dishonorable to Christ, whose ambassadors, however unworthy, they are ; most demoralizing to the parish itself; and dangerous in the extreme to the principles of the Church, as a whole, and sometimes to the usefulness of the most faithful and uncompromising of the Clergy.

The proposed Canon, therefore, undoubtedly approaches more nearly than anything which has yet been suggested towards solving the confessedly difficult problem of how a Bishop and his Synod are to protect the people of the Diocese from the spiritual ruin entailed by an unworthy or incapable priest' od, while it certainly throws a broad shield of protection, perhaps too broad, over such erring clergymen; since we may be very sure that any Standing Committee, composed of thirty Clergymen and thirty Laymen, elected by ballot, must be very deeply convinced of the stern necessity for so doing before a majority of them would agree to "dismiss a clergyman." And, even when they had done so, the consent of the Bishop must be also obtained before any action could be actually taken. And I must say that, not unfrequently as I have conscientiously dissented from my Bishop's views, I never yet met with one who, intentionally, treated his clergy tyrannically. Indeed, the Episcopal weakness in this day seems rather to lean, if one may say so with due respect, to a too-ready yielding to outside clamor.

Again, the attempt in the pamphlet under consideration to show that the present Bishop of Huron seeks to be an "Absolute Ruler," because Archdeacon Marsh no longer holds the prominent position in the Diocese which he formerly did, is an