

rulers of this and other cities learn the lesson so often pressed upon them by the intelligent policeman, as well as by the thoughtful philanthropist, and provide ample spaces where the children of the street and the gutter may play without dread or danger? Can any one, who has given thought to the matter, doubt that to give the boys facilities for harmless play, at whatever cost, would be to make one of the best paying investments, to put it on the low ground of financial results, that could be made of civic funds? Watching and catching and punishing culprits, young and old, are expensive operations. Will not some city or community some day become wise enough to try the experiment of prevention, thoroughly and systematically? Free play-grounds would be but one of the several agencies necessary in a system of prevention; but it would be a most important and indispensable one.

A GOOD deal of very natural indignation has been aroused in Newfoundland by the part the commanders of British warships have taken in the fishery disputes with the French. It is exasperating enough for the native fishermen to be forcibly prevented by the foreigners from fishing in their own waters, or preparing lobsters for market on their own shores. But when to such injury is added what appears to them the insult of having the British officers to whom they appeal for protection take the side of their oppressors, and enforce the claims of the latter to the extent of closing, at their request, lobster-canning factories belonging to British subjects, it is no wonder that the aggrieved islanders feel that their loyalty is being subjected to a pretty severe strain. Even British colonists, when they see or think they see their territorial rights invaded and their means of livelihood taken away, cannot be expected to reason very coolly about the obligations of treaties, old or new. A little reflection, however, should make it clear that the British officers themselves are not to blame. They are under strict orders and have nothing to do but obey their instructions. Sir Baldwin Walker, Captain of the warship *Emerald*, pointed this out in an interview reported in late Newfoundland papers. The Captain says, rightly enough from his official point of view, that he ignores all past treaties and is guided simply by the terms of the *modus vivendi*, which is to govern operations this year pending negotiations for a final settlement of the dispute. The real cause of the present acute trouble is in this temporary agreement, which seems to have been made, not only, contrary to a promise of the British Government, without consulting the Island authorities, but also without any due regard to the rights and interests of the Newfoundland fishermen. That the *modus vivendi* is an unwise, not to say unjust, arrangement seems evident from the fact that, while the representative of the Government in the House of Commons affirms that the Government does not admit the French claims in regard to the lobster fisheries, in this temporary arrangement it is, Captain Walker tells us, expressly stated that no lobster factories erected after July 1, 1889, shall be allowed to work until the year expires and the negotiations are finished. Every one knows how difficult it is to cancel a concession that has once been formally made and temporarily acted upon. It is to be devoutly wished that the pending negotiations may lead to a satisfactory settlement before the close of the period of truce, but it cannot be said that the outlook is just now promising. Captain Walker thinks that the whole Newfoundland story has been greatly exaggerated, but it is easy to understand that, what may appear to him as a very trifling affair may be one almost of life or death to thousands of poor fishermen. Colonial difficulties often appear small to British statesmen and officials. But that which is relatively small may be of vast importance to those who suffer by it. Captain Walker seems disposed to try to intimidate the Newfoundlanders into submission by the obscure but ominous hint that the less said on the French shore matters, pending negotiations, the better for them, a remark which, by the way, is but a left-handed compliment to the British Government. The experience of the people of Newfoundland and other colonies is not likely to incline them to the view that meek silence is the surest way to guard against a surrender of their rights.

CONGRESS having called upon the President of the United States for the documents showing the progress of the Behring Sea negotiations up to date, the public will soon know the present state of the controversy, so far as it has been carried on by an exchange of written communications. As the interchange of views between the British and American Governments seems to have been

carried on mainly by personal interviews between Sir Julian Pauncefote and Mr. Blaine, it is not likely that the publication of the papers called for will make us much the wiser, unless they should be supplemented by a statement of the tenor of those personal interviews. This can, for obvious reasons, scarcely be expected. Indeed, unless such statement were endorsed by both parties, it would have only the weight of an *ex parte* narrative. Notwithstanding press rumours, we may safely accept Sir Julian Pauncefote's assurance that nothing of a threatening or belligerent nature has taken place, and that the seemingly interminable process of diplomatic fencing is still being carried on in a friendly spirit. There seems pretty good reason, however, to believe that a certain element of danger was imported into the controversy by the ill-advised proposal of the American Executive to continue the audacious policy which has been so quietly acquiesced in previous years, in Behring Sea, and that only the decided tone of the British Government led to a reconsideration of the instructions originally given to the revenue cutters which were on their way to do police service in the open sea. We are glad to believe that Mr. Blaine has shown a higher quality of statesmanship by preventing the repetition of the outrages which have caused so much irritation in the past, and which there is reason to hope the British Government will no longer permit. The peculiar unreason which is characteristic of certain classes of American politicians and newspapers is, we are sorry to see, not wanting in this case. What, for instance, can be more illogical than the position taken by Ex-Governor Hoadly, of Ohio, as defined in the *Detroit Free Press*? To begin with the blunt and emphatic statement that "the United States Government is wholly in the wrong from first to last;" to follow this with the assurance that the speaker believes "in strict justice and right in all intercourse between nations," and then to declare that he would "never stoop to advocate anything in the way of backing down," and that, though the country "has simply been treated with remarkable forbearance by the other great nations of the earth," yet "this is not the time for backing water," and "right or wrong we must fight it out on the policy that has been adopted," is surely a remarkable course of reasoning. We fear that it is not wholly peculiar to American politicians. Unhappily the motto, "Our country, right or wrong," has too often been adopted by patriots of other nationalities; we have heard such utterances even in Canada, but we do not think it would, in modern times, be declared with so much frankness by one having any claim to be considered a representative man of any other country. In a somewhat similar spirit the *New York Tribune* complains that "a certain quality of menace" has appeared in the later tones of the British Premier, although, so far as appears, the only shadow of foundation for such a statement is that Lord Salisbury may have signified his intention of protecting British vessels from capture and confiscation on the high seas. If this taking of an attitude so purely defensive is to be construed as a menace, it is difficult to see what course other nations can pursue in their relations to the United States, save that of unquestioning submission to whatever outrage the latter may see fit to inflict upon their subjects. It is to be hoped that the higher qualities of American character and statesmanship may yet assert themselves, and enable the Republic to rise to that true dignity, which makes a nation, like an individual, just as ready to admit a wrong or withdraw from a false position, as to defend the right at all hazards.

EVIL, if not always the perversion of good, is at least oftener than that something with a distinct, independent existence. The tendency to extremes is the bane of every form of pleasure. This law of perversion is in danger in these days of receiving a deplorable illustration in the matter of athletics, especially college athletics. It is well that the heads of colleges and other leaders of educational thought are coming forward to protest against the demoralizing extremes to which the cultivation of athletics is being carried in colleges. There can be no doubt, whatever, of the salutary effect the modern revival of athletic games in school and college has had upon the physique, and consequently upon the brain power and executive ability of American students. A time is within the recollection of many when the typical student was a lank, sallow specimen of humanity, whose frame had been attenuated to a shadow and deprived of every indication of manly robustness, as was supposed, by the fierce burning of the fires of intellect within, in reality by the neglect of nature's demands in the matters of food, exercise and sleep. Happily the days of this delusion are past, it is to be

hoped forever. But unhappily there has come in its place, especially in American colleges again, the opposite extreme, of the worship of brawn, the apotheosis of sport. The physical giant, with muscles developed like whipcords, is no nearer the true manly ideal, than the flabby, nerveless, spectral victim of mental as well as physical dyspepsia. Nor is it easy to conceive of an occupation much less worthy the study and devotion of a human being than that of the professional player of games. Dr. Fairburn, of Mansfield College, in a recent address at a school anniversary, spoke some ringing and truthful words on the subject. He sometimes thought that athletic sports were in danger of becoming the ruin of nobler ideals and higher ambitions. He enjoyed the eights at Oxford as much as any man. He liked to see a cricket match, and he even played lawn tennis itself in the decent and dignified way that became his years. He would say nothing to discourage the higher athletics. But nothing was so vulgar, so shabby, so much the mark of the worst sort of "smug," as the excessive devotion of men and boys to field sports. This excessive devotion to field sports is becoming the ruin of many a young man, who might but for it have large possibilities of future usefulness before him. The evil has not yet attained dangerous dimensions in Canada, but there is some reason to fear the spread of the infection. In the United States colleges it has become a fruitful source of much that is base and ruinous in morals, as well as of irregularity, excitement and extravagance which are utterly incompatible with true student life and ambition. The faculties of many of the higher institutions across the border have taken alarm, and are uttering strong and ineffective protests. Many of them are now giving much anxious thought to the question, and oscillating, for the most part, between the alternatives of restriction and repression, either of which is found to be impracticable. It may be hoped that our Canadian institutions will continue to apply the principle of prevention, so far as professionalism is concerned, which is both better and easier.

PARNELL, the inscrutable, is again playing fast and loose with the loyalty and devotion of his Home Rule followers. What manner of man is this who has so long managed to maintain absolute ascendancy over the minds and hearts of the excitable Irish patriots, and who yet vouchsafes them so little either of comradeship or confidence? When the true history of the great Irish struggle of the last quarter of the nineteenth century comes to be written, not the least interesting of its pages will be those which deal with the character, views and purposes of this mysterious man. It may be, however, that the veil, hitherto impenetrable, with which he has hitherto succeeded in shrouding his real personality, may yet be torn aside, and he stand revealed, as a patriot or a deceiver—which? The partial revelations of his character, which were made before the High Commission, and in the Commons in connection with the sittings of that court, must have left painful impressions upon the minds of many who had been accustomed to regard him as a man of remarkable unselfishness and singleness of purpose, as well as of very great mental acumen. The latter trait is indeed undeniable, and has been throughout the chief source of his power, though the air of mystery with which he has constantly shrouded his private life has probably contributed a good deal to the effect. But when a public man has once coolly declared himself capable of using falsehood, or exaggeration with all the qualities and effects of falsehood, to gain a temporary end, he must have shaken not a little the foundations of confidence on the part of all admirers who care for truth and honour. But be that as it may, it would seem that the Irish leader has now outdone himself in superciliousness. The manner in which he has, if correctly reported, trampled on the policy, convictions and passions of his Irish followers, and proposed a truce, if not a treaty of peace, with the man whom they regard as the deadliest enemy of Ireland, and whom they hate with a perfect hatred, is simply inexplicable. We wait the sequel with deep curiosity. Can it be that the leader has been so absorbed in other thoughts or pursuits that he is actually ignorant of what has been taking place from day to day in the House? Or has he such contempt for both followers and allies, that he does not deign to notice their work and achievements, but pursues a policy of his own? Conjecture is useless. We can but wait and see what we shall see.

CAN it be that the great Bismarck—great but yesterday—says one-half the querulous and undignified things attributed to him by the interviewers? It must be so,