

ink they are a significant amount to that, or thing to do with—mination.” Now, tions you seem to d before, in your Baptists are about ur own shewing, or you say (same f them, they (and of all their society, and the Church to the Church of Morrison’s return, he Baptists, gives ou say, it is “pro- h, (you 13,000. al” with 5,000. h, or

8,000. for the true one;

liberty of pointing nt between thou- d fortieths—there nder that any one as always been a some patience, he say that two and a man of fact and ur account of the fore the Commit- shew this, for the he Committee on

the Church of England

| Rev. W. Dickson, | Rev. A. Mac Donell, | Rev. Mr. Harris, |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 16 | 20 | 6 |
| 12,500 | 10,000 | 33,333 |
| 5,740 | 5,740 | 5,740 |
| 8,750 | 4,260 | 27,593 |

ferences, and if the es, what an od between yours, and lowest 2,000 some th?

The avowed object of all this investigation was to elicit truth, but who will now say that it has been attained? I do not wish to be understood as meaning to say that either yourself, or any of the gentlemen in the foregoing table, have wilfully stated what you knew to be untrue; but this I do not hesitate to say, that you, one and all, ventured opinions upon information, which, if you had given yourselves time to reflect, you must have discovered, was totally insufficient to form so important a record. The calculations I have made shew this most clearly, and how very unsafe it is to depend upon “information,” without being ourselves satisfied of its correctness, is amply proved from the case of Dr. Lee, who, relying on such sources has fallen into the most glaring errors, or rather, has proclaimed to the world the most glaring errors, to call them by the mildest name, of persons (unknown) who, from their residence in Canada, can scarcely offer any reasonable excuse for those errors.

There are two sensible answers given to the question, which could not find a place in the table.

Mr. Rolph—“I cannot say—I have never made such a calculation”—

Mr. Robinson—“I do not know, nor do I think any body else does.”

On this point, one of these gentlemen has been consistent—the other has not—which of the two I mean will be seen hereafter.

The subject, now that there has been time for reflection, must be viewed by every candid mind as having been got up for party purposes, and the Report of the Committee on the petition of Buckley Waters and others, can be looked upon in no other light, than as having been the means of incurring a heavy expense to the Province, without answering any good purpose—its contents could only go to mislead the people—to mislead the British Government, and to injure particularly the Church of England, for it is not without errors with respect to others, an instance of which I think may be found in Mr. Morrison’s Chart, where the Wesleyan Methodists are reckoned at 100 only.

I might go on to point out a great many more inconsistencies in your evidence—a few of them I shall endeavour to compress into as brief limits as I can.

You are asked, (at page 217) “Did many Presbyterians sign the Petition?”—You promptly reply “Yes,” and by way of introducing an individual to the notice of the Committee, you add, “some of the principal signers are Presbyterians—the chairman of the Committee, (Central) Mr. Ketchum, is one of the leading Presbyterians in Upper Canada.” There is something ridiculously ostentatious in this unnecessary addition in your reply to the question. Soon after (same page) you are told by the Committee—“It is stated in Mr. Morrison’s Letter, that the Presbyterians refused to join the petitioners generally”—you answer, “by that part, who are members of the Church of Scotland, the petition was not generally signed.”—Now, what you mean by “generally,” I am at a loss clearly to understand—perhaps you can explain, and give us an abstract shewing to what particular denomination the 8000 signatures to that petition belonged—you will be able perhaps to inform us, by means of the “specific information” of the *pains taking* Secretary of the Central Committee, that it was “generally” signed by one denomination, and that, neither Presbyterians of “different classes,” nor “members of the Church of Scotland.” Make what you will of it, Mr. Morrison and yourself are here at loggerheads. But with the next question, the cat comes out of the bag—“What do you attribute that to?” (the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland not joining in the petition?)—Ah! Mr. Ryerson, now for your answer—“They want to get half of the Clergy Reserves for themselves!” Ingrate, that you must be: did not Mr. Morris, “one of the leading” members of the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, and in the House