

the effect on the sensibilities—upon which the beauty as well as the morality of youthful character so largely depends—of the study of the science of biology, as it is conducted in many of our schools and colleges? All will of course agree that the observation of the structure and habits of living animals, in the freedom of their native habitat, is one of the most refining and elevating of studies. Properly pursued, it tends not only to develop the perceptive powers to a most useful extent, but adds materially to the resources of life, in the way of innocent recreation and enjoyment for leisure moments. But what about the craze for "specimens" and "collections," which is so industriously cultivated in some of our schools? It was but a few weeks since that groups of boys might sometimes be observed in this city, at late hours in the evening, intensely busy with little scoop nets catching the insects that were flitting about bewildered in the glare of the electric lights. The captives would no doubt be speedily impaled with pins, and, after due inspection and approval by the teachers, added as specimens to the growing stock. The question suggested itself then, as frequently before and since: Is this an exercise calculated to make those boys better men, or the opposite? The same problem presents itself, in another form, in connection with the practice of vivisection, which is now becoming so common in the biological laboratories connected with our seats of learning. The question of the real value of this practice in its relation to medical science is still, to a large extent, *sub judice*. But even conceding a certain amount of scientific usefulness, there is yet ample room for the higher doubt, whether the knowledge thus gained is not gained at the cost of those fine feelings and tender sensibilities, which have an infinitely greater value as parts of a noble manhood and womanhood. The other and somewhat disconnected question relates to the paralyzing moral effect of the extreme scientific views with regard to the law of heredity, of which we hear so much in these days. Of course if these views can be shown to be demonstrably true there is nothing more to be said. But they are as yet very far from having been demonstrated, while facts telling in favour of the opposite view—the faith which despairs of no living human being—are constantly multiplying. But what we wish particularly to point out just here is that the doctrine of the inexorableness of the law of transmission, which is often supposed to bear against capital punishment, and which the *Spectator* probably regards as a large factor in producing the "modern opinion" of which it speaks, really points logically in just the opposite direction. It is the Christianity which clings to the belief that while there is life there is hope of moral renovation, which condemns capital punishment in such a case as that of the boy murderers. Let science establish its absolute rule of heredity, and the logical outcome is that the human machine should be pitilessly crushed the moment it is proved to be constructed on criminal lines. Let the spoiled casts be destroyed for the perfection of the race. Let the ancient practice be improved upon by ridding the world of the morally as well as the physically deformed and imbecile.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.

SECOND ARTICLE.

WE have glanced at the difficulties special to the present which beset Mr. Abbott. There are other difficulties which clog the feet and cumber the way of all Premiers, which mar good government and even menace the very existence of Canada. Some of those clergymen who have been engaged in the natural and wholesome task of denouncing corruption, have unwisely propounded a remedy. So long as they confined themselves to denouncing the sin they were on safe ground; but when they declared that it was all owing to party—meaning clearly that close organization of the two parties—they showed that their political science was not as profound as their theological lore. Corruption would disappear if among the professed Reformers on the one hand and the professed Conservatives on the other, party feeling were pervasive and controlling as a motive. There is one part of this Dominion where nearly all the voters have to be bought. In all parts there are venal voters. It is plain if their party feeling were sufficiently strong such would vote unbought. When the late Chief Justice Dorion ascended the bench, a friend said to him he was sorry he had retired from politics, as politics could ill spare him. Dorion answered: "I have been a member of two administrations and I am convinced the people of Canada do not want a pure Government, and therefore I do not care to remain in politics." Eighteen years ago when a gentleman who has since become a member of our Canadian House of Lords was running in the Reform interest in East Toronto,

on the day of the election, a man used to come into the *Globe* office nearly every hour, and in the presence of a person whose intention at that time was known to be to return to England, and who therefore was as the French lady said when about, at the close of a ball in Paris, to entrust a handsome girl to the escort of a gentleman almost a stranger—a thing she would not think of doing were he a Frenchman, above all a Parisian—"only an Englishman"—the late George Brown would hand the ward politician a roll of one dollar bills. In reply to a remark of the "foreigner" Mr. Brown said: "I was sick of politics before I entered them, and I have been sick of them ever since." Welcomed should be the denunciations of the pulpit. Before we can solve a problem we must know all its conditions. The statesman will be eager for facts, and as the pulpit is as a rule, unless indeed in the two hierarchical churches, a reflex of the theological opinions of the pew, when it condescends to deal with mundane affairs, it but gives expression to the sentiments of the congregation. It is of no consequence that one preacher thinks we can have the republic of Plato in *face Romuli*, or another, like the travelling doctor, not of divinity, but of medicine, in Addison's time, proffers pills as prophylactics against earthquakes, the valuable thing is, that we are in the presence of a moral barometer which registers for us the state of the political conscience of the most powerful part of the community, not only because the most numerous, but because it is the most ordered, thoughtful and independent. There are diseases proper to all institutions and party as it exists with us in Canada and in the United States, tends to destroy independence, and destroying independence it has a tendency to a minimum of ability in the representative. But it has no necessary connection with corruption, and no one has pointed out the connection between party and the boodling recently revealed before the Committees. The head of the Larkin-Connolly firm is a Reformer. What connection is there between the plunder of civil servants and party? If the preachers had denounced the flaccid tone of the public conscience which permits it to honour success, worldly advancement, wealth, political prominence, titles, however obtained, they would have been on the right tack, even though some of them might be in the position of David when he said to Nathan: "As the Lord liveth the man that hath done this thing shall surely die." And Nathan said unto him: "Thou art the man." It is a thing for searching of heart for Canada, the prestige that is attached to wealth and titles no matter how gained, gained sometimes by such methods that one might fancy that the worm wriggling from the dirt at the root to the top leaf of our political tree, and remaining the poor wingless, vermiculate thing still, wanted to show a world of snobbery, meanly admiring mean things, how beggarly may be the brain of him on whom Plutus smiles, how spiritless the heart that beats beneath a star.

We have only to read the addresses of the Presidents of the young men's political clubs to see with what generous views an unspoiled mind approaches politics. But what may the years unfold? A class of men to be found in all parties—men who by their activity, scheming, sympathy with the most depraved among the voters acquire a certain influence, will seek to "kill" those ingenuous spirits, should they aspire to serve their country; or these, unfortified by scorn of mean success, in despair will truckle, and cynically turn their backs on the ideal that once stirred their hearts, and become rotten before they are ripe; or they will have to face a double struggle—the battle with the open enemy, the ceaseless watch against the secret foe, misrepresented by the designing, misunderstood by those to whom they are determined to give faithful counsel and faithful service. There may be henceforth, one would fain hope, a fourth possibility that the people would come to see that their true interest is to send to Parliament the best and ablest men they can find, and to require more at their hands than the comparatively humble virtue of party loyalty, which is yet a most important thing, and a powerful safeguard, as we have indicated, against corruption. Such men will be loyal party men in the highest sense, not as members of an organization aiming at power, but as part of a body animated by principles vital, in their opinion, to prosperity and progress. Sir John Macdonald was a great statesman, with broad views and great national aims. There were men in his party who on these grounds—though they never concealed that they did not like all his methods—followed him faithfully to the end, and worked for him in public and private so as to affect tangible results—men who would never think of allowing egotistical ambition or personal grievance or private pique to influence their public conduct.

It is not party, however, that is the great danger; it is faction—and where egotism or ambition or greed overrides public spirit, there is always a tendency to faction. What do we see in the Christian world itself? Do we not see a certain spirit of faction? What would Paul think if he entered a new town in the North-West, and instead of the few Christian people all assembling together to honour Christ, saw them proceed at once to erect different places of worship? Religious faction has impeded the spread of Christianity because that energy has been wasted in inter-necine controversy which should have invaded heathendom. Faction will often destroy a party. Arnold, of Rugby, says the Roman Republic and Roman liberty were destroyed by factions. It was the factions of Carthage that destroyed Hannibal and made it possible for Scipio, standing amid the ruins he wrought, to muse on the inevitable decay of states. Thus much must, however,

be conceded that so far as the spirit of faction enters into a party, it is attended with all the evils of faction, and strikes at truth and loyalty and patriotism and every public virtue. There have been times in England when portions of each party were factionists. Lord Houghton's father tells us he left a great political club because he saw around men who were ready to go against their country in the interests of their party, and who would have huzza'd if Wellington, instead of destroying Napoleon at Waterloo, had been destroyed, though Liberty might next have been struck at in her last asylum, in the little glorious isles,

Girt by the dim strait sea
And multitudinous wall of wandering wave.

Faction has no relation to patriotism or public spirit; it is sometimes the outgrowth, sometimes the matrix of boodling; it has a strong stomach, and can view with equanimity, and even protect, when necessary, the vices and plunderings of a Verres and the profligacy of a Lucullus. The machinery of constitutional government works badly when its main shaft—party—is warped by faction. What do we see in Canada? We have religious, religio-political, ethnic and actually geographical factions. We have a body, let it be represented by the sign A. No government can live, unless A, whether it boasts or not a man fit for the position, has a portfolio. Then we have B, which must also have its Cabinet Minister, and of course C, and then there is D, and the fat will be in the fire, unless that letter which begins some words that irresistibly rise to the lips when thinking of such demands, has its man an honourable and a Privy Councillor, and above all at the head of a great spending department. Then certain quarters of the country must have a man. But suppose they don't grow statesmen there? What matter? They have Chinamen and sausage sellers and green-grocers. But these worthy citizens are ignorant? What matter? They will find themselves cheek by jowl with men as ignorant as themselves. But they are not public spirited; they have been scheming in town sites; they have been into every land-grabbing scheme of plunder in their neighbourhood; they have stolen the golden fruit in the Hesperides of corruption. What matter? The moment the Queen hears of it she will present them with strawberry leaves, and the Duke and Duchess of Reekpot will either be sent to govern a crown colony, or will take in boarders, or will set up a public house, and call it in acknowledgment of her Majesty's most gracious favour, "The Queen's Arms," or as publicans have a great regard for propriety, the appropriate may crush down gratitude, and a title chosen which will be at once suggestive and sentimental—the "Boodlers' Bower." What an educating force it will be! how it will raise Canada in the eyes of the world, when she shall have a tavern kept by such "quality"! What an elevating social influence when Rednose can go up to the bar and ask "Her Grace" for "a drop of gin hot," and how will it not still the anger of Mrs. Rednose, when she begins to storm *apropos* of his unsteady condition, when he can say, "My dear, I really could not help it! The last glass was pressed upon me by the Dook himself." The demands of "interests,"—this is what hampers Premiers and degrades government in Canada, and worse still, banishes honesty and strangles efficiency. The *Sherbrooke Gazette* is well-known to the people of Sherbrooke for its enlightenment and independence, and this is what that powerful journal says:—

"It seems to be generally agreed that whatever changes may take place, the Eastern Townships is (*sic*) entitled to representation in the Cabinet. There is, fortunately, no difficulty in deciding as to who, (*sic*) among the Eastern Townships members, is most fitted for assisting in the deliberations of the advisers of the Crown, and in the performance of the departmental work of the Government."

The name of a very respectable gentleman is then mentioned as the man. Whether the gentleman mentioned is or is not fit for the position we are not discussing. What we point out is that a public journal declares that a small corner of a Province is entitled to representation in the Cabinet. Having decided that, the sagacious publicist fixes on his man. It is hard enough to work constitutional Government in England, where the Premier can fill his Cabinet with men according to their weight in the House of Commons. Here every Province must have its representative, and now it seems not only every Province, but every section of a Province. No doubt the day is at hand when we shall need some forty or fifty Cabinet Ministers in order to satisfy the legitimate demands of Townships and Gores, of Dogtail borough and Pigsfeetville. Again we say if true party spirit pervaded the whole country, the people, politicians and all, instead of making it difficult for Mr. Abbott, would make it easy by telling him to do the best he could for Canada, and not heed sectional interests or individual ambitions.

The effect on the country, the effect—especially on young and ardent spirits—of raising men to the highest positions for some factitious reason, need not be dwelt on. Anyway this important side of the question cannot be dealt with now, and must wait till next week; nor can we say more than to assure those whom it may concern that these articles are not written with the object of furthering individual ambition, but diffusing just views on a subject vital to the successful working of constitutional government. Many years ago when Mr. Goldwin Smith was writing much on public questions, a gentleman, now high in the Reform ranks and then prominent, asked, "What does he want?" The young statesman could not