

possess some of these rare fowl, imagining that Mrs. Mills would regard her wish as a law; but the Quakeress quietly remarked, with characteristic evasion: 'They are rare, as thou sayest; but if any are to be purchased in this land, or in any other countries, I know few women likelier than thyself to procure them with ease.'

Her royal highness more plainly expressed her desire to purchase some of those she now beheld.

'I do not buy and sell,' answered Rachel Mills.

'Perhaps you will give me a pair?' persevered the princess, with a conciliating smile.

'Nay, verily,' replied Rachel, 'I have refused many friends; and that which I have denied my own kinswoman, Martha Ash, it becomes me not to grant to any. We have long had it to say, that these birds belonged only to our house, and I can make no exception in favor of thine.'

This is a fact. Some Friends, indeed, are less stiffly steeled, but old Quaker families still exist, who pique themselves on their independent indifference to rank, and respect their fellow mortals only in proportion to the good they have done in their generation.—*London Court Journal*.

HINTS TO SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

We should remember that children are acute observers, but they form opinions principally from externals. Teachers should be very cautious that they do not give occasion to their scholars to make unfavorable remarks. But, strange as it may appear, such occasions are not unfrequently afforded. Far be it from me to judge too harshly of any individual engaged in the sacred work of Sunday school instruction. Far be it from me to brand any one with the epithet of an unfaithful teacher. I would not be thought deficient in that "charity which hopeth all things," but would believe that all who are engaged in the work do so from truly laudable motives; that there are none who do not feel a deep interest in the glorious work of winning souls to Christ; that all have an earnest desire for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, and do every thing in their power to advance its interests. But, at the same time, it is evident to every observer that many, very many are engaged in the cause who are (as far as outward appearances are concerned) indifferent to the interests of their class; at all events, they give us reason to believe so, from the general tenor of their conduct, and that is the only criterion we have by which to judge of their inward feelings. Besides, children are imitative creatures, and teachers cannot be too cautious of the example which they set before them; for "line may be given upon line, and precept upon precept," yet if the example of the teachers be at variance with the principles they seek to inculcate, their instructions will avail but little. For instance, if the scholars remark that their teacher is not in the school when the exercises commence, we will soon find those scholars becoming as remiss themselves; or they will think, that there is no necessity for hastening to school, for they will find no teacher there to welcome or encourage them. Now for my own part, I can nowhere find an extenuation for this fault, and it is one, I think, which need very rarely, if ever, occur. It surely requires very little self-denial to rise a short time earlier than we are usually accustomed to on Sunday morning, in order that we may be in time to meet our class, and join with them in imploring the Divine blessing upon our exertions; and we may rest assured, unless that blessing is sought and obtained, our labor will be in vain. It is not unfrequently the case, that a number of the teachers come to the school invariably a few moments too late to join in the opening devotions; they must of course sit down to instruct their class without feeling their hands strengthened for the work they have to perform, by having previously sought the aid of the Spirit of grace. True, they may have sought it in their closets, but is it not reasonable to conclude that when the public means of grace are neglected, the private will be also. Besides, the pernicious influence which such conduct will exercise upon the children of their charge, is great. I have scarcely ever known it to fail, that where a teacher was deficient with regard to regularity and punctuality, the members of that class have become so also.

Again, if the teacher neglect to explain the lessons, one great object of Sunday school instruction is defeated. How is it possible that the children are

to understand what they learn without an explanation from their teacher, and what more natural than to conclude that, where this is not done, it is because that teacher is not competent to give the required explanation. Children will not be readily put off with an evasive reply, and if you do not answer their inquiries satisfactorily, they will, most probably, come to the conclusion that their teacher cannot explain its meaning. But those teachers have much for which they will be accountable to their Maker, who, possessing the knowledge, withhold from their little flock an explanation of the plan of redemption, the blessings resulting from a Saviour's love.

But how is it possible that they should know in what manner to speak of, and endeavor to impress upon their youthful charge the importance of this subject, who have never felt, that for them was this boundless love displayed; to them are made the offers of salvation, through the merits of their crucified Redeemer? How can they speak of that great "propitiation for sins," and urge their class to "flee" to that divine bosom for protection, "from the wrath to come," while themselves are yet in the "gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity?" In a word, how shall those who are the slaves of sin and Satan, advocate the cause of the Redeemer? They must feel conscious that unless their darkened minds become illuminated by a beam of heavenly radiance, they are totally unfit to be the instructors of the lambs of the Redeemer's fold. But should they, upon taking this view of the subject, relinquish their charge, and retire from the school? By no means; but bending in humble, fervent supplication before the throne of grace, seek the sanctifying influences of the HOLY SPIRIT, which can alone enable them to obtain that change of heart and life so necessary in the Sunday school teacher.—*S. S. Visiter*.

MULTIPLICATION OF SOCIETIES IN THE CHURCH.

In a late number of the British Critic, there are some excellent remarks on this subject. It is matter of satisfaction that in our own Church the tendency that way is much less decided than it was. Whether the course pursued in the late General Convention has had any influence on the judgment of the writer, does not appear. The coincidence between what is thus deprecated on the one hand, and recommended on the other, and what was then done by us, is at least remarkable.—"If persons rich, and pious, and charitably disposed, wish to contribute funds for the erection and endowment of houses of prayer, why cannot they place them at the disposal of the commissioners for building Churches, or the diocesan committees, or the bishop of any particular see? If persons are anxious to devote their individual energies to the furtherance of God's honour, and man's salvation, why cannot they go at once to the bishop of the diocese, or the incumbent of the parish? Why must societies interpose between the constituted authorities of a Church, and the parties who desire to render the Church assistance? Because, it will be replied, associations are necessary to stimulate, and nourish, and direct; to connect, and centralize, and systematize exertion; to organize and arrange details; to furnish a known medium of communication; to equalize, supply and demand; lest otherwise there should be agents where there are no funds, and funds where there are no agents. Then let one society be formed, and let the bishops place themselves at its head, and let its action be judiciously allied and subordinated to the regular action of the Church."—We have done better even than this. We have made our "one great society," with "the Bishops" "at its head," identical with the Church. The admirable results are read in every eye, and acknowledged, (let us hope,) with fervent gratitude, by every heart.—*Spirit of Missions*.

REVENUES OF ENGLISH BISHOPS.

We hear a great deal of outcry, echoing, per annum, through our whole newspaper world, against the enormous revenues of the English bishops—as if they actually received all that a radical and calumnious press in England chooses to rate them at—as if what they received were to be counted at its worth in this country; as if it were all capable of being expended on personal indulgences; as if there were no great houses attached to the sees, which the bishops cannot alienate, must "keep up"—must repair—and yet do not need or desire; as if there were no expenses arising out of their connection with the state, as peers,

which we know nothing about; as if the English bishops were not the common centres for all applications for charity and benevolent contribution; obliged by public opinion, if nothing else, to patronize every school, college, hospital, church; every deserving enterprise for education or good-doing; every worthy mendicant, every distressed family, every needy clergyman; and in each case to head the list of donations.

Probably there is not a body of learned men, occupying places of high responsibility, either in England or America, who after they have answered all the calls they feel obliged to respond to, either upon their time, care, or means, have less to devote to their own personal or domestic purposes, either in the way of present expenditure or future provision for their families, than the English bishops, with all their supposed enormous revenues. Could an estimate be made of how much they give away in promoting religion and learning, and how much they leave of what they get from their sees, in legacy to their heirs, it would be seen that no class of men give so largely—none die so little enriched.

These remarks are suggested by the death of the late venerable Bishop of Durham, Dr. Van Mildert—one of the most accomplished scholars and learned divines of the age; as remarkable for his simplicity of character and love of a plain retiring mode of life, as for the high reputation in which he was held for all the virtues of a Christian. No bishop has been the mark for more of the abuse of the press than this excellent man; merely because of the supposed revenues of his see. His income has always been rated in our papers at £70,000 per annum. His highest receipts per annum were £17,000. Enormous! Equal to about \$75,000. *Festina lente*. In the expenses of Durham, as compared with those of this country, the pound is about a dollar—in other words he could live on \$17,000 here, as easily as upon £17,000 in Durham. Very well, he had an income then of \$17,000, say \$20,000. What a sum for a bishop! But remember, his see was saddled with two great houses, which, as bishop and as head of the principality of Durham, he must keep up. One of these was the Castle of Durham, a great baronial pile, in which the bishop never lived, and into which he never entered but to entertain the judges of the court at the assizes once a year. But it must be kept up nevertheless. How much such an expense must have reduced the income every year we know not. The year before last the applications to the bishop for money to needy persons, or purposes, were, by letter, one thousand, and how many in other ways is not known. Last year he sent £500 in one donation to St. David's College in Wales. This was only an unsolicited specimen of his habit in such things. His manner of life, in respect to personal and family expenses, was very plain and frugal. After all his supposed opulence, his wife is now left with nothing to maintain her but a life annuity—in other words, she has about what she would have had, if her husband had never been Bishop of Durham, because, like others, his brethren, he felt conscientiously bound to spend the revenues of his see upon objects beyond himself and his family.

When the present Archbishop of Canterbury was Bishop of London, he reduced his own income to a stated allowance, considering his circumstances, that he might rebuild Fulham, the residence, from time immemorial, of the Bishops of London; and then nearly in ruins. He did rebuild it, and resigned its comforts to his successor. As soon as he became archbishop, he did the same with the revenue of his primacy, and rebuilt Lambeth House, making it almost entirely new; and he remains now, as he will be for a long time to come, obliged to a rigid economy for the sake of defraying the cost.

The See of London is one of the wealthiest. The present incumbent was poor when he took it. He is known to be no richer now—and yet every year he alienates a portion of the revenues of the diocese for the purpose of increasing the livings of some of his clergy.

Such are the men who are periodically reviled in our newspapers, and held up for public execration by every writing of an editor, as rolling in ill-got opulence, and pampered in a selfish and extravagant luxury; as living upon the earnings of the people,—when they get not one cent from people or government, but all from property belonging to their sees, as strictly as lands belong to any of our colleges; as living unto them-