

statements concerning matters in which I am concerned, that I feel myself called upon to address you, and to state the circumstances therein referred to, as they really did occur.

I shall treat the subjects mentioned in this document in the same order in which they are discussed in the extra. I am sorry that I am thus placed under the necessity of publicly contradicting statements put forth by a body of such high respectability as the Corporation of Trinity College; but no other course remains to me, justice to myself and a regard for the interests of truth compel me to do so.

With reference to the fourth paragraph of the extra, the following statement of what really did occur, previous to, and at the meeting of the 24th of February, 1853, will show how careless the Corporation of Trinity College has been in preparing the document to which I refer.

I received from the Bursar of Trinity College a circular, informing me that a meeting of the Corporation would be held on the 24th of February, at which important measures would be brought forward, but no report of resolutions of committees was transmitted to me, and I had no intimation what these measures were. I had never attended any meetings at Trinity College up to that time. I went to Toronto, and on the morning of the 24th of February, being desirous to know what the important business was which was to be brought before the meeting, I inquired of the Rev. H. J. Grasett what the business was. He showed me a paper, on which were some resolutions, but the statute, which was afterwards passed at the meeting, was not one of them. I accompanied, not the Bishop, but Mr. Grasett to the College; I saw the Bishop of Toronto only for a few minutes that morning, and when the statute referred to in the extra was read by the Provost. I objected to it, and it will be remembered by the gentlemen who were present that what I objected to was, that when a requisition for the removal of a Provost or Professor was signed by five members of the Corporation, and placed in the hands of the Chancellor, the option was left to him of bringing the complaint before the Corporation or not, as he thought fit. I urged that when a requisition thus signed was presented to the Chancellor, it should be imperative on him to bring it before the governing body. I even suggested that the number of signatures necessary to the requisition should be increased to ten; but that the Chancellor ought not to have the power of refusing to bring the requisition before the Corporation when thus placed in his hands. I have not, therefore, mis-stated the effect of these statutes, as is asserted; but the writer of the extra has kept out of view that provision of them to which I have objected. All the members of the Corporation then present united in the desire to pass the statute, and after stating my objections I ceased to oppose. I might have pronounced my veto on the measure; but under the circumstances, I did not think it advisable to do so. I was then, for the first time, at a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College. I had never assisted the institution in any way. I was surrounded by gentlemen who had largely contributed to the funds of the University. They, together with the Bishop of Toronto, who had done so much, and laboured so long and so energetically to establish Trinity College, were desirous that the statute should pass; I therefore did not think it wise to use the power which I possessed, to veto their wish concerning this statute. Had I done so, I fear the epithets which would have been lavished upon me would not have been more chaste, gentle or courteous than those which members of the Corporation of Trinity College—a Church institution—have allowed

themselves to employ concerning a Bishop, when speaking of me in public and in private.

It is much to be regretted that when the Corporation of Trinity College, in their zeal, not to defend themselves, but, to assail me, resolved to come before the public, they were not more careful as to the statements which they hazarded. They appear to have acted upon the principle, that a man may, to defend himself, employ any means to weaken or wound his adversary. This principle holds good with those who rely for victory on physical strength. But the use of such an expedient in literary warfare, more particularly where religion is concerned, has ever been justly regarded as unworthy of the scholar and the gentleman. A man does not defend himself, or strengthen his position, by endeavouring to inflict a wound on the reputation of his opponent. Such conduct generally recoils, with crushing force, upon the head of him who has been guilty of it.

I will now direct attention to the statement which I made at the meeting of the Synod of my Diocese. A clerical member of the Synod gave notice of a motion concerning Trinity College. I told this gentleman before he proposed his motion, that I was opposed to it, and should be against him. He persevered in bringing it before the Synod, and in a long speech, in which he uttered the most glowing encomiums on Trinity College, moved its adoption, and was seconded by a friend. When the resolution was thus before the Synod, a lay delegate stood up, and requested me to give my opinion on the subject of the resolution. This I did as nearly as I can remember in the following words:—

“Being called upon by a member of the Synod to give my opinion upon the question now before the meeting, I shall do so fully and faithfully, as it is not my wish to give an opinion by halves upon so important a subject. I cannot agree with the mover of the resolution in the exaggerated eulogium which he has pronounced on Trinity College. I have taken every pains for two years to inform myself concerning the teaching of the University, and I cannot approve of it. I think it dangerous to the young men educated there, more particularly if they are educated for the Ministry. I could not comply with the request contained in the resolution, for I should thereby encourage parties to send their sons to the College, and I would not for any consideration send a son of mine to the institution. Nor do I see any prospect of affecting a change in the teaching of the University, as by a recent statute the Chancellor is interposed between the Professors and the Corporation, and power is given to suppress any complaint against a Provost or Professor, even if preferred by all the Bishops in the Corporation.” What I intend to say in this letter concerning this statement will be contained in the remarks which I am about to make on the contents of the last paragraph of the extra.

A passage from a letter of the Bishop of Toronto to me, written in April last, when we had a correspondence on the subject of Trinity College, is quoted, and it is added, “That my refusal to adopt what his Lordship called the wiser and more honourable course, was based on this ground, that I could not expect to effect a change in the teaching of the University.” 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.’” The correspondence from which I have quoted, took place in April last. 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 made 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.

In my opinion this was the time for the Corporation of Trinity College to have applied to me to state what was the teaching to which I objected. It would have been a much more wise and honourable course, when the charge was thus made to the head of the institution, to have enquired into it, than to wait in silence until I had preferred the same charge, in compliance with a request made to me by a member of the Synod, and then to publish a document occupied in the discussion of a comparatively unimportant statute, and calculated to divert public attention from the important subject, namely, the dangerous teaching of Trinity College.

I do not hold myself responsible to any man for the opinions which I entertain. But, as I have in the present instance when appealed to by a member of my Synod, expressed my opinion of Trinity College, I am prepared to submit the grounds upon which I have formed that opinion to any of my clergy, or of the laity of my Diocese who may desire it. I am in possession of ample information upon the subject, which I am ready to impart to those for whose satisfaction and guidance the opinion was expressed.

Amongst other documents I have in my possession a manuscript known in Trinity College by the name of “The Provost’s Catechism;” it consists of 711 questions with answers. It is placed in the hands of every student entering the University, and all are expected to learn it. Independently of the fact, that such a mode of dealing with men is unheard of in any University at home, I consider the teaching of this catechism dangerous in the highest degree; the views put forth are unsound and un-Protestant. The explanations of Scripture are one-sided; the whole thing is calculated to indoctrinate the youths educated at the institution with the views of the author of “the catechism,” and to prepare them to propagate the views amongst the members of our communion throughout the country. An institution which adopts such an expedient I cannot regard as safe. The minds of young men which are, for three or four years, forced into this mould, will not, for a long time, if ever, regain that liberty and independence of thought