

not risk much by prophesying a like history and triumph of *no-partyism* in politics. But that can be reached only by "the slow process of public education," bringing the trained common-sense of the race one day to bear upon the problem.

WHAT a delightful reunion must have been that of the old Upper Canada College boys which took place on prize day last week, in connection with the first public reception in the new and magnificent building. Though the silver-haired youths who, in imagination, took their places on the forms or shouldered their bats and showed how games were won, as of yore, must have missed some of the old associations, with the indefinable charm which clings to local and material objects and cannot be enjoyed quite to the full apart from them, yet their loss in this respect would be more than counterbalanced by the pleasure they must have felt in realizing that the spirit of the old school still lived and had simply changed its place, to enter on a new career amid its ampler and more beautiful surroundings. When the question, "What shall be done with Upper Canada College?" was up for consideration we did not hesitate to express our opinion that the institution had logically no place in the Provincial system, and should be thrown for support upon the loyalty and liberality of its numerous alumni and other wealthy friends. We still think that its continued existence as essentially the school of a class, and to a certain extent a rival of the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes which are an integral part of the public school system, is an anomaly, and that it should have taken its place among the excellent voluntary schools, which we are glad to see increasing in number and influence, to meet special wants and supply elements of training which cannot be had in the ordinary public schools. But let all that pass. Seeing that it has been decided that the College shall be continued on the old foundation, we heartily congratulate its Principal, Faculty, students and friends on the very favourable auspices under which it has entered upon its new lease of life. As Principal Dickson well said, in his interesting address, the residential school differs widely from the day school in its functions. It does a work in the formation of character which the day school cannot do. The formative influences it brings to bear are operating, not for a few hours in the twenty-four, but throughout the whole day. It forms a little commonwealth in itself, governed to a large extent by a public sentiment of its own; and, we would add, by the character of that public sentiment is determined the character of the school, and of the formative influences it exerts upon those who from time to time enter it. The character of that sentiment is, in its turn, determined by those who control the work and discipline of the school, and especially by the many at its head. Hence it is no wonder that Principal Dickson feels that a heavy responsibility rests upon him. Happily he may also feel, and no doubt does feel, that a great opportunity is set before him, in which he may emulate the career of an Arnold or a Thring and become, in the highest sense, a public benefactor. In this grand work he and all associated with him have the hearty sympathy and good wishes of THE WEEK.

THE *personnel* of the Civil Service Commission appointed by the Premier pursuant to the announcement made during the session has not escaped unfavourable criticism. The main objections seem to be negative rather than positive. That is to say, exception is taken to the Commission because of what it does not, rather than because of what it does, include. Some of the members of the Commission, to say the least, are not generally known to have proved themselves possessed of the kind and amount of knowledge and experience necessary for the discharge of so important a trust. This is unfortunate, for in the constitution of such a body it is of the first importance that its members should be so well and favourably known as to command, by their very names, general confidence in the thoroughness of their work and the value of their recommendations. But this alleged deficiency of qualification, however true it may be of some of the persons named as members of the Commission, can by no means be asserted of all. We might, for instance, without suggesting any invidious comparisons, mention the name of Mr. George Hague, manager of the Merchants Bank, Montreal, as that of one unexceptionally well qualified, in point alike of character, ability and personal experience, for the duties of the position. Complaint has been made, not without force, of the comparatively small representa-

tion given to Ontario on the Commission. We are disposed to deprecate rather than to urge sectional considerations in public matters, yet it cannot be denied that there are matters in which local claims are entitled to attention. In determining, for instance, how the management of the business affairs of the Confederation should be changed and improved, it was but reasonable to expect that Ontario, as the partner having the largest capital invested and paying most of the running expenses, should have had an influential, if not a controlling, voice in the investigation. But then the same remark would hold good in reference to the composition of the Government itself, in which, for some reason, Ontario has not for many years had an influence at all proportionate to her share in the political concern. In this case, however, Mr. Hague, by reason of his long residence and business training in Ontario, is perhaps quite as well qualified to represent the Upper as the Lower Province. On the whole we see no reason to doubt that the Commissioners who have been named may find it easy to recommend, as did their predecessors a few years ago, a very much better system than that which at present prevails in the Civil Service departments, especially in the matter of appointments and promotions. But is there any reason to hope that any recommendations they may make, save in matters of detail, will be carried out to any better purpose than were those of the former Commission? Perhaps so. The revelations of the summer may have had their effect. Certain it is, that, whatever room there may be for improvement in the details of management in the different departments and offices, no radical and lasting reform can be effected, unless and until the whole system of patronage, with its opportunities for favouritism, nepotism and subtle bribery, is done away with, and a thorough reconstruction on the basis of appointment and promotion by merit alone substituted. Whether such a reform can be effected on the lines laid down in advance by the Premier is, we fear, doubtful. It is, at any rate, somewhat discouraging that the Government should have pronounced beforehand against a permanent Board of Civil Service Commissioners, with full control. It is hard to conceive of any other method which can secure the desired result of lifting the Civil Service of the Dominion to a higher plane than that it now occupies as a wheel in the party machinery.

THE announcement that Mr. Balfour has been chosen as the successor of the late Mr. Smith in the British House of Commons is but in accordance with general expectation. Mr. Balfour has been marked out from the first by his exceptional strength and his unique record in the Irish Secretaryship as by far the most eligible man for the position. Whatever differences of opinion—and these are exceedingly wide—may exist as to the character of his administration of that office, no one can deny that it has been marked by great ability and very unusual firmness. These are qualities that are always in demand in important Government positions. There are, however, other qualities equally rare and scarcely less indispensable for successful leadership in the Commons, such as unfailing tact, command of temper, and suavity of manner. Judging from the Parliamentary reports we should be inclined to think Mr. Balfour more likely to fail in regard to the latter quality than either of the others. His leadership will certainly be in marked contrast in many respects to that of his predecessor. Whether it will be more successful or satisfactory on the whole remains to be seen, as also whether his popularity within certain large circles will have any effect in staying the progress of the Opposition. In one respect Mr. Balfour will be at a disadvantage. So much will be expected from him that he will find it difficult to equal, much less to surpass, expectation. There will, therefore, be no room for agreeable surprise, while partial failure would be almost disastrous.

A MURDER almost, though by no means quite, unique in the annals of crime was committed in the suburbs of Liverpool a few weeks ago. Samuel Crawford, nine years old, and Robert Shearon, eight years old, murdered in cold blood a lad named Eccles, in order to steal his clothes. Crawford being an incorrigible truant, his mother, in order to prevent his leaving the house, had locked up his clothes. He wrapped himself in some old bit of cloth or canvas and made his escape, and, in company with Shearon, of set purpose and after three separate efforts, drowned Eccles, in order to possess himself of his clothes. The *Spectator* says: "It is a frightful story; but what is to be done with the criminals, if convicted? Modern opinion will not allow of their execution; and impris-

onment for life is a penalty which they will scarcely feel. They will in manhood forget the crime, or that they ever were free. . . The children may practically be rewarded for being criminal." The assumption that a life of severe restraint, with hard, perpetual and hopeless labour, would be scarcely felt, or might even become a practical reward, is a larger one than most minds will, we think, be able to frame. But let that pass. That in the *Spectator's* way of putting the case which invites comment is the regret seemingly implied that modern opinion will not permit the hanging of these child criminals. This, in its turn, seems based on an implied assumption that what the sentiment of justice, or the well-being of society demands, is that the culprits be made to suffer pain as nearly as may be commensurate with their guilt. Logically this view points to torture, for the momentary suffering inflicted by execution would be incomparably less than that involved in imprisonment for life. It cannot be that the *Spectator* is thinking of the deterrent effect of the punishment, because it is obvious that neither the execution nor the imprisonment of these two boys would have any appreciable influence in deterring others of like age and propensities from similar crimes. Of course children capable of so shocking a deed could not be left to run at large. They would be more dangerous than wild beasts. The only thing that it seems possible for modern opinion to approve in their case is that they be put under the influence of the strongest motives which can be brought to bear with a view to developing in them, if possible, some humane and Christian feeling, and thus bringing them in the course of long years to a proper sense of the enormity of their crime. Should this ever be effected, the life-long remorse which would follow would surely be a punishment severe enough to satisfy the most un pitying sense of justice, or the most vindictive desire for vengeance.

"BUT, somehow," the *Spectator* will still say, "that is not wholly satisfactory." Certainly not. Nothing connected with such an affair can be satisfactory, if it falls short of the restoration of the victim to life and to his parents, and the instant and complete transformation of the criminals into good boys, utterly incapable of repeating so wicked a deed, even in thought. Society, under its human limitations, can only do its best. In what direction that best lies, the *Spectator*, it seems to us, indicates in the following sentences: "The case, fortunately, does not often occur, but cases of cruelty betraying precisely the same callous absence of sympathy constantly do. If the children had drowned a cat for its skin, they would, in the suburbs of Liverpool, have passed unpunished." This remark points at once to cause and cure. The cause is the bad training or want of training which is steadily blunting all the finer feelings of humanity in tens of thousands of children in our large cities, and developing that callousness and cruelty which alone make such atrocities possible. Those boys must have tortured many animals to death before they became so fiendishly incapable of pity or mercy. The remedy is for society to devote a large measure of such cost and energy as are now devoted to the detection and punishment of the matured criminal, at whatever age that maturity manifests itself in action, to the nobler and vastly more hopeful work of rescuing, by compulsion when necessary, those who are manifestly undergoing such training, and placing them under right influences for the production of good citizenship. Society in its organized and corporate capacity alone can wield the power and authority necessary to do this work completely and effectively, but parents, preachers, teachers and the thousand and one beneficent agencies which are happily being brought to bear by individuals and societies, working for moral and religious ends, can render and are rendering invaluable aid. Only a week or two since one of the ministers of this city preached, by announcement, a sermon for boys on "Cruelty to Animals," and we are told by those who were present that it was very pleasing to see the large number of boys who came out to hear and who listened with the closest attention. We have since heard, too, of interesting comments made by some of these juvenile hearers, indicating that while they appreciated the discourse, they could, had they been interviewed beforehand, have given the preacher some valuable "pointers." The hint may be worthy of the attention of other of our city pastors.

HAVING said so much, we are tempted, even at the risk of being counted deficient in the modern scientific spirit, to ask two questions more, which force themselves upon the mind in this connection. First, what is