

whom our civilization has produced, so deplorable a feature of the scientific investigations of our day. We have often wondered that those who are fighting what they believe to be the battle of humanity and religion in this matter have not transferred the conflict to the higher ground, to a much greater extent than they have hitherto done. Let it be demonstrated that all those practices which involve the infliction of intense pain unnecessarily upon the inferior animals, whether this be done in the name of commercial gain or of medical science, tend directly to the atrophy and final extinction of qualities which constitute some of the noblest attributes of human nature, and a case will have been made out for the prohibition of all such practices, against which no consideration of pecuniary gain, or even of physical healing, can prevail for a moment. That it should be one of the first and highest aims of all government to promote the perfection of the race in its highest qualities, and in the long run, all who recognize the supremacy of the moral side of our nature must admit. To bring the matter with which we set out down, then, to the true practical test, the question is whether the practice of dehorning cattle is not such as, if it should become common among farmers and stock-raisers, would tend to harden and degrade the natures of those who should thus accustom themselves to inflict such suffering for a slight pecuniary consideration, and of all who should stand in any relation of responsibility in the matter. There is surely something in the very dependence of these domestic animals upon our superior knowledge and prowess which appeals powerfully to whatever is noblest and most generous in the human breast. It is at least worthy of consideration whether that appeal can be habitually and deliberately disregarded without corresponding injury to the higher nature of those who turn a deaf ear to it for the sake of filthy lucre.

WAR has again broken out between the Catholic clergy and the Senate and Chamber of Deputies in France. The fuller accounts which reach us by mail show that the storm aroused by the incident at Rome and the insolent attitude assumed by the Archbishop of Aix and other dignitaries of the Church in reference to the circular of the French Minister of Worship, in which the Bishops were requested to refrain for the present from promoting any more pilgrimages in their dioceses, is still raging. It is scarcely too much to say that the very existence of the Catholic Church as an established church is threatened. As a matter of fact we do not suppose that the mobbing of the French pilgrims in Rome and the correspondence which ensued were so much the cause as the occasion of the violent discussions which took place in the two Houses of Parliament and of the strong and bitter feeling against the Church which was revealed in the course of those discussions. As the matter now stands there is no ambiguity in the attitude of the Party of the Left in either chamber. The separation of Church and State is distinctly demanded. It is probably only a question of time when the demand will have to be conceded, and but a little more arrogance and obstinacy on the part of the hierarchy are needed to bring the time very near. It may be even now at the doors. In the Senate, after violent debate, a motion was carried by a vote of 211 to 57, censuring the clergy and calling on the Government to enforce their submission to the Republic. In the Chamber of Deputies the opponents of the Establishment went further and made a direct motion for disestablishment, which secured 179 votes out of 500. This showed that those who are as yet unprepared to go so far are in a pretty strong majority, it is true, but a subsequent motion substantially the same as that carried in the Senate gave the Government only the narrow majority of twenty. M. de Freycinet made, moreover, the significant statement that while, as responsible Minister, he could not now agree to the separation of Church and State, yet if the agitation continued, and the clergy were determined to set the Republic at defiance, this consummation would be reached in the near future. Apart altogether from the merits or results of the present quarrel it seems quite unlikely that the connection, so alien to the spirit of democratic institutions, can last long after the firm and final establishment of the Republic.

IS Mexico about to follow the example of so many of the South American States and have its revolution? There are some indications that such a thing is possible, though it must be confessed that the spectacle of a revolutionary force taking refuge on foreign soil is not calculated to impress the world with the conviction that it is very

dangerous to the constituted authorities. From the tenor of an interview said to have been had with Garza, one of the insurrectionary leaders, by a representative of the *New York Times*, it would appear that the insurgents are relying upon disaffection in the ranks of the Presidential army for the reinforcements which are evidently needed if any speedy success is to be achieved. If it be true, as is by no means unlikely, that President Diaz is a good deal of a despot and much more intent on consulting his own pleasure and providing for his own future, than upon seeking the permanent prosperity and happiness of his people, or, which would come practically to the same thing, if this impression is abroad in the land and in the army, the reliance of the would-be revolutionists upon the goodwill of the forces sent against them may not be misplaced. The desertion of a body of Government troops, as reported the other day, is an indication in the same line. It is not very improbable that only a temporary success of the rebels in some engagement may be needed to cause a general desertion from the Government ranks. But in the almost total absence of reliable information as to the causes of the insurrection, the strength of its leaders, and the real feeling of the masses, speculations are useless. Meanwhile United States troops are said to be in hot pursuit of the trespassers, and a collision is imminent. It is therefore possible that the insurgent forces on American soil may find a speedy end put to their ambitious dreams by being ignominiously arrested, or driven across the border and into the arms of the President's troops.

### THE NEW YEAR.

THE old year has passed away, and the new year has come in; and the omens are bright or gloomy according to the point of view from which we regard them. The most sanguine optimist will hardly feel satisfied with the present appearance of things; and the gloomiest pessimist will not venture to say that they are bad beyond the possibility of improvement. The reasonable man, who loves his country and his neighbours, and therefore wants to know and think what is true about them, will impartially recognize the good and the evil which exist around him, will be thankful that things are as well as they are, and will take counsel how they may be made better.

For us Canadians such a state of mind is quite justifiable. We have a good deal to be thankful for, and we have some things to be ashamed of. The general condition of the country is good, prosperous, hopeful. The average of well-being and of all that constitutes well-being is high. In this respect there is probably no country in the world better off. There are countries which have a greater number of wealthy men in proportion to the population; and this is perhaps a doubtful good. But the general level is higher with ourselves than in most countries, and this is a great matter. "The greatest happiness of the greatest number" may not be an absolutely safe principle in Ethics; but it is not a bad working theory in Politics.

Still there is everywhere a dark side to things. Many persons have been telling us that our political life is not sound. Unfortunately we are often told things of this kind by the very people who are most corrupt. But whoever may tell it to us, it is unfortunately too true. And it is true, not merely of this party or that, of one class of officials or another: it goes through our whole system. And it is of no avail to say that the people at large disapprove and detest these things; for ours is the soil in which they are grown.

Of course we detest them, especially when they become a scandal. We detest them when they are brought out in all their unblushing hideousness to the light of day. We do not exactly mean that we dislike evil doing only when it is found out; but there is some truth in this view of the matter. If we go a little further and enquire into the root of the evil, we shall find it in the prevalence of party spirit and in the selfish desire, so wide spread, for personal aggrandizement.

Of party spirit we need say little at this moment. It is the curse of every age and of every people. It is one of the horrid forms taken by falsehood, prejudice, bigotry, self-deception, greed. When these are chased out of the world, party spirit will go after them. But the other evil—the desire for personal aggrandizement at any cost—is getting very serious indeed. When men desire public office that they may enrich themselves at the public expense, and to the serious public loss, then things are in a very bad way.

And, it is said—apparently with some considerable degree of truth—that such things are on the increase. Here in Toronto it is alleged that the heavy rate of taxation is the result, not merely of the rapid increase of the city, nor merely of incapacity and mismanagement, but of actual jobbery. It is not perhaps quite easy to prove this to any considerable extent, and it may be retorted that such things should not be said unless they can be proved. Yet the wide-spread belief in such evil doing could hardly have arisen without some reason. These things are bad, not merely as facts, but as symptoms.

We do not propose here to do more than refer to the maycralty contest in Toronto, which illustrates the real difficulty of the situation. How few comparatively seem to see clearly the nature of the issue! How few seem to see that by advocating or approving the advocacy of the privileges of any particular class, they are doing and encouraging the very thing which has disgraced our country during the past year. We are practically and in reality hoodling—that is to say, we are trying unlawfully to get other people's money into our possession.

And the remedy! Of course the first remedy that suggests itself to most of us is to criticize our neighbours and point out where they may amend themselves; whilst our neighbours are going through the very same or a similar process with respect to ourselves. It is always thus. We are willing to reform the church and the world, and to forget our own need of reformation.

This is the way to prophesy smooth things. It is done every day by all kinds of teachers, even from the Christian pulpit. If only we could make other people better, get them to hold our opinions, use our practices, and so forth, then how soon would come the millennium! But the millennium will come in no such way; but only when every one of us takes himself in hand, and resolves that he, for one, will do righteousness, whatever other people may do.

And here is our earnest greeting of good-will and peace for the new year. If things are fairly well with us, let us be thankful and try to keep them so. If anything is wrong with us, let us do our best to find out the causes and go on to remove them. Let every man begin at home. Let him sweep before his own door, and the city will be clean. Let each man consider with himself that it is when he is doing his duty to his neighbour and his country, and only then, that he is gaining his own legitimate good. By this means, and only by this means, however we may try to deceive ourselves or others, will the new year prove a happy one for all.

### THE QUEBEC BOULEVERSEMENT.

THE recent overturn of the Provincial administration in the Province of Quebec by an exercise of the prerogative assumed to be vested in the Lieutenant-Governor is an unexpected and ominous incident in our constitutional history. We have a precedent for the dismissal of a Governor, but none for the dismissal of a Premier supported by a majority in the Legislature.

The Letellier imbroglio of 1878 is our only precedent for the dismissal of a Governor under our present constitutional system. He was a Liberal and the appointee of a Liberal Government. Mr. De Boucherville—the gentleman who has just acceded to office by the grace of Governor Angers—was then leader of the Opposition. Mr. Joly, the Liberal Premier, was sustained by a majority, but the overwhelming victory of Sir John Macdonald in Ontario emboldened the Conservatives of Quebec to attempt the overthrow of the Liberal Government of that Province in spite of its majority. They invoked the aid of the Dominion Premier, and even went so far as to ask the intervention of the Imperial Government. The answer from that high constitutional authority was a palpable rebuff. The Colonial Secretary instructed the Governor-General to the following effect: "Under the British North America Act the Lieutenant-Governor of a Province has an unquestionable constitutional right to dismiss his Provincial Minister if from any cause he feels it incumbent on him to do so. In the exercise of this right, as of any other of his functions, he should, of course, maintain the impartiality towards rival political parties which is essential to the proper performance of the duties of his office, and for any action he may take he is, under the 59th Section of the Act, directly responsible to the Governor-General." It was further intimated that "the power to dismiss a Lieutenant-Governor rests with the Governor-General and the Dominion Cabinet, and not with the Governor-General alone."

Mr. Letellier was dismissed by the Governor-General on the advice of his Ministers. The impartial historian of that event, and of the circumstances and motives which produced it, will hardly care to cite it as a precedent that future Governors-General may safely follow. It was a questionable exercise of arbitrary power by a rehabilitated