

quire the answers which the Provost required, and when they found that they had not the exact answer in their manuscript, they took down the answer given by him.

Ans. 4.—The students were required to give correct answers, taken from the Provost's notes, to the questions asked by him.

Ans. 5.—Never; but he lent his questions sometimes.

Ans. 6.—There is a catechism, question and answer, in common use among the students, handed down from class to class, and familiarly known as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never that I know of.

Ans. 8.—I have heard the students speaking of wishing to have the catechism published, but I do not remember the Provost's objections.

The next answers are from a layman resident in the Diocese of Toronto:

Ans. 1.—Yes; the Provost required an excuse for absence on every occasion.

Ans. 2.—The Provost lectured from his manuscript, and asked questions on the next day for lecture. He has frequently said, when a question has not been answered satisfactorily, "that is not what I gave you." His questions were written as well as his lectures.

Ans. 3.—Some of them took notes; others would have their predecessor's books, and would only follow him while reading, and see that they were correct.

Ans. 4.—We generally answered in his own words, and if not, as nearly as possible.

Ans. 5.—He lent his questions on the catechism on one or two occasions, and his notes on the articles. I cannot answer positively as to his notes on the catechism.

Ans. 6.—The manuscript, with an exact copy of his questions, (as taken by Mr. Wm. Jones, now of Cambridge,) and the answers, as collected (answer No. 3) were handed down. When I entered in 1856, I procured a book from Mr. W. Jones, from which to copy a manuscript for myself. It was always spoken of as "The Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—I never heard of any disapproval, either directly or indirectly.

Ans. 8.—I, on several occasions, have heard students propose to have it published, and the reply generally given was, "The Provost would not like it." Whether or not he was consulted, I cannot say.

The next set of answers is from a layman, now resident in the Diocese of Huron.

Ans. 1.—Attendance on the catechism lecture was compulsory.

Ans. 2.—The Provost read from his manuscript as a continuous lecture, but must have been aware that we had it either written, or took very few notes in the room, and both questions and answers were contained in his lecture, although not distinguished as such by him, being probably aware that we had both questions and answers before us.

Ans. 3.—The students had both questions and answers written before they entered the room, and only compared their's with the Provost's while he read.

Ans. 4.—The students were expected on the lecture day to answer the questions of the preceding lecture day in the substance, and as much as possible in the words given.

Ans. 5.—I never did.

Ans. 6.—Each Student of the first year either borrows, and copies a manuscript from the borrowed copy, or purchases from a student of the second or third year his manuscript.

Ans. 7.—I never heard him say anything *pro* or *con* in the matter.

Ans. 8.—I never heard any proposition of the kind, though it might have been made without my knowledge.

The following is an extract from a note received from a lay gentleman, residing at some distance: "I do not think the Provost has ever given both questions and answers to any student to copy, but I heard when I was at college that he lent his questions on one occasion, and that a copy was taken of them. Of course, as soon as the students had a copy of the questions which were to be put to them, they were able to form proper answers from the notes which they had taken down from the last or preceding lecture. I don't remember hearing any copy called 'The Provost's Catechism;' I have heard of 'The Provost's Questions,' meaning those questions which the Provost asks. I have heard that the Provost has been asked to publish a catechism, in order that the students might be saved the trouble of writing out copies for themselves."

The following answers are from a graduate of Trinity College, residing in the Diocese of Toronto:

Ans. 1.—Yes; it was placed precisely on the same footing with other subjects. Students absenting themselves from catechism, or any other lecture given by the Provost, were *obliged* to account *satisfactorily* to the Provost on the succeeding day, for their absence therefrom.

Ans. 2.—Yes; the Provost's mode of procedure was as follows: at his first lecture to freshmen, he read to us about thirty questions, (the number varied afterwards.) The next Friday, he questioned us on the matter of the preceding Friday, and read to us fresh questions and answers sufficient to fill up the hour.

Ans. 3.—The students had copies of the questions and answers written, either by themselves, or students who had previously graduated in Trinity College, and as the Provost *read his lecture* they compared their manuscripts with what he read, and made alterations in the references, (texts of scripture,) or any thing else in which there might have been a discrepancy. They were thus assured of *perfect accuracy*.

Ans. 4.—Most assuredly they were; for I recollect that on one occasion, a student of my year expressed the answer in a manner which varied, by *two important words*, from that dictated by the Provost on the preceding Friday, and was corrected for it. I remember the more distinctly as every student who took pains with it, used to repeat it with literal accuracy.

Ans. 5.—I understood, by report among the students, that the Provost did at one time lend his manuscript to a student, and I always considered that this was the origin of the almost stereotyped accuracy of our manuscripts.

Ans. 6.—Yes; generally a student, after his previous examination in the second year, at which time he passes his third and last examination in the catechism, either gives, lends, or sells his manuscript catechism to junior students. In my case I obtained the loan of a manuscript catechism, and copied it out. It is familiarly known among the students as "the Provost's Catechism."

Ans. 7.—Never to my knowledge.

Ans. 8.—No; but I often wished, for my own convenience, that it had been printed and published, as the copying of it entailed a great deal of unnecessary labour upon me, and wasted much precious time, in fact, I thought it on the whole a very strange proceeding.

I have stated fully my objections to this mode of teaching in my pastoral; I need not here repeat them.

This manuscript, known as "The Provost's Catechism," with the questions copied or corrected from his own manuscript, lent for that purpose, and the answers taken down carefully from his own lips and corrected from time to time, has

been handed down from class to class, and has even been bought and sold by the students. I have not given the names of those gentlemen from whom I have received the above answers to my questions, but I can obtain permission to do so if necessary, and shall lay the original documents, together with the letters which accompanied them, before any member of the Synod appointed for that purpose. There was but one gentleman to whom I applied who expressed a wish "not to be implicated in the matter." I have therefore not made any use of his communication.

I now proceed to lay before you the teaching which I characterize as "dangerous in the extreme." I have heard when examining graduates of Trinity College, statements which they have reported as made to them, either in the course of lectures, or in conversation with the Divinity Professor. Some of these I took down at the time I heard them, such as the following, that "the Church of England lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good and tended to edification" that "justification was an impermanent subject to introduce before a congregation, as there was not one man in ten thousand who was not already justified." These and like statements I have heard from gentlemen who have been students in the University. I do not here dwell upon them; I come to the consideration of documents which I shall quote, and I think when these documents are well weighed, and compared with the articles and formularies of our Church, they will abundantly establish the conclusion to which I have come, that the teaching in Trinity College is dangerous.

I have now in my possession five copies of the catechism, which has been for years in the hands of the students of Trinity College, and which graduates of the University declare contains the questions of the Provost, corrected from his own manuscript, with the answers taken down carefully from his own lips. I have collected these five copies, and their agreement is such as must convince any one that either they all had their origin from one copy, or that they were reported with wonderful fidelity from the lips of the lecturer.

The following are specimens of the dangerous teaching contained in this catechism:—

On the article, "Born of the Virgin Mary," we find the following questions and answers:—

Ques.—What is the Hebrew form of the name Mary?

Ans.—Miriam.

Ques.—What does that signify?

Ans.—Exaltation.

Ques.—What signification, then, had it as borne by the mother of our Lord?

Ans.—The exalted position resulting from her having given birth to the Redeemer of the world.

Ques.—Who is the first recorded possessor of this name?

Ans.—Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.

Ques.—Show that she may be regarded as holding a position under the old dispensation, typical of that which Mary held under the new?

Ans.—Miriam was an instrument in bringing the Israelites into the promised land, and Mary was an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Glory (or Heaven.)

Ques.—What was the belief of the early Fathers respecting the virginity of Mary?

Ans.—That she continued a virgin ever after.

Ques.—On what grounds did it rest?

Ans.—Some suppose that the mother of such a son could not be mother of another.

Such teaching as this I regard as a dangerous tampering with a false doctrine of the Church of Rome, directly leading to idolatry. It will, I