

Ireland, should be set aside as unworthy of such a name; and that the very men who put it forward should be the men to withdraw from the evil which they were seeking to accomplish.

The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, says:

The English Church papers are wonderfully unanimous in their criticisms on Mr. Gladstone's unconstitutional action. The *Guardian* permission of Him who ruled over all, and, therefore, their prayers should go up before the throne in the name of the Lord Jesus that this great injustice should never be allowed to take place, and that in some way they did not see it should be hindered in its progress, and also that those who had taken the measure in hand might have their minds changed and their consciences moved by seeing the injury it would be the means of committing, and, through the blessing of the Most High, this measure which was spoken of as for the better government of says: "Mr. Gladstone's procedure resolutions are of a piece with his whole attitude towards the Home Rule question. He has steadily refused to recognise the characteristic quality of the change he is trying to bring about—the quality which marks it off from all other acts of legislation during the last two centuries."

His colleagues, we cannot doubt, are perfectly aware that the Home Rule Bill has nothing in common with those other measures with which it is their convenient habit to compare it. They must know that it is nothing less than a constitutional revolution, that it puts Ireland into wholly new relations with Great Britain, and converts the United into a federal monarchy. They must know that the electors have never had the Bill before them, and that they are only now learning by the slow infiltration of the arguments used in Parliament what the real nature of the Bill is. . . . But we greatly doubt, and until the result of the elections clears up matters we shall continue to doubt, whether they have not mistaken the people they have to deal with. There is much in the Home Rule Bill about which Ministers may be anxious to have as little said as possible. That much we can understand. But that this frank disclosure of their desire not to have the Bill examined will in the end minister to its accomplishment is more than we are able to believe." *The Illustrated Church News* says: "Grave Constitutional problems will be settled practically without discussion, and if one may judge from the various parts of the Bill which have had to be recast through the light which criticism has already thrown upon them, we may now fairly anticipate that the Bill will leave the Commons as crude a piece of unfinished legislation as ever was sent to the Upper House." *Church Bells* says: "The Government have determined to take what most people think is a desperate step. . . . No doubt it is very embarrassing to a Government to have to endure such prolonged discussion upon a measure which they are longing to get passed. But it must be remembered that the measure is the most revolutionary one that has ever been introduced into Parliament. It remodels our Constitution. It is to be carried in the teeth of a majority of the representatives of England. No previous Parliamentary measure or crisis can for one moment compare with it. To stifle discussion upon such a measure, to stop the mouths of the Opposition by the closure, and to resort as a last measure to Parliamentary coercion of the most extreme type, is at least an eccentricity of administration which can hardly fail to bring trouble in its wake."

FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

We have more than once pointed out to our young people that the proper and most efficacious way to study the Bible is to read it with

an object. Churchmen are given the Catechism to learn when very young, and they are taught to refer to the Bible in proof of doctrines taught in that precious synopsis. By the time they can understand the *motif* or drift of the Catechism they will know a great deal of the Bible. We cannot impress too deeply upon Sunday School teachers the importance of Catechising. There is little use in cramming scholars with facts, historical or geographical, of the Bible, unless they are in connection with some material point of doctrine. Every scene in history should be brought to bear upon something in their own lives. Every fact in geography or botany should be brought to bear upon something around themselves. For example—in studying the Lord's Prayer, which we think ought to be the very first thing to be taught to children, because from it we can reason concerning the whole Catechism; we use the first words "Our Father"—the questions would be to educate, or draw from the children the clauses of the Christian covenant, showing who is our Father and how He is *Our Father*, by creation and by adoption. Then would come in the stories of Absalom and of the Prodigal Son, which would also be examples of the second answer of the Church Catechism. A skilful teacher would steadily adapt such teaching to the understanding of his pupils, and the interest awakened would not only give him satisfaction, but stimulate himself to deeper research.—*Honolulu Church Chronicle*.

MR. GEO. J. FLEET, one of the founders of the Church of England Sunday School Institute, and a teacher for some sixty years, speaking at the last annual meeting of his own work, "what it has done and what it has been to me," said: "To begin with, I soon learned one lesson, namely, that when God has mercifully kindled in one's heart a wish to labor for Him, it is not for that person to rush hither and thither headlong into anything, but according to a little phrase that I copied out. * * "Do as Saul of Tarsus did—wait: God did not tell him at once what to do." It came in God's time, it came in God's way and it came in God's power. . . . So, I say wait, and God will surely show you what work He has to do. . . . God does not call every one to be Sunday-school teachers. There may be other spheres of work quite as necessary, as honored and as useful."

They who teach must learn. If we fail to fulfil our duty, we soon find out that there are no keener observers, or keener critics, than children: and when children either say, . . . or show by their indifference or thoughtlessness, that they have had enough of us, it is for us to consider whether the fault is not in *ourselves* and that we have not efficiently studied what we have to teach.—*Fleet*.

Children of the Church are to be taught as children of the Church. Our Church has a definite system of truth, clear and simple. It covers a few points of doctrine and that system of truth should be adhered to. Our Church has an orderly form of worship; her children should be taught to love it and to unite in it. Our Church makes demands upon the personal service and loyalty of her children; they should be taught to give willing adhesion. In a word the children ought to be so trained in Sunday-school that as they grow up they will become loyal members of The Church. It is not enough to make them mildly acquiesce in her ways. They should become thoroughly in love with them. This is not to make them uncharitable, but to give them tone and fibre whereby they will go out into the world and be of some positive use.—*Rev. G. W. Shinn*.

S. P. G. Notes.

Nearly 9,000 parishes in England and Wales contribute to the funds of the S. P. G.

The *Mission Field* and the *Gospel Missionary*, organs of the S. P. G. have a very large circulation, which is well maintained.

There are 23,000 Lay teachers, 2,600 students in the colleges, and 38,000 children in the Mission schools of the S. P. G. in Asia and Africa.

The S. P. G. had in 1892, 677 ordained missionaries on its lists, distributed as follows: Asia, 224; Africa, 159; Australia and the Pacific, 18; North America, 210; West Indies, 33; Europe, 33. Of these, 119 are natives laboring in Asia, and 38 in Africa.

During 1892, the Board of Examiners of the S. P. G. considered the offers of forty-five candidates for work abroad: and recommended thirty of them to the Society. Eleven were sent to Africa; two to Newfoundland; four to Canada; three to the West Indies; two to Australia; two to Corea, and six to India.

The Society has published in one large octavo volume (1,000 pages) a classified digest of its proceedings, journals, MS. letters and reports, with a record of all the missionaries whom it has supported from the date of its incorporation by Royal Charter in 1701 to the present time. In view of the observance of the Society's *Bi-centenary* in 1900 the time of publication is opportune. This work will be of great use in giving the early history, not only of the Church in the United States, on which up to the date of the Declaration of Independence in 1784 the Society spent nearly a quarter of a million of money (£), but of the foundation of the Church in every colony of the Empire, with whose history the Society is for all time very closely bound up. The missionary work in India, as well as in countries outside the limits of the Empire, is recorded at length. The work is illustrated by portraits of the fourteen Archbishops of Canterbury, who have been its presidents; of Bishop Seabury, the first Bishop of the United States; of Dr. Inglis, the first Colonial Bishop, and of the Rev. G. Keith, the first missionary sent to America in 1702, and by engravings of many colleges in foreign parts, which the Society has helped by endowment or otherwise. The price is 15s.

WHAT IRISH PROTESTANTS FEAR.

MR. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P., has found it necessary to write a letter in reply to an attack on Ulster Unionists made by Mr. Halley Stewart, M.P., for the Spalding Division. Mr. Arnold-Forster says:—

If Mr. Halley Stewart wants to know what is the kind of thing which Protestants in Ireland fear, I can easily tell him. They fear the rule of Archbishop Walsh, who has declared that a man is *ipso facto* excommunicated—in other words, eternally damned—if he attends a charitable bazaar on behalf of the orphan children of Freemasons.

They are afraid of men who consider it part of their religious and political duty to destroy the liberty of election, which is the right of every subject of the Queen; who fraudulently compel thousands of people to state falsely that they are illiterate in order that they may elude the secrecy of the Ballot Act.

They fear the rule of priests who do not hesitate to denounce men as "adulterers" and their wives and sisters as "prostitutes" because they have chosen to vote for a political candidate who is not congenial to the Roman Catholic Bishop.

They fear the rule of men who, as in Belfast,