid for defending a bad cause.

He says, (page 191) “The number of the Clergymen of the Church of England have multiplied in a greater ratio than their flocks.”

Almost every Clergyman of the Church of England employed in Upper Canada, has from three to eight stations at which occasionally he performs divine service—One has eleven stations. It is evident therefore, that to every one now employed, two or three more Clergymen might be profitably added to labour within the limits of the same mission.—Moreover, the applications from places to which we are unable to send even occasional assistance are twice as numerous as the stations already occupied—yet, in the face of this, Mr. Grant states that our Clergy multiply in a greater ratio than our flocks: such a departure from fact is almost incredible.

In page 192 he states that the Presbyterians in the Western District of Upper Canada amount to 2,250.

In that District there was at the time of Mr. Grant's statement, neither Presbyterian Minister nor congregation.—Lately a small congregation has been organized at Amherstburgh, in connection with the Church of Scotland.—He assumes that out of 20,000, the population of the District, 16,000 are Presbyterians.—On reference to the Report of the House of Assembly for 1828, I do not find a single congregation in that District, in communion with the Church of Scotland, and of other Presbyterians, only three Clergymen and three Churches.—With respect to this District, it appears from a document now before me, signed by two of the principal inhabitants, that in 1789 and 1790, one half of the whole population belonged to the Church of England, and that District being early settled, has had the character of its population less altered by recent emigration than any other in the Province.

With the same recklessness, Mr. Grant supposes that out of 30,000, the population of the Midland District, ten thousand are Presbyterians. The Report of the House of Assembly gives three Presbyterian Clergymen with their congregations—one of which only belongs to the Church of Scotland.

From the Eastern District, Mr. Grant selects from out of ten townships, and gives them as a specimen of the whole—and although warned by the committee that this selection may have been partially made; yet, fearless of detection, for we had no friend acquainted with the localities of the Province present, he persevered. Now it is notorious that the greater part of the Eastern District is inhabited by Emigrants from Scotland, and that the county of Glengary is exclusively Scotch—one half Presbyterian and the other Roman Catholic—and that it would be as near the truth to say that the inhabitants of Ireland were chiefly Presbyterians, because there are many in the North, as to say that this is the prevailing denomination in Upper Canada, because it divides the county of Glengary with the Church of Rome.

He says nothing of the County of Stormont in the same District, which contains a great number of Episcopalians and Lutherans;—such are the vague and inaccurate statements given by Mr. Grant, when speaking of Districts! When he descends to particular congregations, his assertions are equally at variance with truth.—He states the attendance at the Church of Chatham in the Western District, to be from twenty to thirty—the resident Missionary and Church Wardens certify to 300. The hearers at Niagara, Mr. Grant says, are 90. The Missionary says two hundred; and the Public Assessor for 1828 returns 434 Episcopalians out of 1,242, the population of the town, or more than one third of the whole. The hearers at Bastard according to Mr. Grant, are from six to eight.—The Clergyman, with his Church Wardens, certifies to 200. The number of Communicants at Perth, by Mr Grant's account, is twenty; the Clergyman, Mr. Harris, declares the average number to be 163, and 250 within the bounds of his Mission.

But it is painful to pursue this subject farther, or to dwell on the injustice done to the Church of England in the Canadas, in the evidence taken last year before a Committee of the House of Commons.

The object has evidently been to give an exaggerated conception of your numbers in the Colony, and this has been done deliberately, after time and opportunity for enquiry.

First, by holding up the Eastern District as a fair specimen of the whole Province—when it is demonstrable that in none of the other Districts have you any proportionate strength.

Second—by mixing up personal abuse with the question, and dwelling on my letter and Chart of 1827, because it contained a few insignificant errors, though on the whole an understatement, instead of the corrected Chart of 1828, which being founded upon regular returns from the Clergy, you were unable to contradict.

Thirdly, by bringing the Presbyterians not in your communion in the foreground, and assuming them as part of your body.

With the final result of this controversy, the Clergy of the Church of England at present employed in the Province, are not personally interested, for whatever the Reserves may hereafter yield, it is not intended that their incomes shall be increased, but they are not the less strenuous in contending for the preservation of the rights of their Church and of the provision for the Clergy of future generations, nor will they fail to use their best endeavours to preserve the means which they consider the law has given them of extending more generally religious instruction through the Province, and providing a support for additional Clergymen. Nor can they doubt but that an opportunity will be afforded them to disprove the erroneous statements which you and your friends have brought forward, and to correct the mistaken impressions which you have made respecting the relative state of the two Churches, before any measure is adopted on the subject by the Imperial Government.

In conclusion, I have only to add, that to you I have no apology to offer for this letter. Had you appeared before the committee as a private individual, or had you been satisfied with your first evidence, erroneous as it is, I should have given myself no trouble about you. But you have identified yourself with the incorrect statements furnished you from the Colony and made yourself a party in the personal slander and abuse, with which your correspondents here have endeavoured to overwhelm me.—Thus have you compromised the station assigned you by the General Assembly and reflected discredit on that venerable body, by stating in its

ame, matters which with reasonable inquiry you might have discovered
to be without foundation, greatly exaggerated, or wholly untrue.

I have the honor to be, Rev. Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

JOHN STRACHAN.

NOTES.

Note A.—Of their conduct towards me take the following specimens from the labours of the Rev. H. Esson, your principal correspondent.

1st. This Reverend Gentleman, availing himself of the mental infirmity of an old and worthy friend of mine, contrived to procure from him, in a moment of weakness, a confidential correspondence which had taken place between us more than twenty-five years ago, and gave it to a hired slanderer, who published the substance in the *Montreal Herald*, once a respectable Journal. Mr. Esson had afterwards the unparalleled temerity to defend this infamous transaction in a periodical work' said to be religious, and of which he was the reputed Editor. This work was almost wholly employed in abusing me, and became at length so loathsome and disgusting, that it expired, as I have heard, with the third number.

2nd. Mr. Esson, or his friend of the *Montreal Herald*, wrote a letter dated Montreal 8th December 1827, which they caused to be inserted, as they say, in the *Glasgow Chronicle* of the 30th January 1828—the purport of which is to traduce and slander my character—Never perhaps was there a greater number of calumnies and falsehoods against an individual, crammed into the same number of pages. This delicate production Mr. Esson transferred to the very first number of his religious miscellany, and so became responsible for its contents.

3rd. No falsehoods are more malignant than those which contain some sprinkling of truth—Of this Mr. Esson seems aware, and displays some experience in their composition.

Being in Edinburgh in August 1824, Lord Dalhousie invited me to spend some days at his Castle, distant from that city about ten miles. Previous to accepting this invitation, I had engaged to meet an old friend in Edinburgh on the following Sunday between one and two o'clock, and to visit Dr. Allison between the services, as it was the only day that he came to town, on account of his delicate health.

At breakfast on Sunday morning, I mentioned these engagements, and asked His Lordship whether I could keep them and attend the morning Church, for I wished to hear the Clergyman of the Parish, who is a St. Andrew's man, and with whose acquaintance I was much pleased. Lord Dalhousie expressed his regret at the shortness of my visit, but said that in order to keep my appointments I must set out at twelve o'clock or very soon after, when the service would not be half over. His Lordship added that he wished to have some conver-

sation with me before my departure, and would therefore remain at home.

I kept my engagement with my friend, visited Dr. Allison, and preached for him that very afternoon. Now read Mr. Esson's account of these simple facts.

"We vouch for the truth of the following anecdote, which has been repeated to us more than once, on the best authority. Dr. Strachan, on a late visit to Scotland, was invited on the Sunday to accompany the family of his host to the Parish Church—A young Clergyman of the Church of England, who happened to reside with the family as tutor on this occasion, joined with them in pressing the Doctor to go to the Kirk, assuring him that he would hear an excellent discourse from the Minister. To this the Doctor is said to have replied with all the emphasis of a thorough Churchman—I never go to hear Sectarians or Dissenters."

To say nothing of the rudeness of such a reply, it would not have been true, for I heard the late Sir Harry Moncrieff and Dr. Chalmers in Scotland, and Mr. Irvine in London, during my short visit to Great Britain in 1824.

Note B.—I mentioned Navy Point—New Market—Purdy's Mills, and Woolwich in my Chart as having Churches.

Now it appears that one of the Government buildings is used as a Church at Navy Point, at which the seamen and neighbouring inhabitants attend public worship.

At New Market the inhabitants are ready, and have long been, to build a Church the moment a Clergyman is assigned them, but this is a condition with which it has not yet been convenient to comply.

At Purdy's Mills a difference arose about the site of the Church which for a time delayed it, but it has since been erected.

In regard to Woolwich, General Pilkington, the proprietor of the Township, gave orders to his Agent many years ago to build a Church—He went so far as to send out plans and some emigrants, with the assurance that a place of worship would be provided immediately for them, but the Church has not yet been built—Why, I have not been able to learn.

Edwardsburgh is inserted instead of Matilda.

Whitby instead of Clarke.

Etobicoke, where a Church is now building, was inserted instead of Toronto, which contains two Churches.

Two or three preaching stations are mentioned, which have been changed for others more promising.

These, with one or two more noticed in the text, are all the errors, if they can be so called, which appeared in my Ecclesiastical Chart for 1827, and were corrected in the Chart which I published in 1828.

They are not indeed all that my enemies enumerate, because they have discovered many, which have no existence except in their own imaginations.

As a specimen, they accuse me of giving a Church in my Chart to the village of Dundas. If I had done so it would have been quite excusable, for I had subscribed before I went to England for building one—an appropriation of land had been made for a Parsonage House, Church and Burial ground, but not being sure that the building had proceeded, I gave no Church in my Chart to Dundas.

Note C—From the information furnished to Dr. Lee by his Canadian correspondents, he states the population of Upper Canada to average at least three hundred thousand, and that one half, at the least estimate, or one hundred and fifty thousand are decidedly attached to the Church of Scotland. Alas for the Doctor's assertions and the veracity of his correspondents; for the population of Upper Canada by the last census is one hundred and eighty eight thousand five hundred and fifty-eight. If from this we take the Doctor's one hundred and fifty thousand Presbyterians, we shall have only thirty-eight thousand five hundred and fifty-eight to divide among all other denominations.

The Doctor proceeds to say, that from nine Districts and twenty-four townships (a mode of expression I do not pretend to understand) which is only a part of the whole Province, there are specific returns to the amount of thirty-six thousand persons, who are thus cordially attached to the Church of Scotland.

After these brilliant statements, not one of which is true, the Doctor is forced to admit that there are only six (now I believe eight) places of worship connected with the Church of Scotland in the whole Province—but to cover the painful confession of so few Churches among one hundred and fifty thousand Presbyterians, he enlists thirteen or fourteen belonging to other Presbyterian denominations—and declares that in general the Presbyterians from Scotland, from Ireland or the United States, who are not actually in communion with the Church of Scotland, are nevertheless anxious to be connected with it. He says nothing of their Ministers, nor does the General Assembly, in accepting the report, drop a single word in their favour.

ERRATA.

- Page 5, line 21—for “country—that while” read *country. While*
Page 6, line 47—for “matter, nor” read *matter, nor*
Page 9, line 33 and 34—for “pened” read *penned*
Page 10, line 52—for “cause—enabled” read *cause, and enabled*
Page 11, line 15—for “Scotland. That” read *Scotland—that*
line 32—for 567 read 367.
Page 12, line 21—for “informatioa”, read *information*
lines 30 and 31—for “each, the” read *each. The*
Page 13, line 40, for “all the other ten Districts”, read *the other ten Districts*
Page 14, line 5—for “generally, is” read *generally is,*
lines 24 & 25, for “District, 16,000 are”, read *District of Niagara, 15,000 are*
line 39, for “from” read *four*
Page 16, line 2—for “whully” read *wholly*