

From this it appears that it is as true that all changes are not bad as that all changes are not good. A change made or proposed ought never to be condemned *because it is a change*. The late Viscount Canning observed, that those who censure improvements because they are changes, will have to submit to changes which are not improvements. To condemn all change, and fasten upon it the stigma of innovation, is to league ourselves with the worst of company—with the men who have persecuted and maligned the lights of each succeeding age—with the men of old garments, mouldy bread and clouted shoes—the Gibeonites, who are content to hew wood and draw water, when they might be the Lord's freemen, and rise up to seize their true inheritance. It is to anathematise the course of nature and the history of divine providence in this wheeling world, which is rolling on to brighter and better things. It is to hand over every human institution to that decaying worm, which will never suspend its gnawing to please us, but continue to bore on through our castle wall, whether we eat or sleep. It is to thwart the loving labors of those who think too much of the house that covers them to leave it without repairs, or the beauteous tree that shades and refreshes them to spare the pruning knife. It is to doom all we love best to inevitable destruction; for time will not spare it, and therefore we must fight with time and work for eternity.

A. P.

The Sunday School,

Should be the nursery of the Church, and therefore the peculiar care of the Church, and under the eye and direction of the Session or legitimate authority of the Church. We have seen some Sunday Schools managed under a separate "Society" plan, having an independent constitution, as if the School was a Missionary Association, outside of the Church proper. Fancy a household handing over its nursery, its children, to an irresponsible organization to manage. Some Churches act in the same manner with their service of praise. The whole thing is handed over to a loosely constituted joint stock corporation called perhaps a choir, and the Church as such has to stand aside, not venturing even to offer a word of advice or criticism, under the penalty of the corporation summarily dissolving itself and leaving in its stead temporary chaos. Suppose this plan

carried into all the forms and expressions of the church's life. We would then have a similar "Society" to conduct the prayer meeting, another to distribute the alms, another to organize Bible-classes, another to do the visiting of the sick, and each and all would be without a head, and without responsibility. Instead of a Church we would have a number of independent and jarring "Societies." It is quite clear then that though there should be division of labour in the Church, there must be unity; and to ensure unity, the authority of the Session and of the minister as the organ of the Session must be recognised. Not that this authority should be paraded. No; like the power of the law, it will be most weighty and most beneficial when least felt.

In every case except very exceptional ones the Teachers should be in full Communion with the Church; and as a rule they should elect annually a Superintendent and other Officers. When the Superintendent is not a member of Session, it would be well I think that he should be invited to attend the meetings to report as to the state of the School and to 'sit and deliberate,' just as Presbyteries and other Church Courts invite licentiates, missionaries, and others who are not constituent members to 'deliberate' with them.

If an elder has not "the gift of teaching" he should not be asked to teach in the School; but in such a case he should show his interest in it by frequent visits, by assisting in other ways such as recommending good books for the Library, procuring some well-qualified person to teach for him, &c., &c.

The teachers are the servants of the Church, and responsible therefore to it as well as to the unseen master. We have heard discontented teachers threaten 'we'll leave the School and we know our Scholars will follow us.' That is not only disloyalty but treachery. The parents sent their children to the School not because they knew or trusted you, but because they trusted the Church. You got them to teach because the Church trusted you. And you would use your influence over their young and susceptible minds to make them faithless to the Church. In doing so you abuse your trust; you act dishonorably. If