

business, the workers being stimulated to aid the managing staff with suggestions as to improvements and information as to new processes. Mr. William E. Bear, of London, to whose article in *Bradstreet's* we are indebted for the foregoing particulars, says that some strong evidence as to the success of the profit-sharing system is given in the report. Fifty-two English, seventy-nine French and twenty-three American firms are named as profit-sharers. As the system first came into operation more than forty years ago in France and about twenty years ago in England, it must be confessed that its evolution has not been so rapid as the sanguine might have hoped and expected. Still, the fact that it has made so much progress, and has proved undeniably successful in so many instances, affords good ground for hoping for far greater results in the future. Profit-sharing is next of kin to coöperation, but combines with it the advantages of capital and business ability—the want of which have so often proved fatal to coöperative enterprises.

A QUESTION of radical importance in connection with the diplomatic dispute between the United States and Italy is that of the exact nature of the demand made by the latter. Secretary Blaine, in his letter to the Marquis Imperiali, Italian Charge d'Affaires at Washington, after the abrupt departure of Baron Fava, says: "Even if the National Government had the entire jurisdiction over the alleged murderers, it could not give assurance to any foreign power that they should be punished." The Washington Government has distinctly recognized the principle of indemnity involved in the second of the two demands made by Italy, so that the whole difficulty seems to hinge upon the first. As above stated Mr. Blaine's position is so obviously sound that it is not easy to conceive of Premier Rudini as actually formulating or adhering to such a demand as that indicated. No Constitutional Government would or could give a pledge in advance of trial that the perpetrators of a given offence or crime should be punished. As elsewhere stated the gist of the first demand of the Italian Government was that the Government at Washington should give an assurance that the instigators of the massacre should be brought to justice. This is indefinite, if not ambiguous. An Associated Press correspondent, who is said to have perused all the despatches exchanged from the outset between the two Governments, is represented as saying that in substance Italy asked only that a fair legal process should be instituted against the culprits, regarding them as common assassins; in other words, that they should be criminally prosecuted. This sounds fair and reasonable. Assuming this to be the true purport of the Italian demand, the question then arises: is Italy's course wholly unjustifiable in refusing to accept the peculiar division of authority between the National and State Governments under the Constitution of the United States, as a sufficient excuse for failure to comply with this demand? Is it unreasonable for one nation to maintain that another nation is responsible for the fulfilment of its treaty obligations to the extent of bringing to trial the known instigators of a massacre of citizens of the former, irrespective of any peculiarities in its Constitution; or, if not, that the nation whose subjects are denied such protection by the National Government should be entitled to deal directly with that of the State immediately concerned? There seems to be a general consensus in the English and Canadian press comments to the effect that the United States cannot be expected to "alter its Constitution at the bidding of a foreign power." It is instructive at such a moment to remember how the United States on a former memorable occasion met the somewhat similar plea that the provisions of British law had rendered it impossible for the British Government to prevent the sailing of a certain famous privateer from one of the ports of the Kingdom. It may be true, as the London *Economist* says, that "if the United States continues to claim exemption from pressing international obligations, its position will not be supported without new international laws or a recourse to war to obtain modification." But it by no means follows, as other journals contend, that "federal institutions cannot be worked by nations having wide external interests." Everything depends, obviously, on the character of the federal institutions. While we can but think that Italy has reason to be dissatisfied with Secretary Blaine's assurance that the fullest investigation of all the facts will be made, seeing that such information without corresponding action would be but an aggravation of the injury, we are far from supposing that Italy will be unwise enough to carry the dispute to the point of war

with a nation whose immense resources would render the contest an absurdly unequal one in the end, whatever advantage the weaker might derive from its fleet at the outset. But the President and Mr. Blaine will do themselves and their nation the greatest honour by taking some measures to ensure that Italy's just demand shall be granted in substance, if not in form.

THE ETHICS OF OPPOSITION.

A CONTRIBUTOR in commenting on Mr. Blake's letter recites the clearly defined views of Sir Robert Peel, a famous English statesman of great ability and noble character, upon the true function of Parliamentary Opposition. At this juncture these views are well worthy of earnest consideration by the Canadian people. It may well be questioned whether an Opposition which aims by ridicule, invective and obstruction, to defeat the purpose of a Government which is endeavouring to carry out its pledge made to the people before election, and on which it was sustained by the people at the polls, can be deemed either dignified or worthy of the traditions of the English-speaking race. Honest opposition, in a just cause, from a party standpoint, cannot reasonably be objected to. Nor can it be expected that the Canadian Reformers would be fully contented with a measure of reciprocity with the United States if obtained by Sir John Macdonald's Government—when they demand unrestricted reciprocity. But is the good of the country to be deemed inferior to the success of a party? Surely not. The serious consideration for Canadians is this: Is it dignified? Is it fair to the honour and character of the Canadian people? that a Government which represents in its negotiations for a reciprocity treaty not merely a party, but the Canadian people, who have made it their authoritative agent to secure a favourable measure of reciprocity with the United States Government, should by the Opposition journals be persistently hindered and obstructed, and treated with ridicule and contempt, in its effort to do its duty to the electorate of Canada.

We mistake the temper of the Canadian people if we think that such a course of opposition can have any other effect than that of causing them to disapprove of such conduct on the part of the Opposition press. Would not the fair, the dignified, the patriotic course, be like that of the great British statesman referred to by our contributor, —to place no obstacle in the way of the Government in its effort from its own standpoint to negotiate an advantageous trade treaty for Canada, and then, when the Government has either failed through its own inability to obtain such a treaty, or has obtained one that is objectionable and defective, to visit it with the criticism, which it is an Opposition's function to provide? We think the latter course is far better adapted than the former to make a Government out of an Opposition, and to maintain the dignity and advance the true interests of our common country.

MR. BLAKE'S LETTER, AND THE ETHICS OF OPPOSITION.

TWENTY-FOUR years since, when Federal union of the Canadian Provinces had been accomplished, the late Dr. Ryerson issued an address to the people of Ontario replete throughout with apprehensions for the future of the new nation. Approaching the close of a public life of more than forty years his "Prayer to God" was "that the new Dominion of Canada might become prosperous and happy by avoiding those errors which had in times past been injurious, by adopting those maxims of both feeling and conduct which the best and most experienced men of Europe and America have enjoined as essential to the strength and happiness, the advancement and grandeur of a nation. . . . That personal hostilities and party strife had been the most fatal obstacles to our happiness and progress as a people—a most fruitful source of partiality and corruption in legislation and government, a prolific cause of moral degeneracy in public men, and a melancholy perversion of the very purposes of government, the true office of which is to be 'a minister of God for good,' and not a game of party favouritism and proscriptio."

The writings of Hume, the Rev. Robert Hall, Lord Brougham and others are quoted, and show that a systematic opposition is a most corrupt and unprincipled maxim.

Sir Robert Peel, in his last speech made in the British House of Commons, June 28, 1850, while opposing the Government, said:—

"Sir, I will not forget, and I need not remind the House, that I have given or attempted to give, to Her Majesty's Government, my support—during the last four years (cheers). In utter oblivion of the circumstances under which they succeeded to power (a laugh) I have felt it my

duty to give them not an ostentatious, but because it was not ostentatious a not less effective, support (loud cheers). I have not the honour or advantage of possessing their personal friendship; I have never been in political connection with them; I have held no communication with them during the last four years which may not be held by any member of this House, who may be most independent and most unconnected with their policy; I have given them my support because I cordially approved of the policy which they carried into domestic affairs."

Dr. Wayland, the late distinguished President of the Brown University, the brightest ornament of the American Baptist Church, whose work on moral science is used as a text-book in Toronto University College, says:—

"Political corruption is no less wicked because it is so common. Dishonesty is no better policy in the affairs of State than in other affairs; though men may persuade themselves and others to the contrary, an executive officer is not the organ of a section or of a district, much less of a party, but of society at large; and he who uses his power for the benefit of a section, or of a party, is false to his duty, to his country, and to his God. He is engraving his name on the adamant pillar of his country's history, to be gazed upon for ever as an object of universal detestation."

The late Mr. Fenimore Cooper, whose fame as a scholar and writer is European as well as American, thus speaks in his *American Democrat* on the effects as well as the cause of this abominable system of partyism in Government:—

"Anyone who has lived long enough to note the changes of the sort must have perceived how fast men of probity and virtue are losing their influence in the country, to be superseded by those who scarcely deem an affectation of higher qualities necessary to their success."

The late celebrated Dr. Channing, of Boston, thus speaks: "Politics in its common sense, or considered as the invention of temporary shifts, as the playing of a subtle game, as the tactics of a party for gaining power, is a paltry and debasing concern. The intellect in becoming a pander to vice, a tool of the passions, an advocate of lies, becomes not only wholly degraded but diseased. It loses the capacity of distinguishing truth from wrong. The faith of man in the capacity of men for Government is shaken."

Judge Story, in his commentaries on the constitution of the United States, says: "The best talents and the best virtues are driven from office by intrigue and corruption or by the violence of the press or of party."

In Britain the habit of independent thought and of action has resulted in a succession of great men, capable and brave in every emergency for service to the State. In Canada criticism of the past or sagacious reasoning as to the future, anything but "Partyism" which means the "present hour" has hitherto been the unpardonable sin, our autonomy will never be secure until a higher standard of political ethics is adopted, unless we keep in advance the great English-speaking nation to the south of us in all that adds dignity to our public men and until constituencies are represented by men worthy of their trust.

Mr. Cobden entered Parliament not to support a party, to play for office, or educate himself for professional statesmanship, still less to gratify personal vanity or to acquire social importance, but as the representative of distinct principles and the champion of a great cause (free trade).

Under party government "Annexation" has ever been in view as a refuge for the "outs." On this topic open manifestos, platform oratory, muttered threats or secret or embarrassing negotiations are now matters of history.

Canada under Confederation has had twenty-three years of virulent party government culminating in an electoral contest in which the only existence of the Dominion was the subject for decision by the electors. The most noticeable feature in that contest was the painful event closing "the political life" of Mr. Blake. He says:

"By your extraordinary favour I have been permitted to serve you for the greater part of four and twenty years, during which long interval public affairs have mainly occupied my time and thoughts."

"There is much to be done and much to be prevented at Ottawa, and while deeply sensible of many shortcomings it yet seems reasonable to suppose that the experience of all these years has made me less unfit than formerly for your service. This is the sphere which offers the best prospect of usefulness to my country."

"Therefore I pray you not to suppose that it is despondency at the failure of past efforts, or preference for ignoble ease or sordid toil, or indifference to your warm friendship and generous constancy that leads me to ask the withdrawal of my name. But I do not find myself free to-day to speak my mind."

Clean hands and power, or to sail with "a party" in a fog without rudder or compass are disclosed in this letter as equally distasteful to Mr. Blake. But a desire and willingness to give his magnificent intellect, fully trained, but untrammelled by party, to the service of his country in her present crisis is equally apparent.

The manner of Mr. Blake's retirement and the close of "the political life" when never more fit for service, with much to be done and much to be prevented at Ottawa, followed by a brilliant exposition of fiscal, financial and political difficulties to be encountered and discussed is clearly an event in Canadian history.

If the full significance of this act is grasped by the people of Canada a new era may have begun, tending to make perpetual the great northern nation on this conti-