resources were alike rapidly exhausted. They have subsequently learned, with unfeigned pleasure, that the good Bishop of Huron has appointed him one of his Archdeacons and Commissaries for the Diocese of Huron.

EPISCOPAL MISRULE IN CANADA.

[From the Quebec Gazette, July 11th, 1862.]

Every colony is subject to misrule. In Canada we have had misrule of different kinds in different epochs of our history. The great prominent one of "compactism" or "irresponsible government" ceased to exist in 1841, when a Constitution, the transcript of that of England, was granted to the Province. But while in England the church is part of the constitutional fabric, no such alliance between the church and state is possible in Canada. Our system refuse to recognize anything of the kind; but notwithstanding, the connectional necessity, with the Sovereign as the head of the English church, required that this union, though unknown to our Canadian Constitution, should have an existence; and this union is perpetuated by Her Majesty's retaining, ostensibly, the appointment of the different colonial bishops.

The Episcopate is an essential element of the Church of England, and is in harmony with the genius of its people.

In the United States of America, the episcopal church has acquired a deep hold of the religious sympathies and affections of its intelligent population.

In Canada it may be said to be on its trial. For twenty years there was but one Bishop for the whole province. In the year 1839, Western Canada became a separate Diocese. The diocese of Quebee was sub-divided into those of Montreal and Quebec in the year 1850; and recently three dioceses have been formed out of the one in Western Canada. The episcopal church is contending here on even, it not disadvantageous, terms, with other communions. Its success depends entirely on maintaining the confidence of the laity. Recognizing this, Synods have been introduced as a means of drawing the laity together in support of the church. These Syncds have not hitherto been successful, partly because the machinery is too expensive, but principally because the laity, as a whole, feels that it has only the semblance without the actuality of an effective representation. The veto resting in the bishop, he can nullify any measure that he may please; and the clergy can in no sense be said to form an independent house, as all patronage and preferment remain with the bishop.

Nevertheless, with these palpable defects in the system, it is quite possible for a bishop, possessed of godly simplicity, piety, and a high-minded religious zeal, so to exercise the functions of his office, as to make of one