

would have been any discredit to him. It is not correct that Chiniquy was deposed, as Bishop Fulford says, for "unministerial and unchristian conduct;" he was deposed for contumacy in not appearing to answer the charges against him, a very different matter, and there is good reason to suppose that he was treated with undue harshness by the Chicago Presbytery.

The remainder of the pastoral has reference chiefly to proceedings in the Provincial Synod, about a canon defining the powers of a Metropolitan. His statements on this point appear to be satisfactorily answered by Dr. Hellmuth.

In carrying on the controversy, the Metropolitan, in his zeal to attack the personal character of the Archdeacon, seems very soon to have entirely lost sight of the matters originally at issue. What at first brought down the Metropolitan's anger on the head of Dr. Hellmuth, were the assertions by the latter in a speech at Islington in England, to the effect that the teaching in Trinity College, Toronto, was unsound and dangerous and that Evangelical clergymen of the Church of England in the British North American colonies were, comparatively speaking, few in number. If these statements were untrue, it might have been thought that the Bishop would not only have sought to break the force of Dr. Hellmuth's testimony by saying that he was a witness deficient in integrity and reliability, but that he would have undertaken directly to disprove them. In the whole controversy, however, he undertakes nothing of the sort. He expends his strength in making a fierce personal onslaught on Dr. Hellmuth, which that gentleman has very successfully repelled. But as to the teaching of Trinity College, he says—"I am not sufficiently master of this subject in its present state to enter into a detailed review of it." And as to the paucity of Evangelical clergymen, he speaks of three such clergymen in Toronto, three in Montreal, one in Quebec, &c. His condescending on these numbers proves in fact the very statement of which he complains; while as to Trinity College, after all the controversy there has been on the subject, after all the pamphlets which have been published by the Bishop of Huron, Provost Whitaker, and others, if the Metropolitan is himself still unable to form an opinion, he ought not to complain that the Archdeacon of Huron, like his diocesan, has not only formed an opinion, but has been outspoken enough to proclaim it. The whole course of the controversy certainly seems to indicate that the object which Dr. Fulford chiefly aimed at was to injure Dr. Hellmuth, and that the defence of Anglican institutions and Anglican clergymen in Canada was but a secondary consideration, used only as a peg on which to hang his denunciations of the Archdeacon. Having read all the pamphlets on both sides, we cannot see that Dr. Hellmuth's character has at all suffered. On the question how far the Metropolitan's own reputation has suffered by his attack recoiling upon himself, we shall not venture to pronounce an opinion. The further