

be expected to judge rightly on these points? and if so, were these men in any different position from that of a judge on the bench who has taken a large *douceur* from one of the parties to a suit which is to be tried before him. Whatever be the result of the specific charge, it does not appear to our mind that there is any essential difference in the position of the Premier and his colleagues who have accepted the money of Sir Hugh, whether they received it as a matter of positive bargain, or only on those implied conditions which are so well understood to accompany the giving and receiving of large monetary aid.

Of course we know that all this reasoning will go for little with those who take as their principle, "To the victors belong the spoils." If politics be a mere struggle between the "ins" and the "outs"; if bribery and corruption be esteemed a legitimate warfare; if the ends sanctify the means; if principle be a mere hustings watchword; if the interests of the State are to be sacrificed for mere party benefit—then all that we have said will be considered mere idle talk; but if, on the contrary, politicians are bound to think of the evils of corruption that they may remedy them, to seek the good of the State before their own personal weal, to shun the golden snares by which avaricious men may entrap their freedom of action for the welfare of the country—why, if this and not the former be the programme by which a statesman should try to guide himself—well, some of our present Government are by no means ideal politicians, and, it is greatly to be feared some of their political opponents are as far as they from coming up to the standard.

In this connection we may say that the action of the Government, in regard to the investigation, by no means impresses us favorably. We pass over the Oaths Bill, and its disallowance, in regard to which probably no blame attaches to our Government—remarking, however, that it seems very strange that Canadian legislation should be so hampered by English law that a counter-part must be found in the one that there may be validity in the other. We can understand why an Act which affects Imperial interests should be disallowed, but we cannot comprehend how an Act which would be legal, if a similar one were in existence in England, can be illegal because England had not passed such a law, though she might without let or hindrance pass it to-morrow, in which case it would be legal with us also. We look upon the disallowance and the reason therefor as a preposterous absurdity, and utterly inconsistent with the privileges which, we had supposed, we possessed—to make all laws not inconsistent with Imperial interests.

The action of the Government in proroguing the Parliament, without even hearing the report of the Commission, the indecent haste which was shown in that act, and the debarring of any possible action on the part of the representatives of the people, appear to us without any valid excuse. The fact that there was not