

in "the reign of love and fraternity." According to Ernest Renan: "Our century has created a material stock of tools which have been more and more improved; but it has not taken into consideration that, for handling such tools, a certain degree of morality, conscience, and abnegation is necessary.' Instead of appealing to the cupidity of mankind by holding out expectations of a common share in a redistribution of wealth, why not correct the faults and encourage the virtues of the proletariat, to the end that they may exercise aright the privileges and the responsibilities of that full citizenship into which they have now entered?

The counsel of perfection has been eloquently offered by Professor Henry Jones. It is ideal enough to satisfy Mr. Keir Hardie; yet it is sufficiently practical to commend itself to the sober judgment of Labour in the House of Commons:

We have been teaching rights; henceforth we have by precept and practice to teach duties; and of all these duties most of all the duty of sanctifying our daily sphere of ordinary labour. We have been teaching charity; but charity must become justice yet—not in the way of partitioning goods, but of rightly appraising services. To both master and man the social reformer must teach that every industry in the land is meant to be a school of virtue.

Here is a social gospel of sanity and hope. And those of little faith in the ability of conservative England to resist Socialism in a flood may at least take heart from the fact that such counsels of moderation, good sense, and high morality had general acceptance even in the last remarkable plebiscite of a thoroughly roused people, and have since plainly influenced the Parliamentary policy of Labour.

HUGH W. STRONG.