

what was going forward. The congregations were more numerous than on any former visitation, and the result was that nearly six hundred were confirmed from twenty three stations. It is well known that the greater portion of the clergy have on each Sunday three full services and are obliged to travel on horse-back or in a light carriage more than twenty miles in order to perform them. This is of itself a great labor, and when you take into account the general state of the roads—though these have been much improved of late years—and the exertions he has to endure during a long day, you will feel that he ought to be able to ride to a home and to the enjoyment of comforts more bountifully provided than, it is to be feared, the generality of the clergy now possess. The inadequate support of the clergy is a subject, my Christian brethren, which engages my deep and anxious concern. Some years ago, you will recollect, I pressed this subject very strongly upon the laity of the diocese in a pastoral letter. This I believe, was not without its effect at the time, and produced some temporary amelioration of the hardships they were in many cases enduring, and if the improvement was not so great or universal as might have been expected, I am willing to ascribe this not so much to absolute indifference or disinclination, as to an unfortunate habit of carelessness and neglect into which, in face even of the most solemn duties, people will oftentimes allow themselves to fall. But a little consideration of the duty on equitable as well as religious grounds, would help undoubtingly to check the growing evil. The people served with religious ministrations of such paramount value to their soul's good should remember the solemn stipulation into which they have entered—the specific engagements they have made, to afford a certain support to their clergyman. Is this a contract to be slightly heeded? is it a responsibility which they may with safety neglect? Is it not sinful to promise, and not to pay? to affirm a debt in the sight of God, and virtually refuse to discharge it? If this would not be tolerated in the common transactions of life, but provoke a penalty adequate to the offence, let it be remembered that there is One above who witnesses this injustice and unfaithfulness, and Who will, in his own awful way of reckoning, sooner or later, punish the great sin that has been committed. It may be regarded as His own cause,—it is essentially connected with His majesty and honor, and He will be sure to vindicate it perhaps in this world,—certainly in the next. It were strange if Christians entertained a lower view of religious obligation like this than Jews felt and acted on. They, by the command of God, made a bountiful provision for the Priests and Levites, and for the service of the temple; and this they did, as a rule and for ages, without grudging or murmuring. They met these claims cheerfully, and the faithful discharge of them never entailed any personal hardship upon them. Fruitful seasons and national prosperity followed, while they were conscientious in the fulfilment of this duty; and when they ventured to relax, the Almighty felt it a robbery of Himself, and He speedily deprived them of even more than they had in this way kept back from Him. Christian people must look at this example, and rouse themselves to a more faithful exercise of this high duty. They should be systematic and conscientious in their offering, setting a proper share of their worldly means apart, according as God had prospered them. In this way they would always be prepared for their duty to their clergyman, and for other sacred objects, and by this righteous and religious consecration of a part of what they have, they might expect God's blessing upon the whole.

The Sub-Committee on appropriations appointed by the Society for Propagating the Gospel agreed upon their Report, which was presented to the Committee on June 17, and from it we extract the following minutes affecting this and the neighbouring dioceses.

The Sub-Committee recommend a renewal of the block-grant for *Nova Scotia* and *Cape Breton* for three years, on the same conditions as before, but at the reduced amount of £2,500 per annum. The Sub-Committee remark that the weekly offertory (according to the Bishop's letter) is established in several parishes; and they venture to suggest an inquiry, whether it might not be extended to all.

In recommending a renewal of the grants for *Prince Edward Island*, the Sub-Committee suggest that it might be a more economical mode of administration to place the whole amount, £500, like the grants for *Nova Scotia* and *Cape Breton*, at the disposal of the Bishop and the Church Society (if any exist in the island) as a block-grant for three years. The suggestion as to weekly offertory might also be repeated here.

*Fredericton*.—In pursuance of the Society's resolution (May 20, 1861, p. 2) to reduce its grants to this diocese by the amount of £200 per annum at the end of 1865, the Sub-Committee recommend that a block-grant of £2,500, for three years, be placed at the disposal of the Bishop and the Church Society, they undertaking all the pecuniary responsibility of the S. P. G. to missionaries within the diocese, including all further claims for pensions. The amount to be drawn (as in the case of *Montreal*, June 17, 1853) by the Treasurer of the Church Society, with the counter-signature of the Bishop, in quarterly bills, and a yearly account to be rendered to the Society.

They also recommend that the grant of £120, for Divinity Students, be renewed on the condition that a yearly account be sent to the Society of the details of its expenditure, and of the persons to whom it is appropriated, also of the name, age, and nation of each student, his destination on leaving college, and the general condition of the students as regards morality, discipline, and progress in knowledge.

*Quebec*.—The Sub-Committee recommend the renewal of the block grant, for three years, to the Bishop and a Committee of Synod at the reduced amount of £2,100; including therein the grants for a clergyman in *Labrador*, and the Rev. Mr. Ward, of *Upper Ireland*; the reduction being £43 less than was contemplated in 1859 by the Society. They recommend also the renewal of the grant of £300 for *Diocesan Students*, but only on the conditions already specified in the case of *Fredericton*.

They suggest that it should be made a condition of this block-grant, that the assessments levied on the several parishes by the Diocesan Board be required to be paid up by the parishioners, before the allowances from the S. P. G. are paid to the clergy of those parishes. Also that the Diocesan Board be advised to enforce, as soon as practicable, the building of parsonages in the ten parishes, on the Society's list, where there are none, and the raising of an endowment, or procuring of a glebe, in the sixteen parishes which need them.

*Montreal*.—The Sub-Committee cannot advise that the suggestion of the Bishop (see Ann. Report, p. 117) for the renewal of the block grant, without reduction, for six years, be complied with. They recommend its renewal for three years at the reduced rate of £2,700 (for 1866), £2,600 (for 1867), and £2,600 (for 1868).

*Toronto*.—The Sub-Committee recommend