

several days' travel, the white man, wondering what would become of him—for the Indian said very little—suddenly came to the top of a hill. The Indian, stopping him, said, "Do you know that country?"

The white man looked, and at last cried out: "Why, that is Litchfield!"

"Well, said the Indian, long time ago you gave poor Indian supper there. Indian tell white man he never forget," and bidding the delighted and long lost exile farewell, he turned and retired into the wilderness by the way they had come.

GOVERNING A BOY.

Get hold of the boy's heart. Yonder locomotive with the thundering train comes like a whirlwind down the track, and a regiment of armed men might seek to arrest it in vain. It would crush them and plunge unheeding on. But there is a little lever in its mechanism that at the pressure of a man's hand, will slacken its speed, and in a moment or two bring it panting and still, like a whipped spaniel, at your feet. By the same lever the vast steamship is guided hither and yon on the sea in spite of adverse winds or current.

That sensitive and soft spot by which a boy's life is controlled is his heart. With your grasp firm and gentle on that helm, you can pilot him whither you will. Never doubt that he has a heart. Bad and wilful boys very often have the tenderest hearts hidden away somewhere beneath incrustations of sin, or behind barricades of pride. And it is your business to get at that heart, keep hold of it by sympathy, confiding in him, manifestly working only for his good, by little indirect kindnesses to his mother or sister, or even pet dog. See him at his home, or invite him into yours. Provide him some little pleasure, set him to do some little service of trust for you, love him, love him practically. Any way rule him through his heart.

THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH.

We hope the good brother who wrote the following response to a request for an "item" will pardon us for making an extract from a letter not intended for publication. His words are so good that they ought to be read and pondered by many.

You ask for news. I have nothing new or sparkling in my parish life; never had. It is every year the same routine of steady, constant work, and, thank God, there is also the constant blessing of steady, constant growth. Children are born and baptized, some of them grow in churchly ways so that they desire to be confirmed when they "have learned the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and are sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the catechism," and some, without the influence of Christian training, prefer to walk with the world rather than with the church. But those who do walk with the church only show what might be true with reference to every child born and baptized, could he only receive Christian training, as St. Paul expresses it, "the nurture and admonition of the Lord." And I grow more and more to feel that every child in the community whose feet wander from purity and rectitude, is a witness before God to the church's neglect of a most important part of her duty. The ultimate success of our missionary work in the diocese depends not upon our earnestness and zeal in attracting to the Church and influencing to better and holier ways men and women, those who are mature and fixed in their habits of thought and living, but upon our persistent faithfulness in the Christian nurture of the children and youth committed to our care. This is the paramount duty before us all, priests and people, to-day. It is a duty we cannot emphasize too strongly, nor push too earnestly. The wayward youth in any community by their very waywardness, are beseeching the Great Head of the Church to stir up the minds of us, His brethren and their brethren, to action in this matter.—*Exchange.*

SIX DELUSIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

1. It is a delusion that the Church of England was ever Roman, or ever acknowledged, as a Church, any subjection to the Pope, or any other relation but that of an independent English Church (or Churches) established by the preaching of missionaries from Rome, accepted by kings and people of what we call England.

2. It is a delusion that the Church of England seceded or separated from Rome, as indeed she could not if she was always independent of her. She was, in fact, so insular that she had no occasion even to protest, as the German Protestants, at Spire. She renounced certain medieval errors promulgated from Rome, and at a certain stage in her reform the Pope desired all English who would follow him to withdraw from attending English Church services, and so the Pope made a (not very large) Roman schism in England, which remains till this day in our English Roman Catholic bodies.

3. It is a delusion that the Church of England was a different church after the Reformation from before, any more than England is a different country because she has abrogated the slave trade, or had a Reform bill, or than a drunkard's personal identity is lost if he reforms.

4. It is a delusion that King, Queen and Parliament either reformed the church or ordered that the Pope should no longer be her head. The church declared what she has repeatedly testified on occasions of encroachment, that the Pope never had any more authority over her than any other foreign Bishop. Civil enactments maintained that declaration, at home and abroad, in secular action upon it.

5. It is a delusion that the recognition of the Royal supremacy meant or means any spiritual headship, or anything else than what had always been asserted—that the clergy of England, as well as the laity, are subject to English law, without appeal against it to a foreigner like the Pope; that the last appeal of all alike is to the Sovereign. It is strange, in the face of the very strong words of Henry and Elizabeth, that any delusion on this exists.

6. It is a delusion that Parliament settled the Church of England, or even that the Church is subject to Parliament now, except in matters affecting personal or property rights. The Church reformed her errors herself; her Prayer-book and her Articles are her own work. The Act of Submission, which is the limitation of her action, is in theory no more for her than for Parliament itself. It requires Convocation, as the Conqueror required, to be summoned by the Sovereign, as Parliament itself must be, and it requires that canons must have Royal assent for their enactment, just as Acts of Parliament themselves must have it. That has been the relation of councils and princes since Christianity was a recognized religion. Personal and property rights cover a great deal of ground, and civil compulsion in such matters can only be derived from Acts of Parliament, but Church authority is often of as much importance as civil force for obtaining action in Church matters, and the limitation upon that is not Parliament, but the Crown, as it has always been in England, at least since the Conquest.

HELPING OTHERS.

Go, find that heart less blest than thine,
And pour within his ear
Sweet words of peace, and comfort, too,
With sympathizing cheer;
Then shalt thou find a happiness
Around thy being thrown;
The peace diffused in others' hearts
Shall make more blest thine own.

—*Mattie E. Smith.*

SUNDAY SCHOOLS NOTE THIS.—Bishop Huntington has laid the corner-stone of a Parish House for Trinity Church, Watertown, to cost \$24,000—all provided by gifts and subscriptions, largely from the Sunday-school.

PLOTTING TO DO GOOD.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Bishop Niles said to the last convention of this diocese: "I wish that more of us were apt to lie awake of nights plotting to do good. I wish our selfishness would melt away at sight of the Cross, and that in its place might spring up a fervent love born of the Holy Spirit of love. I wish we really cared for the Kingdom of God more than for 'getting ahead' in this world; more than for pleasure, promotion, and pelf. I wish that the wealthier folk all, clever women and shrewd business men, 'remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive,' would believe that word, and would let it lead them out to indulge themselves largely in this sweet luxury. For one who has grown to care for the best things, and who loves God and longs for the welfare of all whom He has made, and is deeply concerned for the common weal, and who considers thoughtfully the ends of wealth and what are the great things of life, and who sighs when he sees his fellowmen suffer from blindness of mind, from sickness, or from sin, and who looks upward to the Healer—for such a one it is the strangest of things, stranger than any miracle, that a man can hold in his hands the power to do good and not do it. To be helpful is to be like Christ. To be helpful is to be joyous. To be helpful is to be rich indeed. To be helpful, largely helpful, very largely helpful if we can be, is to recognize the stewardship over our property, not its ownership, and that we are trustees. To pour forth beneficence in a deepening, widening, constant stream, Oh, what rapture is this! Who that has possessions can hold himself back?"

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

People ought to understand why the law of the land closes stores, shops and factories on Sunday and why it forbids work on this day. It is not merely because our Legislatures are *Christian* they do this, but because they are humane. They legislate for the temporal good of the people of the State, and to allow work to be done on Sunday is for the harm of the poor man and the rich man alike. Here is a petition to Prince Bismarck by a thousand carpenters of Berlin, which puts the matter in proper light:—"You have declared that you will not legally forbid Sunday work until convinced by the voice of the laborers that they demand a rest on that day. We declare implicitly that we desire a law which will grant us protection in the enjoyment of freedom from work on Sunday. Sunday labor leads us to misery, crime and vagabondism."

It is "protection" these men want, it is "protection" our laboring men want, so they shall not be forced to work on Sunday and become degraded.—*Ex.*

—The N. Y. *Churchman* says: A very short-sighted critic in a Toronto paper finds fault with the proposed cathedral in New York, on the ground that "the expenditure of millions" on such an object is "criminal," when it might be "given to the poor." A moment's reflection should satisfy this possibly somewhat envious brother, first, that the six million dollars more or less, that will be drawn chiefly out of rich men's pockets by the building of this cathedral, would not possibly be drawn out by any direct appeal for either missions or charities to the poor, and secondly, that all this money will go to the poor of New York, by a wiser and more helpful distribution—in return that is for honest labor—than any that could be affected by the most careful charity organizations. The result at the end of the building may be summed up thus: 1. Comparatively rich men will have given away, say six million dollars, that they otherwise would not have done, to the great benefit of their souls' health. 2. The working classes of New York will have received six million dollars in return for honest labor. 3. The city will be richer by six million dollars of labor converted into permanent and most useful capital, and the poor of New York will have a place where the Gospel will always be freely preached to them.