

appears on the face of the new arrangement, and is implied in the name and constitution of the new society. The new society was to be a Canadian one, connected it is true with the Colonial Society, yet not as "an auxiliary," its relation was explicitly declared to be that of a "co-ordinate" body.

Two pledges, and only two, were required from the original Committee by the friends in England. The first, "that no augmented liabilities are to be placed upon them *without their consent.*" The second, "that Canada shall raise among its churches and their friends on this continent, *at least as large a sum as heretofore.*" These pledges were cheerfully given, and have both been kept inviolate. Every year the list has been sent home, and *every grant* has obtained the sanction of the English committee.

At the close of the first year's operations, Canada raised \$1823, a larger amount than had ever been previously realized,—last year, closing June 1860, the amount raised was \$3164.

Now it is right to observe, that the friends in England do not blame us for not observing the terms of our agreement; they do not charge the officers or committee of our society with mismanagement in any form whatever; they do not find fault with the missionaries, but on the other hand, express their belief, that they "are faithfully performing the duties devolving upon them." What then is the trouble? They cannot understand why some of our stations have been so long on our "Grantee list," and think "that some of our churches ought in some way to be dealt with." They fear "our grants will degenerate to the character of endowments, which are opposed to the principles by which we are distinguished." They therefore propose two plans, *first* to abandon *unproductive* stations, *secondly* to adopt "*the sliding scale.*" It is not our intention in this article to notice these plans further than to remark, that the *first* is not a new principle but *has* been acted on by the Canadian committee, in *every* case, where the station has *seemed* to them *really unproductive*; and that the *second* principle, however well it may work elsewhere, is not suited to Canadian Congregationalism; has been adopted and has failed, and would again, if tried, soon relieve the society of some of its grants; but would at the same time relieve it also of some of its most promising rural churches, and many of its most faithful missionaries.

We, however, while unable to adopt the last suggestion of the English committee, should be thankful for their interest and advice. The only thing about which we should have feeling, is, that they do not in this matter seem to have sufficient confidence in those who have wrought the society in this country; and are not sufficiently disposed to make due allowance for the peculiarities of the Canadian field. It is possible also, that the committee in England may have lost sight of the actual relation existing between them and our Society. There is confessedly a little more of the *emphatic* in the communications from London, than we could have wished; and although as Canadians we have been somewhat accustomed to such language, (not however hitherto from the Colonial Society), we find it hard to learn to like it.

We do not think we have yet reached the extreme necessity indicated by both the brethren who have written on the subject, namely, that of forming a new society independent of the Colonial society. It is impossible to say what may be the issue, but as yet the matter has not assumed a form in which amicable adjustment may not be secured. We have some hope, that if the case were again presented by explicit correspondence, our friends in England