

ready to take the place in the older Provinces of everyone that leaves for the West. Those who have had experience and training in the older Provinces are, as a rule, the very best settlers for the great North-West, while a large proportion of those who come to us across the Ocean are much better fitted for life in the older Provinces than in the younger. There are thousands of farmers and farm labourers in England, Scotland and Ireland who would gladly better their condition by coming to Canada if the way were open, who would dread going far inland, and would vastly and wisely prefer, for the sake of old associations and for other good reasons, to settle down not far from the shores of the "sounding sea." To such Messrs. Davey and McQueen will, we cannot doubt, be able to report, after full investigation, that in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there are abounding opportunities for skilled farmers not only to reap as rich returns for their labour as in the Old World, but to become their own landlords and acquire broad and fruitful acres to be bequeathed to their children.

DID ever, we wonder, anyone who in a position of trust yielded to temptation, realize clearly that in so doing he was stooping to a dishonourable deed, and forfeiting his claim to be ranked among honest men? Probably not, in the first instance. We have no doubt that everyone who has been dismissed or suspended from the public service during the Ottawa investigations considers himself an injured man. This tendency of human nature is brought out with peculiar and almost amusing distinctness in the form of the resignation which was tendered the other day by Mr. Senecal, Superintendent of the Government Printing Bureau at Ottawa. Mr. Senecal's case is a particularly glaring one. He seems to have made no scruple of laying himself under large pecuniary obligations to those with whom he, in his position of trust, had extensive dealings, and in regard to whom it was his first duty, as a point of honour, to maintain a position of the most absolute and scrupulous independence. And yet Mr. Senecal evidently feels that he has been treated with great harshness. He is, in his own estimation, an injured man. True, he received money, and that in considerable sums, for personal uses, at the hands of those from whom he was making large purchases on behalf of the Government. But the material was, he claims, "purchased at low rates, and those who talk of commissions are simply calumniators." It is very likely that Mr. Senecal is perfectly sincere in this plea. It is very likely, too, that the goods may have been purchased at as low rates as those which rule in ordinary transactions. But we wonder if Mr. Senecal has ever thought to ask himself how he would deal with a steward or housekeeper in his own employ, whom he should find to be in the habit of asking and receiving liberal presents of money from the grocer or butcher from whom the family supplies were purchased. Bringing the case home to himself in this way he might possibly come to see that business men are not accustomed to sow their cash in this liberal fashion without very good prospects of reaping a harvest. Nothing can be clearer to the disinterested than that the merchant who can afford to make a present of a hundred or a thousand dollars to the agent who secures him a large order, could just as well afford to deduct the given amount from the sum total of his bill, and that he would do so rather than lose the order and the prospect of more to follow. This is, of course, simply a business view of the transaction. Still weightier reasons for summary dealing with such agents are those derived from the proverbial tendency of a gift to injure the moral eyesight; and the subsequent inability of the individual who has once accepted such a gift to assume an independent attitude in regard to all future purchases. The very fact that Mr. Senecal and others of that ilk cannot see that they have done any wrong is the best possible reason for replacing them with men of clearer moral perceptions.

SOMEONE has well observed that such transactions as those of which Mr. Senecal and other public servants have been guilty imply two parties, and that the giver of the bribe shares the guilt with the receiver. This is certainly true to some extent in every case, since every man of sufficient intelligence and ability to be at the head of a large business must know, to say nothing of the legitimacy of his own motives, that he is sapping the foundations of integrity in the man with whom he is dealing—assuming that the latter is not already unprincipled—and so, by weakening his moral defences, doing him the worst kind of injury which one man can do to another. It is true to

the fullest extent in such cases as that of Murphy, in his dealings with Perley, in which the giver of the bribe becomes the tempter and forces his gifts upon the recipient, while the conscience of the latter is still more or less feebly resisting. The moral aspect of the affair is somewhat changed when, as in the case of Senecal and his subordinate, the favours are asked for by the receivers, since it is conceivable that, apart from his own selfish interests or sinister ends, the dealer may, in the kindness of his heart, find it hard to resist a pitiable appeal. Of course it is not in the power of the Government to punish the party of the second part, save, possibly, by putting the firm on a black list, representing those with whom the Departmental officers are forbidden to deal. But as a matter of business ethics, it would be interesting to know just how such methods of securing custom are regarded by the average business man. Is there any written or unwritten code governing such transactions? It was obvious that some of the business managers or heads of firms who gave evidence before the Public Accounts Committee at Ottawa saw nothing wrong in the bestowal of gifts, so far as they themselves were concerned, though we may have a shrewd guess as to what were their private opinions of those who solicited and accepted them. It may be pretty safely assumed that in the cases, now so common, in which the dealers in certain lines of goods agree to fix the same prices and terms, the purchase of custom by gifts of money or other articles would be regarded as dishonourable evasion. We do not know whether there is a "combine" among the dealers in printers' material or not. But apart from that question we should really like to know, and so, we have no doubt, would many of our readers, what view of the ethics of the matter prevails in business circles.

THE *Monetary Times*, whose opinions on such questions are usually pretty sound, assumes that Canada will not immediately feel the effect of the treaty between Spain and the United States, affecting the trade of Cuba and Porto Rico, because of the "most favoured nation" clause in the treaty between Great Britain and Spain, which clause includes Canadians in common with other British subjects. The number of the *Times* from which we quote is dated the 21st August. Hence the paragraph must have been written subsequently to the reply given by Sir John Thompson to a question on the point in the House of Commons. Sir John's view, fortified by the opinions of the highest authorities in both Great Britain and the United States, clearly was that the clause in question does not apply in cases in which special tariff concessions are made to another nation in return for equivalent concessions in favour of the nation bound by the treaty, and that hence its provisions could not be invoked for the protection of Canada in the present instance, save on the impossible condition of offering compensating advantages similar to those conceded by the Islands in question. Nor can it be denied, much as we may wish otherwise, that this seems the reasonable interpretation. Any other would put it out of the power of the treaty-making nation to make special commercial arrangements with any other nation, no matter what advantages might be offered in return. True, Sir John Thompson stated further that fuller information was expected from the High Commissioner, implying apparently that the question cannot be considered as fully decided until that information is received, but it was evident that there was in his own mind little or no doubt that the decision would be as indicated. Notwithstanding the above facts the *Empire* of Monday takes the same ground as the *Monetary Times*, saying that there seems to be good ground for believing that Canadian products will be protected by the most favoured nation clause during the year which must elapse before Spain's notice to terminate the treaty takes effect, and adduces in support of this opinion the fact that Spain has made only a provisional arrangement with the United States till the expiry of the treaty, as if she recognized its force in the matter. Has the Minister of Justice received some new light which has modified his opinion, but which has not yet been given to the public, or do these journals decline to accept his high authority in the matter? The question is one of considerable importance to Canada, especially to the Maritime Provinces, whose trade with the above-named Islands has hitherto been considerable.

WE have more than once had occasion to note the marked and growing tendency of public feeling in Great Britain to revulsion against hanging as a mode of execution. This feeling has been greatly strengthened by

the horrible bunglings which have of late years been so frequent in the Mother Country. It is not wonderful therefore that the hideous scene at the recent Conway execution should have caused a fresh outcry and agitation throughout the Kingdom. Nor can it be denied that the feeling is, to some extent, the natural and legitimate outcome of present-day civilization. There is something in the thought of the violent destruction of the life of a human being, under sanction of law, however necessary such destruction may be deemed for the protection of society, which is at the best harrowing to refined sensibilities. Why then should Governments persist in inflicting the death penalty by a mode which is peculiarly revolting at the best, and which is constantly liable to have such shocking accompaniments? No student of human nature can doubt that the effect of capital punishment as a deterrent—which is probably the chief or only ground on which it can be justified—is lessened rather than increased by any associations of needless horror which may accompany it in the public mind. It is not surprising that in many instances the question of mode at first raised is quickly merged in the larger question of the necessity of capital punishment itself. Many jump to the conclusion that when a law leads even occasionally to such results, it must itself be based on wrong principles. Without entering into that broader question we may pretty safely say that one thing is becoming evident. It behooves those who regard the execution of the murderer as one of the indispensable safeguards of human life, to consider speedily whether some less objectionable mode of inflicting the dread penalty cannot be found. We question whether it would not be wise on the part of the British Government, and of the Canadian Government as well, to appoint a competent commission to consider the subject, and, if possible, recommend a less objectionable mode for the taking off of those who have forfeited their right to live.

THE results of the unique experiments which are being made by the Scientific Expedition which has been sent out by the United States' Government to test the possibility of causing rain in arid districts by explosions in the atmosphere will be looked for with interest all over the world. The theory on which these experiments are based is by no means so absurd as many may be inclined at first thought to suppose. The demonstration of the power of man to produce artificially the electrical or other atmospheric conditions which cause rain, and so to bring showers at will, would be but another step in the discovery and utilization of the laws in accordance with which Nature performs her manifold operations. The *modus operandi* would be far more easily understood by the common mind than that which governs the application of electricity for the production of light and force. Of course it by no means follows that the proof of the correctness of the theory would render the method immediately available for practical uses. The question of expense, for instance, suggests formidable difficulties. Yet the history of the applications of scientific discovery to practical purposes in other matters would warrant the belief that the relation of cause to effect being established, economical and workable modes of utilizing the knowledge would sooner or later be found. The possibilities suggested are stupendous. Among the alleged facts which give support to the theory is the statement that many of the great battle fields of modern history have been deluged with rain very soon after the cannonading. It is also said, on the authority of Senator Sanford, that when the Central Pacific Railroad was being built through a mountain region where rain rarely fell, the heavy blasting was followed almost daily by copious showers, and that these totally ceased when the work was ended. If this be so the builders of the Canadian Pacific should be able to give us some corroborative facts.

In the *Revue Internationale des Falsifications*, Dr. Kornauth, of Vienna, writes on saccharine. As the results of his experiences, he lays down the following items: 1. Pure saccharine contains very weak antiseptic qualities. 2. A long use of saccharine, even in large quantities, has shown no injurious effects in the case of dogs, ducks or pigs. 3. The nutritive powers are lessened by its use. 4. The dislike which animals are said to have for saccharine is confined to individual cases. Dr. Kornauth found that dogs refused foods mixed with sugar as well as those which contained saccharine. But as soon as they were used to the sweet taste they ate both.

THINK well over your important steps in life, and having made up your mind never look behind.—Thomas Hughes.