

trasted the fine ear of Grey. He pointed out to me that, although he wrote 'Robin and Richard,' he did not write 'Richard and Robin,' because it failed to satisfy his ear. When I praised his phrase about the 'stedfast shade' of Saturn 'sleeping on his luminous ring,' he said: 'I am not sure that I ought not to alter it, for I am told now that it is not stedfast and it does not sleep; but contracts and expands.' Professor H. H. Turner, however, informs me that Tennyson's original description is quite sound. He adds that for an astronomer 'Maud' is absolutely dated to the spring of 1854 by the lines about Mars

'As the glow'd like a ruddy shield on the Lion's breast . . .'

"He was by nature very sensitive of criticism. He was, however, very willing to accept it when he thought it sound. . . . What is he to us to-day? In this Oxford volume I quote Oxford's Chancellor: 'He is at least these things: a great artist, a great singer, a great prophet, a great patriot, and a great Englishman.'"

Patriotic Generosity.

Lieut.-Col. Sir Henry Pellatt has again proved his faith and love for the Empire by his abundant works. The sending of his regiment, the Queen's Own, to England for a period of instruction at Aldershot with the British troops quartered there is a piece of unexampled generosity, well worthy of the order-in-Council issued by the Government of the Province in commemoration of the event and of the public approval of the act tendered Sir Henry by the Council of the city of Toronto. Such deeds give living significance to the poetic aspiration of our late laureate, Sir Alfred Tennyson, that we should join "hands across the sea." All honour to Sir Henry Pellatt and to the rank and file of his highly honoured regiment!

THE COMING BI-CENTENARY—A LAST WORD.

Within fifteen days the Bi-centenary will be upon us, and well within a month it will have passed into history, and we seize this opportunity after our fortnight's silence to say a last word. In the first place we would reiterate our reminder that this celebration is one which, while specially originating in, and in a sense representative of the Church in the Maritime Provinces, is of national scope and import, and entirely dependent for its success upon the hearty co-operation of the Canadian Church at large. This is evident from the fact that arrangements have been completed by which every diocese in the Dominion will be officially represented. The list of selected preachers and speakers still further emphasizes this fact. They are representative of every section of the Church with one exception, viz., the Maritime Provinces. It was thought better, we understand, to confine the invited speakers to outsiders, leaving, of course, the home clergy the liberty of taking part in the discussions. This was done, not on account of lack of material, but from exactly the opposite reason. The supply of clergymen and laymen exceptionally qualified to preach and speak on such an occasion was so large that the Committee of Management found it necessary to adopt a sort of "self-denying ordinance," and to exclude from the official programme the names of all Maritime Province Churchmen, clerical or lay. It was a case, to use the French expression, of an "embarrassment of riches." Invidious distinctions could not be made, and so no one was asked. The list of invited preachers and speakers with this one limitation is, however, very widely representative, and includes the Bishops of Glasgow, Washington, Duluth, Ontario, Algoma, the Philippines, London, Montreal, Massachusetts, and many other well-known prelates: The Revs. H. G. Perle, S.P.G. (London), Arthur French (Mont-

real), Canon McNab (Toronto), Principal Rexford (Montreal), Prgbendary Stairs (London), Canon Phair (Winnipeg), Dyson Hague (London, Ont.), Canon Tucker, Dr. Worcester (Boston), Canon Robinson (S.P.G., London), Archdeacon Cody (Toronto), Messrs. Silas McBee (New York "Churchman"), Sir Dyce Duckworth (London), N. W. Hoyles (Toronto), Hubert Carleton, and many others. The Congress, to be held on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, will be incomparably the most important gathering of the kind ever held in connection with the Canadian Church, and possibly with any religious body in the Dominion. To many it will be the opportunity of a lifetime, never to be repeated. There will be a cosmopolitan atmosphere about the Congress which will be uniquely suggestive and inspiring, and which may well be epoch-making in the personal experience and careers of some of our younger clergy. We are quite aware of the fact that comparatively few of our clergy will be able to attend the Congress, but to those fortunate few the possibility may in a sense be termed a duty. It is, indeed, a chance which no one in a position to embrace it can afford to lose. We might suggest that some of our congregations should present their rectors with tickets to Halifax. It would be an excellent investment, and would abundantly repay itself. Then, as we have before pointed out, there is the delightful trip during the pleasantest season of the year to one of the most interesting and attractive regions in the Dominion, which is far too little visited by our Ontario people. The attractions of the Bi-centenary are, indeed, manifold, and we do most sincerely hope that the Church people of the Dominion will for once rise to the occasion and prove themselves worthy of this opportunity for making a corporate demonstration of their affection for and loyalty to the old Church. To no other religious body in the Dominion could such an opportunity offer itself. May we prove equal to it.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIALISM.

It is not difficult to cordially sympathize with those who are strongly impressed with the claims of that many-sided movement, or movements, known collectively as "Socialism." Its aims are so lofty and beneficent, and the urgent need for the radical betterment and transformation of present social conditions is so apparent, that almost any clergyman, who is by the very nature of his office a professional philanthropist, may be pardoned for being strongly tempted to identify himself with it. This, indeed, a number of very prominent and deservedly respected clergymen in England have already done, including "Father" Adderley, the Rev. Percy Dearmer, the Rev. J. Donaldson and others equally well known, and a number of laymen. Now, on general principles, we have nothing whatever to say against the clergy actively interesting themselves in certain public movements. We will go even further and say that it is quite conceivable, though hardly likely, where the clergy would be justified in publicly taking sides on certain political questions. Therefore, in strongly counselling abstinence at present from participation in socialistic agitation on the part of the clergy, we do so with the full and frank recognition of their perfect freedom in the matter. On the merits of the case, however, we are very strongly convinced that at this juncture it is not expedient for the clergy to prominently identify themselves with what is known as "Socialism," and for the following reasons: (1) No one knows what "Socialism" is. Practically, there are almost as many schemes of Socialism as there are leaders, and new ones are springing up day by day, if not mutually contradictory, at all events widely and fundamentally differing. There is the Socialism of certain Continental teachers and leaders which is, fundamentally and essentially, anti-Christian, and which repudiates not

only private property, but marriage and every social institution. Between this extreme form of Socialism, with its sweeping negations of a hundred things inexpressibly dear and sacred to the average civilized Christian man, and the infinitely milder type, which finds its advocates among the clergy, how many degrees and modifications are there? Socialism, therefore, as at present constituted is far too vague and indefinite a cause for a man to intelligently espouse. Changing, as it does, every day, the man who identifies himself with it is apt to find himself landed and stranded in some hopelessly false position from which he will find it extremely difficult to extricate himself. At least, we say, let him wait until the movement has finally declared itself in regard to its fundamental principles. (2) Socialism, or the systems known by that name, are at present, at all events, committed to the fundamentally false principle that human well-being is wholly a matter of material surroundings. It engages to bring about the redemption of mankind by increasing his material comforts and making life easier for him. Now, in a sense, Christianity is committed to this, but only as a means to an end. Christianity certainly strives to ameliorate, and has greatly ameliorated, man's material surroundings. But why? Simply that an environment may be created in which the practice of religion may be rendered reasonably easy. Civilization, unless founded upon this principle; i.e., unless it is infused and inspired with a moral aim, unless it ministers to moral development, inevitably rots and dies. "Where there is no vision (of something spiritual, of something beyond and above) the people die." (3) Socialism has been pronounced by the most competent authorities to be an economic impossibility. According to the greatest thinkers of to-day, it is absolutely unworkable. On this phase of the question we do not propose to take sides, not being or aspiring to be an authority on political economy. But this we do not hesitate to say, that there is enough uncertainty on this head to make the clergy exceedingly cautious about identifying themselves with the movement in its present stage. A scheme economically impossible, and, according to some, unthinkable, cannot be morally right or workable, for, in the last and final analysis, economic and moral law is identical. At the same time, we should be equally indisposed to oppose Socialism. There is much that is beautiful in it. Some of its leading principles are distinctively Christian. At worst, it may be said that it does the right thing in the wrong way. But we find in it in its really most definite and aggressive form a fatal repudiation and reversal of the great principle laid down by the Master, "Man shall not live by bread alone." Socialism seems to say, "Man shall live by bread, and bread alone," and that he will attain his highest destiny and fulfil the chief end and aim of his being by creating a terrestrial paradise and living without God and without hope in the world. There is such a thing, it may be said, as "Christian Socialism." This is true enough, and pray, when was there a time when there wasn't? It is just as true that there has always been such a thing as Puritanism, and, we may add, always will be. But the legal application of Puritanism, whenever tried, has miserably failed. So, as yet, it seems to us, will it be with Socialism.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK.

Spectator's Comments and Notes of Public Interest.

The strained relations which now exist between the Government of Spain and the Vatican is another signal of troublous times ahead for the Roman Catholic Church. France and Italy have already shown that the day of the absolute supremacy of the Roman Church, even as a spiritual guide to the people, is a thing of the past,