

And in further support of my statements, I adduce the fact that not one single witness was examined by Mr. Strong in my defence regarding the assault, although, as proved by Mr. Johnston's declaration, they were present and ready to testify. Would I have consented that they should not be heard, or had Mr. Strong any ground for not hearing them had the decision he announced not been in my favor as I have stated? In Mr. Strong's report, he says: "Mr. Dupont, from his defence, seems to be laboring under some misconception of what I stated at the conclusion of the evidence on the charge. I did not, of course, assume as any part of my duty, the office of determining how Mr. Dupont should be dealt with, or even of making any recommendation to you upon the subject. My functions, I conceived to be merely to state what conclusions I drew after hearing the statement of the parties and the evidence as to the charge made. I did, indeed, in order to put an end to a discussion which was consuming time uselessly, and which involved irritating recriminations, say that I should make precisely the report upon the head which I have just made, and to show this was so, I extract the following memorandum from my note book, made at the time:

"At the conclusion of the statement made on the several charges, I stated that I thought as to the assault, I should report that the assault was admitted. That it had been a blow struck in heat, and that Mr. Dupont had *promptly* apologised for it, and had also immediately apologised to the Bishop on behalf of the church."—Sir, I ask whether out of Mr. Strong's own mouth I do not sustain my statement, for although his note book does not to the full express what he stated, which I unhesitatingly repeat, was that he would report that no further notice ought to be taken of it." Does it not show that he thus felt that no further notice ought to be taken of it? I ask Sir, had he sent you upon this subject merely this note and the evidence and statements laid before him, would the impression he has produced against me have been "precisely similar," as by the report he has made?

In common justice, I now most respectfully ask that the evidence I was prepared to lay before Mr. Strong on this complaint, touching the character of the Rev. Jabez Sims, and the intense provocation he had for some time been giving, and which culminated in this occurrence which I most sincerely regretted and apologised for at the time—but which Mr. Strong did not think it necessary on my side to hear:—I may have the opportunity of submitting if you consider it necessary, in my defence.

Having been so unfairly dealt with by Mr. Strong, in his report, I now beg that I may be permitted to offer the following analysis of it:

Mr. Strong says: "The ground of complaint in the several documents referred to, not being set forth with clearness before proceeding with the investigation, I extracted as well as I could from the letters and petition, the several accusations against Mr. Dupont, and arranged them in the form of distinct charges, adopting as nearly as possible the language of the parties preferring them."

"And having read these to the Rev. Mr. Sims, the Revds. Dr. O'Meara and S. Givins, (who attended the investigation on behalf of the Church Society), they were adopted by those gentlemen as explicit statements of the complaints against Mr. Dupont."

Charge No. 1—is that Mr. Dupont is tyrannical, overbearing and unjust to the Indians.

Regarding this charge Mr. Strong says: "He thinks it is, if not to the letter, in substance proved. The evidence of all the Indian witnesses though expressed very simply, and bearing chiefly on matters which to Mr. Dupont may appear of very minor importance, is greatly against him as respects this charge, and I am bound to say, that I give credit for truthfulness to every Indian who gave testimony.

I will only under this head refer particularly to one case, that of She-we-ta-gun-an-Ojibbeway of Little Current, who was to my mind very harshly, not to say cruelly dealt

The efforts throughout in Mr. Strong's Report to put the most damaging construction upon every subject when treated as towards me and his equal endeavour to write up the missionary and gloss over his failings, savors much more of the retained counsel than of the impartial judge.

He cannot but say that the evidence submitted to him by the Indians was on matters of very minor importance, and he can find no case of sufficient *gravity* to specify, but that of the selling of the log house of the Indian She-we-tah-gun to Smylie.

He says he gives credit for truthfulness