

allusions in
St. Andrews,
were made
proves. Fol-
at letter, be-
e when I *did*
Stewart, from
ons towards
posal, in the
to me during
), when the
as Curate in
en they were
y; and I am
y it. I could
ct, as I now
place in that
occasion. I
such an ar-
Stewart the
Dr. Gray re-
I remarked,
t. The sub-
itted more by
as a peremp-
e request, and
g afterwards,
t may appear
uch an absurd
me at St. An-
sibility, if not
s part. I took
shed to retain
ry to him, and
ould not afford
Mr. Stewart is
y had said, a
t St. Andrews,
did not antici-
guarded; and
The truth is,

he *did* anticipate difficulty even then, as his letter indicates; whereas *I did not* anticipate it, as is evident both from my letter, and from his *reply* to it.

I have something *more* to say of this letter of his of Sept. —, 1847. The letter, as you will perceive, was not *answered* by me, but was a reply to mine of Sept. 2d; and, therefore, the expressions in his letter are no proof that such was, in reality, the *only* conversation that took place between us. I do not mean to deny that such subjects were discussed on any occasion, and that I was perfectly willing to do anything really necessary for the sake of harmony. On the contrary, these general matters were discussed previously to his writing this letter to me. But the great subject of the conversations (not conversation), alluded to in my letter of 2d Sept., was that of the Parish, and the work to be done. Into this subject I freely entered; and my letter has reference to this part of the subject and not to the other. Into this I entered fully, and expressed my great pleasure and happiness at the prospect of labouring with Dr. Gray in doing good; for it would have been no source of *delight* to think that I was to labour with quarrelsome Clergymen! The *tone* of my letter speaks for itself, and indicates the real nature of the conversations to which I then alluded. *His* letter alludes to one conversation on certain subjects, and *my* letter alludes to the general conversations that we had together. Dr. Gray inserts my letter of the 2d September *after* his answer to it, and leads the unwary to think that I am replying to his letter of a particular nature, which, of course, had not then been written. He says the letters were written “simultaneously.” How could two *such* letters be written from different places, when one acknowledges the receipt of the other? And why insert the answer first, and leave the *date* of his answer a *blank*? It is very ingeniously done; but the more subtle, the worse it is.

There is another thing to be said on this subject. *My* letter was of a *private* nature; and as such, ought not to have been published without permission. Private letters indeed may be so published, if necessary, to *defend* one's self from wrong or injury; but, when they are published to *do* injury, it then becomes an awful violation of common honesty and of Christian courtesy. My letter was written in consequence of Dr. Gray's request to me at the visitation at Fredericton, to assist in the