

that any well-instructed Christian man must strongly approve the manuscript as a whole, and I imagine that the Bishop of Huron would admit that his own disapproval is the exception, not the rule.

It would therefore, be far better that the Bishop should fully and frankly state what his objections are, and if he should do so, I promise as full and frank a reply, for I entirely concur in your opinion that the controversy will not, and cannot rest where it is.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

GEORGE WHITAKER,

Provost of Trinity College.

Trinity College, 28th July, 1860

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Canadian Church Press will be published in Toronto, every Wednesday afternoon, in time for the mails.

It will be supplied direct from the office of the Publishers Messrs. LORRELL AND GIBSON, Yonge Street, Toronto, for \$2 per annum, payable half-yearly, in advance; no reduction can under any circumstances be made, nor will there be any free list.

This rule may appear an unusual one, but the Editors beg to call the attention of the Subscribers to the fact, that this is not a commercial speculation, but an effort on the part of a COMMITTEE OF CLERGYMEN to supply a common want and to attain a common benefit. Until the circulation attains a point which they cannot immediately expect, every copy which is sent out will involve a personal loss to themselves. As these columns are not supported by any party, the price is regulated by the working expenses, and these have been reduced to the lowest point compatible with the respectable appearance of a journal which professes to be the organ of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Province of Canada.

All subscriptions to be sent by letter, registered, or otherwise secured, to the Editors, at the office of Messrs. Lorrell & Gibson, Yonge Street, Toronto.

The Canadian Church Press.

TORONTO: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1860.

CALENDAR FOR THE WEEK.

- August 1.—Wednesday.
 " 2.—Thursday.
 " 3.—Friday.
 " 4.—Saturday.
 " 5.—Sunday.—NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY. Proper Lessons—Matins: 1 Kings xviii.; Acts iii. *Even Song*: 1 Kings xix.; Hebrews viii.
 " 6.—Monday.
 " 7.—Tuesday.

TRINITY COLLEGE AND THE BISHOP OF HURON.

IN another column we give the Bishop of Huron's rejoinder to the Statement put forth by the Corporation of Trinity College. His Lordship is evidently in earnest about the subject. He is also explicit in his statements; there is no mistaking his words. He positively declares that the document emanating from the College contains "many misstatements,"—a term employed in this case for a shorter, but not more emphatic one. The matter, then, has simply come to this: that either the Corporation of Trinity College or the Bishop of Huron has, in a most solemn manner, asserted that which is incorrect. Now, pending any answer which the body referred to may give to his Lordship, we may be permitted to state "that which we do know" with reference to a few of the facts of the case, as it is at present before the public. And first, with reference to that vague charge, "the teaching of the College." The Bishop declares that he did not assign as a ground of refusal to co-operate with the College, the fact of his not expecting to be able to change the teaching of the University. This can be proved to be a direct "misstatement," inasmuch as the words are copied verbatim from one of his own letters. Surely, any one who takes it upon himself, in a manner displaying such good taste and feeling, to sympathise with the venerable Bishop of Toronto's declining powers, and in so charitable a manner to

attribute alleged mistakes to weakness of memory, should be more careful to refresh his own, or should provide himself with "friends" who may dissuade him from "lending his name to any proceeding unworthy of the position" which he now chances to fill. "Allowance should be made by friends," when "the highest faculties and the most exalted mental powers succumb to time;" but what is to be said of any one in the Bishop of Huron's position, and of his pretensions, who can quote an extract from a letter to suit his own purpose, and deliberately omit that which would disprove what he alleges, and substantiate the truth of his opponent's assertions? Truly "the use of such an expedient in literary warfare, more especially when religion is concerned, has ever been considered unworthy of the scholar and the gentleman."

Again, the Bishop says that he "has taken every pains for two years to inform himself concerning the teaching of the University." This is a strong statement, and will not, we apprehend, be easily credited by the great majority of churchmen. His lordship, for instance, has not heard a single sermon within that time from the University pulpit; and the "pains" which he has taken to procure information on the subject, will not be found to harmonise with "the wiser and more honourable course." His information was picked up from mere gossip and old women's tales. But, apart from the manner in which the Bishop sought for information, and the unauthorised documents referred to, we can distinctly assert that there is no such thing in Trinity College as a work entitled the "Provost's Catechism." It is positively untrue that it is placed in the hands of every student entering the University.

These facts of themselves will shew that the Bishop did not take every pains to inform himself concerning the teaching of the University. For the satisfaction of our readers, we shall lay before them the whole case, which is as follows. The Provost, as will be acknowledged by every alumnus of the Institution, simply gives notes to men of the first year, when lecturing on the Catechism; these notes he requires each student to take down, and they, as a matter of fact, are at times taken inaccurately, or even incorrectly, by some of the students. This, of course, may occur just as in the case of lectures on the Classics, or any other branch taught in the College, as is well known by any who is conversant with the style of lecturing in the English Universities. The Provost has, for his own guidance, a set of questions alone, without answers,—a number of which he asks the students each day of lecturing, covering the ground gone over on the previous one. These questions, we know, the Provost has on more than one occasion objected to let the men have, preferring that they should carefully and thoroughly prepare their notes, and not learn the questions and answers as a mere matter of "cram." With his usual kindness, however, on several occasions he granted them to those who applied for them, and to these the students wrote out answers as best they could from the notes which they had taken. The Provost has never seen the notebooks of the students; he was never aware that such a use was made of his questions as is now brought out by this discussion; and in any case he is and must necessarily be perfectly irresponsible for the so-called catechism. At any rate, as far as he is concerned, the document referred to is, properly speaking, without the slightest authority. It might with greater propriety, be called the students' catechism founded on the Provost's notes. With these facts before us, known to the students of the University and others, we cannot believe that the Bishop of Huron took every pains to inform himself on the subject; and we cannot find language strong enough to stigmatise the rashness of his conduct, so unbefitting one in his position, or the "one-sided," high-handed, unchristian manner in which he labours to ruin our noble church institution. The secret of his action, however, lies after all in the fact that he could not expect to