

kept up by ecclesiastical battledoors? She never was meant for a party machine, but a strictly Church University, entwining a certain amount of Divinity with the other subjects in her Arts' course, and having schools of Divinity and Medicine attached. It may be called a happy accident that we were fortunate enough to obtain a man who, in addition to being Provost of the College, and Vice-Chancellor of the University, could occupy the Divinity Chair, and we can hardly hope to get another equally efficient and willing. This triple office is probably the origin of the confusion of three very different things, but we hope that the evident and welcome revival of life and unity amongst Trinity's sons will breed such a University spirit that absurdities like these—the result of the undue prominence of a department—will die a natural death.

AN AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENT.

The following appeared in the daily press:—

In consequence of several statements which have, from time to time, appeared in the public prints in reference to the proceedings of the corporation of Trinity College, in respect of the appointment of a Provost, it seems necessary that some authoritative contradiction should be given to certain misconceptions or mis-statements, seriously affecting the character of the corporation, and of the College of which it is the governing body.

I. It has been made to appear that with regard to the appointment in question, there has been an antagonism, more or less evident, between the Bishop of Toronto, and the majority of the corporation. Nothing can be further from the truth. The corporation discovered the fullest confidence in the Bishop and the greatest anxiety that the person chosen to fill the office of Provost should be acceptable to him, by entrusting to him, in conjunction with the present Provost, the task of selecting a fitting person for the office during the Bishop's late visit to England.

It has been affirmed that "the Council (corporation) withdrew the trust they had committed to these two important members of the body." The simple fact is that the trust was not

withdrawn. I expired when the Bishop and the Provost quitted England. This was clearly understood, both by themselves and by the body which had reposed the trust in them: their being in England was a necessary condition of their exercising it, and, on their return, it never occurred to themselves, or to any other person interested in the matter, that they still could be regarded as possessed of any such trust, or that it was necessary that it should be withdrawn by any act of the corporation.

II. When the corporation met after the Bishop's return it became evident that there was a divergence of opinion as to the course which was to be followed. The Bishop of Toronto, the Chancellor of the University, and the Provost had been of opinion that reference should still be made to England, being satisfied that there had been hitherto, by no means, sufficient time to make thorough enquiry there. They wished to take this course, partly on account of the exceptional advantages, for some years past enjoyed in England, in the pursuit of theological studies; and partly because in view of past difficulties, they considered that a gentleman who had, in no degree, been identified with parties in this country, would have a better opportunity of conciliating general confidence, that one who had, however innocently, incurred the dislike or suspicion of any section of the church in Canada.

When, however, it appeared that the majority of the corporation were averse to the risk which was supposed to attach to a reference to England, and felt how difficult would be the task imposed on any friends at home of selecting a suitable person, with necessarily imperfect acquaintance with the character of the position and its diversified surroundings, and also that those who took this view were unanimous in their approval of a gentleman who was known to stand very high in general estimation, and was spoken of in terms of the highest praise by persons whose testimony was most trustworthy, the members of corporation who have been named above, as favourable to a reference to England, acceded to the view of the majority, and the Bishop of Toronto did this in such terms as utterly preclude any suspicion of antagonism between himself and those to whose opinion he consented to yield.

In respect of the proposals of the governing body of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, it must be observed that they have never been before the corporation. They were

placed in the hands of the Bursar, who informed the corporation at the meeting at which the election took place, and after that election that he was entrusted with the document for presentation. It was agreed *nem. con.* that it could not be received, as the meeting was a special meeting, at which nothing could be transacted of which previous notice had not been given. The proposals accordingly lay over for the next meeting; but in the meantime the Bursar received instructions not to present them, on the ground, as it appears, that the wishes of the Bishop of Toronto has been thwarted in respect of the appointment of a Provost. If this is the ground on which the proposals were withdrawn, it is indisputable that they were withdrawn on a ground which has no existence in fact. The Bishop has stated what was his *a priori* objection to the name proposed, and has also signified, in no ambiguous terms, his ultimate concurrence in the election, and his opinion that the gentleman chosen would have been especially qualified, by the moderation of his opinions, and by his well-known courtesy and gentleness, to draw together those who had divided.

III. It has further become necessary to affirm, in an authoritative form, that no novelties in doctrine or ritual are taught or practised in Trinity College. It is a bare falsehood to assert that the Reformation has ever been characterized by any teacher there as "a crime, or at least a blunder," or that language has been used, which, by any possibility, can give colour to such a statement.

If the Bishop of Toronto had reason to suspect any such disloyalty on the part of the Professors of Trinity College, he would not countenance such an institution by his declared approval of it, and by his offer to take part in the instruction given in the theological department. Nor would the Chancellor of the University consent to retain his office or his connection with the college, without taking effectual steps to put a stop to so gross an abuse, had he the slightest grounds to believe that it exists.

ARTHUR TORONTO,
GEORGE W. ALLAN,

Chancellor

GEORGE WHITAKER.

Trinity College, Toronto, April 17th.

The following also appeared simultaneously in the City News of the Toronto Dailies of May 8th:

"By a recent change of the statutes of Trinity College, the election of Chancellor and of eight members of