

and Christianization; and under all the circumstances she did not make such a bad job of it. This much at least can be said: that in a few hundred years, out of this rough material a Europe was made that successfully withstood and finally overthrew the Mohammedan power. Could the Europe of to-day do as much? Could a Peter the Hermit arouse and unite the conscience of the Christendom of this age in a great and holy cause? To ask the question is to answer it. His preaching to-day in such a cause would have about as much effect as the chirping of a house sparrow would have. And while our forbears were engaged in this life-and-death struggle with Mohammedanism they found time to build and were able to endow dozens of schools and universities, which were attended by hundreds and thousands of students, many of them getting their tuition free. They also found time and means to dot Europe with churches and cathedrals that even to-day are the admiration of the world; and they adorned those edifices with paintings and with sculpture that cannot be equalled in our time. And the guilds and other social institutions of those ages we are even now trying to copy. Even the wars of those ages were chivalrous and merciful compared with the fiendish wars of the present age. In the face of even the meagre record I have roughly sketched, can it be truthfully said that Christianity has never been tried, or has been tried and found wanting? Yet it must be admitted that there is still much wrong with the members of the Christian churches.

If, in the outline mentioned, I have correctly diagnosed the world's troubles, then to every intelligent, thoughtful person the remedy suggests itself. Once again I repeat our Lord's words: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." In another place He says, "Without Me you can do nothing." Therefore even the wayfaring man could not err if he did not come under the power of Satan. Where is the man, particularly the political ruler or the executive official in business, who will willingly acknowledge that he himself is nothing and of himself really owns nothing, that to God belongs everything that is in the world, or ever will be in it, by the clearest and best of all titles, namely, creation; and that to be God's steward is the highest position to which any man can ever attain, and that all Satan's promises to the contrary are the hollowest of mockeries? If everybody would get these fundamental things clearly fixed in his mind and act accordingly there would not be much wrong with the world.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES.

During the past year Hon. W. D. Herridge has given his views on public questions to the people of this country from the lecture platform. Doubtless the honourable gentleman has some worth-while ideas on the subjects he discusses, but he manages to cover them over with such mountains of words that it is difficult to find them. In this respect he resembles somewhat our friends William Aberhart and Major Douglas. I think Mr. Herridge leans to the idea that the adoption of a democratic form of government would be a remedy for all the ills of our time. Somebody has said with considerable truth:

For forms of government let fools contest;  
That which is best administered is best.

If the ills of the world are so simple that they can be cured by the general adoption of some particular form of government they need not worry anybody. Lloyd George, if I read his letters aright, also has great faith in democracy, but he is clear and specific. He would have the democratic nations, such as the British Empire, France and the United States, impose their form of government and their will on the rest of mankind, by force if necessary. This too would be a very simple, easily understood remedy, and I do not think Satan would object to it. When it becomes a fundamental principle of democracy, and is generally practised by the nations possessing that form of government, that every man is intrinsically equal to every other man in the sight of God, and has an inherent right to equal opportunities, democracy, though often a synonym for plutocracy, will have established a strong claim for general adoption. In the meantime, democracy is, I think, the best form for the English-speaking nations, and for as many others as wish to adopt it.

The attitude of the great democratic nations towards the League of Nations and kindred subjects appears to me to be peculiar. In 1919 they all, with the United States leading, formed a League of Nations and pledged themselves to intervene nationally and internationally, if necessary, to prevent future wars. Later the United States withdrew from the agreement, but France and Britain went on and induced many other nations to go on with them. In 1937 France and Britain took the lead in trying to induce other nations to join with them in a non-interference pact in regard to the world war in Spain. Both courses may have been justified by circumstances which I do not understand, but I think they will appear to the man in the street as being the result of expediency rather than of principle, and will prove to him that democracy would not be a cure-all for the ills