

of the city bad, and the abolishment of the sa'oons would harm the city; others that it is too soon to attempt such a reform. The world, or the people in it, are not good enough for such violent reformation, and you have to let things take their course. But, good people, how is the world ever to move if everyone should sit back and view calmly all the sin and sorrow in it, and say, "Let it take its course; I can do no good with my mite." *What do we live for?* What are we put in this blessed world for, if it is not to help the world in some way and leave the world and those around us better for our stay here, for every mite counts in the Father's eyes. The many seem so ready to criticise the few who are working to purify all government. It reminds one of Mayor Weir's remark in regard to Chancellor Canfield's resignation. He was glad to be out of office, for the people were sure to lay the Chancellor's movement to the Mayor's social reform. Surely this municipal reform is a duty "unto the least of these." As Stead might say: "Do you suppose that if Christ came to our city he would for a moment tolerate the looseness of manner in which the unfortunate ones of the Father are treated?" Jesus might say: "I am the Son of God. I come from my Father to help in the uplifting of my brothers, the children of men. So are ye all sons of God, therefore ye have the same burden on your shoulders that I bear, the care of *your* brothers, the children of men." When one thinks of this, one thinks that all politics (for these parties have in a measure the freedom and happiness of the weaker portion in their hands) these politics *should be questions of right and wrong.* This Civic Federation is certainly a question of right and wrong. If all parties should take for their motto: "Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy," the country and Government would be revolutionized.

Now, if this *is* a question of right

and wrong, where should it be advocated? In the homes are excellent places, but few of the parents seem to be enlightened on the subject. On the street corners? Here the utter publicity detracts from the sacredness of the preaching of a moral question. Where, then, in all the world, should a question so directly in the line of our daily struggle to "be perfect, even as our Father in heaven is perfect," be preached or discussed save in the temple dedicated to Him for His loving kindness to us?

What is a church for? This is a very large question. Shall it be, as our friend before spoken of, thought, a place for quiet and rest out of the busy life of the week. This is truly an idea welcome to most of us, and I sometimes falter in my decision that this is not the highest *mission* of a church. To go on the Sabbath to a place where the minister quietly philosophises on the conditions of our souls, and we can throw off our whole moral responsibility for awhile, this is very restful. But look at it another way. We all live in a live, wide-awake world. *It is our business to be wide awake*; to seek truth in all manners and all places. Who so feels this way wishes to hear a sermon alive with the application of our religion to our daily duties. The best way to worship our Master is to find, or seek to find, the true way in all things, then act upon this way, and we shall be accepted, I know.

Our religion—what is it for? Is it to go to the place of worship on Sunday, to take an active part in the service, to attend the mission societies and all other church formations? Is it to seek to *convert souls* merely to get them to help the church? Is it to help in church fairs and entertainments merely to enrich the church by getting a new carpet or the like? I think it is not simply these things that make religion. It is the taking of the Christ for a model for our every-day behavior. As I have before said, what more than politics needs this element of the Christ