

question whether his *penchant* for pamphlet-writing will make him a loser not only in reputation but in pocket, is one which will probably be decided by a jury of his countrymen.

---

### THE METROPOLITAN AND DR. HELLMUTH.

---

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE QUEBEC GAZETTE.]

SIR,—I have received a number of your paper in which appears Dr. Hellmuth's "Reply to the Third Letter of the Metropolitan," and in the leading article of the same paper, I find your own animadversions on the "vexed question" between these two. I wish to say a word or two on this question.

I ought to premise, that I am what the Archdeacon and, perhaps, yourself, would call a "High-churchman." This circumstance, unlikely as it would seem to do so, constitutes the very reason why I write this note. Englishmen, of whom I am one, are proverbially fond of witnessing a good fight, from one of dogs upwards: but, at the same time, they are equally well known to be lovers of "fair play." On this ground I write a word for my ancient friend. I think Dr. H. has been badly treated. He has shown fight and pluck which all must admire, but I think the rules of the Polemical ring have not been fairly complied with. He has been hit above, and hit also below the proper range within which it is allowable to plant a blow in this kind of warfare. The attack on his father-in-law, and the attack on his own character, as a self-seeker, seem to me to be equally wide of the mark in such a contest. There has been too much of what the Greeks called *skiamachia*, a process which consists of evoking the shadow of an antagonist and then self-satisfiedly knocking it down.

For example, I have no doubt in the world, that nothing was further from Dr. Hellmuth's thoughts than the design of maligning his clerical brethren in that speech of his at Islington. From my own knowledge of him, I am sure he is incapable of harboring in his thoughts a purpose of that fell nature. He had an object to plead, and he pleaded it. He considered that there are not enough of what are loosely called "Evangelical" clergymen in Canada, and he was sent to ask for help to procure more. He did what he was sent to do; but as to casting aspersions upon the hard-working and ill-paid clergy of Canada, I don't believe this entered his head.

Or, take the case of the colleges. No one can suppose that the Archdeacon meant to include any other than Trinity, Toronto, in his charges of unsoundness in doctrine. And viewing at its worst, his judgment of this institution, was there no shadow of an excuse for him? Had not his