

nation—as a nation—be thereby relegated to the category of ‘the nations that forget God.’

“If the Church of England is disestablished, then—as a nation—we shall incur the guilt of irreligion.

“If the Church of England is disendowed, then—as a nation—we shall incur the guilt of sacrilege.

“Many of our Christian brethren, those especially who call themselves Nonconformists, do not apprehend these truths—they do not regard the national acknowledgment of Christianity which is involved in the question of an Established Church, as of vital consequence to the well-being of a nation. On the contrary, they regard an Established Church as an evil in itself, and verily think that they do God service when they seek to pull down the Church of England from her vantage ground as the National Church. For these, our brethren, we pray that God would ‘enlighten their darkness,’ inasmuch as our earnest desire for them is, that they may so apprehend the mind and will of God as to separate themselves from the company of those evil men who seek to pull down the Established Church, because, in spite of all its defects and shortcomings, they find it to be a barrier against evil—a hindrance to their efforts to overturn our monarchy, to desecrate our altars, and to invade our homes. With reference to these emissaries of Satan, sent forth by him to accomplish his work of destruction, we pray that God may ‘overrule their designs.’

TRAINING FOR SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

A paper read before the Halifax branch of the Church of England Sunday-School Association, by F. C. Sumichrast, Principal of Girton House, Halifax, N.S.

(Continued.)

There is a great difference between those hearers of sermons, expositions, and lectures, who desire to be and are contented to remain learners only, and those who are striving, to the best of their ability, to fit themselves for teaching. The requirements of the former are, it may be accepted, fully met at present; the needs of the latter are yet unsatisfied.

True, the Association does something for them; does much. It provides model lessons, calculated to be most useful, but hampered by a faulty system of criticism, in respect of which I would venture to suggest that more valuable results would be obtained by arranging for, say, four model lessons on one and the same subject, with four different sets of pupils. Four teachers would follow each other, limited to twenty minutes apiece as the extreme limit of time. An opportunity would thus be given for practical comparison and practical criticism. But this is by the way.

To revert: The Association holds conferences; obtains papers on subjects of interest to its members; initiates discussions thereon; brings the teachers themselves together, and thus creates an opportunity for exchange of ideas; but all this work is still only partial, and lacks the breadth and comprehensiveness imperatively required in the proper training of teachers for Sunday-schools. The examinations held by the Association are undoubtedly very good, but like many English things, like most English things, indeed, they require to be adapted to our special wants, for in the shape in which they come to us from the Mother Country they suffer from the same defect, and have the same fragmentary character as the other existing aids to teachers.

All this, it may be reasonably urged, is mere fault-finding; tearing down without rebuilding; heaping up objections and doing nothing to remove them. Even granting that the alleged faults are faults indeed, there has been no suggestion of remedy for what is defective, of im-

provement in what is stated to demand it. To criticise is an easy matter, but bare criticism is fruitless of good in such a case as that under consideration. What, you will say to me, do you propose?

I answer—in one word—to give our teachers a broad, comprehensive, really useful training. Not to take here and there a specimen brick from the noble and vast building, and examine it with a commentator's microscope, but to stand off and show them the whole edifice; point out its plan, its various parts; explain their uses; whence springs this—why that.

To do this let the Association arrange for the delivery, during the winter season, of a series of lectures comprising some or all of the under-mentioned subjects, it being a plain direction to the lecturers chosen that they are to give a complete outline of the whole subject, enabling particular study in any direction; bearing in mind that the object is to train teachers, and consequently indicating the points most deserving of attention, the books preferably to be perused, the best methods of study, the points to be chiefly dwelt on in elementary, in intermediate, in advanced teaching respectively.

The subjects which, it appears to me, should form the course, or part of it, are:—

History of the Holy Scriptures, with especial reference to their preservation, inspiration and authenticity.

Evidences of Christianity.

The Prayer Book—its history, its value and place as the expositor of Church Doctrine.

Ecclesiastical History, both Ancient and Modern.

Old Testament History; New Testament History.

Life of Christ, with the particular view of thoroughly impressing the reality and consequent value of the Master's life on earth.

This, I hear some one exclaim, is nothing more nor less than a theological course! Certainly it is; and pray, what less do teachers require? It is not a full theological course, far from it; nor is it to be a detailed, lengthy course; thorough as far as it goes, but, as I stated at the outset, an outline; complete, it is true, but still only an outline.

Then on this foundation can be built up any special work in the shape of classes and meetings. There is something to go and come on; there is a ground-work. In that way, I believe, will be avoided many of the disheartening failures common among men and women who are asked or who volunteer to teach without having enjoyed any previous training or subsequent help, and who, realizing their inefficiency and seeing no ready way of remedying it, become discouraged and abandon the work which, if they had but the right training, they could perform so well.

Besides, are we not all entitled to have that knowledge in right of our Churchmanship?

Who is to do the work?

The clergy.

But they have plenty to do already.

True. Still they can and will do this, at the outset, at least; for the success of the work would perhaps bring forward new instructors, to say nothing of the certain fact that the result of the better training of teachers, and the consequent better training of pupils, would be a reward far reaching and ample.

Of course we all know that numbers of individual teachers even at present work hard to train themselves, but these individual efforts cannot be and are not as successful as they would be if directed by a competent guide.

The lectures, I think, should be given on the premises of the Church of England Institute, the members of which would be admitted to the lectures, while outsiders, members neither of Association or Institute, would pay a small fee.

Each lecturer should take a course, not one lecture of a course.

If thought advisable, examinations on the subjects taught might be held at the close of each season, and model lessons should be frequently given.

A. M. D. G.

SHAKING OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.—“Yet once more I shake not the earth only but also heaven” (Heb. xii, 26-29.) This is one of the *Royal Texts* of Scripture. It declares one of these great laws of the Kingdom of God which may fulfil itself once and again at many eras, and by many methods; which fulfilled itself most gloriously in the first century after Christ; again in the fifth century; again at the time of the crusade, and again at the great Reformation in the sixteenth century, and is fulfilling itself again at this very day.—*Kingsley*.

He that follows the Lord fully will find goodness and mercy following him continually.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—I was glad to notice from your columns that the Parish of Maitland had bestirred itself in raising so much money during the last year or two, and is apparently advancing towards self support; it is high time that these older and settled parishes which have so long been receiving grants from the B. H. Mission should become not only self-supporting but in turn liberally assist new and occupied fields of labor in the diocese. The glowing statement from Maitland shows that with the necessary push and vigor a very great increase can be obtained, and the larger parishes become self-supporting. It needs only a systematic effort to accomplish this, and the sooner it is accomplished the better for the Church's work. In view of the alarming impending decrease in the S.P.G. grant from England it is well that this subject should be thoroughly ventilated, and that the clergy of the older and settled parishes should awake to the necessity of seeing that their parishes become self-supporting as soon as possible. Otherwise all new missionary enterprise will be at a standstill for years to come. What has been done in Maitland shows that the money can be got—let it be obtained systematically, and let the older parishes nobly proclaim themselves self-supporting.

B. H. M.

“TRINITY,” HALIFAX.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—May I ask through your columns what is meant by the sentence in yours of Dec. 23rd, “The well known words: ‘For the poor and the stranger for ever,’ which have been engraven in stone so long over the Church doors, were *chipped off last week*.” Did some vandal rowdy do it? or was it done by authority? If the latter, what authority? The Bishop is away—he and his gave largely to the “Free Church.” I feel sure his commissary would as soon “chip off” his right hand. The Church belongs, it is said, to St. Paul's; there is no rector just now. It was a bold thing to do—bolder to my thinking than taking away the “Gates of Gaza.” I do not live in Halifax, but when I did go I loved to see that mark of care, “for the poor and the stranger” promised “for ever.”

Yours,

RUSTIC.