

And on his face the light, is Galahad.
The one so like a lily is Elaine,
And he whose heart is like a heavenly flame,
Whose beauty is the radiance of the pure,
Whose shield is blazoned with a cross of gold,
Who rides the nearest after him they mourn
And always has been nearest to his heart,
Is Arthur, Engalnds' first and purest knight ;
There at the end, borne to the ground with
grief,
Is (Guinevere, the gentle Arthur's Queen,
Who lost the poet's love because she erred
And was not pure as he had made her fair.
The others are not less his children too,
Gereth, Lynette, the Princess, Launcelot,
And all the numerous, bright, imagined train
That mourn, refusing to be comforted,
Because he nears the limit of the world
And goes to join the friend whose death he
sang.

Those who thus weep for him upon the hills
Are they who knew his children and himself,
And from them drew an inspiration pure
Which filled to overflow their lesser lives
With such great strength of purpose high and
fixed

As raised them to a fellowship with God."
He ceased, and as I watched the scene with
awe,

Slow onward, steadfastly, with weary feet,
He made his way down to the dark-rimmed
sea

Where break the formless waves upon the
strand

With noise, like whispers spoken in the dark.
A ship lay anchored there amid the gloom,
No pinnacle, but a tall and stately ship,
As built to bear across the gathered flood
A mighty spirit. Those upon the land
Stood still with baited breath in reverence
And even forgot to weep as, filled with awe,
They listened for the last thing he would say,
The gloom was great, but as he stood erect
Upon the lofty deck, his eye fixed strong
Upon the density that lay before,
The moonlight broke the cloud and bathed his
brow,

Serene and calm, in gentle silvery light,
While from his lips there fell these words of
faith :

"I hope to see my pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar."

Hamilton. STUART LIVINGSTON.

CHRISTIAN UNITY IN TORONTO.

The recent joint meeting of the Ministerial Association and the Anglican Clerical Association for the discussion of Christian Unity was in many respects a great success. There was a large attendance on both sides, the spirit of harmony and peace prevailed, whilst the expression of widely divergent views was received with a courtesy that would have vastly astonished a fifth century bishop had he been there to see. The paper read by the Provost of Trinity College was pervaded with a genuine unction, which must have deeply impressed the meeting, and attuned the minds of his hearers to the proper pitch necessary to the discussion of topics of such momentous import.

That the public is year by year growing more interested in the subject is manifest from the frequent references to it in the secular press, and by the excellent reports of the present meeting in the Toronto papers, especially in *The Globe*. Indeed the laity are beginning to take the matter into their own hands, as the recent article in *The Week*, by "Fidelis" clearly shows. The movement is common to all denominations and classes of the community. The High Churchman and the Low Churchman, the dogmatic theologian and the practical layman are agreed that if it even had a mission, sectarianism has accomplished it and that in many ways the

present divisions are a hindrance to the cause of Christianity. Indeed, it is probable that in not a few cases the explicit unbelief often based upon, or supported by the discordant voices of those "who profess and call themselves Christians" and the general uncertainty amounting to implicit unbelief, of whose existence within the churches the clergy are only too well aware, have largely contributed to moderate "the din of battle" and to cause men to lay greater emphasis upon common faith and less upon minor differences. As Dr. Langtry well said, "It is a suicidal thing that we should be found in this condition (arrayed in hostile camps) when the great enemy of all righteousness is manifestly marshalling his forces on every field, if not for a final assault, yet for the most subtle, cunningly devised, widespread and perilous attack that has ever been made upon the faith of the Gospel."

The preliminary question as to the desirableness of some bond of unity, being then practically settled, the question as to the way in which it can be realized next demands attention. The famous Lambeth articles, have been very freely discussed in America, with the result that of the four propositions, three could be almost universally accepted, whilst the fourth "the historic Episcopate" alone blocks the way. It may well seem to many that this difficult question is insoluble. The High Churchmen say it belongs to the "esse" of the church. The Low Churchman to the "bene esse". The Bishop of Gloucester and the Bishop of Winchester both Low Churchmen, have recently spoken adversely to any yielding or compromising of Anglican principles in this respect. But those who consider the wonderful progress that has been made in the last 40 or 50 years, will not despair that time will furnish a solution even of this problem.—The subject of the constitution of the Christian Church and especially of the ministry, absorbed the attention of the late meeting.—Dr. Langtry again enunciated the views which he has so often expounded in letters and sermons. Whilst the Principal of Wycliffe College is we suppose for once in perfect accord with Dr. Langtry in saying that: "The root or fundamental question is, what really is the Church of Jesus Christ?" Should the meeting result in a newspaper correspondence, it would be well for the disputants to stick closely to some such broad question as this and write with a view to making clear their various positions, rather than with controversial intent.

It must be confessed that the meeting made no contribution to the solution of the questions they discussed. Dr. Grant showed the uncompromising attitude of the Baptists, and the Anglicans reiterated the absolute necessity of the Episcopate—nor is this surprising. The subject of the Ministry is really one for experts, men who have given years of careful study to the Bible and early church history. And as every one knows, there is a considerable disagreement between the authorities. All have the same facts but very different conclusions are drawn from them. In the Anglican Church alone there are three distinct views, viz.: Those of the High, the Low and the Broad Church schools. Within the last few years each of these has been expounded by a master hand, viz. Mr. Love, the Dean of Norwich, and the late lamented Dr. Hatch, respectively. The

two former have brought down to date the old views of their respective parties, but Dr. Hatch made a decidedly new contribution to the subject; and all further helpful discussion must take into account the new facts and interpretations which he advanced to explain the development of the ministry in the early days of the Church. Outside of the Anglican Church contributions have been made to the subject by Rev. Dr. Cunningham, Rev. Dr. Rigg, and others. There is, therefore, a danger lest in confining the discussion of unity to what might be called its doctrinal aspects the results should be a barren interchange of the various views of the Ministry. Would it not, therefore, be well that at the next meeting more practical subjects should be brought forward. It is scarcely possible to doubt that in a large city like Toronto the really unanimous action of the clergy would have beneficial effects in the spheres of temperance, social and charitable reform. Why should not standing committees be formed, consisting of members of the Ministerial and Clerical associations for the purpose of arranging meetings from time to time for the discussion of special topics and to act as an executive for carrying out any resolutions that might be passed. It does not appear to me that either the Baptists, or High Anglicans would in the least degree be compromising their principles by such action. Nor if the proceedings of such service were carefully drawn up and agreed upon by all, does it seem impossible that some united demonstration of the spirit of unity now prevailing should be made. A public service of this kind in Toronto would convince all the world of the sincerity of our motives, and would largely tend to soften the occasional asperities of denominationalism of necessity more obvious and painful in small towns and country districts.

Asbburnham.

HERBERT SYMONDS.

PARIS LETTER.

The trial of the Panama Canal ex-directors will last nearly three weeks. The indictment, limited to two counts, fraud and abuse of confidence, represents a mass of documents weighing 22 cwts., and now for the first time given to publicity. The journals have thus an immense stock of scandals and surprises wherein to pick and choose. Their investigations must secure the revelation of the innermost history of the leviathan swindle and its ricochet corruptions. As the public prosecutor is in possession of documents establishing the culpability of the accused, the latter's defence is to blurt out all the villainies, make a clean breast of the iniquities and rely for absolution on the fact that the Suez Canal enterprise had been conducted on the same lines of soaping and misrepresentation as has been that of the Panama scheme. The present trial is independent of that the accused in question must undergo for bribery and corruption of legislators and public functionaries.

France has thus anything but a pleasant year before her. The name Panama now suggests the Lernean Hydra, the Beast of the Apocalypse. At its mention women make the sign of the cross and children hide. The country has made up its mind that come weal, come woe, it will penetrate to the lowest depths of Panamism. However, circumspection is necessary, lest in the rage for purification France may be