

or fall. A beautiful site has been presented by Mr. James Gray, on the banks of the Nicomeki river.

BARKERVILLE.—Bright and cheering reports come from the Lay Readers at Barkerville and Quessnelle. Services are held regularly every Sunday, no matter what the weather, and much interest is manifested.

CONTEMPORARY CHURCH OPINION.

The Southern Churchman, (Richmond, Va.,) one of the most prominent Evangelical organs, under the title "How learn some of our duties," says:—

A correspondent not long since asked where in the Bible could any order be found for *public prayer*; taking for granted, as we suppose, if no such order could be found, then there ought to be no public prayer. The inquiry suggests one or two comments. *Everything* we are to do, whether as individuals or as a Church, is *not* commanded in the Bible. God has given reason, and reason commands or suggests a great many duties. There is no command in the Bible to build churches, to celebrate Holy Communion, whether once a day or once a year; we are not commanded to have Sunday-schools or to keep holy the *first* day of the week; or to go to church every Lord's day; or to kneel when we pray, or stand for that matter. Thousands of things we are not commanded in the Bible which ought to be done, and which the reasonableness of them makes as pointed a duty as if we were commanded in words.

The question of our correspondent is like the objections made by the Puritans in the Church of England, and which were answered by Hooker. He showed that even they, with their bald churches and church services, were following reason, even though they affirmed they would do nothing unless they had for it a "thus saith the Lord." Things *necessary* to the *being* of the Christian or of the Church are plainly ordered and directed in the Bible; many other things are not ordered, but *obligatory*, because they are the dictates of that wisdom which God has given us, and from which we cannot swerve without injury to our selves. Reason is a guidance as well as the Bible.

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* in a late number says:—

The arrogant claim of the Rev. Dr. Keller, Roman Catholic parish priest of Youghal, to set himself and his fellow-priests above the civil law, is one that demands the serious attention of the Crown, unless it is prepared to acquiesce in the principle of an *imperium in imperio*. The claim is one which we venture to say would be scouted by every European Power, and the priest who dared to make it would at once feel the result. The sooner the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is brought to its senses, and made to feel that there must be some limit to its arrogance, the better. It really looks as if her hierarchy and clergy considered themselves to be the supreme authority in the land, above all law, and the sole arbiters of right and wrong. If we do not mistake, Archbishops Walsh and Croke will find before long that they have gone a step too far in trying the patience of Great Britain. There is a true saying—"The pitcher that goes often to the well gets broken at last." The Government should follow the precedent set by the German Empire, and claim the right of veto on the nomination to Roman Bishoprics in Ireland.

A Subscriber in Ontario, renewing subscription, writes: "The GUARDIAN has become a household necessity with us."

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER'S WORK.

ITS MOTIVE AND OBJECT—BY A SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER.

What ought to be the one *only* motive, actuating a Teacher in her Sunday-school work? Surely *love*, Love for God. What ought to be the *only* object ever before her in that work? To teach the children to love God, and to instruct them in such religious Truths as will form in them the elements of a religious character!

Her motive ought to be one of love. Ah! but is it? Can each Teacher as she takes her place in her class on Sunday, sincerely and from the heart say, "I am here because I love God, and earnestly desire that these His children should love Him too." Is it not rather, that other and far lower motives actuate us. Perhaps, it is to please our Rector, who, in his dire extremity has asked us to take a class, or, it may be we were getting tired of an aimless, selfish life, and thought it time to begin to do some good to others, or, we were fond, both of children and teaching, so we became Sunday-school Teachers. Very good motives, we flatter ourselves, but, will work thus undertaken last? Will it bear the test which time brings? Let us look at a teacher working with either of these motives? She is regular in her attendance at the teacher's meetings. She finds her Rector's instruction so very pleasing and interesting, that she will ever give up some personal pleasure in order to be present. Every Sunday finds her punctually in her place; well, she does not believe in doing things by halves, indeed, she makes a point of never being late for anything. Her lesson is diligently prepared and pleasantly given, perhaps with the hope that it will result in some good to the children. Now, surely with such a teacher there is little fault to be found. Must we say that such work is for nought! What of this teacher later on, when her first zeal and enthusiasm have somewhat abated? One day, we find her absent from the teacher's meeting—the curate or a stranger has the class. The instruction is not so pleasing to her, indeed, she cannot learn anything from them. Then comes the temptation in the shape of some personal pleasure, a five o'clock tea, or an afternoon call, and she succumbs. On Sunday, how listless she is, what a bother it has become to start out immediately after dinner, the day is stormy, or the streets icy, or the school-room cold. How she wishes she had never become a Sunday-school teacher, and, allowing the wish to master her, she stays at home, leaving her class to be taught by a more faithful teacher, who has already, half a dozen troublesome children to keep in order.

Before assigning a reason for this sad change in our, hitherto, exemplary teacher, let us glance at one actuated in her work by *love*. Outwardly, perhaps, there is nothing to distinguish her from the teacher already portrayed, the same regular attendance at the teacher's meetings, the same punctuality on Sunday, the same diligent preparation of lessons and earnest teaching, but this teacher does not grow listless and weary. As time goes on, she is more earnest, more diligent, more faithful in her duties; her work is not a toil, but a willing service. What then is the secret of success in the one and of failure in the other? How can we account for such different results from apparently the same kind of work? Is it not, that one works without God and prayer, to please man, the other works for God, with both Faith and Prayer. Prayer in her private life for grace and knowledge requisite for her work: Prayer for her work's sake; Prayer in her preparation, yes, even in the act of teaching. Her whole work is done in the spirit of Prayer and Faith,

that God will bless her efforts to the benefit of His children, and His Honour and Glory. To such a teacher the teacher's meeting is a means of gaining knowledge in those things which concern her own and the children's salvation; she thinks not so much of the manner in which the instruction is given, as to the *thing* taught. She is punctual on Sunday, because she realizes that the half hour for teaching belongs to God, and allowed her for the specific purpose of preparing His children for eternity. Her lessons are earnest, because she herself realizes more and more, by the power of God the Holy Spirit, those deep Truths of our holy religion, which she is thus permitted to teach, and she is so anxious that these His children should realize them too, to their own happiness, as they have been hers.

Thus she is blessed in her work! Though she may not see any result, the consciousness that her motive is a pure one, makes her content to work on, to sow the good seed, and leave results to God. Nothing interferes with her duties, she is self-denying, giving up many little pleasures, that she may more fully carry on her work. She will accompany her scholars to the children's service, and set them an example of reverent behaviour in the "House of God." She will visit the children in their homes, and interest herself in their daily life, with its little cares and pleasures. In fact, her work will be one of "self-abandonment," no trouble or sacrifice will be too great, if by it, she can win these children to Christ, and keep them steadfast. If a pleasure presents itself alongside of a duty, the *pleasure must go*, and, what if it does go, are such pleasures so "all satisfying" that we find it hard to give them up? The work in which we are engaged is God's work, *self* must be put on one side. He surely will compensate for every little act of self-denial. What pleasure so great as to hear the words "Well done! good and faithful servant." Closely allied to *Love* in our work comes *Patience*. Patience as a natural virtue and as a spiritual grace. As a natural virtue, requisite in every Sunday-school teacher, when she finds the children restless and inattentive, when, in the most interesting part of the lesson, she becomes conscious that the children are busy telegraphing (in a manner peculiar to children) to their friends in another class, quite oblivious of the fact that they are being addressed at all. What need of patience here! how hard it is to check a frown or sharp reproof, and instead, by a well put question, bring back the wandering attention. We need patience too, when, on coming to school we find we have to teach another class with our own. It is very trying. And, how much greater need there is of that spiritual grace of *Patience* or rather patient trust. So go on with our work when we see no improvement in those taught, they are just as thoughtless, just as careless and wanting in earnestness as ever. How apt we are to despond, to think our work in vain, and why? because of our want of *Trust*, we forget that, though we may be permitted to sow the seed, God alone can give the increase, and it is for us to go on, in the face of seeming failure, *patiently, lovingly, trustingly*.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—There are one or two points in the letter of "Nova Scotian No. 2," in your issue of March 30th, that should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. I refer to his remarks about King's College. I am surprised that a Nova Scotia Churchman should display such ignorance of the College which has educated over half of the clergy of Nova Scotia and a