

wishing for this arrangement, it must see to it that the Government goes more resolutely and persistently about the business. But it has always seemed to us that the position of the proposed Canadian attaché would be nondescript, uncomfortable, and essentially useless. Unless accredited by the British Government, which is not asked or expected, he could have no influential or representative relations with the American Government; while as a mere adviser of Her Majesty's Minister his presence would but still further complicate a method of procedure which is already tediously roundabout. We need less rather than more red tape in international affairs.

As we write we have before us the report of the first day's debate on the Manitoba school question, brought on by Mr. Tarte, and to this our brief comment must necessarily be restricted. Of Mr. Tarte's speech the criticism which at once suggests itself is that his whole argument is a superstructure without a foundation. We can all heartily agree in respect to the folly and the wickedness of permitting any majority to deprive any minority of any right bestowed upon it at the union, or at any other time. We are speaking now of a right, not of a privilege or favour. What Mr. Tarte and those who think with him need, in order to make their argument logical and their appeal irresistible, is to establish the fact that the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba has been deprived of some such right. And in order to do this they must of necessity show that the alleged right exists. To this point Mr. Tarte did not address himself at all, so far as we can see. Hence his argument, so far as he attempted one, is logically worthless. Mr. LaRiviere's speech was made up mainly of denunciations and historical statements. It scarcely attempted argument. The most noticeable point it contained was, perhaps, its intimation that the appeal of the minority is based upon the B. N. A. Act. Mr. Ewart, it will be remembered, told us a week or two since that it was based mainly upon the Manitoba Act. Which is correct? Sir John Thompson confined himself mainly to a laboured defence of the course which the Government has pursued in the matter up to date. This, Mr. Tarte's motion, though not his speech, justified Sir John in doing. With the Premier's emphatic denial that the wording of the report of the sub-committee of the Privy Council implied any attempt to evade ministerial responsibility, Mr. McCarthy will no doubt deal, and his speech will be before our readers before these lines can meet their eyes.

In his communication in another column, Mr. Louis Simpson, General Manager of the Montreal Cotton Company, uses some strong language in reference to Mr. Edgar's statements in the House of Commons touching the workings of the Cotton combines; but it will be observed that, save in one particular,

his letter contains no satisfactory refutation of Mr. Edgar's charges. Mr. Edgar stated that the report of the Montreal Cotton Company, submitted at the recent meeting, showed the output during the last year to have been \$1,468,000 worth. Mr. Simpson says that the amount was a little less than \$900,000. This is a very serious discrepancy, no doubt, which Mr. Edgar must be left to explain. Moreover, as his calculation of the output of all the other mills was based upon the figures above quoted, it will be seen that unless he can verify this statement, his subsequent figures will need to be reduced by nearly one-half. But even after this reduction is made a strong presumption remains in favour of the view that the Cotton combines are enabled by the tariff to levy a large sum upon the consumers of their goods. The fact, which will not we presume be disputed, that the combines can afford to pay the proprietors of several mills handsome gratuities for keeping their mills closed, seems in itself conclusive. Can there be any reasonable doubt that the amount of those annual gratuities is added to the price paid by consumers? Our comments, to which Mr. Simpson takes exception, were distinctly made conditional upon the correctness of the facts and figures. If Mr. Edgar's figures are wrong—we do not know whether he will admit that they are—it is scarcely in reason to suppose that he would make a gross and wilful misstatement of a kind so easily exposed, it will be seen that Mr. Simpson's denials, with the exception above noted, are too general, not to say vague, to settle the question. In regard to the postscript, it may be observed that the gravamen of Mr. Edgar's charges in respect to the companies whose capital has already been so greatly enlarged is that the Government allowed them to make the increase contrary to the provisions of the charters. We certainly have no wish to abet an attack on the companies, but in the public interest we repeat that the purchasers of cotton goods should inquire carefully into the facts, as denoting the working of the protective tariff and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. Jeannotte, M. P. deserves all the popularity the publication of his views can give him. The member of Parliament who has the intrepidity to stand up in Committee of the House and protest against a bill to deprive of their franchise electors who sell their votes, as a violation of the liberty of the subject, is a legislator of no common order. His name should become a household word throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. We are by no means sure that the thirty-three who voted for his motion the other day, thereby causing Dr. Weldon's bill for the disfranchisement of venal voters to be thrown out of Committee, should not be regarded as entitled to the same publicity. We are glad to see that the Bill has been replaced upon the order paper. The principle of this mea-

sure is so obviously sound that it is hard to understand the mental or moral attitude of those who oppose it on other grounds than that so frankly taken by Mr. Jeannotte, who is reported as having said "It was a recognized fact that every body bought votes and every member of the House knew it. He had bought them himself." The Member perhaps deserves credit for his frankness. His aim may simply be to tear the veil from the face of political hypocrisy, but it may be questioned whether it is not better after all that vice should continue to pay tribute to virtue, than that she should stand forth unblushing in all her deformity until we all become so familiar with her features that they cease to be repulsive.

We confess ourselves unable to understand the attitude of some of the members who are, there is every reason to hope, honestly opposed to the use of corrupt measures in elections, in failing to support this bill. The reasons assigned seem unsatisfactory. It is, as both Dr. Weldon and Sir John Thompson maintained in effect, no valid argument against a bill designed to punish a certain notorious class of offenders that it contains no provision against another distinct class, whose offence may be even more heinous, but who are either already subject to punishment under another Act, or whose case may call for further legislation. Nothing could be more just and appropriate than that the men who sell their votes, whether through ignorance or baseness, should forfeit the right to vote. It may be and probably is in most instances true that the individual who accepts the bribe, is somewhat less guilty than the individual who bestows the bribe, inasmuch as the sin of the former may be largely due to ignorance or poverty, while that of the latter is designed and wilful. For this reason it is desirable that the offences should be placed in different categories. Mere disfranchisement would be, by no means, an adequate punishment for the briber. It is argued by some that it would be bad policy to punish the bribe-taker, as it would prevent him, in many cases the only possible witness, from testifying against the bribe-giver. But the same argument would hold good against legislation for the punishment of any other crime which in the nature of the case could hardly be proved save by the evidence of one of the two parties concerned. Nor are we by any means sure, to refer to another argument, that the giver of the bribe is always the tempter and the receiver the tempted. Mr. Jeannotte's words rather suggest that his experience may have been the opposite, as no doubt is that of many another, if they would testify. Not the least consideration in favour of Dr. Weldon's Bill is the effect that the enforcement of such a bill would have in educating the consciences of the least intelligent classes, for whose benefit it is intended. As we have before had occasion to observe, the old