

of the signatories of the first occasional paper of the Association "which would give their opinions the slightest importance" (meaning, as was surely apparent,) *on the theological questions* which they had raised. I am quite unable to qualify that assertion. Their "character" in all other respects may be excellent, but theologically, they have destroyed it by their own writings. Their "attainments may be (and in one case are confessedly) high for their respective positions of Judge, Consul, and Merchant. I think few, however, who are capable of thought will accept the original logic of their present advocate who would have us believe that these special attainments of the gentlemen in question, afford a guarantee of their competency to instruct the Church at large in matters of religious controversy.

The thought of attacking their *social* position as a legitimate mode of shaking their *theological* one would have betokened a pitch of coarse stupidity to which I do not profess to have attained, and which I gladly leave to the undivided enjoyment of my assailant, who avails himself of it so freely; the idea that there was any reference to it could occur only to one who feels that he cannot touch my arguments, or question my facts, and who is led by some innate vulgarity of mind, or malignity of motive, to adopt the tactics, usual in such cases among a certain class of of "abusing not the plaintiff's attorney," but the plaintiff himself.

II. Notwithstanding the assertion of this writer, there is not in the letter referred to a single word of "boasting," but a simple statement of fact, prefaced with the express statement that

I have never by word or act assumed to be "a person of consideration." That fact is, that my nearest relatives and connexions occupying honorable positions in the professions of law and medicine, and having had their place in every grade of Her Majesty's service, from subalterns up to general officers and Governors of her colonies, have, in my earliest boyhood, taught me to look with disdain upon anything likely to tarnish a man's honour. I am not aware of having ever forgotten or discredited those teachings. I resented warmly the attack upon the honesty and truthfulness of honorable men, myself among the number, which I believe to have been made in the occasional paper referred to, because I felt it to be at least as dishonourable to the principles of a clergyman as it could possibly be to that code of worldly punctillio which prevails among persons of respectability, and which from my associations I had early imbibed.

The correctness of this persons assertions may be judged by the fact that my father never placed his foot on Canadian soil, and therefore did *not* "settle in the bush;" that I was *not* brought up there as a Scotch Presbyterian, because I was brought up by a mother who was born and reared in the south of England, and never saw Scotland or Scotch Presbyterians, until long after she had reached the age of womanhood, that my proclivities therefore were naturally English and not Scotch; and that the probabilities are that my assailant is much more conversant with non-conformity than I have ever been. The vulgar personalities of this writer make one