

implicate Archdeacon Marsh, who has been kind to me ever since I came to this Diocese. I would rather that you should ask himself about the matter contained in your letter." One application of the "machine" not being sufficient, the Dr. writes thus on page 35,—“I must state that neither the Archdeacon nor any one else outside of my house is responsible for writing the letter: it was written innocently, without any instigation, on the impulse of the moment, and without any intention of hurting the feelings of any one.” After these statements, what do the others amount to? Many an Inquisitor has obtained from his victim far less truth. We then hear about the *Free Press* and *Herald*, after which we are edified (?) by some of the doings and sayings of that obsequious Cleric, “Canon Innea.”

Let us now consider what the Bishop elect said. When seconding the resolution to expel Archdeacon Marsh he gave as a reason, “that he had always considered him sincere until recently, when a circumstance came to his knowledge which proved his want of sincerity.” Yet on page 44 the then Archdeacon Sweatman asserts the reason to have been “that the connection of Archdeacon Marsh with the publication of “Churchwoman's” letter was the culmination of long continued opposition on the part of the Archdeacon.” This gentleman, however, on page 57 writes that the reason was on account of some matter of petty envy which had been engendered in *his own bosom* concerning the “Dominion” and “Evangelical” newspapers, but which he flatly contradicts, by asserting it was “opposition to the Bishop of Huron.” No need to prove “duplicity” here. Truly, “envy is as rottenness of the bones.”

By “Dean Boomer” permitting the meeting for such “special” business to be held in his drawing room, the