

weapons in his possession. As the sale of spirits to Indians is prohibited, so the sale of lethal weapons to foreigners should be strictly prohibited. This is a free country, it is true, but most Canadians prefer that incisions in the human body should be confined to hospitals and be performed by surgeons.

Thrift in Farming.

It must amuse English and European farmers generally to read of the artless astonishment of Professor Creelman at the methods of cultivation in these old lands. We look on Mr. Creelman's visit and outspoken remarks as the greatest blessing that he could convey to our own trans-Atlantic agriculture. Many years ago, the first agricultural labourer who made a political mark, Joseph Arch, visited the old provinces and expressed, not the admiring surprise that was expected from him, but his honest indignation at the labour-starved fields and his honest contempt of the people who with so many advantages, achieved so little. But our critic did not take sufficiently into account the cost and scarcity of labour and the difference in climate. Admitting all that can be said truthfully on both sides there remains the undoubted fact that the early settled portions of North America are now far less fertile than they were or than they should be. Haste to get rich has been the chief curse. Take every thing off and out of the land there are millions of acres in the West, has been the animating sentiment of generations and now the descendants, or the foreign successors, of the early settlers, have to learn and to apply to the worn out acres the experience of old nations and to re-learn the need of the old proverb, "Waste not, want not." Many an old farmer in Canada amassed a handsome fortune which in a few short years his thriftless descendants threw away. Professor Creelman, we are glad to see, has found there is much to learn and new habits to inculcate.

Bemocked of Destiny.

A very interesting historical document, bearing indirectly on this subject, the writer saw recently. It is a simple autobiography by the late Mr. Charles, which he styled "Bemocked by Destiny." "I have succeeded," he wrote, "after a long and desperate struggle, in making a lucky strike in mining at last. But at my age and with the most of my loved ones in the grave, it is only the wished for come too late." Poor fellow, he did not realize that his was the common fate of mankind, and like most of mankind he failed to realize and be thankful for the blessings bestowed on him by destiny. The little book has more real interest than three-fourths of the average new publications in a public library, as it contains glimpses of old habits, of pioneering, and the struggles of Canadians in the early days of Confederation. The writer was a true Highlander by origin, with the love of mysticism ingrained in the national character and many other traits showing the strength and weakness of one of our pioneer peoples. One immense advantage a book of this kind possesses over the average story book or novel is that its characters are not built up upon a resemblance, real or fancied, to some suppositious being, but are a lively record of real persons and events. The writer, the most religious, knew little about ecclesiastical differences. Detailing a conversation round a camp fire one night he says: "The packman of the party, who was an Episcopalian, had been silent for some time, but just then he looked up and said that his Church never interfered with politics or religion." An excellent character for us would that it was always true. He meant that we did not meddle with party questions, nor the affairs of other religious bodies. An intense Canadianism oozes out in every page, Mr. Charles quoting Ruskin, "Nothing can avail any race or condition of men but the spirit that is in their own hearts, kindled by love of their native land."

Loyalty to Principle.

Mr. Winston Churchill in England, and Professor Royce in the United States have, the one with tongue, and the other with pen, been emphasizing the purifying and uplifting power to the individual and by parity of reasoning to the nation of loyalty to religious principle. There can be no reasonable doubt that the more a man or a people devote themselves, unselfishly and unflinchingly, to applying the principles of a pure religious belief from within to without themselves, the higher they will rise in the scale of beneficent achievement and the better it will be for the world at large. But, it must never be forgotten, that as in the case of individual or national patriotism the true principle never sleeps, but is always operative even to the ultimate test, if need be, of shedding one's blood so the possession of religious principle is always demonstrated by the law of perpetual growth against all opposing, destroying forces. There must be determined, unyielding, progressive, daily growth to a harvest as sure as the sunrise to-morrow.

THE GREAT CONGRESS.

The Pan-Anglican Congress, now passed into history, will remain as an unique event in the long record of our national Church, which begins ages before there could be said to be an English nation, in any sense approaching that in which the term is used to-day. And yet the development or evolution of the race as of the Church shows a wonderful continuity, unequalled, in the case of both Church and nation, in the history of any of the Western races. For there has always been an English or British Church, in a sense quite unique in Christendom. This, we think, will be admitted by the staunchest upholder of the Papal claims. The Church of, or in England, has always possessed an individuality of its own, that has marked it off from the Church in any other European country. And this was true long before the Reformation. The English Church always had a mind of its own, always had a disposition to do things in a fashion of its own, and always stood for some principles and ideals not common to the whole body of Christians. To-day, it may safely be said that the same thing holds good. The Anglican Church continues to occupy her own peculiar place amid the various religious bodies, great and small, ancient or modern, into which our common Christianity is divided. Of course this in a sense may be said of any religious body that is in any sense historic. Each does stand for, or represents, in fact owes its existence to some special phase of our common Christianity. But this is true, we submit, of the Anglican Church, in a sense that cannot be claimed for any other Christian communion. The three leading principles, according to a very thoughtful and appreciative article in the London Spectator, on the Pan-Anglican Congress, for which our Church stands, are comprehensiveness, the spiritual side of the State in its various legislative activities, and the necessity for a wide diversity in methods of work and organization. These three aspects of the life and work of the Anglican Church, the Congress, so the Spectator thinks, very strikingly illustrates. And, in our opinion, the judgment is just. Is there any other religious body in the world, in ancient or modern times, which could have supplied material for such a gathering, the most heterogeneous and widely representative that perhaps the great metropolis has ever seen of its kind. And representative, not only in a geographical, but in the far deeper sense of divergent, contrasting and therefore complementary viewpoints. It may, we think, safely be said, that no religious body in the world could have called into being such a gathering as the late Congress, composed of such diverse elements and embracing in the sphere and scope of its work, such a far-reaching range of inter-

est. The Congress, if it has done nothing else, has assuredly supplied the world with a memorable object lesson of the comprehensiveness of our Church, and of a real, working, and not merely paper comprehensiveness. The Congress again, we think, has justified the second point made by the Spectator. It has demonstrated the deep and vital interest taken by the Church in public questions. For while there is probably no Church in existence which interferes so little in politics as our own, there is none that is so much in evidence in the great social movements of the day, which concern the whole mass of the community. The Anglican Church stands everywhere for the principle that Church and State, whatever may be their accidental or superficial relations, are fundamentally engaged in the same work, and that their spheres of work and influence, not only overlap each other, but in the last analysis are identical. This, we think, was made plain by the nature of many of the subjects discussed, e.g., the unrest in India, the great racial questions of the day, the care of aborigines, Socialism, etc. The third characteristic, that the Congress illustrated, viz., our diversity in our methods of work, is one that needs no enforcement, and may almost be called notorious. The Church of England is pre-eminently the Church of societies, and its members are distinguished above every other class of religionists for doing exactly the same thing in a number of different ways. Take the question of missionary work. Is the parallel of the present state of things in the Mother Church, with its numerous missionary organizations, conceivable in any other religious community. Hardly. Of this diversity in method of work, for which the Spectator seems to have so deep an admiration we prefer to say nothing, beyond that it appears to have worked vastly better than might have been expected. In the absence, as yet, of detailed accounts of the proceedings it is, of course, impossible to do full justice to this great and unique gathering. But that it has been a most gratifying success, and furnished a magnificent advertisement of the Church's work is abundantly and unmistakeably plain.

THE UNREST IN INDIA.

"The way of transgressors," we are told upon the highest authority, "is hard." It is unfortunately often true that in international or interracial affairs, the way of benefactors is equally hard. In her long, eventful and world embracing history our Mother Land has had abundant experience in the truth of both these sayings. Her bygone transgressions, now dim memories of a vanished past, have been sharply punished. Now she is apparently getting it on the other cheek and suffering for her virtues and benefactions. In Egypt which she has transformed from a state of semi-barbarism, not much more advanced than that of the days of the Pharaohs, to a condition of average European civilization, she is not loved, and apparently in some quarters actively disliked. She has diffused general prosperity in this ancient land, unknown before in its history, oppression, corruption, grinding poverty, widespread misery, has been succeeded by freedom, honesty, prosperity and comfort equally widespread. Still she has failed to win the affection of the people. In India we have a parallel on a very much larger scale, with considerable difference in the conditions, but, however, these may vary in both cases, the one common fact stands prominently out, the troubles in both countries are due directly and primarily to certain benefits conferred by England upon the inhabitants, and of her own free will and initiative. Had England continued to hold India "by the sword" to the present day, as it is more than likely any other European power would have done, there would probably have been little to complain of in this connection. But having laboured and toiled