

likely that an old and distinguished officer, who has served his country with honour and credit, and whose upright character has been so long known in this country and elsewhere, would descend to the meanness and trickery which your Lordship charges equally upon him and myself.

"My Lord, whatever your intention was in making these charges, you will find that you have gravely misunderstood public taste and public feeling, if you expect that your unwarrantable though futile attack, upon a meritorious soldier and servant of the Crown, who has served in every quarter of the globe with distinguished honour, will be received either here or in England, with any other feeling than disgust. That officer inaugurated the feelings which the public will hereafter confirm; he repels your charge with disdain and with the coolness which has been his companion through life; he looks upon your efforts to degrade him in the eyes of his fellow subjects with cool indifference, assured that your attacks will be more damaging to yourself than to him."

Such are the charges brought against Dr. Hellmuth by the Bishop, and such the defence made by Dr. Hellmuth. That a man, filling the important post of Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada, could have so far forgotten himself, his high office, and sacred calling, as to descend down into the arena of personal detraction, there to make an unjustifiable, unsustained, and calumnious attack upon one of the clergy of a neighboring diocese, of unblemished reputation, does indeed greatly surprise us, and certainly partakes more of the character and habits of the backwoodman's life, than of the Bishop's Anglican antecedents as a Presbyterian of the mother country, and a graduate of one of her Universities.

We must have another word, however, with the Bishop before dismissing the subject. We should like to be informed how it was, that the Bishop having discovered the untrustworthy and deceitful character of Dr. Hellmuth at so early a date, as "not long after I came to Canada"—and having had "his eyes opened," did, notwithstanding, at a period subsequent to that important discovery, on sundry occasions repose confidence in Dr. Hellmuth and move votes of thanks to him—for instance, why did he in 1853 appoint him to the Divinity Chair in Bishop's College? And why did he, in 1854, move a vote of thanks at a College Meeting at Lennoxville, as follows:

"It was resolved, on the motion of the Lord Bishop of Montreal, that the Corporation, entertaining a high sense of the services rendered by Professor Hellmuth to the College, tender him the thanks of the Corporation for his past services, and *regret the severance of their connection with him*?"

And why did he, shortly after, join with the Bishop of Quebec in appointing him a Trustee of the College?

These are questions we should like to have answered. It seems a strange thing indeed that Bishop Fulford, having already discovered Dr. Hellmuth's real character, as an astute deceiver, did, nevertheless, express "his regret at Dr. H.'s severance from the College;" and, not content with that, did actually put one in whom he had no confidence into the responsible office of Trustee. If a man can do such things with his "eyes open," what would he not have done had they been shut?