

several passages in the official communications, and then declared "assent and consent,"—precisely as the Evangelicals do with the Episcopalian prayer-book. Where did the Society "find" the liberty to make long-continued grants? Not in the notifications of a changed policy which came from England,—not in Dr. Wilkes's explanatory statements,—and not in Mr. Poore's announcements. Grants of long continuance were to be stopped, *even though it involved extinction of feeble causes*. Mr. Poore was asked what the Committee at home would regard as an "old" pensioner on the funds? He replied, "A church that had been receiving aid for *five years*. That would be a *very old* station."

2. The principle of action laid down in the extract from the minute, is precisely that which has guided the past course of our Committee. To it the Home Committee objected. In fact they vetoed it, and hence all our trouble.

3. Mr. Poore distinctly told us that he could not alter the thing that had gone out of the mouth of the Colonial Missionary Committee, *nor could we*. It was useless for us to discuss and object, we could only accept and conform.

4. If Mr. Poore discovered that he possessed a discretionary power which he publicly disclaimed, and did actually concur in the minute,—and if the Committee at home have endorsed his action;—then we have gained our point, there is an end of controversy, and the new policy of which we have heard so much, fizzles into an unimportant modification of the constitution and by-laws of our Society.

Now you know this is not the case. There is "antagonism." Its nature I explained in my last. And instead of acting like a set of politicians, drawing up diplomatic minutes, and dealing in "glittering generalities," we ought to have met the difficulty and settled it. The smouldering embers of our contention are in that minute, and they will burst into a flame again, sooner or later. Nor is it possible for us to get on harmoniously until the Colonial Missionary Society becomes, 1st. A trusting co-partner, having confidence in our appropriation of funds; 2nd. A cheerful giver, making its grants "not grudgingly nor of necessity; and 3rd. A patient helper, willing to wait until the child becomes a man.

But for your habitual seriousness and the gravity of the subject, I should suspect you of the ironical or jocular, in the wonderment you express as to the features of the "bolder and more vigorous policy" which I believe in. You surely know that for years I have advocated an independent Congregational Missionary Society? Such a movement need not be in opposition to the Colonial Missionary Society. A respectful offer might be made to that body to be the channel, as now, of its benefactions to the Canadian churches. Or if it declined to vote grants to a self-managed Society, we might make our own appeal to Britain. I cannot believe that a candid and kind statement of our case would be repelled by the churches at home. It is their ignorance of the facts, and not want of sympathy, that makes them slow to help us.

To my mind one of the strongest arguments in favour of an independent Society, is that we could then seek help from our brethren in the United States, as well as from our brethren in Britain. The American churches owe us help as well as the British churches. All over the province, we are supplying the means of grace to settlers of American origin, and if the way were open for an appeal to the other side, we could make it in all good conscience. Our connection with the Colonial Missionary Society prevents our