

introduction of a question which had never, at any previous period, been thus officially agitated in the country.

The circumstances which took place at the meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, in February, at which the Bishop of Ontario was present, have not been fully set before the public. I will now supply some of the omissions: The resolution which I proposed at that meeting had no reference to evidence obtained from students; but was confined to the statements of the Provost made in his letters to the Bishop of Toronto, and it is manifestly most unjust to say that the Provost would have been condemned unheard had my resolution been affirmed by the Corporation. These letters contained the Provost's reply to the charges brought against his teaching. He had thus been heard at length. His reply to the charges was carefully written; it had been laid before the Corporation, and a favorable opinion had been expressed upon the first letter, while several members of the Corporation, among whom was the Hon. Justice Hargarty, had expressed their unwillingness to be held responsible for the contents of the second letter, and added that they never knew of the publication of the third letter until that day.

Before the publication of the Provost's letters other sources of information were appealed to. But now we need not go beyond these letters and any further evidence as to his teaching is quite unnecessary. The Bishop of Ontario, however, in his address to his Synod takes no notice of the Provost's letters, which were the subject of the resolution before the Corporation, but speaks only of the evidence which had been adduced previous to their publication. He says, "To my surprise and sorrow I found that it was made up of second-hand extracts supplied from an apocryphal catechism by anonymous and disaffected students." Thus raising what may be termed a false issue, and diverting attention from the real subject then before the Corporation, namely, the published letters of the Provost. If by "apocryphal" his Lordship meant "fabulous" this epithet cannot apply to the work spoken of, for the questions in the catechism were copied from the Provost's, which he lent for that purpose; and the answers were compiled from notes carefully taken by the students and corrected from time to time. As to the catechism being "anonymous" I am surprised that the Bishop of Ontario should so soon forget that at the meeting of the Corporation of which he spoke, I produced a copy of this catechism, which I stated had been compiled by the Rev. I. Middleton and Messrs. Jones and Badgley, who had united in order to obtain, with perfect accuracy, a copy of the Provost's lectures. If then, the catechism could, with truth, be said to be anonymous to others it surely was not so to the Bishop of Ontario and to the other members of the Corporation then present. Neither can the letter of N. McLeod, Esq. which was published with his signature, and which is appended to this document, be considered as either apocryphal or anonymous. What his Lordship meant by "disaffected students" I can only conjecture. It cannot be said, with truth, that the three gentlemen named above are disaffected to the University. Nor can it be said of the late Mr. P. Steward, of Guelph, or of Fras. Evans, Esq., or of the Rev. Mr. Montgomery, or of the Rev. M. Baldwin, whose copies of this catechism I had, and upon which I grounded the charges which I first brought against the teaching of Trinity College. The Bishop of Ontario has said, "I went to the meeting of the Council of Trinity College, held last February, for the purpose of taking the whole question into consideration, with my mind made up to no course but that of trying a fair and critical investigation into the charges against Provost Whitaker." It must have been apparent to all present that the Bishop of Ontario came to the meeting prepared to second the amendment of the Chief Justice, the effect of which was to give the sanction of the Corporation to the things contained in the letters of the Provost. In the speech which the Bishop of Ontario delivered he made certain statements which he has repeated elsewhere, to which I shall now allude. His Lordship said that the proper course of procedure was to present the Provost for erroneous teaching before an Eccles'ial Court. To this I replied in substance that there was no such court in the country, and even, if there were such a court, every body knew the extreme difficulty of convicting a man of teaching that which, in the eye of the law, was contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England. That much might be considered most dangerous which it would be impossible to prove was legally unsound. At all events that it was not my duty to intrude into another diocese and to present the clergyman of another Bishop for erroneous teaching; that I did not accuse the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, as a clergyman, of teaching what the law would pronounce