

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 effecting 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 honorable 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 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 741 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 which are indispensable to those who are to administer the Word of Life to intelligent and reasoning men.

Let this Catechism be no longer kept in manuscript, but published and circulated as the text-book of the University of Trinity College; and I will venture to predict that the same conclusion at which I have arrived, will be expressed by many, namely, that the teaching of this Catechism, is dangerous in the extreme.

I have been induced, my Rev. Brethren and Brethren, to address you upon this subject, because of the honoured name which is affixed to the document I have been considering; had it borne any other signature, I should have allowed it to pass in silence. But such is the respect which I entertain towards the President of Trinity College Corporation, that nothing can ever weaken the feelings of veneration with which I regard him. We know that the highest faculties and the most exalted mental powers succumb to time, and if His Lordship is not now what he once was, if his memory does not faithfully record events as in years past, allowance should be made for this by his friends; and those who act with him and for him, should be careful not to lead him to lend his name to any proceeding unworthy of the position he has so long filled with honour, and calculated in the evening of his days, to bring a cloud over the high reputation he has so nobly won.

I am, my Reverend Brethren and Brethren, with earnest prayer that God's Spirit may be poured out upon us to guide us unto all truth.

Your faithful friend and pastor,

BENJ. HURON.

London, 21st July, 1860.

(To the Editor of the Globe.)

Sir,—In your issue of yesterday there appears a letter addressed by the Bishop of Huron, to the clergy and laity of his diocese. To this document, as a whole, it is neither my duty nor my wish to reply; but it contains statements affecting myself, which seem to demand an immediate contradiction. I will merely state the facts of the case, leaving the readers of the Bishop's letter to compare my statement with his.

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 order to save time, and to observe due method in my questioning, I have prepared, for my own use, a book of questions, omitting or adding questions at my discretion when I use 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, on their plea that it would assist them to complete or correct their notes. I know also that note-books have passed from hand to hand in the college, 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. My wish is further, that in replying to my questions, the students should give, 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, therefore, to observe that no manuscript known by the name of "The Provost's Catechism," or by any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the University, far less is any student expected to learn it. I regret that the Bishop should have put forth these statements, when either his position as a member of the Corporation, or his personal acquaintance with myself, gave him full opportunity of ascertaining, with out difficulty, and without misunderstanding, the mode in which any department of my teaching is conducted. I regret it still more, because I happen to know that a Professor of the College pointed out to the Bishop, within the last fortnight or three weeks, that he was sadly mistaken on this very point.

While, however, I do not hold myself responsible for the teachings contained in manuscripts which I have never seen, I feel that I am fully responsible for the teaching contained in my own. This, it necessary, will be published in full. Except for the purpose of disabusing the minds of the Bishop and others interested in the question, I should not for a moment think of publishing it; as I am happy to say that it is simply a compilation abbreviated for the most part, from the works of approved authors, which are too diffuse to use as elementary text-books. I am confident, however,