

THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23rd, 1891.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Eighth Year.
Vol. VIII., No. 47.

THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance. Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. Remittances by P.O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher. ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period. No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Pulpit in Politics.....	747
What Does it Mean?.....	747
Partyism in Politics.....	747
Chancellor Fleming's "Utopia".....	747
The New Upper Canada College.....	748
The Civil Service Commission.....	748
Mr. Balfour as Leader of the Commons.....	748
The Boy Murderers.....	748
The Cause and Cure.....	748
Vivisection and the Law of Heredity.....	748
THE REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.—Second Article. Nicholas Flood Davin, M.P.	749
PARIS LETTER.....	750
BEAUTY.—(Poem)..... M. Grant Fraser.	750
OLD NEW-WORLD STORIES: THE SAINT CASTINES.—II. Pierce Stevens Hamilton	750
HISTORIC MONTREAL..... Achemist.	751
A RESCUED RECORD..... S. A. Curzon.	752
MR KINGDOM. (Sonnet)..... Emma Playter Seabury.	753
THE RAMBLER.....	753
ART NOTES.....	753
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	754
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	754
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	755
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.....	755
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	756
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY.....	758
OBSCURE.....	759

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

SOME time ago, it will be remembered, an able correspondent argued forcibly, if not convincingly, in our columns, that it is a breach of political right to forbid the Roman Catholic clergy of Quebec to take part from the pulpit in election contests, and even to bring, as they were wont to do, spiritual intimidation to bear in support of the candidate or the party preferred by the Church. Whatever the weight of Mr. LeSueur's contention, it must be obvious to every impartial mind that there is no real parallelism between such intimidation and the moral arguments which are the only influence the Protestant clergyman can bring to bear in any case. Hon. Mr. Chapleau, however, contends that the same restriction, which he claims credit for having helped to place upon the utterances of the priests, should be applied to those of the Protestant preachers. Mr. Chapleau may have been quite sincere, we dare say, in his argument. He may be to some extent excusable for failing to recognize the fundamental difference in the two cases. To one accustomed to the spiritual absolutism of the Romish Church, it must be hard to understand the freedom of opinion and action which is the glory of Protestantism. But there is, surely, a radical difference between the commands and denunciations of a clergy who, their parishioners are made to believe, have the keys of the gates of Heaven in their hands, and the exhortations addressed by ministers to hearers who are taught to cherish the right of private judgment, and to believe themselves personally responsible to the Court of Heaven for the use they make of that right. Apart, however, from that view of the case, Mr. Chapleau, and the journals which have supported his demand for the banishment of political themes from Protestant pulpits, ought to be able to perceive another broad distinction, viz., that between the general condemnation of political corruption, and the specific support of a particular candidate or party. The priests and bishops of Quebec would do themselves honour and their country service, if they would do the former on every occasion. The Protestant Ministers would incur censure, and their conduct would be regarded as unseemly should they do the latter in any case. The only distinction, then, if there be one, arises out of the fact that the French Catholic

clergy are in possession of a weapon which they are able to use with much effect, to the destruction of the political freedom of their parishioners, while the Protestant ministers have no such weapon, and consequently cannot use it in any case. Can it be doubted that clergymen of all denominations, Catholic or Protestant, are or should be just now reminded that their duty, both to the State and to those under their pastoral oversight, demands that they should bring all their influence to bear to rebuke and to root out political corruption, and to elevate the standard of political morality in every constituency?

IS the spirit of political trickery in the very atmosphere? Has it already permeated to the core even of our juvenile societies and clubs? One is almost compelled to think so, on reading the accounts of the scenes which have been enacted in connection with the annual election of officers in the young men's societies, during the last few weeks. Some of the smart young men of the University, Osgoode Hall, Liberal and Liberal-Conservative clubs will no doubt think us incapable of appreciating a joke, or of putting ourselves *en rapport* with the spirit of the younger generation. None the less we are free to admit that we have read the newspaper reports of recent proceedings in connection with these societies with humiliation and misgiving. We have never been of the number of those who are forever crying out that the former days were better than these. But we cannot be mistaken in believing that there was in some at least of the societies of a quarter of a century or so ago, a chivalrous sentiment, or *esprit de corps*, or whatever we may choose to term it, which impelled its members to despise every dishonourable means of achieving their ends, and which would have led to the speedy ostracism of anyone who should have attempted personation, or repetition, or any of the corrupt devices of the tricky politician. Can it be true that in the societies of these days these and similar dishonest methods were called into requisition and wrought, in the slang of the day, "for all they were worth," and that those known to be guilty of such disreputable tactics are still able to retain their membership in the societies? We should be most glad to learn that we are under a misapprehension, but such is certainly the impression that has gone abroad. It is also said and believed by some who had opportunities for knowing that even the disgraceful practice of bribery, in some of its subtler forms, has been resorted to by some of the wealthier candidates for office, or their friends. All this may seem to some of those concerned too trivial for serious comment, or even a bit of good sport, but a little serious reflection must convince the thoughtful that it is of exceedingly bad omen. One of the benefits of these societies is the training they impart for the serious work of after life. But woe to Canada in the future if her young men at the outset learn to practice and are willing to tolerate the methods and devices of the lowest politicians, so far as to allow them a place in their electioneering contests. But perhaps we are doing these societies an injustice. Possibly they will take the earliest opportunity to strike from their rolls the names of all who can be shown to have resorted to any dishonest expedient. We hope so.

OVER against Mr. Mills' defence of the party system in his Sarnia speech, a week or two ago, may now be set Chancellor Fleming's strong impeachment of it in his address the other day at Queen's Convocation. The question is one worthy of the most serious consideration by Canadians at the present juncture. No one fact stands out more plainly in the evidence given, in regard to the cases of "boodling" which have been under investigation at Ottawa, than that partyism was at the bottom of most of it. The main argument in favour of the system is undoubtedly forcible from the practical point of view, though it is by no means complimentary to human nature in an advanced stage of civilization. It is in effect that only by setting a sharp Opposition to watch the men entrusted with the government of the country can an honest administration of the public funds be secured. This, moreover, begs the question by assuming that the same class of men as those now chosen to represent us

would be elected to Parliament and placed in the Government under a non-partisan system. So, too, when Mr. Mills pointed out, correctly enough, we dare say, that but for a vigilant Opposition the scandals recently brought to light at Ottawa would not have been unearthed. He evidently reasoned from the assumption that the critics of the party system seek to abolish it by the simple device of doing away with the Opposition, and leaving the reins in the same hands which now hold them. In fact, throughout his argument, as reported in the daily papers, Mr. Mills failed to grapple with the only plausible scheme for a non-partisan administration. It is easy to see, of course, that under a democratic system, even assuming that the electors could be relied on to choose their best man, without reference to party politics, differences of opinion on great public questions would still occur, and representatives in favour of, or opposed to, certain measures would work together to carry out these views. But there would be a very wide difference between parties thus organized with reference to a particular act or policy, and parties, such as we now have, composed of members pledged to support, or to oppose, the Government of the day, almost irrespective of the measures it may introduce. There may have been times in the history of the country when the terms "Tory" and "Reformer" indicated continuous lines of policy, so broadly contrasted throughout by reason of fundamental differences of principle that a perpetual division was inevitable. But the Tories of those days have long ceased to exist, or, if a few survivors still linger on the stage, they are without influence in the conduct of affairs. The most that can now be said is that there may, from time to time, arise a question of policy so overshadowing all others in importance, as to justify permanent party organizations, working solely with reference to it, and prepared to subordinate all other considerations until success is gained. If there is any such question now before the Canadian public, it is that of our trade policy. But no one will contend that such is the sole or chief reason-to-be of our present party organizations, or that the final settlement of that question would have the effect of dissolving the existing parties.

CHANCELLOR FLEMING, on the other hand, dealt with his subject theoretically and broadly. In the newspaper report before us it is said that "he touched on the structure of Parliament, and showed that through partyism a large majority of the people, whatever party may rule, has no part whatever through representatives in the administration of public affairs. In the late Parliament sixty-one per cent. of the whole body of electors had no share in the government of the country." We confess ourselves unable to understand these figures, and suspect some error in reporting, but a mistake in the percentage would not invalidate the argument. We have not at the moment within reach Mr. Fleming's Royal Society paper, to which he refers as showing how a Parliamentary representation of the whole nation, instead of only a part of it as now, could be attained "by a scientific adjustment of votes and the application of sound principles." We may refer to that scheme at another time. Meanwhile it is impossible to deny the force of the illustrations used to show that party organization is unnecessary for the proper conduct of public affairs. The absurdity of such a system in the management of a business, a university, or a church, is clear. Perhaps the nearest parallel to the waste of time and energy in legislation is to be found in our Courts of Justice. There, as in Parliament, it seems to be taken for granted that the longest way to a given point is necessarily the only sure and safe one, that truth can best be elicited by the method of formal disputation, wherein each party is interested in seeking to blind the eyes of the jury to the arguments of his opponent, and striving as one party or the other inevitably must, "to make the worse appear the better reason." Chancellor Fleming is right in expecting that his views will be, for the present, treated as visionary and Utopian. But the history of popular government presents many cases in which great reforms have been ridiculed as unwise, or flouted as impracticable, when broached, which have, nevertheless, long since been generally accepted. Perhaps we should