

THE rejection of the Fisheries Treaty by the United States Senate may now be considered certain. The Republicans have carried their point, and the discussion in open session has commenced, Senator Frye, of Maine, taking the lead. To say that Senator Frye's speech was characteristic, is to all who have read his out-pourings on former occasions equivalent to saying that it was a tissue of extravagant and absurd denunciations of Canada and England, and their alleged course throughout the controversy. We must do the American proletariat, to whom such harangues are really addressed, the credit to believe that those of the Senator Frye type will disgust more than they will convince. The unreasoning prejudice and dislike of some will no doubt drink in every word as truth, but the more thoughtful will conclude that the cause must be weak which needs such advocates. Should the prospective rejection of the Treaty be followed, as we suppose it must, by the abrogation of the *modus vivendi*, and the renewal of strict protection with all its dangers, the fact will be regrettable. Otherwise we are not sure that the failure may not be a blessing in disguise as leaving the way open for a more complete settlement of the difficulty under better auspices.

A GOOD deal is being said, especially in American journals, about the smallness of the amount of personal property the late Matthew Arnold was able to leave his family. The fact is commented on by many as if it involved some grave moral delinquency on the part of the British people. We have no means of knowing how liberal was the remuneration Mr. Arnold received from the publishers of his books and essays in Great Britain. No doubt his income would have been considerably increased by contributions from the United States had an international copyright law been in operation in the latter country. But it need not be supposed that Mr. Arnold's life would have been made either much happier or much more useful by a princely fortune. He no doubt lacked the money-making faculty, or if he ever possessed it, had suffered it to remain undeveloped. He had a higher mission. One contemporary thinks it a severe reflection upon the money-making methods of the day that money did not flow into the coffers of such a man as Mr. Arnold. No doubt many of our money-making methods are reprehensible enough. But it is hard to conceive of any times or circumstances in which a Matthew Arnold would have accumulated wealth. The universal law is that "he that seeketh findeth." No man can reasonably expect to obtain money unless he makes it the object of desire, and devotes time and energies to its acquisition. Mr. Arnold, no doubt, understood the law, and cheerfully accepted the penalty. Nor is it at all likely that he would have accepted, or that any one who knew the man would have cared to offer him, the largess which men of talent have sometimes been but too ready to receive from men of wealth. The man who makes philosophy his profession and the highest truth his *summum bonum* is not likely to be overburdened with filthy lucre. He would find it a clog.

WHATEVER else the Southampton election may or may not have meant, it is now pretty clear that it meant popular condemnation of the "compensation" clause of the Local Government Bill. The immense gathering in Hyde Park a few days since has afforded full confirmation, if any were needed, of the strength of popular feeling in this regard. It is hard to account for the prevalence of such a sentiment in the nation which did not hesitate to pay the former slave-owners when it decreed the manumission of their slaves. An influential American journal has tried to express the prevailing view in the present case in an epigram. The people refuse to admit that there can be a vested right in a public wrong. But this is an attempt to conjure with mere words. If the selling of liquors under license is a public wrong, it is a wrong which the people have hitherto not only condoned but have permitted for money. It is surely a little late in the day for those who have been for many years not only granting the publican his license but making that license a source of public profit, to turn around and declare they cannot on principle compensate him for the loss they are about to inflict by withdrawing it. That would hardly be in accordance with our ordinary conception of British justice. The fact perhaps is that, owing either to some defect in the clause itself, or to a mistaken apprehension of it, it is supposed to leave the way open to claims for enormous "constructive" damages, from which the taxpayers might well recoil. What course the Government will now take in the matter remains to be seen. If they cannot limit the liability in such a way as to quiet popular apprehensions, they may be obliged to expunge the clause, though this would probably involve the withdrawal of the whole subject of license from the province of local option.

It has often been said that the best way to effect the repeal of a bad law is to enforce it. Acting on this principle, Mr. Kennedy, the gentleman

who set the law prohibiting the importation of contract labour into the United States in motion against the Church of the Holy Trinity in New York for having brought the Rev. Mr. Warren across the ocean as rector, has probably succeeded in effecting his purpose. That purpose was avowedly, it seems, to bring discredit upon the Act. That Mr. Kennedy had no other end in view appears from the fact that he is a member of the church in question, that he is personally favourable to Mr. Warren as rector, and that he has even promised to pay the fine of \$1,000 imposed under the statute. To an onlooker it is not, indeed, very clear why it should be thought so much more absurd to import a clergyman under contract into a land abounding with clergymen than to import say a cabinet-maker into a country abounding with cabinet-makers. But so it strikes the majority, and it is very likely Mr. Kennedy's action may ultimately bring about the repeal of the Bill. All such legislation is objectionable, because it puts a premium upon evasion, and because it naturally tends to keep out the best immigrants while leaving the door open for the worst.

THE outside observer of a Presidential contest in the United States must be struck with the comparatively slight importance attached to the choice of the Vice-President. Indeed, so feeble are the attractions of the office that prominent men whose names are canvassed do not hesitate, in some cases, to say they will not accept the nomination on any terms. This reluctance is easily enough understood. Under ordinary circumstances the functions of the Vice-Presidency are as nearly as possible reduced to *nil*, and the incumbent, no matter how strong a man, is effectually shelved and muzzled. As *ex-officio* presiding officer of the Senate the Vice-President is not only removed from the arena of debate, but he may not even vote, save in the very rare event of a tie. And yet, as experience has but too emphatically shown, it is really necessary to national dignity and safety that the Vice-President should be one of the best men in the nation, seeing that he may be called upon at any moment to take the Presidential Chair. As the *Nation* reminds its readers, four of the eighteen men elected to the Presidency during the first century of the Republic died in office, and, by consequence, four men elected to the Vice-Presidency became the chief magistrates of the nation for longer or shorter periods. Nevertheless the Vice-President is usually chosen almost without a thought of his qualifications for the supreme office. "He is," says the *Nation*, "hastily picked out to strengthen the ticket in a doubtful State, like Hendricks, in 1884; or as the representative of a faction in the convention which has failed to get its candidate for President, like Arthur, in 1880; or to represent some 'element,' like Johnson, in 1864, as the type of the loyal man in the border States." This is surely a serious defect in the workings of the electoral machinery, though it cannot be said that any great harm has come of it as yet.

CONSIDERABLE interest, both scientific and theological, attaches to the recent action of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, in the case of Dr. Woodrow. This clergyman, who was until recently a professor in a southern institution of learning, was some two years since, by the Synod of Georgia, pronounced guilty of the offence of teaching an unscriptural doctrine, namely, the evolution of man from the lower animals. From this action Dr. Woodrow appealed to the General Assembly. Before the latter he seems to have pleaded his case with much ability and eloquence, showing by various incontestable instances that Christian bodies had often in the past made the mistake of condemning as unscriptural scientific theories which are now universally accepted as demonstrated truths. Several strong speeches were made by other ministers in support of Dr. Woodrow's position, and a few did not hesitate to declare boldly their absolute belief in the theory of evolution. Nevertheless the appeal was rejected by a vote of 109 to 34. The action does not speak well for the education and broad-mindedness of the Southern Assembly, as, however far the theory in question may be, as yet, from having been demonstrated, it is clearly a scientific rather than a theological question, and should be treated as such by lovers of truth and freedom. Dr. Woodrow's appeal was for liberty of thought and investigation. "If," said he, "you convict me, you take a similar stand to that taken by the Church against the truths discovered by Copernicus and Galileo. You say to all young men: You cannot hold the doctrine of evolution, and be Christians." Not by such methods is the cause of Christian truth to be promoted.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY is about to do what it can to raise journalism to a place amongst the learned professions, if it has not already attained that rank. It has arranged for a Course in Journalism, under the direction of one of the Professors who has had experience in the work. The method is