

no expedient untried—he put in requisition every kind of influence both in England and Scotland—was indefatigable in waiting upon, and endeavouring to conciliate to his own views, all men of any weight either in Church or State—and his representations, having been made to the Colonial Office in a private manner, could not be sifted, until the author of them was traced out by the friends of our Church, and his statements submitted by them to the test of public opinion, in the only country, where the people were competent to decide on their truth and accuracy.

In commenting on these statements, which are the next object of our attention in this Review, it is important to remark that those—contained in the Letter and the Chart, and a Pamphlet published at the same time in London, of which last we have only seen extracts—were made, at a most momentous crisis, when the Doctor was placed in a situation the most delicate, in which not only a sense of integrity and honor, but common prudence and modesty should have taught him to make his statements with caution, and with that reasonable degree of diffidence which would, have become one, who, in some material points, at least, gave his evidence, from vague impressions and recollections. He ought to have distinguished carefully what was certain, and the result of personal knowledge and observation, from what was uncertain and indistinctly remembered. Assuredly it was, to say the least of it, most rash and unwarrantable to venture upon giving a chart of those religious denominations, of which he was not only imperfectly informed, but, as will appear in the sequel, grossly ignorant; and this temerity and indiscretion are not a little aggravated, when we consider, that the communication was made with the prospect, and we doubt not, the hope, that the question on which all this evidence was intended to bear, would be decided, long before the absent parties could have any opportunity of knowing and refuting his representations. The Doctor could not be ignorant of the great interests, involved in that cause, of which the decision depended in a great measure on his opinion and evidence, and he must have known the confidence that would be reposed in statements, resting on the authority of a dignified Clergyman and confidential agent of the Church of England, who had the most ample means of information, and whose evidence came enforced by his own express and unqualified averment of personal knowledge.

But the Doctor, as he himself tells us, with great simplicity, was not afraid or ashamed, of his cause, and though some of our Scottish Members of Parliament discovered a most unholy scepticism and want of faith in these statements—notwithstanding that they were urged with unbounded confidence, and rivetted by the decisive averment of “I have seen, and sure I ought to know”—in the face of all this unbelieving opposition—the Archdeacon boldly maintained his ground, and, as we think, magnanimously supported the credit of a certain class of his countrymen, whose *antiphrastic modesty* is proverbial over