

is more wonderful than our slowness in learning toleration. A comparison of our church with the reformed continental churches will show that ours is the only protestant reformed church that has made any way since the reformation. When Luther died the reformation had gained an ascendancy in Europe, to which it has never reached since. The reformed principles of England's Church, though sometimes under a cloud, have never retrograded, and to-day they stand more exalted than ever. May not this, under God, be attributable to the wise comprehension that distinguishes her? A great church cannot have narrow tests. A happy characteristic of our church is the slight interference with the private opinions of her members, and however varied may be those opinions, it is consolatory to know that men are never so good or so bad as their opinions. "Who can doubt it?" says John Wesley, "while there are Calvinists in the world, assertors of absolute predestination? For who will dare to affirm that none of these are truly religious men? Not only many of them in the last century were burning and shining lights, but many of them are now real christians, loving God and all mankind. And yet what are all the absurd opinions of all the Romanists in the world compared to that one, that the God of love, the wise, just, merciful father of the spirits of the blast, has from all eternity fixed an absolute, unchangeable, irresistible decree that part of mankind shall be saved, do what they will, and the rest damned, do what they can." Our great business is clearly to refute, instead of attempting the useless task of frowning down opinions probably absurd but certainly harmless, neither interfering with the daily duties of life, nor preventing the holders of them from conscientiously using our formularies. The most we are entitled to expect from the vaunted enlightenment of the times, is "to think and let think," for it is vain to hope that we shall obliterate opinions which divided the Latin doctors for 1000 years after Augustine—which drove Luther to write his violent book on free will, concerning which the divines of the council of Trent wrangled in vain, and the Synod of Dort enacted its useless anathemas, in short, opinions which divide two great protestant denominations—Methodists and Presbyterians.

Now, the teaching of Trinity College has not been Calvinistical. Hence I believe the denunciation of its theology. No pains are taken to bias the students in favour of the doctrines of absolute decrees, nor do the lectures probably tend to repress a love of didactical subtleties regarding free will and reprobation. Because of this absence of Calvinistic theories the College is charged with a tendency towards Romish error, though as we have seen, a belief in predestination to life or eternal death, is quite compatible with communion with the Church of Rome. That the specific charges of dangerous teaching, which are urged, are not the real cause of the attack, appears from the facts stated in the last charge of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, namely, that Trinity College was opposed by some through the whole of its progress before any Professors were appointed, and from the fact that the charges themselves are so wretchedly unsupported by good evidence. From the readiness and easy way in which the controversy glided into its natural channel, namely, a debate on the subject of Calvinistical Churchmanship, I infer that there must have been a foregone conclusion against the College, and a determination to urge at once objections that seem doubtful rather than wait for the chance of more substantial ones hereafter.

I shall not refer to the mode in which the agitation was first set in motion before an oppor-

tunity was offered to the Council of redressing any supposed wrongs or remedying any alleged false teaching. I had the honour of being a member of the Council of Trinity College, and to my utter amazement the first intimation I had of anything having been laid to the charge of the College was information gleaned from "the Globe" newspaper. On this grievous treatment I shall not dwell, but proceed to give you my reasons for having expressed, by my vote in the Synod of Toronto Diocese, my confidence in the teaching given in the College. It was my good fortune to have had personal intercourse with many of the Graduates of Trinity College, and I naturally inferred that if the teaching of the College had been so dangerous, some traces of the danger incurred and the errors embraced would be visible. But I found those men by no means imbued with extreme views, and remarkable for sober mindedness and the avoidance of all novelties in religion. This inconsistency with the charges against the Professors who had instructed them, I of course remarked, and judging of the tree by its fruit, I required strong evidence before I condemned the Provost. Another consideration which held me back from giving too ready credence to the charges laid against the Provost was the fact that all the Divinity students who applied for Holy Orders were examined and approved by the Rev. H. Grasett, a gentleman of views I believe identical with those held by the opponents of Trinity College. I never could for a moment endure the supposition (which was the only alternative) that the examining Chaplain was dissatisfied with his candidates for Holy Orders, and yet presented them at the most solemn occasion of their lives, as "apt and meet for their learning and Godly conversation to exercise the office of Priest duly to the honour of God and the edification of His Church." The supposition is so odious that my apology for alluding to it is the fact that the Rev. Mr. Grasett being examining Chaplain, inspired me with confidence that extreme views in a Romish direction were not apparent in the Divinity Students, and this helped to make me suspicious of the truth of the charges against the Divinity Professor. It became my duty, however, to examine into the evidence itself, and to my surprise and sorrow I find that it is made up of second-hand extracts supplied from an Apocryphal Catechism by anonymous and disaffected students. Here I would observe that when such grave charges were laid against the Provost, the proper course to adopt would have been to present him for unsound teaching in the Bishop's Court, or to have transferred the case by letters of request to the Court of the Metropolitan. We should then have had the names of the witnesses, who would be examined on oath: we should have been able to satisfy ourselves of their integrity and the animus of their opposition to the College; we should have seen whether their witnesses agreed together or whether they could not be contradicted by others, who, forming as they do the great majority of former Divinity Students, have come before the public in a more manly way and over their signatures denied the truth of the charges against the institution. I therefore acted wholly in a spirit of fairness which will ever prevent my considering a man guilty till he be proved so. 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. The Lord Bishop of Huron moved a resolution which in my mind would have had the effect of condemning the Provost unheard. The Chief Justice of Upper Canada moved in amendment to the effect that

we refrain from condemning the Provost, till we had the charges in writing. I seconded the amendment, which was carried by the votes of all the members of the Council except the members from Huron Diocese and that of the Rev. Mr. Grasett. During the conversation that ensued on the motion before the Council the Lord Bishop of Huron openly and manfully declared that he did not charge the Provost with having taught any thing heretical nor anything contrary to the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland, but he did charge him with teaching doctrines dangerous in the extreme. On this admission, the council felt more than ever convinced of the propriety of acting with great caution, and refraining from condemning the Provost without formal trial. It was finally arranged that the charges against the Provost should be put in writing, and submitted to him for inspection and reply, and the feeling of the council which I share, is in favour of submitting both charge and reply to the Metropolitan of Canada, who should associate with himself the Bishops of British North America, exclusive of Upper Canada, and that the decision of these arbitrators be final. I regret to say that the proposal to submit the question to such arbitration was not favourably received by the members from the Huron Diocese, who refused to abide by such an award. This seems to me the more unreasonable, because the Lord Bishop of Huron once proposed to submit the whole case to the Bishop of Rupert's Land for his decision, and also because the council of Trinity College, composed largely of laymen, would naturally feel incompetent to decide so nice and intricate a point as would be involved in the examination into doctrines dangerous in the extreme, yet not heretical nor contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England.

I have now laid before you the state in which this unfortunate agitation rests, and assure this Synod that I shall watch over the teaching of Trinity College and its other interests as carefully and impartially as is possible. I was brought up in a theological school which gave no uncertain sound regarding Romanism, yet I was not taught the theory of churchmanship exclusively Calvinistical; on the contrary, in Trinity College, Dublin, one of the test books was the work of Archbishop Lawrence, proving two articles of the church of England non-Calvinistical; and I may add that the text books of Trinity College, Toronto, are used in Trinity College, Dublin. I am as jealous as is possible for me to be for the sound teaching of our youth, for their receiving such an education as will help them to resist Romanism in all its varied guises, but I affirm that I have been unable to detect in the teaching of Trinity College any tendency towards such error. I believe the Provost of the College to be a well-learned and pious man, who desires to train up the youth under his care in the old fashioned tenets of our standard divines, who wishes to show the exact point of difference between the churches of Rome and England, not so much in his own point of view as in that from which they are viewed by those to whom we owe the existence of our reformed faith, the martyrs and confessors of England's church. I shall say no more, lest I seem to prejudice a case which still may require a judicial decision. But I cannot conclude without expressing my belief that the Provost has not had such fair treatment as the teacher of any common school might justly claim from a Board of Trustees, that of "having his accusers face to face." The accusations, so far as they have appeared in print, are perhaps familiar to you. I shall not comment on them further than to say that the point in those accusations depends on