

complementary abstract propositions and set them down in contradictory attitudes, after the manner of a high-school debating society, and then proceed to set the whole body politic by the ears with whole campaigns of contentious rhetoric with the net result that the democracy substitutes one party oligarchy for another at irregular intervals. What is the use, for example, of discussing whether 4 is 3 or 1 since it is obviously the sum of both these numbers? What is the use of arguing whether water is hydrogen or oxygen when we know as a scientific fact that it is both of these elements, two molecules of hydrogen to one of oxygen? What is the use of contending whether light is red or green when it is in reality a composition of all the colours of the spectrum and the result the glorious light of day? The philosopher Spinoza tell a quaint story of two geometers who fell to fighting because one said a shield was concave and the other said it was convex. What is the use of asking the question whether a man should love his father or mother or wife or son or daughter, when he should obviously love them all, and all should work together in harmony for the good of the home? What we all need at present is more mutual trust, less mutual mistrust; more conference, less controversy; more consultation, less conflict; more co-operation, less competition; more peace, no war. If two forces meet in opposition the resultant is the difference; if they act together the resultant is the sum. Two men working together can do more than twice as much as one man working alone, and two men working in opposition do nothing at all. How long will it take us all to learn some of the simplest truths of the world we live in and apply them to our own lives?

Let us now turn from external to internal affairs. If this outline is to be at all complete, something at least must be said about some institutions of government within Canada! for example, the Cabinet, the Senate, the House of Commons, the Dominion Provinces, and the Electorate.

The Cabinet.

The Cabinet is generally supposed to be the most characteristic creation of British political genius. Parliamentary government is not peculiar to British forms of government. All nations, even primitive tribes, have their public parliaments or assemblies, some of them based on the electoral or representative principle and many of them conducted with much more dignity and much less nonsense than the great parliament at Westminster. Some primitive tribes even elect their King or Chief and are, therefore, really republican in character. But the peculiar institution, properly called a Cabinet, is found only in constitutional formations of British origin. The constitution of France is really no exception to this statement, for the French Cabinet was copied from Great Britain by Thiers after 1870, and the reason which Thiers gave for doing so was that he expected that, after the storm subsided, France would return in peace again to the Limited Monarchy. The fact is that the Cabinet device worked so well in France that a return to the Monarchy became unnecessary, a signal proof, indeed, that it is neither the monarchy nor an elected parliament which constituted the peculiar potency of the British constitution. What then is the nature and function of the

Cabinet? Let us try to answer this question as briefly and as lucidly as we can.

The Cabinet is at once an executive advisory King's Council carved out of the Privy Council and a powerful standing committee of Parliament. As an executive council, it is composed of all the active heads of the chief administrative departments of state, and as a committee of Parliament of prominent members of both chambers of Parliament, i.e., Lords and Commons, in the ratio of about one to five, which represents pretty accurately the relative influence and power of these two chambers in the government of the state. The following figure may serve to visualize the position of the Cabinet.

The Privy Council	Cabinet	The Parliament
----------------------	---------	-------------------

Several important results follow from the peculiar position and functions of the Cabinet.

1. Since the Cabinet is a committee of advisers and councillors to the King, it must act as a unit. To burden the King with the responsibility of composing differences and settling disputes between his own ministers especially when these ministers are selected from the most powerful and influential members of a parliament elected by the people would be to set at defiance the whole mechanism of the Limited Monarchy. If, in other words, the King could choose between factions in his own Cabinet, this power would necessarily carry with it the right of the King to be guided by ministers of his own making and so to set at naught the whole principle of responsible, popular government. A united unanimous Cabinet is, therefore, a necessary adjunct to the Limited Monarchy. No Limited Monarchy can exist without it. Some person or group of persons must be in a position to say to the King, this is the final conclusive will of the people.

2. Since the Cabinet is also a committee of Parliament it must, therefore, like any other committee, report to Parliament. Since, however, it is created, as we have just seen, to report in each case the final concluded advice which it proposes to offer the King, it must report its proposals unanimously. No minority report is possible. For the Cabinet to make more than one report to Parliament would be to abdicate its duties. Dedicated to the special task of advising the King, it must be prepared to do so. The whole Cabinet must, therefore, stand or fall together. If any minority, great or small, should differ irreconcilably from the majority the only alternative is for the minority to resign or be retired by the Prime Minister.

3. Since the Cabinet advises the King on the one hand and reports to Parliament on the other, it cannot air its grievances in public. It must compose its own differences, settle its own disputes. It necessarily, therefore, sits in secret. No minutes are kept of its proceedings. It is strictly bad form for a minister even to make private notes on its proceedings for his own use. On a recent occasion in one of the Canadian provinces the Prime Minister made some personal notes of this kind and placed them in his desk. By some unknown channel the notes found their way to the

press. The laugh was really on the Prime Minister.

4. Since the Cabinet is at once an Executive Council composed of the responsible heads of the chief executive departments of state and a standing committee of Parliament elected by the people, it is, as Eagehot so clearly shows in his remarkable well-known book on "The English Constitution," the "link or buckle" which makes the executive responsible to Parliament as Parliament in turn is responsible to the people. The Cabinet is, therefore, the kingpin in the whole mechanism of responsible government under a Limited Monarchy or even under a limited republic like the Republic of France. The people propose, Parliament confers, the Cabinet consults and the Crown consents; that is the whole formula of free government. In theory, at least, the mechanism seems complete. In order, however, to make this point abundantly clear, let us compare again the Cabinet system with its only serious rival the Presidential system. The following diagram shows the difference at once.

THE CABINET SYSTEM

The People—Parliament—Cabinet—Crown.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM.

The People—Congress Council—President

The simple way in which all the forces of public opinion are made after careful deliberation and criticism to converge in the end upon the Crown at the centre of the body politic is obvious under the Cabinet system. The element of deadlock at the centre, where President and Congress fail to agree, is equally obvious under the Presidential system. If any illustration be needed of how serious and far-reaching this deadlock at the centre may become we need only call to mind what happened to the League of Nations a short time ago in the United States.

THE SENATE

Why should there be two chambers in the legislature, two Houses of Parliament? This question is, perhaps, one of the most perplexing questions in political theory. And yet the two-chambered, the bicameral system, is almost universal. Only two or three of the smaller Europ-

Phone Seymour 2288

THE YAMATO

Direct Importers of
SILKS

460 Granville Street
Vancouver, B. C.

Daintiness and Good Taste

Are reflected in the attractive two-color monogram stationery we print to your order.

It is distinctive and pleasing in appearance. Appealing as it does to all lovers of things beautiful, it is truly stationery you are proud to use. Your monogram in red on blue ground, or the reverse, or any two colors to suit your taste or special purpose.

100 sheets and 100 envelopes sent post paid for \$1.75. Give full name and address. The Columbia Press, Dept. B., Merritt, B. C.