

(Continued from first page.)

ing graduates of Trinity College, statements which they have reported as made to them, either in the course of lectures, or in conversation with the Trinity 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 impertinent 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 *Protestant*, corrected from his own manuscript, with the answers taken down carefully from his own lips. I have collated 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 the *Protestant* catechism:—  
On the articles, "Born of the Virgin Mary," we find the following questions and answers:—  
Q.—What is the Hebrew form of the name Mary?  
A.—Miriam.  
Q.—What does the name signify?  
A.—Exaltation.  
Q.—What signification, then, had it as borne by the mother of our Lord?  
A.—The exalted position resulting from her having given birth to the Redeemer of the world.  
Q.—Who is the first recorded possessor of this name?  
A.—Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.

Q.—Show that she may be regarded as holding a position under the old dispensation, typical of that which *Mary held under the new*?  
A.—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*).  
On the article, "The Communion of Saints," I find the following questions and answers:—  
Q.—With whom have the Saints communion?  
A.—With God the Father, &c., God the Son, &c., and with God the Holy Ghost, &c., and the holy angels, &c., and with all the saints of the Church Militant, &c., and with all the saints departed, &c.

Q.—Wherein does communion with saints departed consist?  
A.—In union of affection, involving on our part reverential commemoration and imitation, and on their part interest on our behalf, and probable intercession with God for us.  
I will add here a letter lately received from a clergyman who some years since graduated at Trinity College:—  
"I will now endeavor to state, as well as I can remember, things which struck me as particularly strange in the *Protestant's* doctrinal teaching. I cannot remember his exact words. I can only give the impression they left on my mind at the time. In lecturing on the communion of saints, he certainly gave us to understand, while discoursing on the interest the saints took in our spiritual welfare, that he thought they pleaded with God for us. He did on one occasion make use of these words, or words very like them, 'This is one of the things which we understand, that things which we lost at the Reformation, and I have a very strong impression upon my mind that it was when asking for prayers for the dead. He always spoke of baptismal regeneration as if all divines received the doctrine in its strongest sense, without ever hinting that there was a far more evangelical view of it taken by many of our divines in our Church. When young men are thus taught, in the creed we profess to believe, that the saints departed take an interest in our spiritual welfare, and probably intercede with God for us, the transition is easy to 'Holy St. Dominick pray for us.'"

On the article "Remission of Sins," in the creed, I find the following questions and answers:—  
Q.—How is remission of sins granted under the Gospels?  
A.—In baptism, past sin is forgiven, whether original or actual, in the case either of infants or adults, duly prepared by faith and repentance.  
Q.—How is it granted after baptism?  
A.—On repentance.  
Q.—In what manner is redemption declared and sealed to the penitent?  
A.—It is declared in the authoritative absolution, and sealed in the reception of the Holy Communion.

Q.—Prove from Holy Scripture?  
A.—If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive our sins. 1 John i. 8, 9.  
"To whom we forgive anything, I forgive also, for if I forgive anything, to whom I forgive also, for your sakes forgive I, in the person of Christ."—2 Cor. ii. 10.

The evident intention in quoting this passage from the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, is to justify the statement that the remission of sins is declared "in the authoritative absolution" mentioned in the answer to the preceding question. Contrast the mode of granting the remission of sins set forth in this catechism with the mode enunciated so clearly in the 11th article of our church:—  
"We absolve all manner of sins, not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works and deservings; whereas, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification."

This mode of teaching the remission of sins in baptism, sealed by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and declared by the authoritative absolution of the Church, is not that which God has revealed in His Word, and which our Church teaches in her formularies—her articles, and her homilies. If baptism, the supper of the Lord, and the authoritative absolution, take away sin and seal the pardon of the aggressor, then the Church of Rome is right, and our forefathers were unjustifiable schismatics in separating from her communion.

ON THE SACRAMENT, called the Eucharist.  
Concerning the sacrament, I find in the catechism the following questions and answers:—  
Q.—Of what sacrament does the catechism treat?  
A.—Of only as generally necessary for salvation, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Whether this has always been sufficient to prevent the growth of the error, I cannot say. Before I conclude this letter, which is the last I shall address to you on this subject, I would briefly advert to one or two passages in my late pastoral.

The resolutions of the committee, which were said to have been transmitted to me, were never received, that never came into my hands.  
When the statute which has been the subject of discussion was read at the Council, I strongly objected to it, stating, at the same time, that if we could always depend on having a Chancellor like the gentleman who now so worthily occupies that position, there could be no objection to leave some extraordinary power with him, as all know that he would use wisely and justly, but that such discretion could not be safely intrusted to every person who might hereafter be elected Chancellor of the University.

With reference to my reasons for not appearing at the meetings of the Corporation, they are stated by me in my letter to the Bishop of Toronto, and occupy a paragraph of that letter.

It is very unfortunate that when the Corporation of Trinity College undertook to state from my letter the grounds on which I declined to take my place at the corporation, they should have selected part of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and overlooked those portions of the same paragraph which immediately precede and follow that part of a sentence which they selected. The latter is now before the public, and any one who will take the trouble to analyze the paragraph referred to will find that there are three grounds for my refusal to attend the Corporation of Trinity College.

The first and chief reason which I quote in my pastoral is contained in the words "I am not a member of the Corporation of Trinity College, and I do not intend to be." The second is in the following words:—"I am not a member of the Corporation, and I do not intend to be." The third is in the following words:—"I am not a member of the Corporation, and I do not intend to be."

Q.—What is to be observed concerning confirmation?  
A.—Confirmation was in early times part of the sacrament of baptism; it became separated from it in three ways, &c.  
Q.—What concerning orders?  
A.—This rite was appointed by Christ, and was accompanied by an outward sign, but the grace bestowed is not personal, but official, and there is no promise of remission of sins.

Q.—What respecting penance?  
A.—In early times, those who were subject to ecclesiastical penalties were required to confess their sins, and after having been separated from the Church, were admitted by the laying on of hands. (This rite is not attended by the remission of sins.)  
Q.—What respecting marriage?  
A.—This rite is an outward sign, but no spiritual grace, and no promise of remission of sins.

Is it safe to teach young men thus to regard the so-called sacraments which the Church of Rome has added to the two appointed by Christ? and not as our Church plainly teaches concerning them in the 25th article?  
Q.—These five commonly called sacraments are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments, with baptism and the Lord's Supper, for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God.

Our Church does not speak of two great sacraments, leaving us to infer that there are lesser sacraments, and that the Church of Rome, in adding to the sacraments appointed by Christ, has only erred in not making a "due distinction" between the two great sacraments and other holy rites and sacraments. Neither does our Church trifle with her members by using the word generally, when she intended to express "universally."

ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.  
When we add to this that those young men who are thus taught in the first year of their university course, to try with the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, are further instructed that the recipient of the bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper partakes of "glorified humanity" of the Son of God, I think it will be acknowledged that the teaching is dangerous in the extreme. Moreover, in this catechism our Lord's words are recorded in the 6th Chapter of St. John's Gospel, and are repeatedly quoted, as spoken concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as in the following answers:—  
Q.—Prove from Holy Scriptures that the Lord's Supper is generally necessary.  
A.—Then Jesus said unto them, "Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."—John vi. 53.

Q.—What words of our Lord show this?  
A.—Our Lord speaks of the special benefits which should certainly flow from eating his flesh and blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be taught to partake. "Who-so eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him."—John vi. 54, &c.

Q.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the Holy Eucharist sustains the spiritual life imparted by baptism?  
A.—Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."—John vi. 53.

In these questions and answers, taken from different parts of the catechism, the student is unhesitatingly taught to interpret the words of our Lord, in the sixth of John, as spoken concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Commentators of the church of England since the Reformation, and some of our Catholic divines, have interpreted the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel as having no reference whatsoever to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and one of the latter has asserted that "the Universal Church has understood this passage ever since its promulgation, to mean spiritual eating and drinking by a living faith."

Our Protestant reformers, when combating the doctrine of transubstantiation thus expressed himself concerning this passage:—"Christ in that place of John spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained), but he spake of spiritual bread, many times repeating, 'I am the bread of life, which came down from heaven,' and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eating of as many as believed on him although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore he said, 'Your Father did eat manna in the desert, but he that eateth this bread shall live forever.' Therefore, this place of St. John can in no wise be understood of the sacramental bread, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat it. Nor of such bread could Christ have then presently said, 'This is my flesh,' except they will say, that Christ did then consecrate the bread before his institution of his Holy Supper."—Cramer.

I cannot, therefore, think it sound divinity, or good Protestantism to teach that, not only the sacramental eating of the bread, but also the spiritual eating of the bread, is necessary to the spiritual participation of his body and blood by faith; such teaching is most unchristian and in the extreme.

I have thus laid before you from authentic sources, some of the teaching to which I allude. The impressions conveyed to my mind by the examination of graduates of the University, I cannot of course convey to yours. The mode adopted by me to ascertain the character and effects of the teaching in Trinity College is that which common sense dictated, and which any position required me to adopt, namely, to examine the pupils. It would be quite impossible to write all I have learned in this way, but the result has been a deep-seated conviction that a large proportion of the young men educated in the institution, in some, if not in many, have not taken any other view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, than that which is presented by the good seed which had been previously sown by the early of their parents or pastors.

THE BISHOP OF TORONTO.  
The Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed report upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued, and in which before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—  
MR. LORD,—I have prepared in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, and in which I have endeavored to show that the teaching of the Church of England; but, independent of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to

some of the contents of the Bishop's letter, in the manner mentioned in my last communication. As respects the answer, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily paper, and which I here transcribe.

It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript, which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In regard to the notes, I observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared for my own use, a book of questions, omitting all questions that are not in my discretion, when I read it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish is a summary of them in the note-books of the Students. The contents of these books I never see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, and they did it with me to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand but so far from encouraging this, I have urged young men to trust if not exclusively, at all events mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. It is further, that in replying to the questions, the students should give their answers in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, to observe, that no manuscript prepared by the name of "The Protestant Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University. The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state that as the ground of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reasons for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is, "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 be in a discussion with the Council, and thus to render rather the difference, which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the Corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I do not take my place at the Council (for the three reasons stated in the paragraph), I stated in the most emphatic way, "I cannot of my own accord approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College," and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to participate in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. What I have written above, all may judge of for themselves. The documentary evidence I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favor of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can now misunderstand my attendance at the Council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" when I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the Corporation, and I have interpreted in my pastoral, to effect those changes in the constitution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

Yours, my reverend brethren and brethren,  
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,  
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.  
At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September 27th 1860.

The Hon. the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beveridge, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Rev. the Provost, the Rev. the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Sprague, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D. L., James Lusk Robinson, Esq., Samuel Blackton, Esq., James G. L. Le Roy, T. H. Fuller, D. D., D. C. L., the Reverend William McMurray, D. D., D. C. L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, L. D. J.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed report upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued, and in which before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—  
MR. LORD,—I have prepared in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, and in which I have endeavored to show that the teaching of the Church of England; but, independent of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to

some of the contents of the Bishop's letter, in the manner mentioned in my last communication. As respects the answer, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily paper, and which I here transcribe.

It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript, which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In regard to the notes, I observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared for my own use, a book of questions, omitting all questions that are not in my discretion, when I read it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish is a summary of them in the note-books of the Students. The contents of these books I never see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, and they did it with me to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand but so far from encouraging this, I have urged young men to trust if not exclusively, at all events mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. It is further, that in replying to the questions, the students should give their answers in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, to observe, that no manuscript prepared by the name of "The Protestant Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University. The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state that as the ground of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reasons for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is, "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 be in a discussion with the Council, and thus to render rather the difference, which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the Corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I do not take my place at the Council (for the three reasons stated in the paragraph), I stated in the most emphatic way, "I cannot of my own accord approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College," and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to participate in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. What I have written above, all may judge of for themselves. The documentary evidence I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favor of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can now misunderstand my attendance at the Council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" when I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the Corporation, and I have interpreted in my pastoral, to effect those changes in the constitution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

Yours, my reverend brethren and brethren,  
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,  
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.  
At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September 27th 1860.

The Hon. the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beveridge, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Rev. the Provost, the Rev. the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Sprague, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D. L., James Lusk Robinson, Esq., Samuel Blackton, Esq., James G. L. Le Roy, T. H. Fuller, D. D., D. C. L., the Reverend William McMurray, D. D., D. C. L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, L. D. J.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed report upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued, and in which before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—  
MR. LORD,—I have prepared in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, and in which I have endeavored to show that the teaching of the Church of England; but, independent of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to

some of the contents of the Bishop's letter, in the manner mentioned in my last communication. As respects the answer, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily paper, and which I here transcribe.

It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript, which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In regard to the notes, I observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared for my own use, a book of questions, omitting all questions that are not in my discretion, when I read it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish is a summary of them in the note-books of the Students. The contents of these books I never see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, and they did it with me to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand but so far from encouraging this, I have urged young men to trust if not exclusively, at all events mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. It is further, that in replying to the questions, the students should give their answers in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, to observe, that no manuscript prepared by the name of "The Protestant Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University. The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state that as the ground of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reasons for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is, "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 be in a discussion with the Council, and thus to render rather the difference, which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the Corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I do not take my place at the Council (for the three reasons stated in the paragraph), I stated in the most emphatic way, "I cannot of my own accord approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College," and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to participate in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. What I have written above, all may judge of for themselves. The documentary evidence I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favor of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can now misunderstand my attendance at the Council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" when I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the Corporation, and I have interpreted in my pastoral, to effect those changes in the constitution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

Yours, my reverend brethren and brethren,  
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,  
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.  
At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September 27th 1860.

The Hon. the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beveridge, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Rev. the Provost, the Rev. the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Sprague, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D. L., James Lusk Robinson, Esq., Samuel Blackton, Esq., James G. L. Le Roy, T. H. Fuller, D. D., D. C. L., the Reverend William McMurray, D. D., D. C. L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, L. D. J.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed report upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued, and in which before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

The Bishop then called upon the Provost to read the following letter:—  
MR. LORD,—I have prepared in reply to the letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Synod, a full statement of my teaching on the points objected to by his Lordship, and in which I have endeavored to show that the teaching of the Church of England; but, independent of this more elaborate reply, I think it necessary to give a brief answer to

some of the contents of the Bishop's letter, in the manner mentioned in my last communication. As respects the answer, I can add but little to the statement which I made in my letter of the 28th of July, which was published in the daily paper, and which I here transcribe.

It is my duty to lecture the students of the first year on the catechism of the Church of England. For this purpose I have compiled a manuscript, which I read and explain to the class. The students are expected to take notes of the lecture, and to answer questions on the next day of attendance. In regard to the notes, I observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared for my own use, a book of questions, omitting all questions that are not in my discretion, when I read it. The only written result of my lectures which I require or wish is a summary of them in the note-books of the Students. The contents of these books I never see, nor can I hold myself responsible for them. I am, however, given to understand that it is the practice of some of the students to write down the questions which are addressed to them, and to reduce their notes into the form of answers to these questions. This practice I disapprove, and it is well known that I do not consider it to be a legitimate mode of registering the information given in the lectures. Some years ago I consented, more than once, to place my book of questions in the hands of students, and they did it with me to complete or correct their notes. I know also that the note-books have passed from hand to hand but so far from encouraging this, I have urged young men to trust if not exclusively, at all events mainly, to their own recollection and record of what they hear. It is further, that in replying to the questions, the students should give their answers in their own language, for the most part, the substance of what they have been taught. Of course there are instances in which substantial accuracy can be secured only by keeping close to the exact terms in which the instruction was conveyed.

I beg, to observe, that no manuscript prepared by the name of "The Protestant Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University. The words which I have included between brackets are the only portion of the paragraph noticed by the Corporation, and they state that as the ground of my refusal to attend the meetings of the Council, whereas these words constitute an inferior member of the sentence, and do not express my reasons for not attending the meetings of the Council. The third reason assigned in the paragraph is, "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 be in a discussion with the Council, and thus to render rather the difference, which unhappily exist among us." With these three reasons thus plainly before them, the Corporation of Trinity College selects an inferior member of a sentence in the middle of the paragraph, and asserts that in that part of a sentence, without reference to the context, is contained the ground stated by me for refusing to comply with the request of the Bishop of Toronto to take my place at Council.

This letter was written as a "private communication" to the Bishop of Toronto, but it is evident it was laid before the Corporation, as it is referred to in their document of the 29th June. In that letter, while I do not take my place at the Council (for the three reasons stated in the paragraph), I stated in the most emphatic way, "I cannot of my own accord approve of the theological teaching of Trinity College," and I hoped and expected that his Lordship would have asked me to participate in what this teaching consisted; to my regret and surprise he did not do so, and therefore, I could not arrive at any other conclusion than that which I have stated in my pastoral.

But discussions on these minor points are unimportant, and are of no real interest to the public. The teaching of Trinity College is that which concerns the community. What I have written above, all may judge of for themselves. The documentary evidence I have adduced is but a small part of the information which I have obtained in my examination of the graduates of the University. Some, perhaps, may not see the danger I apprehend, and may think it quite safe to send their sons to the institution; but I feel assured that many will concur in opinion with me, that it is not wise or safe to subject young and inexperienced minds to such teaching, even though great names be quoted in favor of it.

In conclusion, I would say, that as no one can now misunderstand my attendance at the Council of Trinity College, and as "the melancholy picture" when I wished to avoid has been made patent to all, I shall take into consideration the expediency of appointing five gentlemen as members of the Corporation, and I have interpreted in my pastoral, to effect those changes in the constitution which will render it such, that I may be able conscientiously to recommend it to others, and avail myself of it for the benefit of my diocese.

Yours, my reverend brethren and brethren,  
Your faithful friend and brother in the faith,  
August 29, 1860. BENJ. HURON.

TRINITY COLLEGE.  
At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on Thursday, September 27th 1860.

The Hon. the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto, the Hon. Sir John Beveridge, Bart., Chancellor of the University, the Rev. the Provost, the Rev. the Hon. G. W. Allan, the Hon. Mr. Vice-Chancellor Sprague, James M. Strachan, Esq., the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, D. L., James Lusk Robinson, Esq., Samuel Blackton, Esq., James G. L. Le Roy, T. H. Fuller, D. D., D. C. L., the Reverend William McMurray, D. D., D. C. L., the Rev. S. Givins, the Reverend J. T. Lewis, L. D. J.

The Lord Bishop of Toronto made the following communication to the meeting, "I beg leave to lay on the table a letter which I have received from the Reverend the Provost of Trinity College, in vindication of his religious teaching in the College from an attack which has been made upon it by the Bishop of Huron, and also the printed report upon it by the Bishop of Huron to the Executive Committee of his Diocese, in which that attack is continued, and in which before the Council not doubting that it will appear to them on their consideration, that the Provost in regard to those things which he admits that he has taught, has successfully defended his doctrine by reference to Holy Scripture, and the Book of Common Prayer, and to those venerated Divines, whose writings are of the highest authority in our Church."

rate conversation. I must indignantly protest against the production of any such manuscript, and the previous manuscript brought forward by the Bishop, respecting "the losses sustained at the Reformation," and "the impertinence of preaching on the doctrine of justification," I meet with the full denial of their truth. In the same way I meet the letter of a clergyman quoted by the Bishop, in which mention is made of prayers for the dead, a practice, against which every Theological student of the College must know that I have repeatedly, and strongly urged every argument both from Scripture and from reason.

To proceed to the Bishop's specific objections:—Concerning the