

been forced to declare himself. Our Church University—the re-building of which called out to the utmost the devotion and self-sacrifice of churchmen, which will hand down to posterity the name of our own honored prelate amongst those of the great and noble-hearted founders of former ages, the grand triumph of principle, of indomitable energy and strength of will in the cause of truth, amidst circumstances of unparalleled difficulty and danger, which absorbed, for the time, the sympathies and interest of our Church in every land where English prayer is said and the English tongue is spoken, which was founded amidst the fervent prayers and tears, the most sanguine hopes, the brightest anticipations of all members of our faith in Canada, and was to be the Strong Tower of our spiritual Zion against false doctrine, unbelief, and godless education—is now held to be a folly, the principles for which we so nobly contended, a sham, a delusion, a lie. The Sanballat who would trouble the building and pull down the towers of our Jerusalem because its teaching is not measured by the line, square, or plummet of the narrow and sectarian views which he professes, belongs to nothing less than the Episcopate itself. Because they are not instructed in the strictest dogmas, and most stereotyped phraseology of an effete Puritanism, the sons of the prophets are to sit at the feet of a Presbyterian, a Socinian, an Infidel. When His Lordship sent two of his sons to a University whose distinctive character is that it has no religious teaching whatever, it was surmised that the Episcopate had not been proof against the material considerations offered by an institution richly endowed by the State from the sacrilegious spoliation of the Church. It may now be doubted whether the superior spiritual advantages of the system did not present the leading inducement.

Let us state the matter between Bishop Cronyn and the College plainly. The charges he prefers are two: first, against its teaching; secondly, that he has no power to alter such teaching. We presume that the erroneous teaching His Lordship refers to is in the Theological Faculty. Those of Arts no one has, or is likely to impugn. Suffices it to say that the instruction given in these faculties is as thorough and scholarlike, if not more so, than anything of the kind on this continent. In the Theological Department, whether we take the Divinity Lectures incorporated into the University system, the special course for theological students, or the more general teaching of the University pulpit, we challenge the Bishop of Huron, or any other, to substantiate one instance of teaching which does not harmonize in letter and spirit with the Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Canons of the Church of England and Ireland. That these are not taught with simplicity and truthfulness, in all the integrity and purity of our Reformed Faith, not even a deeper theologian, a more exact scholar, a more acute and logical reasoner than His Lordship can in any way demonstrate. After the general charge he has made, of course he will produce, in detail, good and substantial proofs. The *onus probandi* rests with him. We have no fear of the result. The doctrinal teaching of the College may be in the directest contradiction to the theological views of the Bishop of Huron. It is in the strictest accordance with the authoritative formularies of our Church.

The second charge, that by a recent statute of the College he had been deprived of the power of controlling its teaching, lays him open to the imputation of disingenuousness, or the still more grave one of actual misrepresentation. Whether the force of the statute be such as he declares we know not. This we know, that when it was passed, he was present, and after due deliberation and discussion of each clause, sanctioned it. Without such sanction it could not have been passed at all. The charter of the College gives to each Bishop the right of veto upon any measure whatever. Why he did not exercise his undisputed prerogative in a matter which is of such vital importance as to sever his

connection with the College, or why the personal share he had in it was not explained to his Synod are equally subjects of mystery. If the final appeal in matters of academic discipline and management is to the Chancellor, this follows merely the analogy of every other existing university. There can be little doubt that in matters touching Religion and Doctrine the control rests with the Visitors. Before the Bishop of Huron fairly broke with the College, before his gratuitous and wanton attack, was it not worth while to have tried every constitutional method for the reform of what he considered objectionable? At all events he should have laid his grievances before the corporation. After Dr. Townley's motion had been forwarded to the Secretary, after it had been printed and presented to his Lordship, two months elapsed before the meeting of Synod. Was not this a fitting opportunity of seeking redress, at all events of suggesting the difficulty? Did the Bishop of Huron accept the many invitations to, or take his place at the meetings of the corporation? His powers were equal to those of the Founder of the College, and there is no doubt that any suggestion of his would have been cheerfully and promptly attended to. Again, more than six months ago the same motion proposed by Dr. Townley, and seconded by Dr. Caulfield, who surely cannot be accused of any strong church bias, was passed unanimously by the Church Society of Huron. This drew forth no remonstrance from the Bishop, and shewed well in what high estimation Trinity College was held through the length and breadth of the Diocese.

But the real question at issue is far removed from this. The Bishop of Huron knows that he can never have the Church University so far under his control as to make it the training school for any section or party. The basis of its theological teaching will never be narrower than that of the Church itself. No one special doctrine, the Shibboleth of any school, but the whole complex of Christian truth in its due proportion and analogy will there be faithfully and impartially set forth. Bishop Cronyn holds himself answerable only to a party, and regards himself solely as its exponent. Within the Church he has no idea of toleration. He believes himself placed in his high position to advance one school and to suppress the slightest divergence from it. The attack upon Trinity College is but part of a settled and deliberate course of action. The Theological School which is to be dominant in the Diocese of Huron being one which postulates—as its primary mental conditions,—an obliquity of perception—a kind of color-blindness to all that is Catholic in doctrine and Apostolic in practice—as its moral—narrowness of heart and contracted sympathies, needs no high intellectual and literary culture. With the same view we hear the Diocese is to be isolated from the great body of the Church: it will be refused permission to join the Provincial Synod. We expect next to hear of a special Book of Prayer according to the use of the Church of Huron. Already those men who were conspicuous for holding Apostolic order as well as Evangelical truth are being quietly eliminated from its ministry. A phalanx of good men and true of the solemn league of Huron readily fill up the vacant ranks. Those persons who a little against their Church principles were instrumental in raising to the chief pastorate one with whom they did not agree are now realizing the fruits. The fable of King Stork was written for all time. However, we do not despair. We may be assured that a system which mars the due proportion of the revealed faith by the exaggeration of one or two doctrines and the correspondent dwarfing of the rest, which is supported by no analogy of natural religion, against which the reason and conscience, the purer emotions, sensibilities and instincts of our nature equally rebel can take no deep root. A better and purer faith must finally prevail. It might as well be attempted to keep out of the Diocese the pure air of heaven unless charged with the acrid humors of the Westminster Confession, or the daylight unclean colored by the baleful and lurid fires of Geneva.