land 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 honorable 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 *resumé* 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 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."

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 has 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 intreat 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 anything 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 " 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 believeing that no thought or effort for good is ever lost in our Lord's kind Providence, I persevered in my course, and I now find on looking back when nearly at the end of my journey, that the balance is greatly in my favour. To bear and forbear in all situations of life, is the ordained lot and the wisdom of humanity, and our struggle after good, like prayer, should never cease Hence, I have always strongly felt the truth of the Apostle's doctrine, "That to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin"—Again entreating you to re-consider and withdraw your letter, I remain, my dear Lord,

Your faithful Brother in Christ,

JOHN TORONTO.

To this strong and affectionate appeal of the Bishop of Toronto, the Bishop of Huron replied in a letter containing the following passage:

"I now come to that part of your letter which has caused me much anxious thought. I would preface my remarks by assuring you that, in commencement of my Episcopal career, moved by the high opinion which I entertained of your experience and judgment, I formed the resolution to avail myself of your advice and fatherly counsel whenever I could do so without doing violence to my own convictions, and it has caused me many unpleasant feelings, that I am not able, in the present case, to agree with the opinion which you have advanced.

You say that in early life you adopted the rule, "never, if possible, to permit an opportunity of doing good to pass unimproved." Any one at all acquainted with the history of your life will acknowledge that few men have more fully acted up to this excellent rule. But there is another rule of Divine authority, which, I feel assured, you would not desire to overlook, and which regulates my conduct towards Trinity College. It is the Apostolic rule, "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 theological teaching of Trinity College, I believe that my appearing to sanction this teaching 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;" 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. To avoid this I have heretofore kept aloof from the University, and I am still satisfied in my own mind, that it is better for me thus to act than to introduce discussion into the Council, and thus render patent to the world the differences which unhappily exist amongst us. Praying earnestly that the Lord will grant to us both that wisdom which cometh down from above, and which is pure and peaceable, so that we may be enabled to follow peace with all men.—I remain, my dear Lord,

With unabated respect and esteem,

Your brother in the ministry,

BENJ. HURON.

P.S.—I have written the above as a private communication to your Lordship, as your letter of the 25th of April appeared to me to require it.—*B. H.*

Such is the correspondence. In the first letter the Bishop of Huron declares that he disapproves of Trinity College in many things; in the second, the Bishop of Toronto urges him to give explicit expression to that disapproval at the proper time and place; in the third, the Bishop of Huron refuses to do this, because he considers that such interference would be useless, at the same time stating that his letter is a private communication. And yet he does not fear to commit himself to the following statement: that he had made a charge against the teaching of the College, in the most solemn form in which he could put it, to the President of the Corporation; that he received no answer to his letter, and that he thence concluded that the President was indifferent to his opinion, or that he agreed with him in thinking that it was better that he should stand aloof from the College.

Any reader would justly infer from this statement that such a letter as that of the Bishop of Toronto could never have been addressed to the Bishop of Huron; he would, indeed, infer that the whole transaction had been utterly the reverse of what it really was; that the Bishop of Huron had openly and candidly stated objections against which the Bishop of Toronto shut his ear,