

of the two has set in motion intellectual and spiritual forces which will last the longer and work the more powerfully for the good of the race, is one well worth the best consideration of every thoughtful mind.

THE reply of Minister Pereira, of Chili, to the ultimatum of the President of the United States is conciliatory and almost submissive. It contains, nevertheless, some points which are of special interest in their bearing upon the suggestion which we made last week to the effect that President Harrison's message must be regarded as a one-sided statement of the affair. That message, for instance, conveyed the impression that the Chilian authorities had never clearly expressed regret for the Valparaiso affair, whereas Minister Pereira, in his note, "regards it as his duty to declare *once more* (the italics are ours) that the Government of Chili laments the occurrence," etc., and reminds the President of "the fact that five days after he (Minister Pereira) had taken charge of the Department of Foreign Relations, he addressed to the Minister of Chili in the United States a telegram which, in the part relating to this matter, says, "Express to the United States Government very sincere regret," etc. It is to be noted, too, that the Chilian Government, while yielding perforce to the President's demand, persists emphatically in its declaration that the attack on the American marines was not preconcerted, or caused by hostile feeling to the United States; though he admits that in the nature of the case it would be impossible to prove that there was no doubt as to the special cause. While it must be confessed that appearances are rather in favour of President Harrison's view of the matter, the fact of this persistent denial on the part of the Chilian Government shows clearly that the case was one for arbitration, rather than for dogmatic assertion backed up by superior force. On the other hand, it is undeniable that the note of Senor Matta was insulting in the extreme; imputing, as it did, intentional deception and falsehood to the Chief Executive of the United States. The insult was so gross that it is probable that no nation conscious of power to enforce its demand would have accepted anything less than the unequivocal withdrawal and apology which has now been made. It is indeed hard to understand how a responsible Minister of any Government, with any proper sense of the dignity and responsibility of his position, or even with the training and instinct of a gentleman, could have been betrayed into the use of such language in a grave official despatch. On the other hand, again, it cannot escape impartial notice that the refusal of the President to await the decision of the Chilian court, which, Minister Pereira declares, commenced its preliminary enquiry in the morning which followed the night of the conflict, and whose slow progress was, he affirms, the result of the rules of procedure established by Chilian laws, which it was not possible for the President of the Republic to modify or set aside, was in direct contrast with the position taken by the United States Government in regard to the nearly similar case which arose touching the operation of her own courts in the difficulty with Italy. In nothing is the submissive spirit of Chili more apparent than in her consent, now to proceed without awaiting the decision of her own examining judge. Nothing could be handsomer in itself, or more flattering to the United States, than the offer of Chili to submit the main question to the Supreme Court of the latter. One is reminded of the action of Great Britain and Canada in the affair of the confiscated sealing vessels. Perhaps we should not be very far astray if we were to guess that British advice and influence may have had something to do with this perhaps unique proposal.

SINCE the foregoing was written, the reply of President Harrison to Chili's despatch has been published. That reply in itself is all that could be desired and is what would be expected from a great and magnanimous nation, conscious of its power. The President desires Minister Egan to "assure the Chilian Government that the President will be glad to meet in the most generous spirit these friendly overtures." But if a Washington despatch to the *New York Herald* may be relied on, this message of peace was quickly followed by another conceived in a very different spirit, as follows: "While Chili's apology is in terms all that this country could ask, yet there is one thing more to be done before the dignity of the United States will be fully satisfied. Chili must salute the Stars and Stripes." This cablegram itself lacks dignity and savours of petty vindictiveness to a degree that makes us

reluctant to believe that it has actually been sent. What makes it still more improbable is the fact that it is so inconsistent with the despatch which preceded it. It has all the appearance of an afterthought. If actually sent it must have been the outcome of a sinister influence brought to bear from some quarter, probably for party purposes. It reminds one of what we sometimes see in the case of private quarrels, in which the valour of one party waxes or wanes very perceptibly in inverse ratio with the demonstrativeness of the other. It is, of course, true that the requirement of a salute of the kind indicated is by no means uncommon in the case of international quarrels, but it is also true that it has often been foregone by magnanimous Governments—as, *e. g.*, by Great Britain in the recent trouble with Portugal—for good and sufficient reasons. There is little room for doubt that those reasons exist in the present instance. It is extremely doubtful whether the state of popular feeling in Chili will permit the Government to submit to this additional humiliation. It can hardly be denied that it would have been much more noble on the part of the great Republic not to have made the demand. We are disposed to go further and question whether such a mode of humiliating a conquered enemy is not unworthy of a great Christian nation under any circumstances. We shall be disappointed in our estimate of the feeling of the better classes of the American people if such a requirement, which looks much as if prompted by the naval officers who are said to be longing for a brush with their little antagonist, be not heartily condemned and repudiated.

WE have more than once been constrained to express wonder that a people so intelligent and so spirited as the Germans could take so patiently the large doses of paternalism which their dashing young Emperor is fond of serving out to them from time to time. It has always seemed reasonable to suspect that he would overshoot the mark some day and find himself in open conflict with the freedom-loving and self-ruling instincts of a brave and manly race. The fact is, we suppose, that there is really so much that is liberal and progressive mixed up with his wordy claims of absolutism, and that his tendencies towards reaction have hitherto been manifested in so harmless a shape, that the good nature of the people has not been seriously ruffled. That this is the correct explanation seems pretty clear from the emphasis with which the liberal spirit of the nation is now protesting against the zeal without knowledge which has prompted the Emperor to attempt to crush out scepticism by handing over the children of the nation to the tender mercies of the clergy, for that is probably the meaning of his Educational scheme. In making this attempt, he seems to be actuated by no narrow sectarianism. He may not deem one sect, or one system of religion as good as another, but he evidently believes that any form of religious belief is better than none. It is something in his favour that he does not attempt to have the religious faith of the coming generation of Germans cast in some one chosen mould, or fashioned after one prescribed pattern, though it must be confessed that such an attempt would have been more logical than the course which he has approved. Indeed, from a logical point of view, it is not easy to conceive anything more absurd than to invoke the authority of the crown to compel the teaching indifferently of two systems of belief so diametrically opposed to each other as, *e. g.*, Roman Catholicism and Evangelicalism in any of its forms. But be that as it may, it is evident that the German intellect is too clear to be blind to the evils which have always followed and which must always inevitably follow the handing over of the children of a nation to the training of a priesthood. The experiment of handing it over to a variety of priesthoods has probably never yet been tried, but is hardly likely to afford better results. The fact that the Government has so far yielded in the struggle as to consent to refer the Education Bill to a committee may probably be taken to indicate that the Emperor is not rash enough to enter into open conflict with the will of the nation, and it is very likely that a way out of the difficulty may be found without subjecting the loyalty of the people to too severe a strain.

THAT which is called firmness in a king is called obstinacy in a donkey.—*Lord Erskine.*

A FACE that has a story to tell. How different faces are in this particular. Some of them speak not; they are books in which not a line is written, save perhaps a date.—*Longfellow.*

PROFESSOR WORKMAN'S CASE.

THE conclusion to which THE WEEK has come, after considering the enforced resignation by Professor Workman of his Chair in Victoria University, invites some further consideration on the merits of the particular case. No doubt these may have been discussed in the organ of the Methodist Church, but the public generally is not well acquainted with them; and in these matters the public, as well as the denomination, has an interest. A university professes to be the greatest organ, not only for teaching, but for discussing, truth. Admittedly, new views of truth are unpalatable to those accustomed to old views; but, none the less, investigation is welcomed, because

Truth like a torch
The more it's shook it shines;

and again and again it has been proved that truth which was at first disliked and dreaded has been not long after welcomed as a friend and ally.

What, then, are the facts of the case? We have no exact knowledge of them, and therefore write subject to correction. The public desires only the broad outlines and forms its judgment on these. Professor Workman was appointed to his Chair some years ago. He must have been considered competent even then by the Board of Regents. Had he remained at Victoria ever since, doing his duty in a routine way, he would certainly be a Professor still, in the enjoyment of better health than he now has as well as in the enjoyment of his salary, of the respect of the Regents and the confidence of the Church with which he is connected. But he felt that duty demanded that he should master his subject. He proceeded to Leipsic, studied there for five years under acknowledged authorities in Hebrew and cognate languages, and then gave proof of capacity for independent research by publishing a critical investigation of the text of Jeremiah, which Professor Delitzsch—a man honoured for scholarship and piety by the whole of Evangelical Christendom—pronounced to be "a work of valuable and lasting service." Naturally enough, Dr. Workman, on his return, was received by the University authorities and students with all the distinction to which he was entitled. Canada has as yet produced no work in theology, biblical criticism or oriental literature known to the outside world. Here, at any rate, was a promising beginning. Again, had Professor Workman been content to do his duty in a routine way, and raise none of the questions that have been discussed for more than a century on the Continent of Europe, and that are now being freely discussed in every other seat of learning in Britain and America, he would certainly be Professor still, and every graduate of Victoria would mention his name with pride. But, he again felt that duty demanded thoroughness, truthfulness and sincerity. He gave a lecture to the Theological Union, in which he showed the modern point of view of looking at Old Testament prophecy, and indicated that it was the one occupied by himself. He must have known that most of his hearers accepted the traditional interpretation of the passages to which he more particularly referred; but he knew also that the traditional interpretation is rejected by every critic, and that it is not demanded by the Creed or Confession of Faith of any Church in Christendom. Thereupon the Board of Regents relegated him to the Faculty of Arts. Now, again, had Professor Workman been content to teach his classes in a routine way and evade questions that eager students would be sure to put, he would still be Professor, and possibly after a few years he might have been allowed to teach the Divinity as well as the Art students. But he again felt that duty demanded a nobler course. He told the Regents frankly that it was impossible to teach Hebrew, even in the Arts course, without discussing the interpretation of the passages studied; that it would be inconsistent with truthfulness on his part not to give his students the utmost help and the clearest light in his power; and he therefore asked to be allowed to do, not only part, but the whole of his work. His enforced resignation followed.

Are these substantially the facts of the case? If they are, they certainly show that Dr. Workman is a man of whom Canada may well be proud. If they are not, the public should be informed. Assuming that the facts have been given with substantial accuracy, let us ask wherein the Professor offended and what are the lessons to be drawn from the treatment he has received.

In the first place, he has not been tried by any Church Court or any Civil Court. Admittedly he is not guilty of shortcoming in scholarship, teaching power, or moral influence over students. His offence is that—according to the judgment of the Board of Regents—he is heterodox. But surely an ecclesiastical court or—in the case of the Church of England a civil court constituted for the purpose—should have found him guilty of heterodoxy. If the Board of Regents considered itself a court, it should have proceeded to a regular trial, stated the article or articles in the Methodist creed which the accused had contravened, and called on him to offer pleadings in defence. If it considered this beyond its province, and felt that it would be too long to wait for a decision by conference, an immediate solution, which the Professor himself suggested, might have been accepted. The question might have been submitted to a body of experts, especially as this is the first case of the kind that has occurred in Canada, without the slightest loss of dignity to any party in the case. Of course, it may be added here, that no one doubts the power of the Board