

Canada in the list of countries from which living cattle cannot be admitted into Great Britain." The Canadian Government replies, "We admit the force of the reasoning but we deny the alleged fact on which it is based. There must be some mistake. Either the disease in the case referred to was not pleuro-pneumonia, or there was some error in regard to the identity of the diseased animal, or the disease must have been contracted after the animal had left the Canadian shore, for notwithstanding the utmost diligence and the most careful scrutiny by our most expert surgeons, not a single case of pleuro-pneumonia has been found in Canadian herds. We will pay the expenses of a thorough investigation, and if your experts can find such a case in all Canada, we will cheerfully recognize the justice of your decision." It is hard to conceive of a fairer offer, and the interests at stake, on the part not only of Canadian producers but of British consumers, are surely sufficiently great to warrant the Board in taking a good deal of trouble to find out the truth.

The recent furious riots between the Hindus and the Mohammedans in Bombay, give colour to the contentions of those in India and in England who ridicule the idea of granting any instalment of home rule to the natives of that vast empire. Probably it would have only been necessary for the local authorities of the City of Montreal to be stupid enough to permit of two processions, one of Orangemen, the other of Catholics, to take place in that City on the same day, half a century ago, to have supplied the opponents of home rule for Canada with an equally cogent argument against the fitness of Canadians for such a mode of government. This is, of course, comparing small things with great so far as numbers are concerned. It must be admitted, too, that there are other important elements of difference in the two cases. That anything like a sudden bestowment of political power, anything more than a very cautious and strictly tentative educational movement, would be certain to result disastrously if not tragically in India, may readily be admitted. But it is surely a needlessly dreary and pessimistic view that it must always be thus, that the future has nothing better in store for that great congeries of tribes and races than perpetual subjection to the rule of the strong arm of a benevolently despotic Power whose seat is in a far-off land, and whose genius and traditions are all in perpetual contrast with those of the warm-blooded peoples of the sunny realm. Generations, perhaps centuries, may be needed to work out the necessary changes, but there is, nevertheless, a world-wide difference between the ruler who has ultimate, even if far-off self-rule for his ideal and goal, and him who can neither see nor aspire to anything better for these great

and interesting multitudes than perpetual subjection to foreign domination. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he," whether as ruler or subject.

When an inspired apostle enjoined upon a young fellow-labourer the duty of praying not only for all men generally but for kings and those in authority in particular, we wonder if it could have entered his mind that the question of the order in which the names of kings and other rulers should be brought before the King of kings might one day in the far-off centuries become a subject of newspaper controversy and international jealousy, on a small scale. Paul was surely short-sighted in that he did not exercise his prophetic powers and draw up a table of precedence for the use of nineteenth-century clergymen. He might thereby have saved some susceptibilities from suffering, and some of his successors, whether in the true apostolic line or not, from criticism. What a pity he did not think of it. If he had done so, by the way, and had undertaken the task, on what principle would he have proceeded. Is there in the nature of things any law by which we can determine whether it is more efficacious or more respectful to mention the names to which it is meant to do special honour first or last in order? There is, be it observed, a kind of contradiction between the order of precedence in court processions, and that of climax in literature. Which should prevail in the case in question? Might it not with all reverence for sacred things be suggested that the mind of the great and only wise Potentate, before whom the petitions in question are laid cannot, be thought of as subject to any failure of memory, such as could make it a matter of moment whether a given name should be presented first or last in the order of those for whom supplication is made, and that there is no fear of impoverishment of resources, or fatigue in bestowing benefits, such as might make the order of names important. Surely in the act of prayer and worship, if our prayers are not to degenerate into mere formalities or ceremonies, all such questions should be set aside and forgotten, as utterly out of keeping with the solemnity of the Presence into which we are ushered and the august character of the Being addressed.

Neither the reported interviews with Sir John Thompson nor the elaborate attempts of unfriendly critics to show that Canada's representatives were without weight and her interests wholly ignored in the deliberations throw much additional light upon the probable effects of the decision of the Behring Sea arbitrators. That the positions taken and the claims made by the Canadian Government and its representatives were over-ruled in several important respects goes without saying. But the same is conspicuously the fact with regard to

those of the United States. It may be hard for us to perceive that the former of these positions and claims may have been as untenable as the latter, but it is not improbable that some of them may have so appeared to impartial jurists. A good many complaints have been based on the fact that no regulations were made for the governance or restriction of the killing of seals on the Pribyloff Islands and the territorial waters surrounding them. But what proud or self-respecting people would submit to dictation from any international tribunal as to the manner in which they should carry on a sealing or any other industry on their own territory? How would Canada, for instance, take it were some similar Board of Arbitrators to undertake to regulate her fishery operations within the three-mile limit on the Atlantic coast? The two determining factors in the result seem to have been the facts that both parties were agreed upon the necessity for restrictions upon freedom of pelagic sealing if the animals were to be saved from extermination, and that any restrictions, in order to be effective to this end, must seriously diminish the number of seals taken. Whether the regulations which have been adopted are the best which could have been framed, whether they will prove unduly restrictive, or the opposite, can seemingly be determined only by actual experiment.

It was, we suppose, inevitable that it should be attempted to make party capital on one side or the other out of the Paris arbitration. The Premier was wise and statesmanlike in refusing to accept ovations on his return such as might have been conducted or construed in a partisan spirit. On the other hand, any attempts on the part of the Opposition to belittle the influence of the representatives of Canada in connection with the affair can only succeed in showing that as a colony it is impossible for the Dominion to shape the policy of the Empire. There can be no reasonable doubt that the conduct of the affair, so far as Canada's part in it was concerned, was on the whole as able and as influential as it could have been under any other management. There is, it is true, some reason to doubt the wisdom of the policy of putting forth extreme and untenable claims, on the principle that the greater the demand the larger will be the concessions, though it must be confessed that this policy has proved remarkably successful on more than one occasion in the hands of our Republican antagonists. But in so far as all parties are agreed on the substantial justice of their country's case, an international question is the last one which should be brought into the party arena, and the Canadian Opposition will, we venture to predict, be well advised if in its own interests it holds closely by the tariff and related issues, and gives the Government due credit for its partial success in the Behring Sea