

danger just now, under the impulse of modern scientific enthusiasm, of over-estimating the force of the former. One fact, for fact we think it must be admitted to be, pointed out by Dr. Daniel Clark the other day, is of very great importance, and has not hitherto been sufficiently taken into the account by those who have spoken and written on the subject. "The law of heredity is," he is reported as saying, "that nature is always fighting back to normal conditions." In other words, we suppose, the hereditary tendency is always towards a restoration of the equilibrium which may have been in some way disturbed in the case of the individual progenitor. This view, which regards nature as enlisted on the side of reform, is full of encouragement to all workers for the physical and moral uplifting of the lapsed masses. It should be the inspiration of all educational and reformatory movements. But we find it hard to reconcile with this view Dr. Clark's opinion that a child older than four years taken from the slums of England would carry the taint of its environment, in any such ineradicable form as should discourage those who are working for the rescue of such. It is noteworthy that several of those who have given evidence before the Commission have condemned the work of such philanthropists as Dr. Barnardo on theoretical grounds, with a positiveness that is in singular contrast with the absence of practical proof, such as, if their doctrines are correct, should by this time be forthcoming in abundance. So far as we are able to gather, the facts are, happily, very much against them. In regard to other matters, such as the futility and worse of sending inebriates, prostitutes and other slaves of vice to prison for a few days or weeks for each offence, and repeating the process again and again, there is a unanimity of opinion on the part of the expert witnesses which can hardly fail to impress itself strongly upon the minds of the Commissioners. May we not hope that this will ultimately lead to the substitution of some more scientific and rational, not to say Christian, system for a mode of treatment which is unworthy of the intelligence of the age?

A GOOD deal of comment has naturally arisen in view of the omission from Lieut. Governor Royal's speech, on the opening of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, of any reference to the constitutional question which so nearly brought a legislative dead-lock last session. His silence may, we suppose, be fairly taken to mean that he still maintains his position that the representatives of the people have control of the \$16,000 or so of territorial revenue only, and that the \$140,000 voted by the Dominion Parliament is to be expended by the representative of the Dominion Government on his own personal responsibility. The disallowance at Ottawa of an *ad interim* act passed by the Legislature, recognizing the right of Mr. Royal to make such appropriations during recess as might be approved of by certain representatives named, may be taken, no doubt, to mean that the Dominion authorities sustain the Lieut. Governor in his interpretation of the law. It is pretty clear, we believe, that this was the original intention of the Act, and some plausible objections may be urged against giving to the representatives of the people of a vast region so sparsely settled the unlimited disposal of the funds voted for territorial purposes. On the other hand it cannot be denied that, apart from any power of control over eight-ninths of the whole revenue, the Representative Assembly is little better than a mockery. The power of legislation is of little avail without the power of the purse. The most important laws are very often those which involve the disposal of money, or which need money for their enforcement. The effect of Lieut. Governor Royal's adherence to his former position will almost certainly be a renewal of the struggle. The result of the struggle is certain. The question is one of time only. The principles of responsible government are too deeply imbedded in the Canadian mind, to admit of peace or truce so long as the boon is withheld from any considerable part of the population. The question is whether it will not be wiser for Government and Parliament to yield the point promptly and gracefully, than to wait until forced to do so by the voice of the popular majority.

TO those who desire, as all men of right feeling in the three countries must desire, to see every cause of possible misunderstanding between Great Britain and Canada and the United States removed, it is gratifying to learn that negotiations for the settlement of the Behring Sea seal-fisheries question are about to be resumed. The Washington despatches which claim to give the proposals about to be submitted by the British Minister, as confided

by him to a newspaper reporter, are evidently unreliable. That is not the British way of doing things. It is quite likely, however, that the guess, based on a study of the former correspondence, may not be very wide of the mark in some of its main features. No doubt the necessity for some scheme of protection during a close season, the limits of which can be determined only after full investigation by a joint committee of experts, will be cheerfully conceded by Great Britain and Canada. It is in the highest degree probable, too, that the British offer of arbitration will be renewed. Mr. Blaine can hardly afford to refuse such an offer, provided terms of reference can be agreed on. The main difficulty in regard to such terms will, it is surmised, arise in regard to the question whether the extent of the jurisdiction of the United States in Behring Sea shall be one of the points to be submitted. Mr. Blaine's dread of the loss of prestige that would result from a decision unfavourable to his claims may be stronger than his desire for a final settlement of the whole question on just principles. It will be remembered that in his last despatch he laid great stress on the alleged recognition by the English Government of Russian jurisdiction to a certain extent, and claimed that the United States is now entitled to the same consideration that was accorded to her predecessor in the ownership. Lord Salisbury, in reply, intimated the readiness of the Imperial Government to concede to the United States all the jurisdiction that was recognized as belonging to Russia. The crucial question will then evidently be whether the mere fact that during the period of Russian occupation her jurisdiction may not have been disputed, simply because no one at that time had any interest in disputing it, can justly be pleaded as a recognition of that jurisdiction. This Mr. Blaine will no doubt plead, and this the British and Canadian Governments will as certainly deny. On common-sense principles the case seems clear enough. No one would think of maintaining that the fact of B's cows having pastured alone and unchallenged on the public lands for years before he had a neighbour, would give B any right to forbid the use of those lands to the cows of A, a newly arrived neighbour. Failing mutual agreement, impartial arbitration is surely the fair and unobjectionable way of settling such questions. It is greatly to be hoped that the Atlantic fisheries dispute may be included in the same negotiations, and, if need be, made the subject of reference to the same or another Board of arbitrators.

THE Halifax *Chronicle* suggests that the death of the late Hon. T. D. Archibald affords an opportunity for the Government of Canada to do a justice that has hitherto been denied to one-half of the entire Province of Nova Scotia. This one-half, including Hants, Kings, Annapolis, Digby, Yarmouth, Shelburne, and Queens Counties, has been, it says, for the last seventeen years and still is without any representation in the Senate of Canada. We are of opinion that as a rule the less sectionalism in either Commons or Senate the better. But as one reason for being of the Senate is to balance and safe-guard local interests, as marked out by Provincial lines, and as it is equally desirable that a similar regard should be had to the balancing of the views of large territorial sections within the provinces themselves, there is some force in the *Chronicle's* complaint and suggestion, especially as it is pretty evident, from the lists of possible candidates it suggests in the respective counties, that there is no lack of eligible material in the neglected western section whose claims it champions. It is, indeed, not a little singular that so large and important a part of the whole Maritime Province territory as that represented by these seven contiguous counties should have been for so many years passed over in the choice of members of the Upper House. The result was no doubt accidental, since no reason can be suggested why so unequal a distribution of Government patronage in the matter should have been purposely made. The Senate of Canada is an expensive institution and in the opinion of many besides those the *Chronicle* represents more ornamental than useful, but so long as it is maintained and holds in its hands a considerable share of legislative authority there is no good reason why occasion should be given for complaint that the honours and emoluments of the Senatorial office are distributed so very unevenly as in the case in question.

THE Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States shows the appalling number of 1,972 railroad employees killed and 20,028 injured during 1889 on the railways of the country. During the same period only 310 passengers were killed, and 2,146 injured

on these roads. When we compare the many millions of passengers who must have used the roads during the year with the comparatively small total number of employees, the contrast in the numbers killed and wounded is startling and suggestive. A contemporary contrasts this terrible slaughter with that of the Battle of Waterloo, in which the British forces lost but 2,009 officers and men killed and 4,923 officers and men wounded, and adds: "The figures above given by the railway commission represent an aggregate of suffering horrible to contemplate, and that finds no parallel save in the carnage of a great battle." But there is a third line in the table of statistics given which calls no less loudly for the attention of the thoughtful and humane. Besides the "employees," and "passengers" there is a list of "other persons," of whom it appears that no less than 3,541 were killed, and 4,135 injured during the year, by the railways of the Republic. A very large proportion of these "other persons" were no doubt the victims of the level crossing. The paper to which we are indebted for the foregoing figures adds: "What makes it the more sad is that much of the railway slaughter is not only preventable, but criminal. But a small portion of those killed lose their lives in accidents that might not have been prevented. Hundreds of brakemen are annually made the victims of a system of coupling cars that should long ago have been prohibited." Nothing can be clearer than that just so much of the sum total of slaughter as was preventable was criminal. We have not the figures in reference to our Canadian roads before us, and do not know whether they could be procured, but there is, unfortunately, no doubt that whatever difference in proportionate slaughter and maiming there may be in their favour, is a difference not in kind, but only in degree. From recent statistics prepared at Ottawa it appears that of every 1,000 deaths in Canada 31 are from so-called accidents, and in the United States 39. There seems no reason to doubt that the percentage of these accidents occurring on railroads in Canada bears at least no smaller ratio to that in the United States. What is to be done? Surely such reckless waste of life cannot be permitted to go on unchecked. We can think of but two means of dealing effectively with it: Either the Dominion Government should appoint a commission to enquire into the matter, and report to Parliament, or the people should form a life-saving league, as suggested by a correspondent a few weeks since, to secure the reform so imperatively needed.

UNDER the title of "An Armenian's Cry for Armenia," James A. Malcolm, in the *Nineteenth Century*, forcibly arraigns the British Government and people for neglect at the same time of a solemn treaty obligation and of their own best interests. To the question "Why does the Turk oppress the Armenians?" the writer makes the brief answer, "Because they are Christians." This answer, however, he proceeds to fortify with numerous quotations from the Koran, to which all the edicts of the Caliphs must conform. These quotations show clearly that animosity and war to the knife against all unbelievers is enjoined upon all Mussulmans as a religious duty. Dwelling on the enmity of the Turk to commerce and civilization the writer says:—

Armenia, by its industry, resources and genius once supported a population of over 30,000,000 souls. Yet since it was brought under Turkish rule, the national resources have remained undeveloped, pasture and arable lands have been abandoned and are fast falling out of cultivation, rivers choked up, roads broken, so that the country is now but sparsely inhabited and become almost a dreary waste. The work of decay and destruction alone progresses under that organized brigandage whose chiefs are the crony advisers of the Sultan.

For all this Albion is held responsible. Having secured, through the instrumentality of Lord Salisbury, at the Berlin Congress, the withdrawal of the Muscovite troops, England has done absolutely nothing to carry out the reforms which, by a subsequent agreement with the Porte—the Cyprus Convention—she undertook to introduce. As a result, the writer claims, of England's national remissness, "Armenia, fertile and metallurgically rich, veritably a land 'flowing with milk and honey,' has now become a vast chaos, wherein all the fiercest passions of which brute humanity is capable, are free to roam about, unbridled and unchecked. Public interests are in the hands of whoever can lay hold of them; private warfare is pitiless and rampant; every man, save Christian, goes armed, and every weapon is tolerated." In the same impassioned strain Mr. Malcolm goes on to urge that while it is admit-