

As regards the proposed Canon itself, I am of course aware that it met with little favor from Synod. But this, I think, must have been owing to a hasty and superficial view of the question, and from looking too much to the secular interests of the Clergy, rather than to that infinitely more important matter, the spiritual well-being of the Church of God. The Clergy are not put into the priests' office for "a morsel of bread," but to do the Eternal Work of Christ and His Church, at whatever sacrifice to themselves. If, then, any of us incorrigibly neglect to do that work, surely the power should rest *somewhere* to remove "the idle shepherd that leaveth (*i. e.*, neglecteth) the flock."

It may be said, "We have Canonical laws, let unfaithful clergymen be tried and punished according to them." But, alas! do we not all know that there are cases of indolent, evil-natured, or unfortunate clergymen, yea, and even of those unsound in the Faith, whom yet no Canons of the Church can reach, but whose parishes are, nevertheless, one after another languishing in ever-increasing spiritual decline. What, then, shall be done? Shall the Bishop and the Synod look on as unconcerned, or at least helpless, spectators, for fear they cause inconvenience, or even suffering, to some unfaithful, or at best incapable, shepherd; though at the same time the Master is being dishonored, and the flocks for whom He died are perishing? Or, shall it be left to the unhappy parish itself—which, by the way, from its very spiritual deadness, must be peculiarly incapable of judging aright in the matter—to *starve out* its appointed minister? Surely such a remedy would be almost worse than the disease;