

general proposition;" and then it was—and not at the first interview as Dr. Heilmuth asserts, that on third day in consequence of sundry questions put by me in order to try and find out what the proposal really meant, that I was at last informed of the actual terms on which the Church was to be built. And certainly I at once expressed how entirely I had been under a misapprehension during all our negotiations; and upon that ground, put an end to the conference, so that all the Archdeacon has stated on this subject is purely imaginary. Most certainly I knew the terms (as he asserts), upon which the money was to be advanced before I came to a decision, and it was he who communicated that fact to me; but it was thus elicited at the eleventh hour, and was the sole and simple reason of my declining to proceed with the business, which I did directly I was informed upon this point.

The Archdeacon justifies himself in the matter of the Clergyman, whom he eulogized in England, after he had been under censure in Canada, by stating that a considerable time, two years, had elapsed; and that he had much improved during that period, and that therefore it was correct to speak of him as he did. This may be perfectly true; and I most truly rejoice to think it may be so. But as the Archdeacon left for England towards the end, I believe, of September, and the speech in question was made about the middle of November, of course he was in possession of these facts before his departure. I would ask then why as General Superintendent of the Society, he did not take measures to have the Rev. Mr. ——— restored to his proper status, before he left Canada; and whether the other members of the Society's Committee were not left by him still seeking to enforce the removal; and were not a little embarrassed and surprised, when they read what had occurred at the meeting in England. Perhaps the Archdeacon knows whether his conduct in this matter has been satisfactory to them.

The Archdeacon complains in connection with a letter from the Bishop of Quebec, published by me, that I had been seeking information against him, while waiting for his reply to my letter to him in England, enquiring as to the truth of the report of his speech at Islington. The fact was that while I was travelling down from Kingston with the Bishop of Quebec, he spoke of what the Archdeacon was reported to have said respecting the Canadian Colleges; and expressed himself, very nearly as given in his letter. All I did was simply to ask whether he had any objection to send me in writing what he had then said, which he said he would do very willingly.

It was with the full conviction that I had undertaken a most painful task, that I moved at all in this matter; and have done it solely as a matter of public duty. My only desire has been for the cause of truth; and if I have used any language that the occasion has not warranted, no one will regret it more than myself.

I remain, Your faithful brother in Christ,

F. MONTREAL.