

look upon divine guidance as a perfectly natural thing to be had for the taking, and to be more easily taken as it is more earnestly sought. They believe that while "spiritual ministers" are the best ministers, spiritual carpenters and spiritual traders, spiritual bankers and spiritual street-cleaners, are just as much superior to those in their several callings, who follow the letter that killeth.

Those, on the other hand, who insist more upon our own insufficiency, are more likely to think that guidance by the spirit is a peculiar and almost supernatural thing that strikes certain persons and makes them preach in meeting. To be sure, Paul was talking about preachers, but he might have said the same thing about cooks or farmers. These have taught us that "spiritual guidance" is all right in business, but that it must go along with training and experience, and a knowledge of the world; while in preaching, spiritual guidance counts for everything, and training and experience and careful preparation, count for less than nothing, being, it may be, an actual hinderance. I think generally we know better, but some of us are like men who carry horse-chestnuts in their pockets to keep off the rheumatism. Our reason says there's nothing in it, but we don't throw away the horse-chestnuts.

"Having, therefore, such a hope, we use great boldness of speech."

Boldness of speech, in the early Friends, is much admired by us all, at a safe distance. Boldness of speech by Friends of to-day is by many deprecated as likely "to unsettle the opinions of others, especially the young," to give offence to those who differ in opinion, and to do more harm than good. I submit that those who are afraid of the effects of "boldness of speech," either in themselves or in others, have not the "hope" referred to in the text. If we believe that

"where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," and feel that we have that spirit, we cannot hesitate to use our liberty. If we believe that "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," and feel that our hearers have that spirit, we must know that they are willing to allow us liberty, and will not be shocked. If we doubt the presence of the spirit of the Lord in ourselves, we must be quiet. If we doubt its presence in our hearers, they are the ones to be stirred up, and we must stir them, or we need stirring ourselves.

EDWARD B. RAWSON.

"WHAT OUGHT WE TO DO?"

From the British Friend.

In concluding the papers of this series, so far as they refer directly to our Society organization, it may be expected that the writer should state his conclusion, if he has one, on the question of the American correspondence of London Yearly Meeting. This is by many felt to be unsatisfactory at present. The drift of rapid change in America has caused us to find ourselves in official alliance with the Pastoral Yearly Meetings, as against—for I fear that is how it is naturally regarded—as against bodies of sound Friends, to whom we are doing an injustice in their lonely isolation, but those hands of testimony we might well help to bear up. Nor have we any influence with our present correspondents, in leading them to think or to worship in our way; that they will not do; they mainly value the imprimatur of London Yearly Meeting as a sort of stamp with which to encourage themselves and discourage their neighbors from whom they have divided, and from whom we are withholding our approval. Of that they are very glad, but to dismiss a single pastor to please us is the last thing they would do. So that the present system is useless for effecting any good.