

position than to be the Church of the small minority, caressed and pampered and perhaps corrupted by State patronage, whilst all our fellow christians, equally worthy of assistance with ourselves are willingly giving their hard-earned money to the building of their churches and schools, and to the support of their clergy, and are denied other assistance or favor? On this ground it may be said that we have paid dearly even for the glebes granted to us by the Crown, which have yielded more odium than profit, and have contributed to foster the injurious suspicion that the clergy of our Church are paid by government, and have some secret support of which nobody can give any account. And valuable as has been the aid of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, it is clear to me that whenever a church is rooted in the affections of its people, it ought to sustain its own clergy, to build its own churches, to establish its own schools, and to consider itself as much bound to provide for its spiritual wants as the father of every family is bound to labor for his children's daily bread, and to educate and send them out into the world to make homes for themselves. Where the settlers are poor and unable to provide the whole salary of a clergyman, their richer brethren should assist in bearing the burden; but it is a shame and a scandal that this burden, after sixty years of assistance, should be laid on charitable people in England, and especially on servants and poor agricultural laborers. It would have been greatly to our credit had we *volunteered* to take some of this burden on ourselves: this, however, is not to be expected from human nature; and we naturally cling, as others have done before us, to the dole of good money, and shrink from the trials and privations to which its withdrawal may expose us. But even if the withdrawal should lead to the temporary abandonment of some missions, I think it would be better to be a real honest Church of somewhat smaller dimensions, doing our own work, and paying our own way, than to have the mere shadow of an establishment, and to be clinging to a real pauperism, with the affectation of a respectability that does not belong to us."

Glancing at the past history of the Church in New Brunswick, (identical with that of our own Church at the same period,) when Churchmen filled all the offices of State, the Bishop points out the disastrous and deadening consequences of serving God with that which costs nothing, and observes that this entire leaning on State assistance would have proved the ruin of the Church, had it continued; and as it was, left many injurious consequences which seem hard to shake off. "Many still," he says, "lean on the broken reed of State aid, and do not believe even in themselves, much less in those powers and gifts which our blessed Master and ascended Son has granted to His Church, and has never withdrawn from her."

On the subject of the Lambeth Conference (which the Bishop did not attend,) he gives us some remarks which are evidently the fruit of much reflection. He says nothing of the great advantage of having thus obtained the initiatory step towards a General Council, or of the impetus given to Synods and Councils generally by this famous movement. He feels rather disposed to look at its shortcomings, and to be dissatisfied that this was not itself a General Anglican Council. Thus, the Bishop argues, the business should have been first agreed upon, (by whom?) and made known to the various dioceses in the Anglican Communion. The sentiments of the elders and brethren might thus have been ascertained, and afterwards, at Lambeth, as at the first Council in Jerusalem, each bishop could have spoken for his diocese. It is true, he argues, that some subjects which might have been brought forward at Lambeth were still in a transition state, and some *sub judice*, and therefore unfit at that time to be made the subjects of dogmatic legislation.