CHURCH ATTENDANCE

SURVEY of South and Centre Winnipeg reveals the fact that a great many people, even though they express preference for certain denominations, do not attend church anywhere. It is interesting and instructive to search out the reasons for this.

There are some who openly say that the church has nothing for them in its teaching or its practice, that the preachers seem to be living in another world, drawing their lessons from books rather than from life, and that the members do not seem to be more godly, more righteous in any way, than the men they meet from day to day. In other words these people who talk in this way have lost confidence in the organization as it is, and so they leave it alone. That is undoubtedly the wrong attitude, since if the church can be a helpful organization it is the duty of men to unite with it and keep it pure and active. Because some members are inconsistent, well disposed people should not keep away. That is only playing into the hands of the enemy.

There are some who say the church is to-day a capitalistic institution, that it dare not teach what its founder taught—the Brotherhood of Man and the Golden Rule. This is not true, of course, but it is a misfortune that some of the churches are so rich in their appointments and so exclusive in their membership that there seems to be in them no place for the poor man and the plainly-dressed woman. The paid pews and all that go with them are forbidding to men and women with a sense of independence.

There are some who say they have little use for any one-man concern, that they prefer to unite with an institution that gives them an opportunity to say something and do something. This is a proper attitude. The chief duty of a pastor is to direct the activities of his people. He should by no means do their work for them. Every church member should be a minister. Unfortunately many who attack the church on this ground are very careful that they never associate themselves with any philauthropic organization.

This leads to the conclusion that their are some in every community that do not attach themselves to churches because they have no room in their hearts for the woes and sufferings of other people. They will accept no responsibilities beyond those of the family. They are so wrapped up in their own affairs that they have no room in their hearts for God or Man. The real function of the Church is to arouse this great feeling of responsibility—to lift the individual to the species, to harmonize his will with the Will of God.

The last class of objectors worth noting comprises those who have affiliated themselves with some other organization than the church—a fraternal body or a trades union or a class brotherhood or something of the kind. Or it may be that they have so closely indentified themselves with their own business that they have no room for other thoughts. They cannot understand nor sympathize with the doctrine that "one can save his life only by losing it in the lives of others." They never know the bigger world and they can not understand those who are attempting to find it.

Notwithstanding the fact that so many keep aloof from the church, it is still the greatest force for righteousness that is in the world to-day. Christ was the first great Socialist. His doctrines and His practice were of the kind that will save mankind from self-destruction and degradation, and there is no substitute for the organization He set up to develop the feeling of brotherhood and teach the relationship of Man to His Maker.

THE REMOTE REGIONS

HE one class of people who have to endure hardships and privations are the settlers in outlying districts. The disadvantages are many and not the least of them is the fact that it is difficult to arrange for the education of the children. Few in numbers they have to pay a heavy local school tax in order to get a teacher. The teacher is usually of low grade-for it is natural that the best teachers should accept positions where there are greater social advantages. Nor can the teachers, such as they are, be obtained for less money than others with higher qualifications. One will naturally work for a thousand dollars in the town when she would refuse twelve hundred in the backwoods. This points to the necessity of rearranging school appropriations so as to make it possible for pioneers to educate their children. The children of the pioneers are as valuable to the state as children in the thickly-settled districts. As a rule they are even rugged and possess more individuality. They are, above all, the people that should be cared for. The last word in distribution of public aid to schools has not been spoken.

oved

ctly

Editorial

HIRED HELP

girls to act as housemaids? Any one who examines into the conditions under which they are often compelled to work will understand how they must wish to fly to other occupations. Yet, there are few classes of people who do so much to add to the happiness and welfare of society, and they are needed at some time or other in almost every family whether in stown or country. It is quite appropriate, therefore, that their peculiar problem should be considered.

Why should the work of looking after the home be considered less honorable than that of salesgirl or office worker? Why should a housemaid have longer hours than any other worker? Why should she be referred to as Mary or Bridget rather than as Miss Brown or Miss Black? Why should she have to do her courting in the back lane, and why should she be denied all social privileges? Why should she, as the hardest worker in the home, have the worst room and the least opportunity for culture? In the days of our mothers the household helper was a member of the family. Except when it was advantageous to have it otherwise she was treated just like the other members of the household. She sat at breakfast table, used the livingroom in the evenings, joined in the family worship, and even on occasion went to the community dances. No one expects just that to-day, especially in larger city homes. Division of labor has caused divisions in society—even within the family itself. But there is no reason why the spirit of the old times should not be preserved.

There is another side to this whole question. The servant girl will find her position altered as soon as she becomes a recognized expert in her work. If training schools could be organized and certificates of efficiency given, and standards of excellence guaranteed, things would be very much better. It is not very satisfactory for a mother to pay thirty or fifty dollars to a helper and find that she can not keep house, nor cook, nor look after children. If on the one side the maid expects social recognition, opportunity for culture, privilege of entertaining the young man, short hours and the like, on the other side the mistress expects some ability to perform the duties of the home. The calling requires standardization. Everyone should read the article on this subject in another column.

Now that there are might schools for all classes of people, why not open up a night school for domestic help? There is no class in the community more useful and none requires greater consideration.

AMERICAN INCONSISTENCY

HOSE who have read the life of Abraham Lincoln will remember that his great doctrine was "The Union must be preserved." In a letter of Dec. 17, 1860, he said to Thurlow Weed: "My opinion is, that no state can in any way lawfully get out of the Union without the consent of the others; and that it is the duty of the President and other government functionaries to run the machine as it is." That is just the position Lloyd George takes to-day on the Irish question. His bill may be right or wrong, but he is going to preserve the Union. Why should Americans of 1920 differ from Americans of 1860?

GOOD ROADS

because they are necessary to transportation of farm commodities and a convenience to travel. They are necessary to social progress of all kinds. Without them good schools are impossible and church attendance greatly reduced. They cost money to build and keep in repair, but they increase the value of all the property through which they pass. Everything that saves time and labor and which eases the strain on men and animals is worth striving for. The decision of the Western Provinces to continue the policy of road-building in a large and comprehensive way is worthy of all commendation.

AFTER THE WAR

T is very natural that France and Belgium should view movements in Germany with a degree of fear and suspicion. They have ample reason to feel alarmed. It is very natural, too, that a country which is actuated by strong political feeling should fail to perceive the world-significance of its actions. If we do not have further trouble, it is not because national fear and

national jealousy have not done their utmost to bring about a repetition of horrors. Our own duty in the matter seems to be very clear. We shall not lose our national ambition but we shall remember that our success is dependent upon world-peace and world-peace is impossible unless the thought of humanity is concurrent with the thought of nationality. When a man is so intensely patriotic that he never considers any country but his own it is pretty certain that he is a poor type of patriot.

FREE DISCUSSION

N an article in the Journal of Commerce, Dr. J. M. MacMillan in discussing the eighthour problem lays down a few principles that should guide discussion of all problems affecting labor. He says:

In a democracy the path to public opinion lies through free discussion. And law is worth little unless it represents the crystallization of public opinion. There are quite a number of sides to the question. It has a medical side, in which the effects of fatigue upon general predisposition to disease, as well as to nervous diseases, infectious diseases, and liability to accident should be considered. It has a civic side, for it is well that the uncrowned kings who govern through the ballot should have time and energy allowed them for the deliberate study of national issues. It is the overworked and ignorant labor "masses" who are liable to be stampeded by the hot gospeller of some violent radicalism. It has an ethical side, for the hours of labor bear on the drinking habits of the workers, and open or shut the door on wholesale recreations, which are antidotes to vice. On the economic side there is not only the question of amount of production but of its quality, and the question of the regularity of work as well as of the amount of it provided on any one day. And, back of all, is the question of morale, the mental attitude of the worker to his work.

THE LATEST COMEDY

ERE is how "The Nation" presents the Comedy of Kaiser and Constantinople.

1. Mr. George prepared to hang the Kaiser and his generals and the French agreed.

2. He next got ready to drive out the Turks, bag and baggage, and the French hotly dissented.

3. He changed his mind about the Kaiser and generals and the French objected to his changing his mind.

4. The French allow him to change his mind about the Kaiser and generals on condition that he changes it also about the Turks.

5. In the final scene the rope which should have hanged the Kaiser pulls the drowning Sultan safely to dry land.

AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA

N the minds of people generally the word Russia calls up a picture of Bolshevism. Yet Bolshevism is not the greatest force in Russia. It is endured by the Russian people for the time being, and that is all. The Supreme Council in Paris in its dealings with Russia has recognized this fact, and the happenings of the present time all indicate a change in internal management, whereby the will of the government will harmonize with the will of the people.

The greatest force in Russia is that known as the Co-operators. The various societies under this heading include in their membership 20 000,000 heads of families—not far from 100,000,000 individuals. They co-operate for purposes of production and consumption. Seventy per cent of the people belong to the organizations.

How does it come about then that they tolerate a political party that is opposed to its fundamental interests? Co-operation rests on the free will of voluntary members, whereas Bolshevism rests on compulsion. One acts through economic competition, the other through legislative decrees. One is based on the thought of people as consumers, the other on the thought of the people as workers. How can the

majority tolerate the rule of the minority?

And how can an army which is led by anti-Bolshevistic leaders be true to a leader like Lenine?

Even the rank and file of the Russian army are not committed to Lenine's theory of government. How

do they tolerate his political authority?

The answer is very simple. They all take the stand that they will support any government that opposes the invasion of Russia by foreign soldiers.

That is why the Allies have withdrawn from Russia. They cannot act with Bolshevism, but they can enter into trade relations with the great majority of the Russian people, who are as opposed to Bolshevism as the Allies themselves—but for a different reason.

Co-operation is consistent with loyalty to one's land. Bolshevism ignores boundaries and aims at world-wide civilization. There is no doubt but that the Co-operators will take control when circumstances point the way.