

over the business to come before the Corporation in the afternoon, and should any amendments occur, they may still be adopted, and thus secure a pleasant unity in our proceedings.

I remain,

My dear Lord,

Your's faithfully,

JOHN TORONTO,

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF HURON.

Of this letter his Lordship says nothing; yet, strange to say, on arriving in Toronto he acted upon it. He did, at the time appointed, present himself at Mr. Cameron's office, and thence go to the residence of the Bishop of Toronto. After consulting with him, he returned to Mr. Cameron, and informed him that, having seen the Bishop of Toronto, he had agreed with him respecting the report of the committee on statutes, except in a few unimportant particulars, which he thought would create no difficulty at the meeting.

The Corporation cannot conceive that this understanding with the Bishop of Toronto could have been arrived at, in the absence of any written document in the hand of either party, or at a casual meeting which might properly be described in the terms which the Bishop of Huron employs when he says: "I saw the Bishop of Toronto only for a few minutes that morning."

The Bishop of Huron next demurs to the assertion that "he accompanied the Bishop of Toronto to the meeting of the Corporation." If these words necessarily imply more than that the Bishops presented themselves to the meeting together, the Corporation willingly withdraw them, together with any imputation which the Bishop of Huron may suppose them to convey.

At the opening of the business of the meeting the Bishop of Toronto spoke to this effect: "I am happy to inform the gentlemen present that the Bishop of Huron and myself are of one mind respecting the statutes now to be proposed for adoption; the Bishop has one or two unimportant amendments to suggest, which I trust the Corporation will adopt." The Bishop of Huron sat by and assented to this statement. The Corporation consider it impossible that, if some new statute, of which the Bishop of Huron had never heard, had been brought forward for adoption, and brought forward as forming a part of the body of the statutes respecting which he had consulted with the Bishop of Toronto, (and in this way they affirm that it must have been brought forward, if it was brought forward at all,) he should not have uttered one single syllable of remonstrance or surprise.

As for the opposition offered to the Statute at the time, not as introduced by surprise, but on its proper merits, the recollection of all present would show that the Bishop of Huron took no exception against the vesting of a discretionary power in the Chancellor, but merely offered some suggestions respecting details, which he by no means pressed; and that he certainly left on the minds of all present an impression as to his feeling respecting the statute, directly opposed to that which his pastoral letter would convey.

The Corporation would desire to make every reasonable allowance for the imperfect recollection of circumstances long past of which no written record remains, but they owe it to themselves to declare that they see no reason to retract any assertion which they have put forth, and that they believe that if the Bishop of Huron had fairly availed himself of the proper means of recalling the occurrences of that time, he could not have impugned their assertions as he has thought proper to do so.

The Corporation, however, proceed to notice one or two statements of the Bishop of Huron which they confess have greatly surprised them

and though, in any personal controversy, they would gladly have foreborne to point out so particularly, as they will now proceed to do, the just grounds of their surprise; yet in vindicating an important institution, in which the Church of England has a deep interest, from a very injurious attack, which they feel to have been lightly and inconsiderately made, they cannot properly refrain.

The Bishop of Huron quotes from the statement of the Corporation the following words: "And his refusal (to bring forward in his place in the Corporation his charge against the teaching of the College) was based on this ground, that he could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University;" and he adds, "I never stated any such ground for my refusal. To prove this I have only to quote the passage from my letter in which I replied to the Bishop of Toronto. The passage is as follows: 'You say that in early life you adopted the rule, never, if possible to allow an opportunity of doing good to pass unimproved; all who are acquainted with the history of your life will acknowledge that few men have more fully acted upon this rule. But there is another rule having divine sanction, which I feel assured you would desire to observe, and which must regulate my conduct towards Trinity College; it is, 'Abstain from all appearance of evil.' I feel that I am bound to act up to this rule, and as I cannot in my soul approve of the teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction it, would be a positive evil, and would expose me to the condemnation which the Apostle says is the just portion of those who say, 'Let us do evil that good may come.'"

Here the Bishop's quotation from his letter ends, though the *very next words* of that letter are the following: "Were I to go to the Council, as you say, would be the 'wiser and more honourable course' and enter my protest against the teaching which I disapprove, no good result would follow, as I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University, and the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself would be presented."

It thus appears that, in order to disprove the assertion of the Corporation, the Bishop of Huron quotes the first half of a paragraph of his letter, stopping just when he arrives at those words, used by himself in the same letter, which would establish their assertion and disprove his own. The Corporation also invite particular attention to the fact, that after denying the ground for his refusal which the words of his own letter, left unquoted by him, had distinctly expressed, the Bishop of Huron proceeds to quote in his pastoral expressions which immediately follow them, thus giving a *résumé* of the whole sentence with the omission of the only words upon which the Bishop and the Corporation are at issue.

Once more, the Bishop of Huron says:

"From the above extract it will be seen that though I did not, in my place in the Corporation, bring forward a charge against the teaching of the University, yet I make the charge in the most solemn form in which I could put it to the President of the Corporation, and as I received no answer to my letter, I concluded either that the President was indifferent as to what opinion I might entertain of the teaching of Trinity College, or that he concurred in the view which I expressed in the same letter, 'that it was a wiser course for me to stand aloof from the University, than by a public protest to exhibit the melancholy picture of a house divided against itself.'"

"I should not, even when called upon by a member of my Synod, have given expression to the opinion which I had formed of Trinity College, had I not, previously, in the most pointed, and

solemn manner, given expression to the same opinion to the President of that Institution."

The Corporation regret that they are compelled to characterize this passage as most disingenuous. In proof of this assertion they quote below from two letters of the Bishop of Huron, and from the reply of the Bishop of Toronto to the first of those letters. In a letter, dated April 19th, 1860, the Bishop of Huron uses the words, "I disapprove of Trinity College in many things." He thus gave the Bishop of Toronto opportunity of appealing to him, in the following earnest terms, to state the grounds of his disapproval. The letter of the Bishop of Toronto bears date April 25th, 1860, and it may here be observed that the correspondence originated in a letter addressed to the Bishop of Huron by the Bursar of Trinity College, inviting him, in the name of the Corporation, to exercise his privilege of nominating five members of the College Council from his own Diocese, in accordance with a statute to which he had so recently given his assent.

Toronto, 25th April, 1860.

MY DEAR LORD,

I have read your letter of the 19th inst. with very much regret, because it has been my earnest wish that you should take your place at the Council of Trinity College, as you have equal power and authority with myself, and give us your hearty and strenuous assistance in its government and direction. Suffer me therefore to entreat you to re-consider and withdraw your letter of the 19th inst., and to proceed to the nomination of those whom you desire to represent your Diocese in the University.

Trinity College being always intended for the benefit of Upper Canada, and desiring no pre-eminence in the establishment, it was provided in the charter at my desire that all the Bishops should enjoy equal authority.

There are, you say, some things which you disapprove of in the institution, if so, permit me, as the wiser and more honourable course, to request you to come among us and point them out that they may be fairly examined and modified if deficient, or confirmed if found correct. I feel assured from the knowledge I have of the members of our Council that they are not unreasonable or disposed to retain any thing really objectionable.

The authorities of Trinity College are quite aware, that among the members of the Church in Upper Canada there are in some few points differences of opinion, but they have never considered them, nor are they disposed to consider them, a just cause of separation and estrangement. The same differences and in much the same proportion exist in England, as they do in the Church here, but the true Christians of both parties are found associating to promote and support institutions really good, and they disapprove of those who make them grounds of contention.

This being the view which I take, and have always taken of the University's relation to the Church, I desire without offence to state, that as it seems to me, you are not at liberty to refuse to discharge the important duties of an office to which you have been appointed by competent authority without incurring a responsibility which the reasons you assign will in no way sustain or justify.

In truth the very fact of your separation from us will inflict upon the Church and University an injury that you can never repair.

One of the rules of conduct which I adopted in early life was the following: "Never if possible to permit an opportunity of doing good to pass me unimproved." In carrying out this principle I may have frequently failed and suffered much discouragement, mortification and sorrow; but be-