

of 1881 [which broke down old contracts of tenancy, and even prohibited tenants of holdings valued under £150 yearly from contracting themselves out of the Act] COULD NOT HAVE BEEN GIVEN UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER'S WORK.

ITS MOTIVE AND OBJECT.—By a SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER.—*Concluded.*

As to the *object* of our work, I said at the beginning, it *ought* to be to teach the children to love God, and instruct them in such religious truths, as will form in them the elements of a religious character." Now, if we would teach children to love, we must ourselves first love. How can we speak convincingly of a thing of which we are quite ignorant? We may talk of love, and the happiness which comes to those who do love, but our words do not convince. No words are so effective as those spoken from the conviction of one's own heart and experience. The child, to be convinced, must see by the earnestness of our words and consistency of our loves, that to love God and serve Him is the only true happiness. Children are very watchful, and, no doubt, wonder often and often how it is that "Teacher," who speaks so beautifully of love, patience and forbearance on Sunday, can be so cross and impatient on Monday, especially is this the case when teacher and scholar are sisters. It behoves us then to be very watchful over ourselves, that we practice on Monday what we teach on Sunday.

As a teacher of a Bible-class of girls, I have ever been interested in the oft discussed question. How can we retain our elder boys and girls at Sunday-school? Various answers have been given, such as the due exercise of parental authority or personal affection between teacher and scholar; but these have not been found sufficient, either incentive may be withdrawn and the scholar withdrawn too. No, there must be a deeper, truer motive in the heart of the girl or boy, and that is *love*. Love for God and the desire to know more of Him, and those things which concern their salvation. Until this love and desire exist, I think there will always be the cry of non-attendance on the part of our elder boys and girls. To try and arouse these feelings is the work of the Sunday-school teacher, and we must begin at an early day, that as the scholar grows older he or she may become strengthened in that love and desire. We must show them by our own love and experience that we are in earnest. I do not mean to say that earnest love on the part of the teacher will convert the scholar, that alone is the office of God the Holy Spirit; but I do say that we, teachers, can, by our own experience, do much to encourage them to choose the "better way."

As to imparting religious knowledge, we must first possess it. Now, surely in these days of teachers' meetings and Bible-classes, of Sunday-school Association meetings, of model lessons, and of Teachers' examinations, not to mention the numerous books of instruction provided for us, it is impossible that a teacher can plead ignorance, yet so it is. I think that most teachers convert themselves very readily of all the above mentioned helps, with the exception of the "Examinations," than which, I think, there cannot be a more pleasant and effective means of finding out one's ignorance and having it removed. I said that words of experience are generally most convincing. I trust, in all humility, that these of mine may have some effect on those teachers, who, as yet have not entered the list of competition I think, I do not speak too strongly, when I say "It is the bounden duty of every Sunday-school teacher to try these examinations." Her duty

first to God, then to her Rector, and then to the children of her class.

To God first as "workers together with Him." Is it not that these examinations are an opportunity given us by Him, through His Church, to make us more fit for the work we have undertaken? If we neglect the means, are we not accountable to Him alone? Some teachers might plead a want of time, for study, but would God have put the opportunity before us, if He saw we had not time to carry it out. As the world rushes on, it is perhaps hard to find time, but how would half an hour's earlier rising answer? It is astonishing what an amount can be learned in one short half hour.

Now, for the duty of those who have the charge over us. Our Rectors, perhaps, in their anxiety to help us in our work, have given their valuable time in preparing lectures on those subjects put out by the examiners. How discouraging to them when, but a few teachers attend the classes, feeling as they do, that the opportunity may never come to us again. Is it not a shame to us teachers that we are so slow to appreciate and take advantage of the helps thus given. If for no other reason, their gratitude to those who are so mindful of our spiritual interest, ought to influence us in at least attempting this means of improvement.

With regard to the children of our class: Do we not seek to make them good churchmen and women! that they may be able, throughout life, to say *why* they are so, and to give a reason for the "faith" that is in them; that they be not "carried about by every wind of doctrine." If we would be efficient teachers in this respect, we must ourselves be well instructed in the "faith," and in the history of "the Church." In these days when children's heads are crammed with secular knowledge, it is difficult to find room for other things; but we teachers must remember that *our* aim is not so much to cram the head, as to arouse the feelings of the heart. For these reasons then, I think these examinations become a positive duty, for the neglect of which we are answerable before God. And really they are not so formidable, after a course of preparation they become comparatively easy, even to a teacher of ordinary intelligence. For my own part, I cannot be thankful enough for the opportunity given me, and have found these examinations of the greatest benefit. I earnestly ask you, who have not yet tried, to begin now. If you do not succeed at first, never mind, try again.

Perhaps we teachers do not realise always that our work is also God's work; that to Him alone we must account for every careless preparation of lessons, every absence from teachers' meeting and Sunday-school, for every neglect of the means given for our improvement. It is a serious thought, and ought to make us less careless and selfish, more earnest and watchful.

Perhaps the standard thus put forth is a high one, and we would ask, "Who is sufficient for these things." But, if the standard is high, shall we on that account stand still or despair? Surely not, rather let us try to attain it, thinking less of our own inability, and more of God's power to make us what He would have us to be, if we use the means He gives us. Let us strive day by day to become more perfect in ourselves, more faithful in our work, remembering that the "good" or "ill," which results from our work and conduct, will not end with this life, but will endure throughout eternity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—Please correct a mistake which might mislead intending students. The annual cost to a student of board, rooms, tuition, &c., in King's College, Windsor, is from one hundred and sixty to two hundred dollars.

ISAAC BROOK.

King's College, April 15th.

SIR,—Will you permit me to inquire through your columns when matrimony became a sacrament in the Church of England? I have been a member of that Church for forty-five years; was taught and always held that there were but two sacraments, namely "Baptism and the Supper of the Lord," as set forth in the Church Catechism. I was, therefore, much surprised on reading the letter "Catholicus" in your last issue to see that rite called a Sacrament. Is it some new dogma lately propounded in the Diocese of Nova Scotia? or is "Catholicus" endeavoring to promulgate the doctrines of the Church of Rome under cover of zeal for having all things done "decently and in order?"

INQUIRER.

Frelighsburg, April 16th, 1887.

WANTED A CHAIR OF COMMON SENSE.

SIR,—I have been set thinking by the advertisement of one of our Bishops for Clergymen who are endowed with common sense—a quality which one would infer to be conspicuously absent from the clergy. The question has occurred to me, why is it so scarce that a Bishop has to advertize for it, while he can take for granted that they have purity of doctrine and believers of life? And in tracing the matter up to its ultimate source I have discovered that the blame lies in our numerous theological colleges. I know that in my *Alma Mater* common sense was not one of the branches taught, and I know of no college where there is a professorship of it. And it seems to me that to endow such a chair would be to supply a long felt want. The subject ought to be systematically taught during term, and the students should be subjected to a rigid examination at the end of their course, or before the Bishop's examining chaplain when they go up for ordination. By careful labor we might in the course of a generation breed a style of clergy, including bishops, well endowed with the needed common sense, while the present impracticables would in time die off.

How would this do for an examination paper? "Subject: COMMON SENSE—Rev. Prof. Gump-ton, examiner; time, three hours."

1. Define Common sense, stating whether it is a natural or an acquired faculty.
2. State whether you think it necessary to Priests alone, or equally necessary to Bishops.
3. Give prominent examples of it (if you know any) among: 1st bishops; 2nd priests; 3rd deacons; 4th laymen.

[N.B.—The greater number of examples you give the higher marks you will receive.]

4. Do you think the "judicious Hooker" could have administered the affairs of an average backwoods' parish or frontier Mission-field, without giving offence either: 1 to his bishop; or 2d to the most touchy of his parishioners? (State what you *think* as clearly as you know how), and remember, the value of your answer depends on its length.

5. Analyse carefully the following case, and state what percentage of common sense it discovers, and in whom. A priest, otherwise above reproach, offers his services to a bishop and is refused on the ground of lack of funds to pay him. A few months later the same bishop with the above offer on file, or, elsewhere, advertises for clergymen who have common sense. Did the priest show a lack of common sense, and if so, how great, in writing to the bishop instead of working some scheme of his own to get one of the best parishes for himself?

6. What degree of common sense, and what degree of faith, did the Apostles show in undertaking to convert the world to Christ, under the circumstances of their day?

7. Was common sense one of the qualifications mentioned as necessary to the seven first deacons?

Yours truly,

G.

Eastertide, 1887.