

This I must characterize as almost an unwarrantable and ungentlemanly liberty with the names of these ladies. I accepted your verbal expression of regret on the 4th inst; but your present letter is not only without any expression of this kind, but it also contains an attempted vindication of your conduct, and some of its expressions amount to a re-assertion of your statement to Dr. Jennings—thus making the original offence doubly offensive.

In vindication of your conduct, you say that you have been asked, "how could a total stranger enter the City and act the part therein (in the printed correspondence) brought to light, unless with the knowledge, if not with the approbation, of the household in which he and Mrs. Guinness were guests?" Whatever impertinent questions people may have asked, I repeat the fact already stated to you verbally, that, up to within an hour of the time when the printed correspondence was handed in to my door, neither my family nor myself knew any thing of that correspondence.

You say a good deal about my hospitality to Mr. and Mrs. Guinness. Pray what have you to do with that—or what has it to do with the question before us? You have no right to interfere with my opinion of Mr. Guinness' conduct in the matter, or with my conduct towards him after it came out. That opinion, if expressed at all, must be expressed to Mr. G., and not to you. But since you force this subject upon me, I may, with perfect propriety, express my detestation of the conduct of those who caused that correspondence to be printed without his knowledge or consent; and the subterfuge of placing the word ("Printed for Private Circulation") at the head of a fly-sheet, scattered over the length and breadth of the Province, only aggravated the dishonorable conduct of printing a person's private letters without ever notifying him of the intention.*

What has all this allusion, on your part, to what took place after the correspondence was printed to do with your speaking, as you did, of an event which took place before these letters were written? How could you, on the ground of a mere impression of your own mind, and in the face of Mr. Guinness' statement that the authority was "not Mr. Inglis nor any of his family," attach the names of Mrs. Gale and Mrs. Inglis to a statement to which they had as little to do as you had? You speak of the prevailing opinion being still correct, in your supposition. Now, if so, you are largely responsible for the formation of that opinion by your own shewing. But I

* Any one will see the fallacy of this reasoning. The very letter to Mr. Guinness demands an answer, clearly, *on public grounds*. There can be no doubt that it might have been much more agreeable to the "conspirators" if they had been permitted to carry out their plans without exposure. Yelverton, on his examination, declared that he considered seduction no crime—but the exposure of his deeds to public gaze, he admitted, made his conduct a crime of the most atrocious character. It is the bounden duty of every man to expose by every means in his power such infamous doctrine; and no other course can free the community from its perpetration and results. Any man by putting on a certain elongation of face, and assuming "the shepherd's voice," it would appear by the doctrine here propounded, may speak and act towards his fellow man as he dared not, even for one moment, sanction in a public position, or where he can be dealt with as he justly merits. The man who steals a loaf, to satisfy the craving of the hunger of his wife and children, merits committal to the Penitentiary far less than the whining hypocrite who, by a nod or a shake of his head, whispers away the character he dares not *openly* assail, as he does in the way described.