

not aware that "the plea of poverty," in Mr. Poore's sense of the word, has been ever put in. We have few either very poor, or very rich, in our churches in Canada. They are numerically small, and the outside congregations do not, as in England, recognize their obligation and privilege to take a large share of the support upon them. We believe that the standard of giving in our country churches is quite as high in proportion to the means possessed as in our city churches, or in the churches in England; and, with individual exceptions, such as may be found in every church, we may challenge a fair and honest investigation—as we have publicly done before—into the percentage on the value of their incomes which our people pay to the objects of religion. It is only by such a test that we can be in a position to say that our churches do or do not come up to an honourable standard in maintaining the funds of the church.

One very injurious mistake has been made in speaking and writing about our missions here. They have been represented as supported by the friends in England, with the exception of the small sums collected here for missions; while the truth is, the greater portion of the salaries of the missionaries has been raised by the people themselves, besides what is given ostensibly for missionary purposes. It can be seen, moreover, by a little study of our statistical tables, that the sums raised per head for varied religious objects by our churchmembers, do not indicate a state of forgetfulness of "the duty of those who are taught to communicate," &c.

Mr. Poore regrets our "want of missionary spirit." We repudiate the aspersion: it is unjust. As to "the contentedness of Congregationalists to be regarded as a sect," &c. &c., we can truly say that if this applies to some Congregationalists, it does not to all, or to many. If our churches could speak out, they would repel the charge. Mr. Poore's proof of the need and scope of evangelistic agencies in our towns is not conclusive to any one who understands the mixed nature of the Canadian population; neither does it prove that our churches are weak because we have failed to put forth such agencies.

The churches that are sunk into the condition of *annuitants* are to be pitied, but none such are known to the writer. All we know pant and long for independence. We are sorry for these sunken churches and ashamed of them. They should have been advertised, that our feelings may be rightly directed, and that no right minded church may be suspected.

We suppose that the "surmises of neglect and selfish ease" which have been "verified," are intended to be applied to churches. That such a state of things should be detected by a stranger in a flying visit, and not be previously made known by the pastor, reflects very little credit on him. What honourable man would be content to remain with such a church and sponge on the Missionary Society, we are at a loss to know.

Another unfortunate mistake our respected visitor made and reported, was the supposition that "the principle and aim of the Society have been allowed to drop out of sight." Certainly, every man among us knew—has long known—that the Colonial Society did not contemplate helping any church that was likely to be permanently upon its funds. We did not need the extract from the Report of 1841-2 to remind us of that; since it was iterated and reiterated by Rev. J. Roaf in his day, and since then has been talked of at our annual gatherings, read again and again to us by the Secretary-Treasurer, and, we might say, has been a fact ever before us. It has never been gainsaid, or, that we know, "produced feelings and utterances of antagonism." Our