

the evident design of shaking the confidence of the Bishop in his Archdeacon, behind his back, (as you were in hopes you had done it with the Bishop of Quebec by similar means.) The taking advantage of such an opportunity was quite unfair, and entirely opposed to all gentlemanly feeling. I speak plainly. Your Lordship fails with the Bishop of Huron—the poison cannot be distilled into his ear; and, feeling no doubt that, upon Dr. Hellmuth's return to this country you would be called to a proper account, you anticipate it, and issue your first Pastoral, as it appears clear to me to obtain some justification for these slanders to the Bishop of Huron, and to escape from them, and not for the ostensible reasons put forth by your Lordship, of taking the Archdeacon to task for his so-called attacks on the Church. The prominence you have given to this Church episode is an additional reason for drawing such an inference. If you believed this story, or gave much weight to it, I would have naturally looked to some earlier publication of it, and then the Bishops of Quebec and Huron, and the Colonial and Continental Church Society would not have been placed in the false position of honoring the clergyman whom you now defame to them. But your Lordship's conduct is inconsistent with such a belief; for when it was in your power to have refused to be a party in honoring and appointing Dr. Hellmuth to different responsible offices in connection with the Church, we find you on several occasions joining in this, and on one expressing yourself "*that it was with much pleasure.*"

III. There is no variance between your Lordship's statement of the proposition as made to you by General Evans, or your understanding of it, and that stated by General Evans and Dr. Hellmuth. After your positive assertion in your letter of the 21st May last to me, in which you say "I beg most distinctly to deny the correctness of your version of the matter," I was certainly not prepared to find that your Lordship's letter would result in placing all the different statements as to the nature of the proposition made in perfect accord, and that the only point now open is whether you had an *evening* as well as a *morning* interview with General Evans on the subject. Whether there were two or more interviews, or only one, it can make no material difference. Did you not understand the proposition made before you were called upon for a decision, and did not the parties making it inform you of it? If so, what matters it