

ance, the obligation of active assistance in building up and keeping together the church family in the parish were among the things referred to.

There were very few words said on the subject by those present. The Bishop before calling up the next question, however, pointed out the value of the inventory of church furniture, etc., mentioned, as well as the importance of keeping policies of insurance paid up. There were two or three places in the diocese where the people refused to pay the insurance, and it was generally found that in such cases the people had their buildings almost if not wholly given to them. It was a hard thing to correct. He had no fund to pay insurances, even if it were right so to do. He had hesitated to take the serious step of withdrawing the services of the Church from such points, but it might soon be his duty to do so.

The next subject proved to be the last. It was introduced by Rev. A. H. Allman in a paper that commanded general attention. The title was

CHURCH PRINCIPLES AND HOW TO MAINTAIN THEM

Our will to give a lengthy summary of the paper is good enough, but our columns will not stretch. Therefore a very few words will be better than an imperfect *resumé* of the paper. Church doctrine, government, discipline, worship, authority, etc., as set forth in Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer, including the Ordinal and the Articles, were all glanced at. All Church people were bound by a spirit of loyalty to maintain the principles of the Church. Regarding public services they should be conducted without addition to or subtraction from the order given in the Prayer Book. Every clergyman should always have an eye to his ordination vow. Teaching should be positive.

A lengthy discussion followed, nearly every one present taking part. Things better to do and things better not to do for the maintenance of Church principles were fully mentioned by several speakers. Some, too, laid stress on the difficulties that arise from misunderstandings in connection with the Church's relation to other religious bodies. Our separated brethren so often failed to recognize that Church people acted entirely on principle.

The Bishop summed up. While taking a general view of the discussion, he referred to two or three subjects concerning which questions had been asked. (1) A rubric directs us, and limits our freedom, in the matter of notices in time of public service. It were well the clergy should ponder the subject. (2) Referring to the difficulties which arise from time to time when Church people were unable to take common ground with others, the Bishop said our kindly feeling to others need not diminish because on principle we are sometimes compelled to hold aloof from them. Personally we should strive to cultivate loving relations with those from

whom we differ. (3) The Church owes a great debt to the Bible Society, and where it can do so should not refuse to pay it. But it must not be forgotten that we have in the S.P.C.K. a Church Bible Society claiming and deserving our heartiest sympathy and support. Each man must decide what is his duty in the premises. In reply to a question the Bishop added that the spirit in which Morning and Evening Prayer begins seems to suggest that, as a rule, the service should not begin with a hymn. Of course, a processional hymn was a different thing.

During the afternoon Messrs. J. Hilliard and E. Bazett arrived from Burk's Falls.

The business of the day being concluded, the conference adjourned, the Bishop having pronounced the Benediction.

THE LAST SERVICE.

After tea Evening Prayer was said in the Church of St. Paul, and a sermon preached by Rev. T. E. Chilcot, B.A., of Port Carling. The church contained a congregation of about 150. As on the preceding evening, the clergy robed in the vestry and entered the church in procession.

The local choir did itself credit at this, as at other services, being led and "held up" by the little organ, which was played by Mrs. A. E. French.

Nearly all the visitors left that night or early next morning, and took with them pleasant reminiscences of their trip to Sundridge.

Sunday—Rest or Work.

So far is Sunday becoming a day of labour or amusement that its characteristic quality of rest is surely being lost. In some places within the Diocese of Algoma—a small fraction of the Canadian Dominion—this is manifest. Post offices are open on Sundays, stores do business on Sundays (though there is an outward appearance of being closed), while in the larger spheres of labour men are kept employed at mining centres and on railways seven days in the week. It is toil 365 days in the year in order to satisfy capitalists' required dividend or to gratify the amusement seeker. And this is lawlessness, if, as we understand, the law of the land says men shall not pursue their ordinary avocations on the Lord's Day. The law, too, prohibits railway trains from starting from a terminal point on Sunday. In this respect the law is a dead letter. Here is a recent instance. The change made a month ago by the Canadian Pacific Railway in increasing the speed of its transcontinental express trains has been made the occasion of adding a train each way per week. That is the train that leaves the terminal point—Montreal or Vancouver—on Sunday. To connect with this service the Grand Trunk Railway runs a train out of Toronto that did not run before. Who will interfere to assert the majesty of the law? It seems

certain no official will. It is exceedingly difficult for a private citizen to do so. He cannot single-handed fight a great, wealthy, and influential corporation; he shrinks from being an "informer" against his neighbour, whose violations of the law seem to be small in comparison with the more serious offences of large industrial concerns. Thus unchecked, encroachment after encroachment steals away our one-day-in-seven-day of rest.

Apart from the loss we as a people sustain from a religious standpoint, and that is not here minimized, is the loss of rest which the man needs to prevent him going down hill to mental and physical decay. How great is the selfishness that takes from men that rest they ought to have and which, we believe, for the most part is desired. To the Christian we can appeal on religious grounds to do what he can to check this down-grade practice. To others—to those who are not even nominal Christians—may we not look for support in seeking to maintain that day of rest which, if lost, must inevitably result in the deterioration of the race? May we not appeal in the name of justice, of fair play, for united effort that shall preserve to the workingman—we are nearly all workingmen in Canada—the day he spends at home with his family, to arrest the coercion that forces him to work for the profit of another against his desire. No one should be so intolerant as to force his neighbour to work on Sunday. This is to be noted by all who for their enjoyment compel others to labour. We express no inclination here to urge rigid rules for the observance of the Lord's Day, but we do urge that no man has a legitimate right to force his fellow to work on that day.

Of course, more is desirable. In our eyes the Lord's Day has for its paramount obligation the duties of Christian worship. There must be some special times for worship, and Christians naturally assemble on the day of the week on which our Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

Will the Canadian people rise to the occasion and save to us the divinely-appointed "Day of Rest"? If our Sunday be lost nothing can take its place. Will Canadians in this matter strive to maintain a vital principle?

Our Indian Wards.

Another extract from the twenty-fourth annual report of the Shingwauk and Wawanosh Homes is given in our columns. Our quotation is from the Principal's report. Mr. George Ley King says:

"Our efforts, cares and anxieties are more than repaid by the satisfactory results which have been achieved by our wards not only in class and technical work, but—more important still—in their moral training and deportment.

"The hereditary indolent habits with