

Bishop applied for evidence against the Archdeacon, and in his third pastoral he produces a letter from him, obtained with that view. But on the same day on which he wrote to the Bishop, he wrote also to Dr. Hellmuth another letter, which is given in the Archdeacon's reply, and which states circumstances that completely upset the whole charge. In connection with that part of the controversy which had reference to negotiations with Gen. Evans about the erection of a church in Montreal, Dr. Hellmuth had stated that the General requested him to remind his lordship of two long interviews with him on the subject; on one of the occasions the Bishop, with Mrs. Fulford, was spending an evening at the General's residence, and fully and freely conversing on the whole matter with the General himself and Dr. Hellmuth. This was stated to show that everything was done to make the proposal intelligible to the Bishop, and that any conspiracy to entrap him into a scheme which he did not understand was altogether out of the question. The Bishop replies to this that he has for thirty years kept a daily journal, and that he finds an entry on the 28th July, 1851, that he drank tea at General Evans', met Dr. Hellmuth and others, and had some music. This evening party, he says, took place six months before he heard about the church, and he declares that there is not one word of truth in the assertion that he had fully and freely conversed with the Archdeacon and the General on the subject. Speaking from memory, and from the evidence of his journal, he declares that the only interview he had with General Evans was in January, 1852, and that it was a short interview, because the General was unwell and unable to enter into details of business. His negative evidence is met by the positive evidence of the Archdeacon, the General, and Mrs. Crooks, who, in a note given in Dr. Hellmuth's third reply, says she distinctly remembers the Bishop coming to her father's residence one evening for the purpose, and that the conversation on the subject occupied a considerable space of time. It is certainly unfortunate for the Metropolitan that on a question of veracity he should have placed himself in a position in which the public have to decide between his own positive denial on the one side, and the equally positive affirmation on the other of three witnesses, whose testimony there is nothing to discredit but the Bishop's own unsupported statements. A third charge against Dr. Hellmuth, to which the Metropolitan returns, is that he advocated in England the cause of Father Chiniquy; and he refers with an air of triumph to a newspaper paragraph alleging that Chiniquy had been deposed by the Presbytery of Chicago "for unministerial and unchristian conduct." Dr. Hellmuth replies, by adducing evidence to show that the appeal he made in England was not on behalf of Chiniquy personally, but on his suffering colony of converts, who were at the time in circumstances of severe distress. But we may remark that, even if his advocacy had been on behalf of Father Chiniquy himself, it remains to be proved that this