

Government, that the carrying out of the Medical Faculty Restoration Scheme would not involve the spending of a dollar of University or any other public money." Whether the facts are correctly understood and represented in this remarkable letter we have no means of knowing, other than those which are within the reach of any reader. But surely statements of so grave a character, put forward on the high authority of the Dean of Faculty of Trinity Medical College, cannot be ignored by Mr. Mowat or his colleagues. That the Legislature of Ontario either intended or would consent that any portion of the public funds should be used for the purpose of aiding in the work of medical education proper, thus bringing the Provincial University into competition with the self-supporting colleges which are doing the same work, and doing it well, we cannot for a moment suppose. Are the public funds being, or has any portion of them been so appropriated? That is the question which, we repeat, should have an answer from the highest authority.

WHATEVER the future may have in store, it must be confessed that thus far the evidence adduced in the election courts has not been just such as to convince the country of the special fitness of the Liberal party of Canada to be entrusted with the task of elevating the standard of political morality, successful as they may have been in showing us how badly such elevating process is needed. The record thus far is certainly discouraging. However impossible it may sometimes be for a candidate even with the purest intentions to prevent corrupt acts of agents with more zeal than principle, all such pleas are unavailing in presence of such facts as those of clear connivance of the trusted party managers with the authorities of great railway corporations to violate the law on a wholesale scale. It is not at all unlikely that further investigation in other courts may show as bad or worse transactions between the other party and the other great railway of the country, but if so this will only make the matter so much the worse. The state of affairs suspected all along and now being brought to light has more than one aspect well adapted to create alarm in the breasts of the thoughtful. It is bad enough that some of the representatives of those who have been the chief promoters of the strict legislation which is proving so fatal to its inventors should thus be found foremost amongst the violators of the law. It is still worse, if not from the moral at least from the national point of view, that those who have most earnestly and persistently warned the people against giving too great powers into the hands of a great railway company, and who have not ceased to predict evil and danger from its vast power in the country and in the Houses of Parliament, should not hesitate, for the sake of a doubtful party advantage, to place themselves and the party they represent under obligation to another and rival corporation. We are assuming of course that the free tickets solicited by the managers of the party campaign were actually given by the Grand Trunk authorities. Should it appear, on the contrary, that the tickets were purchased for free distribution, the managers of the railway may be free from blame, but the intention and act of the party managers are no less reprehensible, even should it be shown, as seems likely from evidence to which we have before referred, that the other party, having more money at command, distributed their favours still more liberally. It is surely time that all honest electors, in Parliament or out, should arise in their indignation and say that all this political corruption—and every violation of laws put on the statute book because deemed essential to purity of elections is surely corruption—must be stopped. The sound principle of "one man, one vote," and that vote only in the locality in which the man resides, would go far to remove one of the most prolific sources of abuse. As to the rest, we should like to repeat, with all the emphasis we can give it, a question which we have pressed on former occasions, and which was well put the other day by the *Toronto Mail*—the question, viz.: Where is the use or the consistency of passing these stringent laws to secure purity of elections and of conducting these expensive trials in the election courts, without some effective provision for punishing every individual elector who may be found guilty of offering or accepting a bribe? We pause for a reply.

IT is but natural that some of the papers in the Maritime Provinces which support the present Canadian Government should be beginning to grow restive, in view not only of the failure of the Government thus far to secure a swift line of steamships between Halifax and Great Brit-

ain, but of the arrangement which, it is understood, has been made with the Allan Line to carry the Canadian mails to and from Portland during the winter. The disappointment is certainly a most grievous one to our fellow-citizens on the sea-coast. As is well known, one of the weightiest considerations which prevailed with those of them who accepted Confederation at the outset was that Halifax or St. John would become the winter port for the trade of the Dominion. To this end the building of the Intercolonial Railway was made with them a *sine qua non* of Confederation. It is hard to conceive of any other motive which could have made them willing to bear their share of the heavy cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway than the expectation—an expectation which was certainly encouraged by the Government, that either St. John or Halifax should be its eastern terminus, and thus become the depôt of trans continental traffic. Yet thus far the people of those provinces find themselves disappointed in both expectations. The fast steamships prove slow in coming; the old Allan liners are giving them the go-by, and the Canadian Pacific quotes lower rates on grain to American than to Canadian ports. And yet it is not easy to see that the Government is greatly to blame, except for holding out inducements and exciting hopes which a soberer judgment, or a higher principle, should have forbidden. The suggestive rumour which was current a few days ago to the effect that the enormous subsidy of a million a year was about to be offered to secure a fast Canadian line was promptly contradicted from Ottawa, as well it might be. We dislike pessimism, yet it is useless to disguise facts. The fact is, we fear, that ocean greyhounds of the highest speed are, for the present, beyond our reach. The cost of equipping and running such a line is, we can well believe, enormous, and an enormous travel and traffic are required to warrant it. This we have not to give, though it might, perhaps, soon be developed if the trans-Canadian route between Europe and the East meets reasonable expectations. But it does, none the less, seem strange that the Government could not have effected some arrangement with the Allan Line by which to save at least some portion of the Canadian ocean traffic for ports in our own territory.

THE Conservative demonstration at Perth quickly brought an opportunity for a reply to Mr. Laurier's speech by the Canadian Minister most directly interested. Two points in Mr. Foster's speech seem specially important in this connection, viz., his argument to show that, in case of failure to secure a reciprocity arrangement on satisfactory terms, the country can get along very well without it, and his not unnatural complaint that Mr. Laurier's address on the subject, delivered in the United States on the eve of the coming conference between the Ottawa and Washington authorities, and constituting, as it did, an offer on behalf of the Canadian Opposition, outbidding any that the Government could possibly make consistently with its avowed principles, was a bit of party obstruction, unpatriotic in itself, and unworthy of the leader of a great Canadian party. In regard to the first point, Mr. Foster's reply was not without force, so far as it went. It was in effect that the trade of the country, notwithstanding the operation of the McKinley Bill, is in a prosperous condition. The proof of this was, it must be admitted, less comprehensive than could have been wished. It consisted almost wholly of certain facts in reference to the two articles of eggs and poultry, in both of which a brisk trade has been opened up with England. These are important articles of traffic, no doubt. They are, too, as he reminded his hearers, prominent amongst the articles which the advocates of unrestricted reciprocity were accustomed to point to as those the market for which would be destroyed by the McKinley Bill. In regard to the former, Mr. Foster stated that returns, which will be published soon, will show that within the last six months or less there have gone into the port of Liverpool alone more than thirty millions of eggs laid by Canadian hens. He told us also that there will go forward to the Mother Country this year hundreds of tons of Canadian poultry, and that he believed that all would find a profitable market. What Mr. Foster did not tell us, and what was needed to make his argument conclusive, is whether the prices realized for these articles in Great Britain are as good as would be obtained in the United States under reciprocity, and what has been and is likely to be the effect of the McKinley Bill on the one hundred and one other Canadian products which he did not enumerate. It is true that a partial and so far satisfactory answer is contained

in the fact that the total volume of trade of the Dominion increased \$14,000,000 during the last fiscal year, and that more than half of this increase was in the export trade. Still the question of relative prices remains unanswered. So, too, does the fact of the slow increase of population revealed by the census, even under the operation of an American tariff much less unfavourable than that of the McKinley Bill, remain unexplained. There is a good deal of point in Mr. Foster's arraignment of Mr. Laurier's good taste and patriotism in crossing the border to deliver such a speech just before the proposed conference at Washington, though the act would have been much more reprehensible were it not that the policy of the Liberal party on this question was already so well known, having been proclaimed and reiterated from the public platform and in resolutions offered in Parliament and supported by interminable speeches for years past. Mr. Laurier would further, no doubt, plead that in view of the unofficial but emphatic utterances of Mr. Blaine and other prominent American politicians, the failure of negotiations on any other basis than that of discrimination against Great Britain is a foregone conclusion, and that it is, therefore, but a waste of time to await the issue of negotiations between two parties, one of which is firmly pledged to an impossible condition. The one thing which stands out clearly in the whole discussion is that this question of discrimination against the Mother Country constitutes at the present moment the broadest and most fundamental line of demarcation between the policies of the two great Canadian parties. It would be interesting to know what British statesmen think about it. Should it prove that many of them regard free trade with the continent so essential a condition of Canada's growth and prosperity that her rapid increase in ability to purchase would, under such an arrangement, be likely to make her a more valuable customer than at present, in spite of the higher tariff, the fact might have a very important bearing upon the negotiations.

TO what extent the hopeful tone adopted by Sir John Thompson and other Ministers at Perth in reference to the success of the Cabinet reconstruction now in progress is warranted by the circumstances, the future will decide. We see no reason why the changes, if wisely and, let us add, courageously made, should not result in the formation of a stronger Ministry than has occupied the treasury benches for some years. In fact the vigorous shaking up the Departments have received as the result of the investigations of last session, and the reforms that are being introduced in consequence, should purify the atmosphere for years to come. In view of the well-known facts and results we are somewhat surprised at the tone of some of the remarks made by Sir John Thompson and others at Perth. It is not easy to see what they can hope to gain by denouncing the policy of the Opposition as a policy of slander. It surely cannot be that Sir John or any other friend of pure administration really regrets that those charges were made and investigated, or that the very serious peculations and irregularities, which might otherwise have been continued indefinitely, were thus brought to light. It is not necessary to give the Opposition credit for very lofty or disinterested motives, and as a matter of fact some of their jubinations over the discoveries made were unseemly enough, as have been those of some on the other side, on the very similar revelations in Quebec. But it is obvious that if the frauds had not existed they could not have been discovered, and the accusations could have resulted only in the discomfiture of the accusers and their expulsion from Parliament. Grant that the sum filched from the treasury by one firm of contractors was but a paltry three hundred thousand dollars instead of the round million into which some ardent Grit imaginations have magnified it, it is generally supposed that the essence of dishonesty does not consist in the amount of the sums fraudulently obtained. Nor is \$300,000 itself a sum wholly insignificant, even in Canada. Surely when the Opposition knew of such corruption, or even had good reason to suspect its existence, their leaders would have been unfaithful to their country and recreant to the duties of an Opposition had they failed to bring it to the attention of Parliament. It was noteworthy, too, that some other of Sir John's references to the "scandal" revelations were scarcely characterized by the fairness and frankness which might have been expected from the judicial mental habit acquired by years of experience on the Bench. To say, for instance, that it is absolutely true that Sir Hector Langevin had no knowledge of the