

he was bound to regard the jury's recommendation to mercy as part of the verdict. The maximum punishment would have been five years in the penitentiary. The accused, on being asked the ordinary question what he had to say why sentence should not be pronounced, pleaded physical and mental decay. But this plea was weakened, if not nullified, by the admission that he had held on to the office after he was able to efficiently discharge the duties. It was about the same as a man pleading drunkenness in excuse of misconduct, with this difference, that drunkenness is more or less controllable, more or less voluntary, while age is a thing against which all humanity fights in vain. The judge, pitying the culprit, to some extent closed his ears to the wail of anguish that swept across the country, calling for the severest punishment. Doubtless he felt, as every judge must feel, that he ought not to be influenced by anything outside the court room, and then the jury accompanied their verdict with an appeal to mercy. The council for the defence asked, unreasonably, that sentence should not be then passed. Notice of appeal to the Attorney General for a reserve case, which Judge Wurtele on his part rejected, was given.

Some confusion in the public mind has been created by a speech of Colonial Secretary Chamberlain, in which is mentioned the good feeling which exists between England, the United States and Germany, he recited the different forms of understanding between nations, but certainly without creating the impression that any written alliance, over even formal understanding, exists between these three countries. In the course of his speech he strongly resented French attacks upon the Queen, and pointed out that, if continued, they might give rise to trouble. The latter remark cannot be commended for discretion. Irritating these attacks undoubtedly are, but perhaps the best way to treat them is to leave them to the silent contempt of the world, which they well earn, and which they are certain to receive. It remains true that the best feeling does exist between the three countries in question. With Germany and the United States the Samoan question has been arranged; and besides this, England and Germany have made definite territorial arrangements in Africa. And last year a treaty was made between these two countries, in virtue of which England binds herself, if she carries a railway in Africa to the Atlantic coast, it is to go through territory Germany holds on that coast. What equivalent England gets is not known, but it is not likely that she binds herself in this way for nothing. A more recent arrangement about the railway, elsewhere fully described, has been made. Stripped of its indiscretion, the speech of Mr. Chamberlain tallies well with one delivered about the same time by the American Minister at the Court of St. James.

ELEVATORS FOR INTERNAL NAVIGATION.

A private company is now, it seems, to be empowered to build elevators in connection with our inland navigation. The want of the facility which elevators afford has been a great drawback to our canal system. There never was a time, perhaps, when the Canadian forwarders might not have obtained the right to build the necessary elevators; but they have neglected their opportunities, and now, unless the Government is to do the work, it is just as well to call in the aid of the foreigners. The Government digs the canals and builds the locks, but it leaves the working of them to private parties, who, to tell the truth, have been sadly remiss in supplying the essential requisites in modern days. More than half a century ago, the late Hon. Hamil-

ton Merritt, who, more than anyone else, deserves the title of father of the Canadian canal system, and who was once Minister of Public Works in Canada, likened the building of canals by the State and then permitting individuals to control them, for their own benefit, to a Government building a railway and then allowing one or two individuals to control the steam power. This he thought would be an indication of insanity. And yet, he said, "this is precisely the case with the St. Lawrence canals. The forwarders have control of them as effectively as if they were constructed by their own capital."

Elevator facilities on a large scale are essential; and the only question is whether the Government or private individuals ought to build them. If they be built by private individuals there will be two capitals employed in perfecting the internal navigation: the capital of the Commonwealth, which made the canals, and the capital of private persons who build the elevators. Before the question is finally decided where the control shall be, it would be well to decide whether the canals are to be, in all their belongings, public works. If decided in the affirmative, the difficulty would be for the Government to get a return equal to the interest and the cost of maintenance out of the revenue of the works. If built by private persons it would be necessary to guard against the possibility of the elevators becoming practically a monopoly. What would be desirable, in case of private ownership of the elevators, would be that the two capitals employed, the capital of the Commonwealth in making the canals, and the capital of private persons in building the elevators, should have an equal chance of fair play. But, in this country, it does seem as if the Government is the only proprietor that cannot protect himself. All sorts of specious reasons are brought forward to show why the public wealth should be postponed or sacrificed to private interest. If in connection with the canals, the forwarders had done their share, there would be the less ground of complaint; but the fact that they have allowed sixty years to glide away without providing sufficient elevators, certainly raises the question whether they ought now to be permitted to do so. The government, by its inaction, must be held to have tacitly decided not to build the elevators.

The Montreal Harbor Commissioners have come to an agreement with the Connors' Syndicate, which undertakes to erect large elevators at Montreal. The expense of the structures is put at \$3,000,000. The confidence of the syndicate in the success of the enterprise is shown by their undertaking, under a penalty of the forfeiture of the property, to bring down 25,000,000 bushels of grain during the first of three years and 35,000,000 in the other two. At the same time the agreement to forfeit the property, in case of failure, has somewhat of a reckless look. Canada has spent \$70,000,000 in the attempt to attract the trade of the West through the channel of the St. Lawrence, hitherto without success. The plan of the syndicate properly takes into account the ocean as well as the inland carriage; it has often happened in the past that the inland freight was lowest, but was more than overbalanced by the greater cost of ocean freight. The declared object of the syndicate is to compete with the New York route. To do this they must carry cheaper, and if they carry cheaper our North-West will be in a position to compete with the Western United States. Much of the traffic will no doubt be drawn from our growing North-West. A lowering of freights will be a benefit, but it is a mistake to suppose that it will all go to the tiller of the soil; the cheapening of the carriage of grain will mainly enure to the benefit of the consumer, if the quantity carried be large enough to affect the price of the whole mass of wheat consumed in England; if