

tyrannical Bishop, (for a Bishop is still human,) would be relieved from the restraint which the proximity of his brother Bishops might exercise over one of a like spirit in England. This evil must appear still greater, if we consider that we are liable to have placed over us some favorite of the Prime Minister in England, himself possibly an Unitarian, an Infidel, or a semi-Papist.

The case of Dr. Hampden and the University of Oxford should be a warning to us.

To meet all these wants, and to avoid all these difficulties, I see no other mode, than a *thorough change in our ecclesiastical arrangements*. To changes, in general, I am decidedly averse; but when a change is absolutely necessary to the well being, or rather to the very existence of our church, let us not object to it. Whilst things remained as they were ten years ago, there was less cause for any change. But since our situation itself has been materially changed; since, from being a mere body of missionaries, and of course under the control of the missionary society that sent us out and supported us by its bounty, having had that bond severed, we have been constituted a different body, some change in our arrangements is necessary to meet this change in our situation. What was perhaps good under former circumstances, is not so under present. The situation of our church at the present moment, and its probable situation a few years hence, (for I contend that we are bound to look to the future,) is very different from that of the church in England. There she makes part of the constitution. The support of her clergy, of her bishops, and of schools for preparing her youth for the ministry, are amply provided for by law. To deprive her of these provisions would require nothing less than a revolution. But are equally good provisions made for our church in this country? and are even the partial provisions we now have equally well secured to us? I think the facts already adduced will answer the former, and the signs of the instability of all our church property, so frequently seen in our political horizon, may answer the latter of these questions. But are the clergy of the church in England satisfied with their present condition? Do they not feel, that if they had their *right*, they would have, as they once had, their houses of convocation?<sup>(g)</sup>

If these things are indeed so, and this no one can deny, are we called upon to rest contented with our present depressed condition? I think not. We *require some change*; a change which, under God, will meet our wants, and remove our difficulties. *No change will effect this, less than one by which we may be enabled, together with lay delegates from our parishes, frequently to meet in general council; nothing less than the adoption of a code of laws, embraced*

---

(g.) Convocations have been revived in England; but they were not in operation in 1836.