

nor their Governments, we venture to say, ever suspected themselves of such deep designs, or took credit for a policy so astute and far sighted, as that ascribed to them by the New England orator. Canadians had supposed that in taking steps to protect their in-shore fisheries, and to enforce the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, they were simply exercising the natural right of every people to guard their own property. They must now be surprised to learn that the preservation of their fisheries has been but a secondary and comparatively unimportant consideration, and that what they have really been aiming at is to contract within the narrowest possible limits the naval training ground of the neighbouring Republic, to enlarge their own in like proportion, and to compel the people of the United States to contribute for the development of the British and Canadian navy, by becoming purchasers of Canadian-caught fish, and thus aiding their "only possible enemy," to support a naval school "in comparison with which Annapolis or Greenwich is quite unimportant." Such an harangue suggests a curious question in psychology. When a politician of the character and capacity of Senator Hoar wishes, for partisan purposes, to enunciate such views with all due solemnity, does he first dragoon himself into the belief that he actually believes the things he is about to utter, or does he soothe and cajole his conscience by some subtle moral casuistry until he is persuaded that the misrepresentation is harmless or justified by political exigencies? Whatever may be the true explanation of the phenomenon, it is well, in the interests of peace and good neighbourhood, that the antidote to such mischievous perversion is so soon and so effectively administered in the Senate, in calm, sensible and logical addresses, such as that of Senator George which followed.

THE attempt which is being made in certain Republican quarters in the United States to stir up prejudice against President Cleveland on the ground of his "numerous vetoes of measures for pension relief," is likely not only to fail of its purpose, but to rebound to the advantage of the Democrats in the campaign. The manner and spirit in which President Cleveland is carrying out the Pension Act shew him at his best, as a sturdy, uncompromising, and courageous administrator, a lover of honesty and justice. The reasons attached to the various vetoes are so cogent that only the most prejudiced or the most sceptical can fail to be convinced that they were wise and right. In several cases it is clearly shown that to have granted the pension would have been to sanction an unjust discrimination against thousands equally as well entitled to receive it as the applicant. In other cases the evidence of fraudulent intent is clear and unmistakable. For example in one instance the Act vetoed was made to relieve a pensioner of 1812 by increasing his pension from \$8 to \$20 a month. But the President says that only a month before application was for reimbursement of expenses attending the sickness, death, and burial of this same soldier, and was acted upon by the proper officers. The evidence of hostility to veterans which can be elicited from such vetoes is not likely to prove very damaging to Mr. Cleveland in the eyes of those of the American people who admire uprightness and hate fraud.

THE movement for the further restriction of immigration in the United States seems to be making headway. Among significant utterances of prominent men, those of Mayor Hewitt, of New York, and George William Curtis have attracted considerable attention. Mayor Hewitt points out that whereas in former times people flocked to the country to escape foreign oppression, a large proportion of those who are now coming in are brought in by corporations and are practically serfs. The national danger is largely increased by the fact that not only the labour but the votes of such can be purchased very cheaply. He urges that no man be given the franchise who cannot read and write, which is a reasonable proposition. But when he goes further and contends that no foreigner should be given it until he has been in the country fourteen or twenty-one years he is surely becoming extreme and undemocratic, though it must be confessed that recent statistics, showing the overwhelming preponderance of foreign born voters in New York and elsewhere, are alarming and call for precautionary measures. Mr. Curtis pitches eloquent and fervid words of warning to the same key. The nation, he declares, is imperilled "by the ignorant, lawless, idle and dangerous overflow of other countries." "A miscellaneous multitude, sprung of many nations, without a common heart to vibrate instinctively to common memories and associations, would lack that supreme patriotism which is the moral defence of the nations. Let us beware, then, how we water our life blood." All this may not be uncalled for, or unwise, but it is very different from the spirit in which the great Republic formerly welcomed all comers, confident in its power not

only to absorb but to assimilate the largest possible inflow of foreign elements. Truth to say, it has hitherto succeeded, to a wonderful extent, in doing so.

As we anticipated, Sir Morell Mackenzie emphatically denies having made any such ill-advised statements as those ascribed to him, in reference to his knowledge of the cancerous nature of the late Emperor's malady. His present rôle of silence is a wise one. It would have been better for the dignity of the profession, and of those distinguished members of it who have put their names to the report recently published at the German capital, had all who had to do with the treatment of the deceased monarch observed the same reticence. Such a display of professional, or national, jealousy—the public will not be slow, and can hardly be astray, in ascribing the report to one or the other of those sources—on the part of men so eminent, is a surprise and a humiliation to all concerned. The points in dispute are such as, in the nature of the case, can neither be proved nor disproved, and, hence, should not be made subjects of assertion. In a matter in which life, especially the life of so important a personage, was at stake, the balance of judgment will always incline to the side of the more cautious and conservative treatment. As to the highly sensational reports concerning the alleged surveillance of the bereaved Empress, and the nature of the disclosures which she is supposed to hold in reserve, the sceptical attitude is probably the wiser, though it must be admitted that the manner in which the Imperial palace was undoubtedly guarded for several hours after Frederick's death was a singular and suspicious circumstance. The public will have to await developments with what patience it can. It may be long before it can be definitely known what embers of fact underlie the smoke-clouds of sensational rumour which just now fill the atmosphere about the Prussian Court.

THE majority and minority reports of the Royal Educational Commission appointed by the British Government are likely to afford matter for earnest discussion for many months to come. On many points—such as those relating to the supply of schools, school management and inspection, manual and technical instruction, etc.—the Commissioners are in essential agreement. Some of the recommendations of the Majority Report are of special importance, e.g., those relating to the need of providing better accommodation for the children, including a proper "amount of air and space, suitable premises, airiness and lightness of site, and a reasonable extent of playground;" to the fixing of teachers' salaries, providing larger staffs, better means of training, etc. The two burning questions are the granting of aid to denominational schools out of the rates, and the development of religious teaching in the Board Schools. On these points the sharp division of opinion amongst the members of the Royal Commission is but the foreshadowing, or rather the reflection, of a similar division amongst educationists and the public generally. On these points the dissentient minority of the commissioners, including Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Lyulph Stanley, Dr. Dale and five of their colleagues, could not bring themselves into line with the majority of fifteen, and as the views of the minority will be warmly and influentially supported, there is every probability of a renewal, at an early day, of the bitter disputes that accompanied the passing of the Act of 1870. There can be little doubt that the complete secularization of the whole system of State education alone can afford the basis of a lasting peace, but the subject is hampered with so many complications that this outcome still lies probably far in the future.

THE Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce has taken alarm at the International Copyright Act now before the United States Congress, and calls on the British Government to enter into communication with that of the United States with a view to securing an arrangement worthy of the name international. The object is certainly a good one though the time is probably unpropitious. Edinburgh is specially interested in the American measure now proposed, which, by giving English authors a right of property in their own books when published in the States only on condition that the books shall be printed from type set up there, threatens to put the craft of the English, and Scotch printers in danger. The effect of this Act, it is thought, would be that the English author, being already protected in his own country, and being anxious to take advantage of the security offered in the United States, would send all his manuscript to be printed there, and would thence supply the English as well as the American market. As the proposed Act can scarcely find favour with American authors whom it leaves subject to competition in their own market with the influx of cheap English literature, and as it can scarcely be acceptable to the reading