

above all, the duty of the clergy is to the souls of men. Work done for the body, the feeding the hungry and clothing the naked and caring for the sick must be subordinate and auxiliary to work for the soul. Much of it is done that souls may be won to Christ. In pursuance of this end sacrifices must be made and we make them gladly. We give our time, our strength, our energies, our thought, our money. We give ourselves to God and to His service, our souls and our bodies, or at least we think we do, but one thing we withhold from Him. We cannot sacrifice we cannot even risk our social position. Now there are many immortal souls, needing to find Christ and to be built up in Him, which do not dwell in poverty. Indeed, many of them are rather unpleasantly rich. How are they to be reached? "Through the preaching of the Gospel," Yes, and that is true of the poor also. "They must be drawn into the churches." Yes, but how? Have the Christian women of the Church no responsibility in this matter? Does it all rest upon the clergyman? He does what he can and so does his wife, but that is very little if he is unsupported by the people. Think how attractive to such persons must that Church be, to which they come Sunday after Sunday, and from which they pass out unnoticed and unrecognized.

They do not need physical comforts, but they do need Christian sympathy. They need the love that Christians owe to one another, and we withhold it for fear of hurting our social position, of injuring ourselves in the eyes of people who have not part or lot with us in our Christian walk. Do not think I speak too strongly. Ask your own rector, and he will tell you that these social distinctions are stumbling blocks in his way at every turn. People drift away from good influences and he is powerless to hold them, because of the want of interest shown in them by people in the Church. Any clergyman will tell you that this is so, that many women who consider themselves humble in the sight of God, will not speak to those who are beneath them in social position; much less will they visit them or invite them to their houses. A clergyman once asked a woman of position in his church to visit a sick neighbour who was feeling desolate and sore because none of those with whom she knelt at the Lord's table had been to see her. I hardly like to give you her answer. You will find it hard to believe it. She said: "If I were, sure she was going to die I would go, but suppose she should get well, she might return the visit." Oh, Christian women, should we be not willing also to risk this intangible thing which we call social position if we can thereby help to win souls to Christ, or to build up into noble Christian characters some of the weak ones of this world. In view of the great things of time, not taking the things of eternity into consideration, is not this thing so small as to be almost contemptible.

A few years ago I was engaged in the formation of a Girls' Friendly Society in a suburb of a large city. The work was made difficult by the discovery that vast social distinctions existed among the girls. There was no question of character, for girls of doubtful character were not admitted. It was simply a matter of social distinction. No girl who worked in a mill could possibly associate with girls who lived at service, and the mill-girls were in turn looked down upon from a great height by those who had a trade. Even the girls who worked in one mill were above those who worked in a mill in the next street. It was very provoking. It was very silly, but are we entitled to throw stones.

If we would help men spiritually we must love them much. Doing good is not handwork alone, but hand-work and heart-work combined. If we enter upon it unduly anxious lest we should form acquaintances or even intimacies outside of our social circle, we shall fail.

We may wisely follow the example of our Master. When he would do good He ignored social distinctions. He looked up to the despised little publican who was watching Him out of the branches of a tree, and said: "Make haste and come down for to-day, I must abide at thy house." The publicans and sinners followed Him because drawn by His love for them.

He received sinners. He ate with them. He was often their guest. He was their friend as well as their benefactor. He did not try to help them at a respectable distance, but hand to hand, and heart to heart. There may be those who will find fault with us, as there were those who blamed Him for sinking below our supposed social level, but if so, let us give them the answer furnished us by Christ Himself. "The disciple is not above his Master nor the servant above his Lord. It is enough for the disciples that he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord."

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE IN ENGLAND.

In his address at the last Diocesan Conference in June, the Bishop of Rochester is reported to have spoken as follows in this important subject:—

As to Sunday, there can hardly, I suppose, be two opinions to the considerable increase of persons who deliberately use it as a day of social pleasure and physical recreation, without any apparent recognition of its obligation on the Christian conscience as "the Lord's Day." This pervades all classes alike. Among the young men of the various strata of the middle class the bicycle has effected an entire revolution in the use and observance of Sunday. The Thames which flows past our own borders has always, I suppose, been the Sunday resort of Londoners; but the modern invention of the house boat and steam-launch goes far to aggravate the painfulness of the scandal. I have been informed that the constant blowing of the steam-whistle from morning to night is in some places an actual disturbance to public worship. On the mass of toilers from the great city, who come for air and greenery, and for the music of the birds and the sweetness of the flowers, and for the moral bath of nature's harmonies, I, for one, will not cast too stern or reproachful a look. Their needs are great. The glory of Nature is God's kind gift to them. The Church desires to help them to enjoy it. Their Saviour shall judge them; we will not. Further, it is no lofty ideal of a rare devoutness that we claim imperiously to lay on the necks of our toiling brethren. Nor do we ask any to go back out of the personal liberty of the man made free in Christ, by Christ's Spirit, into the yoke of an obsolete Judaism, with its necessary strictness and its impracticable ordinances. Nor would I, for one, excommunicate or even upbraid the Churchmen (I do not concur with him, and think his example unfortunate) who, careful of his worship and his communion in the early part of the day, uses the rest of it for recreation. But we may blame and warn those pleasure-lovers of the well-to-do classes of society who, having all the week wherein to enjoy and amuse themselves, must have Sunday as well; whom no one compels to worship God if they do not wish to worship Him; but who have no right to prevent others from worshipping Him, through employing them to minister to their pleasures. To take from the poor man his precious inheritance of a seventh day's rest is a kind of moral robbery. The observance of Sunday is no mean bulwark of the fear, and sense, and recollection of God. It lies at the very root not only of religion but even of morals. To secularize Sunday may be, in the

end, to banish God out of the thoughts of the people. It is increasingly perceptible that none are more jealous of keeping Sunday as a day of rest than the working classes; none view more sternly, more bitterly, the increasing encroachments of wealthy and luxurious selfishness on the needful repose of the poor. But the hard thing is to know how to remedy it. Will the Conference help us? If we preach about it, the people about which we preach are not present to hear us. If we write tracts about it, should our compositions ever reach their hands (which is most improbable), the last thing that is likely to happen to them is their being read. Anything like a public protest might only win a bitter scoff at priestly interference with the innocent liberty of the people. What is even a more difficult matter is, that we are a house divided against itself. The Divine authority for the Lord's Day with some of us is a matter of passionate and indisputable conviction; with others it is hedged by so many exceptions, and weakened by so many concessions, that it is practically valueless as a solid argument; and we all of us know sincere Churchmen—whom we respect for their intrepidity and esteem for their excellence, while we could wish that their energies were employed in denouncing real moral evils—who seem inspired by a melancholy enthusiasm for disabusing the public mind of its noxious superstitions about the sacredness of Sunday; and who are succeeding so rapidly and so fatally in their effort to separate the idea of the Hebrew Sabbath from the weekly festival of the Lord's Resurrection, that they may soon be spared the necessity of vindicating His religion to all. Sunday is a Divine foundation. "If the foundations are cast down, what shall the righteous do?"

EDITORIAL NOTES.

SINCE issuing the last number of the GUARDIAN we have received pretty full accounts of the proceedings of the Synod in Nova Scotia, and especially of that part of them which related to the proposed amalgamation of King's and Dalhousie Colleges. We assume that the report of the discussion that took place, as given in the daily newspapers, is correct, and a careful perusal of this fails in any degree to remove our dissatisfaction and astonishment. We have not been able to make room for this portion of the Synod proceedings in our Nova Scotia columns, but hope to give the report next week, and we shall defer any further remarks thereon until that time. We would only note now, as subject matter for thought, these two statements reported as made during the debate. (1) That in order to put the College on a proper and sound basis a sum of \$150,000 would be required. (2) That there are 60,000 church people in Nova Scotia, representing 12,000 families.—Twelve dollars and a half per family, or \$2.50 per head, would secure the \$150,000; and yet the Synod decided to ignore "the old time glory and prestige of King's College": virtually wipe it out of existence, and abandon the secular education of the Church youth of the Diocese to a non-denominational (so called) institution to be! Surely the churchmen of Nova Scotia will not endorse this step; but will prove themselves worthy of the name they bear and of the privileges they enjoy.

Our contemporary *The Evangelical Churchman*, of Toronto, in its last number, says:—

"We were pleased to receive the other day a letter of commendation on what we said in a late issue about the question of Theological