

he said, "I hold Mr. Bethune responsible for it all, not the young woman;" that is, that I invented the whole myself! To impress his readers that I was very active in seeking to injure him in the matter, he stated that I "published it in one of the Walkerton papers," etc., and he "cannot imagine where or when I am going to end it." I published it in no Walkerton or *any other* paper or place, but only as above mentioned. Now suppose of that misstatement of his, I were to follow his example and say, 'I hold him responsible for it all, not anyone else?' But I will not be so *unjust*, as I presume he has been wrongly informed, and, believing it, has repeated it to his readers of me as true. He further describes me to them as one who "sanctimoniously subscribes himself, 'The Presbyterian Minister of Chesley;'" and remarks that he "had no apprehension that the charges would to any serious extent damage his reputation, *considering especially their source*;" that is, considering especially what kind of a person I am known to be. Such and other like language he has chosen to use of a minister of whom he knows little, and against whose personal character he certainly never knew anything unprincipled, though not without its share, doubtless, of the imperfections common to all Christians. To such statements I make no reply, but that I have no doubt they will be regarded as quite inapplicable and improper by all around who know us, with all our shortcomings. That statement of mine, however, I am free to say in the interests of truth and justice, I regard as in the first place an indiscretion on my part. Being on the subject of proselytism, (of unworthy methods of which I knew a good many genuine instances of different places, and who does not?) I related this in a moment of warmth, simply from happening to have been informed of it but two weeks before by one I deemed trustworthy, which was therefore fresh in my mind. I had before in the Baptist church (17th Dec.), mentioned another instance of a flagrant kind in our immediate neighbourhood, the principle actor of it being present, (who smiled as it was referred to,) which has not been denied. It also was known to me only by testimony, (on which we must depend entirely for much of our knowledge,) but was not strictly private. The case in question, however, being of a private conversation, had