

Association, and editor of the Association's organ, *The Arbitrator*. This fact is very suggestive.

The proceedings of the Convention will be watched with much interest by many of the best friends of humanity in every nation. A concerted movement of this kind seems to us much more hopeful than any effort to bring about a treaty of arbitration between two single nations, such as the proposal for such a treaty between France and the United States, which is just now attracting some attention. Such an arrangement, made and carried out in mutual good faith, might be a grand thing in itself, and would be a distinct advance in the direction of a universal agreement. But then the motives of the two nations would always be open to suspicion, and it is undeniable that the tendency of such a treaty to lapse into an alliance would always be strong, and, under certain circumstances easily imagined, might become irresistible. Witness the fact that influential American newspapers, among them some of a religious character, which express themselves in favour of such a treaty with France, are decidedly opposed to a similar one with Great Britain.

To be able to believe that the world is yearly drawing nearer to the age of universal disarmament and international tribunals for the settlement of the international difficulties would be to be able to answer affirmatively and confidently the question, "Is the world growing better?"

The Day of Rest.

THE Seventh-Day Adventists are a small sect whose members hold themselves bound to keep holy the Seventh Day, our Saturday, according to the divine law which they claim is still in force. These people have, of course, in a free country, a perfect right to their own conscientious opinions touching a question of Scripture interpretation. They have also a perfect right to carry out those opinions by observing the Seventh Day of the week, instead of the First, as their Sabbath. We have not heard that in any State or Province of English-speaking America has any one attempted or desired to interfere with the free promulgation and practice of these beliefs. But it appears that the Adventists, or some of them, go a good deal further and claim that the same command, "Six days shalt thou labour," etc., which forbids them to work on Saturday, commands them to do so on every other day, and so, of course, on Sunday. In several cases in some of the States, and now in one case at least in Ontario, these people have been prosecuted and punished for persisting in working in the fields in open violation of the Sunday laws of the State or Province. Hence an outcry against what is called "Religious Persecution" has been raised, and not only members of their own body but representatives of other religious denominations are denouncing the enforcement of the Sunday laws against them, and sympathizing with them as suffering persecution for conscience' sake. The case is somewhat perplexing. It may be easy to demonstrate the folly of their assumption that in observing Saturday as a day of rest they are keeping sacred the exact twenty-four hours set apart by the law of Moses. But that has really nothing to do with the case. It is a matter for their own judgments and consciences. The principle involved seems to us to be just this. If and so far as work on Sunday is forbidden and punished on religious grounds, the State is interfering with men's relations to God, which are matters for their own consciences and quite outside of and above the sphere of human governments. But it will generally be conceded, and is, we hold, scientifically demonstrable, that the enforcement of a weekly day of rest is absolutely necessary to the physical and moral well-being of the citizens of every State. In order to the enjoyment of such rest by the whole

people it is indispensable that the same day be observed by all. No one can doubt that Sunday is the day which suits best the interests and convenience of an immense majority and is therefore indicated as the proper day to be set apart by the State as the Day of Rest. It is, no doubt, a serious inconvenience and loss to those who feel conscientiously bound to keep holy the Seventh Day, to be compelled to abstain from work on the First Day also, but is it not a duty they owe as good citizens to the community to submit to the sacrifice? The sole practical question, to our thinking, is whether it is practicable to make an exception in the enforcement of reasonable Rest-Day laws in favour of those who may solemnly declare that they have conscientious objections to abstaining from work on Sunday. If this can be done—we do not say that it can—without serious interference with the general enforcement of the Sunday laws in the case of other citizens, it might be well to make the exception—absurd though the conscientious scruple may seem to others.

But if, in order to meet these scruples on the part of a few, the health and welfare of the whole people, or of a large number of them, are to be made to suffer by the want of a periodical day of rest, one can hardly avoid the query whether it is not a questionable kind of religion which would thus sacrifice the good of the many to the peculiar notions of the few.

* * *

Professor Clark Murray on Mr. Carnegie's "High Politics."

THE *Open Court* of July 11th is almost entirely given up to a Canadian view of that U.S. attitude towards Canada, which Mr. Carnegie and Senator Lodge authoritatively announced in *The Forum* of last March. Those gentlemen are shining lights of the Republican party; and as that party will sway the next Congress and probably seat its candidate on the Presidential throne at the next election, it is well for us to know the true mind of its leaders, and it is well for the people of the United States to consider the real meaning and the probable outcome of its policy, as far as a friendly neighbour is concerned. No one in Canada is better fitted to discuss such a subject, in wise and temperate fashion, than Professor Murray, because he has consistently maintained his Free Trade position in a city like Montreal—largely given over to Protection, because of his life-long friendship for the United States, and because of his philosophic spirit and sympathy for modern as distinguished from military civilization. His rejoinder gives "the other side," in a tone, too, in marked contrast to that of the articles discussed. The only wonder is that his side was not presented to the world in *The Forum*. A forum is supposed to be a place where both sides are heard; and when two strident voices declare it to be the solemn duty of the United States to aim at separating Canada from Britain and annexing her to the States, and that the best means of effecting the end is by a hostile tariff directed against Canada, surely one philosopher might be allowed to ask the pertinent question, "Can Canada be coerced into the Union?" If Professor Murray's article was sent to *The Forum*, but not accepted, we have another indication of the extraordinary bias, entertained in some influential quarters, against Canada, simply because she desires to live her own life—a bias which twists the journalistic as well as the commercial and the political mind. If, however, the article was sent originally to *The Open Court*, it can only be regretted that many of those who read Messrs. Carnegie and Lodge are not likely to read the rejoinder, and it may be hoped that *The Forum* will see the propriety of asking some qualified person to give the Canadian view of the subject, in justice to its readers as well as to the grave practical issues involved.

"Come now and let us reason together," Professor Murray calmly says to the two exponents of the Republican policy. He asks them two questions: (1) whether the present position of Canada justifies their fears that Canada may be called on, at the dictation of Britain, to make war upon the United States; (2) whether the policy of coercion by a hostile tariff which they advocate, on political grounds, presents any reasonable probability of being successful? His answers to both questions ought to convince reasonable people, and—though we know what happens to those "convinced against their will"—there are enough reasonable men