

large is taken away. It is a saying in the world, that "you cannot eat your cake and have it." You cannot take away the consciences of the clergy, and still demand that they shall have consciences. It was freely said that, as the Laity have to pay the clergy, the latter must yield compliance. If they are to be the mere echoes of the Lay mind, it is as well for them to know the price at which they are to sell themselves. If it is to come to a matter of hiring servants, and paying them so much to do just as they are told, it may as well be known at once that we are come under the dominion of Mammon, and that we are henceforth to surrender the awful sanctions and restraints of the Ordination Service, and the Christian conscience in general, for the American idea of subordinating all things to the will of the people.

It is quite another question whether any, and what amount of, consideration is to be yielded from the clergy to the Laity. *Such duties are reciprocal*, and will be yielded, *on both sides*, most freely, and most lovingly, where conscience is most respected.

In curious contrast with this high-handed behaviour towards the clergy was the pretence that the party were standing up for the rights of the Diocesan Clergy against the House of Bishops. Certainly, up to the moment when it suited a party to seek to have one only recently come into the Diocese made a Bishop, the clergy have never had any reason to suspect these new friends of a special zeal for their interests and rights. The clergy, as a body, are probably too cautious to take up hastily with new friends; and they were not a little amazed to find credit claimed for a virtue in many quarters where they could not so much as have suspected it before. To them it seemed, therefore, nothing more than a pretence got up to serve a purpose and gain over their suffrages.

Springing from the same fountain were many of the remarks made in the Vestry meeting at Montreal, (see Full Report of