

apology or defence. Yet it may not be amiss to remind ourselves what the place and duty of the Sunday-school is, in order that we may better understand its work and what we can each of us, do for it. If I devote a few minutes to this it will be justified, I trust, as an introduction to what can be said on the subject specially assigned me.

It has been often urged, and truly enough, that if parents and sponsors did their full duty in giving a religious training to their children and god-children, and if, in connection with this, the children were constantly catechized in church by their pastors, according to the rubric, there would be little use for Sunday-schools. But, in point of fact, the first of these duties is, as a rule, not performed; and the failure in regard to this makes it impossible to carry out the other satisfactorily. Very many children, especially in large cities and in manufacturing towns, can get little or no religious training at home; the Church must stand to them in this regard in the place of the parent or the sponsor, and must make up for the defects of the home; nay, oftentimes it can gain its only influence over the home by means of the children whom it is allowed to instruct. And there are many cases besides, both in city and in country, in which parents are faithful in teaching children the principles of duty and the elements of Christian belief—the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments—and bringing them up with the purpose and intent that they should lead godly and Christian lives, and in which sponsors are ready to second the efforts of parents, while yet there is need of more full and systematic instruction in regard to a great many religious matters which cannot be taught or learned in the home. Nor, on the other hand, can this instruction be given altogether by the minister in the church. Theoretical catechizing should follow upon theoretical parental instruction. It is not possible that the pastor's work in the church should make up for all the defects in the parents' work at home. And so, as I said the Sunday-school deserves to have the recognized place in the practical work of Christian training which is so generally accorded to it. We look forward to the time when each child shall learn from father and mother and god-parents all the things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health; when, taught in that excellent form of words which the Church catechism supplies, the child will be prepared intellectually, and disposed spiritually to make public confession of his Christian vows, and to seek God's grace in the laying-on of the Bishop's hands; and when in each parish the clergyman shall be able by stated catechizing to complete what has been taught elsewhere, to impress it upon the minds and the souls of the children, and thus to do a most important part in their education in Christ. But till the time when theoretical home-training and theoretical church-catechizing can accomplish their work, there will be a place for the Sunday-school, not as a voluntary organization outside of the Church, to do something which the Church cannot or will not do, but as part of the Church's organized work. It should have teachers who, for one reason or another, are better qualified to instruct in many matters than most parents can be; who can make a study of the Bible and the Prayer-Book, and can teach what they have learned; who know how to ask questions, and how to answer them; who can inspire and guide the enthusiasm that has more place in a class than it can usually have in one who reads and studies by himself; who can find out what each pupil needs, in order to develop or strengthen his moral and spiritual character, and can do something to supply the special need. In this way—and often more fully than is indicated—the Church can, through the

teachers in her Sunday-schools, do a part of her work which might conceivably be done by parents, but which, as a rule, she cannot expect parents to do.

(To be continued.)

“THE WHOLE CHURCH PARTY.”

We notice in one of our contemporaries a suggestive name to supplement High Church; Low Church and Broad; Tractarians; Evangelical and Latitudinarian. It is comprehensive and it is so universally charitable that it would seem incapable of partizan appropriations. It is “The whole Church Party.” It would appear to be the very desideratum of these times to render the internal forces harmonious with the outside movements; unity is a professed object towards which much of public thought is reaching. Its developments are unhappily not uniform. The Romanist presses his view of the matter with persistent and relentless spirit and energy; his idea of unity is committed to a development and departure from Apostolic and Primitive Practice ever growing wider and wider—passing through the long list of burdensome and enslaving superstitions from the imposition of *worship* of Saints, Martyrs, and Angels in “A. D. 350,” to the final assault upon human intelligence and religious freedom in the promulgation of “Papal Infallibility” in A. D. 1870. The Romanist realizes no gate to unity except opened by the pretender to the successorship of St. Peter and defined by the autocrat of Christendom. On the counter-side of the mountain of human devices are the needless sectaries of Protestantism whose very gospel consists in pulling down not merely the proved and worthless accretions of the Church of Rome, but with these the faith itself—the form of sound words and the entire external organization of the Church of Christ which is His Body. The non-conformist and dissenter in his integrity as such, is ready in his haste to surrender all claims to organic unity and to find his consolations in the simple denial—whether true or untrue—whether Scriptural or Primitive, or purely Papal—; of whatever has been possessed or at any time acknowledged by the Church of Rome. Blind to logic and fact he is ready to undermine the foundations of the Christian or Scriptural superstructure in order to vex and take revenge upon a monster antagonist. Reason and Truth would dictate a very opposite course; Saul's armour is not wanted, but the sling of Apostolic authority and Primitive Example and Practice are essential to the hurling of the smooth stones of the Divine oracles against this semi-political and apostatizing Goliath. “We must go forth says Archdeacon Farrar “not to the corrupt fourth century—not to Sacerdotalism not to Romanism—but to the first century if we would have beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for sorrowing, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness”—here is a statement as clear as can be enunciated. It is to the first century, when the New Testament itself had no collective form that we must look for the foundations upon which we must build that kingdom of Christ which never changeth. There is no uncertain sound in the inspired writings launched, one by one, in different quarters for the establishing of the Faith and of the Church which is “the pillar and ground of the Truth.” We have delusions and heresy scathingly denounced and we have the essential orders definitely outlined. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries we have the confirmation and verification of these as explicitly marked and substantiated, as the Canon of New Testament Scriptures, all which (Apostolic order and Gospel Truth) are derived from the same identical testimony and sources. Here are the *Ancient* and still existing foundations of the Church of England—she is *ancient* as Rome; she is as pure and wit-

nesses as faithfully for Divine Truth as any practices of professed Christians; she is neither engulfed by an over-loading of traditions or superstitions nor is she *rudderless* in the ocean of the Everlasting Gospel, and Primitive and Apostolic orders; High, Low and Broad Tractarians, Evangelical and Latitudinarians, acknowledging the Creeds; worshipping in a form of sound words traceable largely to Primitive use, and submitting to the Episcopal regimen have surely a *united* work to do for the kingdom of the great Shepherd and Bishop; and for the schism rent and scattered children of His fold. We think “the whole Church Party” commends itself to every lover of Truth; to every disciple of the Lord Jesus; to every member of our Reformed and yet Catholic Church; to every Protestant who protests against error, whether of excess or excision, whether of addition or mutilation; to every Christian who can pray the Master's prayer, “That they all may be *One*.”

A WEEK'S TESTIMONY,

A subscriber in Ontario writes: “I very much appreciate your paper, and I cannot very well do without it, so long as I can afford to take it.”

Another Subscriber in Nova Scotia writes: “Your valued paper is the most welcome paper I receive, and is most highly appreciated by both myself and wife.”

A Clerical Subscriber in Ontario, renewing subscription, writes: “I am sorry I cannot do more. I do not miss any opportunity of trying to get subscribers, for I like the paper very much.”

A Layman in New Brunswick writes: “I now enclose — in advance for your valuable paper, THE CHURCH GUARDIAN. May it long continue to prosper and advance is the sincere wish of —.”

A Lady Subscriber in Ontario writes: “I am living a long distance from Church and very seldom receive a visit from a clergyman; and find the reading of the CHURCH GUARDIAN a great solace, as well as an educator of my family as regards the Church.”

A Subscriber in Ontario writes: I like the CHURCH GUARDIAN very much; it is thoroughly Church and full of news from all parts of the Dominion, and you may depend upon it I will not miss an opportunity to advance its interests. Our country people are slow to take a Church paper.

A clerical Subscriber in the Diocese of Quebec writes: “The teaching of the CHURCH GUARDIAN will be very beneficial and helpful; allow me to congratulate you upon the improved tone of the GUARDIAN during the past two years. I sincerely wish I could induce every member of this mission to become a subscriber.”

A Layman in New Brunswick says: “It is with feelings of the deepest sorrow I look around me upon our unhappy divisions, and am satisfied that any one who after reading the CHURCH GUARDIAN is not convinced of the true Catholicity of the Church must be a person of very limited understanding. I think the solid truths contained in the paper should arouse all Churchmen out of sleep to do their duty as set forth by The Church.”