

contributed to its production, while sometimes the heart of a millionaire may be smitten with the suspicion that he is absorbing far more than an equivalent for the share which he has contributed to the production of the aggregate wealth.

It is evident, therefore, that the intrinsic nature of gambling connects it with a very wide range of problems in our industrial life. The solution of these problems depends on intellectual and moral improvements in human nature, which a sad experience has taught us not to expect by any short and easy method of passing Acts of Parliament. If the gambling of bucket-shops can be put down by legislation, let us congratulate ourselves on a new legislative victory over crime; but do not let us delude ourselves into the imagination, that men will cease to be gamblers as long as they deem it right or desirable to grab, in the confusing scramble of trade, a larger share of the general wealth of the world than forms a fair equivalent of their own contribution.

J. CLARK MURRAY.

### A SPRING-MORN REVERIE.

O my heart is light,  
For the sky is bright,  
And the voice of my love is near;  
Her joy-laden song,  
All the morning long,  
Has ravished my earth-dulled ear.

And I look on high,  
To scan the blue sky,  
For the form of one long at rest;  
But the lang'rous clouds  
Are mere empty shrouds,  
That mirror no face of the blest.

So I sigh and pray  
All the lagging day,  
And I ask the dear Lord how long  
Till the Master's call  
On my ear shall fall,  
And I mix with the white-robed throng?

But the winds they play  
And mock what I say,  
And the answer ever is vain:  
I hear just the beat  
And feel but the heat  
Of my heart in its strife with pain.

Still the breezes blow,  
And clouds are as snow,  
And the earth lies bright in the sun;  
But my face is worn,  
And my life is lorn,  
While waiting His will to be done.

Yet her voice I hear,  
And her soul is near,  
To solace the heart that is riven;  
So I long and wait  
Till death ope the gate  
And I soar to her side in Heaven.

Toronto, April 21.

CERRER MADA.

### A FEW THOUGHTS ON SOCIALISM.

ALTHOUGH we have been pretty fully sated with the discussion of problems embraced under the comprehensive and ambiguous title of Socialism, it cannot be denied that many of them still seem persistently to defy solution in actual life. Now and then we are furnished with startling evidence that our civilization, for some reason or other, is not proving itself adequate to maintain general harmony. Some of the theories of reform, perhaps, have not been thoroughly tested, and may yet accomplish a great deal that is claimed for them. But there is a growing conviction among many earnest thinkers that important elements of the question have not been duly considered; that the unrest and discontent of the age are not to be dismissed with self-complacent sneer as unfortunate manifestations of human nature; that the honest effort should be made to find out who is responsible for them, and how far and in what way they are open to remedy.

Socialism may be regarded as the latest effort to deal with matters which in some form or other are as old as the human race. Its Protean changes render exact definition impossible, but in its best estate "it means or wishes to mean"—to quote the words of Lowell—"co-operation and community of interests, sympathy, the giving to the hands not quite so large a share as the brains, but a larger share than hitherto, in the wealth they must combine to produce—means, in short, the practical application of Christianity to life, and has in it the secret of an orderly and benign reconstruction." There are, indeed, phases of Socialism in which it is difficult to detect "the practical application of Christianity to life," or the practical application of any other principles than those of

selfishness and malice. We have seen something of the work of the Extremists, and have learned that we cannot reason with them. Accepting the easy doctrine that nothing is true which is disagreeable, and that the sole cause of existing grievances lies in the constitution of society, they openly declare war against every historic institution, and boast that they will build on the ruins of the past a new earth in which every man shall do that which is pleasing in his own eyes. But those blatant demagogues who have startled both continents with their diabolical power must not be allowed to give character to a movement under whose ægis they seek protection. They are but the froth and scum cast up by the troubled social wave, and they owe their importance solely to its volume and energy. Their theories, if put into operation, would soon destroy the Family, the State and the Church, and overwhelm us in the horrors of anarchy. No one has greater cause than the working-man to cry: "Save me from my friends." But Socialism is not necessarily identified with such principles. Its legitimate aim is economic reform, and though there are wide differences of opinion as to the best way of securing it, a Christian Socialist, like Maurice or Kingsley, is not yet an impossibility.

If we heard this word Socialism for the first time, we would not suppose that it could possess the startling significance with which recent history has sometimes invested it. It seems structurally to be on the side of right, and though its present form is a coinage of this century, its root idea recalls those Christian axioms which, while teaching us to seek perfection in another world, emphasize so strongly our mutual responsibilities in the present one. It is a significant fact that a word which promises so well when we first see it should have degenerated and lost caste, until now any one who, without further explanation, bluntly declared that he was a Socialist, would lay himself open to strange suspicions, and in many quarters would be regarded as a dangerous character. If any truth essential to the well-being of mankind fails to find adequate illustration, we are certain sooner or later to see a hideous caricature usurping its place. Correct laws, whether for the individual or society, are not settled by caprice, or selfishness, or mere enactment, but are written in the constitution of our own nature and of the world. Cicero teaches us that "neither the senate nor the people can give us any dispensation for not obeying this universal law of justice. It needs no other expositor and interpreter than our own conscience." But if this law is ignored, it cannot be wondered that mischief should arise, and that more or less violent effort should be made, though perhaps in a foolish and abortive way, if not for the possession of the true rights of man, yet for the shadow and semblance of those rights which neglect and tyranny have in a part destroyed.

There is a good as well as a bad side to the policy of *laissez faire*. Only the most ignorant and foolish will clamour for change simply for its own sake. It is not till the friction of life becomes well-nigh unbearable that the majority of men lose all faith in the present state of things as part of the order of nature. Most of us are constitutionally biassed in favour of conservatism. When, therefore, the hoarse outcry of the mob is supplemented, and in some tones, at least, echoed by the calm voice of earnest thought, the circumstance is too significant to escape attention. We may afford to disregard the unreasoning attitude of the man who sees an enemy in every prosperous citizen; but when intelligence shows signs of revolt against social law and custom, there are grave reasons for alarm. The genesis of much of the socialistic agitation of our day is undoubtedly to be traced to what one writer calls the "unsocialism" which has preceded it. Men have forgotten the reciprocal relation between their rights and their duties, and have demanded a maximum of the one with a minimum of the other. A stable and peaceful community can never be formed in that way. "When every man is his own end," says Coleridge, "all things will come to a bad end." The first axiom of commercial prudence may be to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, but it certainly needs some qualifications if every-day life is to illustrate the golden rule. It is the wildest folly to imagine that one's own rights can ever be obtained by inflicting wrongs on others. If there are any principles of political economy which encourage selfishness and envy and the neglect of duty towards our fellows, they should either suffer amendment, or be called by some less euphonious name.

The watch-word of revolutionary Socialism is that all men are equal. The fallacy of such a dogma scarcely needs to be exposed. It is because men are men, and not machines, that absolute equality is impossible. Even if their position could be equalized to-day, to-morrow by indolence or vice on the one hand, or by thrift and ability on the other, the equality would be destroyed. It is impossible to ignore the significance of personality. Success is not the result of chance, but of the exercise of those qualities which make for success. It is in virtue, not of the equality, but the inequality of men that true Socialism becomes possible. Any thing which unjustly interferes with the realization of the best that is in each member of the state should be removed, if it can be. "Society is barbarous," says Emerson, "until every man can get his living without dishonest practices." Launcelot in Kingsley's *Yeast* thus expresses the duties of the commonwealth: "If any man living in civilized society has one right which he can demand it is this, that the State which exists by his labour should enable him to develop, or, at least, not hinder his developing, his whole faculties to their utmost, however lofty they may be." It is only when individualism becomes one-sided and selfish, and forgets that privilege involves responsibility, that the "social problem" begins to emerge from the midst of the unseemly strife.

There is profound significance in the rule of a great French economist, *Tous les intérêts légitimes sont harmoniques*. The interests of Capital and Labour are an illustration. They stand or fall together. When antagonism seems to exist between them, it simply proves that something is wrong in the construction of the social fabric, or in the mutual attitude of classes.