

NOW that Mr. McCleary's Bill to amend the Anatomy Act has been rejected in the Ontario Assembly by a large majority, it may seem a little late to discuss the question it raised. While we might have hesitated to advocate the passing of the Bill in the shape in which it was presented, and in view of the disastrous consequences which were so confidently predicted as sure to follow from its adoption, we cannot hesitate to express our sympathy with a great deal that was urged in its support by the mover and others. In the first place, we must confess that we were surprised, not to say shocked, by one of the arguments dwelt upon by several of the opponents of the measure, and even by the Attorney-General himself. This favourite argument was to the effect that the passage of the amending Bill would lead to the desecration of graveyards by the medical students. The students must have the material on which to operate, said Mr. Mowat, in effect, and if we do not give them the bodies of the friendless inmates of our poor houses, they will steal what they require from the burying grounds. That is to say, these medical students are a kind of scientific desperadoes who must be carefully conciliated. If we make our laws to suit their fancies they may observe them, but if not, their passion for qualifying themselves for becoming the future benefactors of society is so ungovernable that they will set all law and all decency at defiance. Else it must be meant that they are a kind of creature whose ghoulish propensities are such that we can save the bodies of our dead from indignity only as we propitiate them by casting to them the corpses of a certain number of those who have no friends to protect their remains, or protest against such a disposal of them. To say nothing of the left-handed compliment to medical students and their professors, the argument is surely a strange one to come from the lips of the chief executive officer of the country, whose business it is supposed to be to see that the laws of the land are enforced, and who has at his command all the resources of the Province to aid in their enforcement. But seriously, is it not, to say the least, an ungenerous thing that is done under the sanction of the existing law? Granting that it is necessary to the skilful practice of surgery and so to the physical well-being of society, that the students in our medical colleges be able to obtain a supply of bodies for dissection, there ought surely to be some means of furnishing such supply that conflicts less with our sense of justice and magnanimity than the ignoble practice of discriminating against the poor and friendless, especially seeing that these are often the very persons who can least appreciate the force of the argument from scientific necessity, and whose feelings are most harrowed by the dread of the dissecting knife. Ought not the enthusiasm of modern science to be able to find a more excellent way? Surely among all the devotees of the healing art there ought to be volunteer offerings enough to supply all demands. Why should not every medical student and practitioner make it a point of professional honour and etiquette to bequeath his body, when he is done with it, for the promotion of science? Surely none of these should hesitate? Would not this be a vastly nobler and better thing to do than to leave the students of the profession to depend upon the operation of laws which are unequal and unjust in that they deny to the poor that consideration of their views as to the disposal of their mortal remains which they scrupulously concede to the rich. Then there must be multitudes of such philanthropists as the members of the Legislature who so warmly espoused the cause of surgical science, who would also cheerfully volunteer. In a word, is it not time that the merits of the voluntary principle were tried in this department of scientific enquiry, and the feelings of the unfortunate, friendless poor saved from outrage?

RUMOURS are rife as to the choice about to be made by Premier Mowat for appointment to the position of Master in Chambers now vacant at Osgoode Hall. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of having all appointments to judicial positions of every kind made from the ranks of those who stand highest in public estimation on the grounds of uprightness as well as of ability. There are, we dare say, several among the number of those who may be regarded as eligible for this position, whose appointment would be satisfactory to the public and creditable to the Premier. But if we may, without seeming to be invidious, express an opinion in regard to the matter, we would say that one of the names which have been mentioned is that of a gentleman who seems so well qualified in every way to command the respect and confidence of

the Bar and the public, and to reflect credit upon the Government making the appointment, that we earnestly hope to see him nominated. We refer to Mr. W. H. P. Clement. This, we think it will generally be conceded, would be a most meritorious appointment. A gold medalist in law of Toronto University, the first of his class in the examination for call to the Bar, and now a barrister of some ten or eleven years' standing, during which he has read extensively and to excellent purpose, having also for years as a member of one of the largest firms in Toronto had charge of the Chamber Practice and won the distinction of being one of the ablest practice counsel in the Province, his professional qualifications are unquestionably of a very high order. Better still, he is, we believe, regarded by all who know him as a man of sterling integrity. His personal reputation is without a spot. He has moreover, in large measure, that judicial turn of mind which is so essential in a position of this kind and which could scarcely fail to win him the confidence of his brethren and to secure respect for his decisions from all parties concerned. Last, but not least, Mr. Clement combines in good proportions the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*, a combination which is eminently desirable in the incumbent of such a position who is to succeed one who has discharged the duties of his difficult position with such ability, urbanity and dignity as Mr. R. G. Dalton for so many years has exemplified. It is but fair to Mr. Clement, though it is, we hope, unnecessary so far as our readers are concerned, to add that these words are spoken without his permission or knowledge. It is, indeed, quite probable that he would have disapproved our purpose had he had the slightest suspicion that we should thus make free with his name and reputation. We speak in what we believe to be the best interests of the profession and the public, and if we might hope that our words would have some influence, however slight, in determining the decision of the Minister in favour of Mr. Clement, we should feel gratified, believing that we had done the public a service.

THE attitude of Sir John Thompson and the Government of which he is the ruling spirit in regard to Mr. Edgar's charges against Sir Adolphe Caron must have been a surprise, not only to Liberals but to Conservatives as well. To high-minded Canadians of both parties it was, we venture to say, if the truth were told, a painful surprise. That the very leaders who have been profuse in their protestations of their readiness to investigate all charges of wrong-doing that might be brought, on proper responsibility against any branch of the Administration, and to punish all who could be proved guilty, should have gone back so directly on their own promises, is astounding. It is hard to believe that anyone accustomed to think for himself could have been convinced by Sir John's laboured refinements that the case was not a proper one for investigation by a Parliamentary Committee. Even were the question, as Sir John rather disingenuously sought to make it appear, simply one of electoral corruption, the time has gone past when it could be investigated by the courts. Shall it, then, be said that corruption of constituencies in the grossest manner and by wholesale cannot be enquired into in Canada unless the facts happen to come to light within the brief time-limit set by the Controverted Elections Act? That would be a sad state of affairs indeed. But it is clear that the charge of bribery in elections is by no means the principal one contained in Mr. Edgar's resolutions. The gravamen of the charge is that a member of the Canadian Government—the question whether he was at the moment a member of Parliament is too subtle for the lay mind and may be left to be settled between Mr. Thompson and Mr. Mills—did, first, in his capacity as one of his Excellency's advisers, promote the giving of a subsidy from the public funds, in aid of a certain railway, and that he did, second, while still a member of the Government, receive a large portion of the money thus voted for such railway and use it for personal or political purposes. We are not saying, of course, that these allegations are true, or even that we believe them to be true. What we want to know, what the country ought to demand to know, is whether they are true or not. We are merely stating what the charge is which the Minister of Justice of the Dominion of Canada, and leader of the House of Commons, tells his followers in the House is not a proper question for it to enquire into. Assuming the truth of the charge, can anyone deny that Sir Adolphe Caron was guilty of a flagrant breach of trust? Can anyone deny that he was guilty also of stealing from the public chest, or, which amounts to about the same thing

in law and equity, of taking moneys knowing them to be stolen, and using them not only for a purpose wholly foreign to that for which he caused them to be voted, but for a purpose wholly unlawful and base? What would be thought of a trustee of a private estate who should first cause a portion of the trust funds of which he was joint custodian to be appropriated for a certain purpose, and then by dint of improper and confidential relations with the persons to whom the money had been thus handed over, receive a large part of it and apply it to personal and dishonourable uses? Yet, this is the alleged transaction which Sir John Thompson and some of his colleagues would have the House of Commons pass by as an offence beyond its jurisdiction, though the accused is one of its members and a colleague of the honourable gentleman himself. If the Minister of Justice really believes that the charges ought not to be investigated by the House he surely ought, as the official embodiment of the spirit of righteousness in the Government, to feel sufficient indignation at such a charge to point out in what way it can, if proved, be punished. May we not hope that many of his own supporters will unite with Col. O'Brien in pressing this view of the case upon the Ministers. Nothing less surely is demanded in the interests of justice; for the good name of the Dominion, already sadly compromised; above all for the sake of the reputation of the accused Minister, if he be, as he solemnly avers, innocent. If the case is quashed by Government action, nine out of every ten honest Canadians will, in their hearts, believe him guilty.

MR. MILLS' motion claiming for Canada the right to negotiate her own commercial treaties, scarcely received the consideration at the hands of Parliament which its importance demands. Not only was the debate unduly limited in respect to the numbers who took part in it, but even those who discussed the question did not grapple very closely with it, as one of practical politics. It is doubtful whether it is such as the lines laid down in the proposed resolution. Mr. Mills dealt with the subject largely on philosophical and historical grounds. His speech seemed fairly open to the objection taken by Mr. Foster that he did not face the practical difficulties which lie directly in the way. It was easy for a student of political history to show that all vigorous colonial life has always been, and must in the nature of the case always be, subject to a law of development. Standing still in the life of a colony as in the life of a nation, perhaps even more than in the life of a nation, means stagnation and decay. It was particularly easy to trace this law of political development in the history of the Provinces now constituting the Dominion of Canada. And it was, we venture to say, perfectly safe to take the position that the status of semi-independence reached by these Provinces at and through Confederation was but another step forward in the direction of full-fledged nationality, and that any policy which accepts this step as the final one, and seeks to check the process of development at the stage now reached, tends to disaster, to disintegration, to political death. This is felt and tacitly, if not always explicitly, conceded on all hands. The ferment of discussion in regard to the various projects of Imperial Federation, Independence and Annexation can have no other meaning. The practical point, then, to which we should have expected Mr. Mills to address himself, would have been to prove that the change he advocates is the natural, reasonable and feasible next step in our progress towards that complete nationhood to which both he and his leader avowedly look forward as the goal of Canadian progress. Perhaps he said all there was to be said in favour of his proposal as a practical and practicable one. Possibly the idea of the Queen negotiating, say, a Franco-Canadian, or an American-Canadian, treaty of commerce through the Canadian Government, just as she might negotiate a Franco-British or American-British treaty through the Imperial Government, is a proposal of such a kind that valid arguments in its support, in face of the serious practical difficulties which immediately present themselves, are not easy to find. One of these practical difficulties which does not seem to have been referred to by any of the speakers is that the operation of the proposed system would bring the Imperial authorities into connection with the Canadian Ministers in a way which Canadian Liberals would be the first to object to, seeing that these Ministers are directly responsible to the Canadian and not to the British people, and hence could scarcely act under the direction of the Queen—that is to say, the British Government and people—without serious risk of friction.