

that in Canada the mass of the people are in a fool's paradise, and are not even conscious of the fact that public opinion is dead, and that the electorate never dream of enquiring into the ethics of any act of the party leaders.

The *Globe* has recently published a series of *fac simile* letters containing the orders of Sir Hector Langevin and Sir Adolphe Caron upon Mr. Thomas McGreevy for funds to be used in elections in Quebec. The sums were enormous, infinitely more than Mr. McGreevy would think of contributing out of his own pocket. Hence it is manifest that the fund was purposely formed to corrupt the electors and buy up a number of seats for the Government. No one doubts that the *fac similes* published by the *Globe* are genuine, and that these two Ministers of the Crown actually drew on this iniquitous fund for an aggregate amount of \$112,500; that \$16,000 or more of this was spent in Sir Hector's own constituency, Three Rivers, and over \$15,000 spent in electing another Minister—Sir Adolphe Caron. An instant's reflection is sufficient to satisfy the dullest intellect that such a system is intrinsically bad, and destructive of free government, and public morals. Any one, whoever he may be, who would indulge in such practices, should be despised and contemned; while a suspicion of such conduct on the part of a Minister of the Crown should drive him instantly and forever from public life. This is what would happen in England, and—the flippant talk about political corruption in the United States to the contrary—in the United States. No man with the smirch which attaches to Sir Adolphe Caron in respect of the McGreevy letters could hold up his head in political affairs in the United States for a day. But I want any one to find me a single Conservative in the whole Dominion of Canada who has ventured a manly utterance on this point. Name me one of the hundred and twenty or thirty supporters of the Government in Parliament who has uttered a note of condemnation, or even protest. That subtle power upon which alone rests the moral dignity of mankind, the safeguard to social life, the existence and permanency of institutions and governments—the only sure foundation of all hope of the race—that power in Canada in this year of our Lord 1892 is wanting, is absolutely a negative quantity.

Only, be it remembered, in the political field. In the execution of the criminal law public opinion is all right. When a poor wretch commits an offence against the statute law, or a poor girl takes a step aside from the path of virtue, behold ye, there is a most vigorous and effective public opinion! If a man's theology is at variance with the fashionable or orthodox beliefs of the hour, he is quite sure to feel the iron hand of public opinion descending upon him. But in the political world any offence may be committed against public morals, or against justice and fair play, and no one seems to be in the slightest affected by it. The party organs will approve and applaud. No sign of independent opinion is discoverable. A newspaper, here and there, professed independent, utters the note of condemnation, but it does not disturb the mind of a single partisan, and if the writer of the condemnation belongs to the party, he votes with the culprit, whatever he may write in the name of morality and at the dictate of conscience.

Take the gerrymander—the most odious of all abuses of power. Who pretends that the measure as submitted this season was not tinged with party bias—was not framed in the hope of benefiting the party in power at the expense of their opponents? Carried to its full extent, such a method of legislation would simply destroy popular government. If a legislature can pass laws to help the party in power to stay there—what is to be the limit? The next step would be to disfranchise all constituencies which refused to send members to support the Government. After that we should have a registration under the control of rigid partisans, by which it was contrived that no man who would not express his confidence in the Government should have his name endorsed on the list of qualified electors. That Parliament has the constitutional right to perpetrate such iniquities is unquestionable. What, then, is the usual safeguard against this arbitrary assumption of absolute power by a Government or a dominant party? Absolutely nothing but public opinion—the exercise of the public conscience inspired by a sense of the value of popular government. Where are the tokens of the existence of any such factor in Canada at this moment? Who is disturbed by the gerrymander? Mr. Dalton McCarthy and Col. O'Brien—life-long Conservatives and avowed supporters of the Government—did manfully denounce this infamous measure. For this they are entitled to the highest praise—the more so, as there is nothing in the outlook to encourage independent work or actions. But where is the evidence that a dozen persons in all Canada are influenced by what these two gentlemen said or did? The whole Tory machine goes on its way as solid and as self-satisfied as before. The phalanx gathered itself together in Parliament to vote down every modification, and the phalanx outside will gather itself together to carry the elections. One-half of the clergy men of Canada will vote for the gerrymander with all the unction of their sacred office.

In view of the actual condition of public opinion in Canada at the present moment perhaps the most wonderful incident of our public life is the phenomenal moderation of the party in power. Instead of taking infinite pains to collect an election fund and worrying great corporations, contractors, and protected monopolists for subscriptions, it

would be much easier during the session immediately preceding a general election to come down with a sum of \$1,000,000 in the supplementary estimates, to be used to assist the Government and their supporters to bear the expense of the ensuing elections. This proposition seems so outrageous that it may be deemed out of place in a moderate and rational discussion of the political situation. But, while it may be true that such an outrage would, at length, arouse some public opinion in Canada, and while it is doubtless true that there are Conservatives in Canada who would resent such an infamous violation of the principles of popular government, yet I have to make the humiliating confession that out of a very large circle of acquaintances in this Dominion, I do not know where I could put my hand on a single supporter of the present Government who would either withdraw his support or even avow that he was shocked by any such proposal. I hear in advance from every hide bound partisan in the Government ranks the cogent defence of the transaction to the following effect: "The Grits are trying to ruin the industries of the country, and hand it over to the mercies of a foreign power. It is very proper that a large sum be put at the disposal of the Government of the day to guard the country from a treasonable conspiracy." It is always a brilliant policy to bribe the people to prevent them from ruining themselves.

I do not wish to take an extreme or absurd view of the situation. It must be that there are yet some lingering moral instincts in relation to political matters in the Canadian people, and some things may be imagined so atrocious that the great majority would revolt against their perpetration. But I have used the illustration of the voting of money for corrupt purposes to emphasize the moral atrophy which actually does prevail. If Sir John Thompson should actually propose to vote money to help the Government in elections, it is my firm conviction that an overwhelming majority of the Conservatives of Canada would support it—perhaps seven-eighths of them, and, if this be true, it is a terrible indictment of the state of public opinion in Canada. At all events, with the greatest deference to those who are pleased to differ from me and with an undying regard for the welfare and development of Canada, I have to regard this low standard of public opinion as the greatest problem confronting us, and most deserving of the serious consideration of patriotic men. Let there be no injustice by sudden outbursts of public indignation, but by all means let the slightest departure from fair, just and honourable conduct in public affairs be visited by swift and unrelenting public condemnation. All that a nation has, as the basis of its life, is the public conscience. This gone, anarchy, despotism, or any other evil may ensue. Therefore, whatever differences exist in relation to public policy, no man should permit his party leanings to allow him for one moment to condone fraud or injustice. The greatest power for good within the state is public opinion, and the higher the standard, the more swift the judgments, the better will be the moral status and the material prosperity of the nation.

I have dealt with the six causes which contributed to the success of the Government in the bye-elections, and it only remains to conclude by a few suggestions as to the present and future.

J. W. LONGLEY.

L'ILE DES RÊVES.

DARKLY the shadows fall,
Flash golden gleams;
Hark how the echos call
"Island of Dreams."

Look where the light lies low
Far, far away,
Red with the crimson glow
Of dying day.

There ye will find a rest,
And toil no more;
Life is a mocking jest,
Strive for the shore.

Hark how the music thrills
Soft o'er the waves;
Is it a spell that kills
Or one that saves?

Truth from a dying breath
Is all it seems;
Why should we shun thee Death,
Island of Dreams?

J. A. T. L.

THE very thing that men think they have got the most of, they have got the least of; and that is judgment.—*H. W. Shaw.*

To dread no eye and suspect no tongue is the great prerogative of innocence—an exemption granted only to inviolable virtue.—*Dr. Johnson.*

THE really efficient labourer will be found not to crowd his day with work, but will saunter to his task surrounded by a wide halo of ease and leisure.—*Thoreau.*

WHAT valour were it, when a cur doth grin, for one to thrust his hand between his teeth, when he might spurn it with his foot away?—*Shakespeare.*

PARIS LETTER.

ST. DENIS, the great manufacturing suburb of Paris, is more socialist than either Marseille or Roubaix; its municipal council resolved to institute civil baptism as the complement of secular marriage. The Prefect informed the municipality that step would be illegal. The objection has been turned, by some of the councillors forming themselves into a joint stock company for running civil baptisms, when their proceedings thus became lawful. The little stranger will be brought before the president of the society, who is also the mayor; he will ask two sponsors do they undertake to see the child brought up morally and physically sound, and in case of necessity to support the infant as if their own; an affirmative response being given, the mayor, reading out the name, baptizes the child in "the name of the grand principles of the Revolution," and admits baby a citizen or citizeness of the republic. A special register records the proceedings. On the 14th July, 1792, while the national fête was being banqueted in the Champ de Mars, a young drummer mounted upon a table, announced that his wife had just been confined of a daughter, and requested the representatives to select a name for his little girl; he himself belonged to the battalion of Pikes; Pétion, the mayor of Paris, presided at the feast, and the holiday being national, the infant was named "Citizeness Pétion—Nationale—Pique." A deputation was then formed that set out for the mother's bedroom, preceded by music executing the lively old ditty "Where are the merry old shepherds going to?" The infant was well wrapped up, then placed in a cradle made of flags suspended from pikes; the cover consisted of a flag conquered at the Bastille; the processionists wore phrygian caps, and sang Christmas carols and the *Ca ira* alternately, till the chapel of St. Marguerite was reached, when Bishop Fautet received the little *citoyenne* into the bosom of the Church, at the baptismal fount.

The Academy of Sciences delegated a commission, headed by Dr. Charcot, to examine Jacques Inaudi, the wonderful "calculating boy." Some curious facts are supplied by the report. Inaudi, like all infant prodigies, is the son of poor and illiterate parents; he was born in October, 1867, at Onorato, in Piedmont, and when a lad came to France, exhibiting at provincial cafes a tame Alpine rat and working mental sums instanter for a few sous. He is now in his twenty-fifth year, has become a naturalized Frenchman, and for three years has been taught to read and write. His character is mild and modest; he talks agreeably and sensibly, and is expert at cards and billiards. He is five feet one inch in height—nearly all great men have been small; looks like a fat peasant; has a large head and an immense forehead. For those who judge character by the nose and the mouth, these are respectively fine and small.

When given a problem, Inaudi who prefers to receive it verbally and not in writing, after he has taken it in, says, "I commence;" then he mutters inaudibly to himself, touches his forehead occasionally, clinches his hands, and describes imaginary lines on the palm of his left hand, with the index finger of his right hand. Nothing disturbs him during his mental work, of which two facts are remarkable: the complexity of the problem and the rapidity of the solution. He was asked, "How many seconds in 18 years, 7 months, 21 days, and 3 hours?" In thirteen seconds he announced the solution. Few but can add two figures of one number each; less easy two figures of two, three or four numbers each. Inaudi can add, quick as thought, two figures of twelve numbers each. He does not perhaps calculate more rapidly than would a professional arithmetician on paper, but he does his sums mentally. Philosophers assert we have not one, but several memories; now Inaudi, while capable of correctly repeating twenty figures once stated, is incapable of that feat with respect to twenty letters; he can only remember six, recalling them at the rate of two per second.

It is thus that he has repeated for Dr. Charcot, with ease and volubility, twenty-four figures when read out; one reading suffices, and he will repeat them inversely too without error or fatigue. Macaulay could repeat all the Archbishops of Canterbury seriatim, and then name them backwards. Inaudi could repeat correctly thirty-six figures, but broke down at fifty-six. Ordinarily we see figures as images, with the mind's eye, as do blindfolded chess players the pieces; sight does not assist Inaudi, he "hears the figures by his ears." This explains why he prefers a problem to be given to him verbally; when written on paper, he reads it aloud to himself and then thrums away the document. He must be allowed to mutter to himself while working a problem; during the latter process, Dr. Charcot asked him to keep sounding an easy vowel; Inaudi did so, but was five times longer in solving his sums. He does not see the figures in his memory, he there jingles them. The associated faculties of calculation, as perception, attention and judgment, are largely developed in Inaudi.

The cleavage between the Catholic monarchists is profound; the majority of them implicitly obey the Pope and accept the republic; the dissidents led by M. Emile Ollivier and the Duc de Dondeauville decline to become republicans; they will remain with the Comte de Paris in a state of political suspended animation till the advent of the next Pope, who may be monarchical in his views. Archbishop Ireland, of Minnesota, returning from Rome to his diocese in the United States, delivered a few evenings ago a politico-religious conversazione; he urged