

moral distinctions? His early history, perhaps his life history, was against him. This suggests a further practical query. What amount of effective moral training is being had by thousands of young lads now growing up in our streets, possibly attending our schools?

The trite saying that corporations have no consciences has seldom been so clearly proven by individual members of such corporations, as in some of the testimony recently given by officers of the American Sugar-Refining Company, before the U. S. Senate Investigating Committee. Mr. Havemeyer, the President, and Mr. Searles, the Secretary of this company, both of whom are said to be in private life esteemed men of spotless reputation, testified, in answer to questions, before the committee, that on the formation of the trust they did advance the price of sugar to the American consumer; that the latter is to-day paying three-eighths of a cent a pound more for such sugar than he would have to pay under a system of separate refineries; that the trust had endeavored to control legislation; that it had contributed to the Democratic State (New York) fund last year; that it always contributed to the Republican State campaign fund, etc. Mr. Havemeyer's frank reply to the question why his company should contribute to either of the political parties in the State was: "We have large interests in this State; police protection and fire protection. They need everything that the city furnishes and gives, and they have to support these things. Every individual and corporation and firm, trust, or whatever you call them, does these things and we do them." He further admitted that the trust is a Democrat in a Democratic state, and a Republican in a Republican state, that the dominant party gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters. Mr. Searles made practically the same admissions and could see nothing improper in the thing, "as parties are now managed." Of course, the McKinley tariff is the backbone of the trust. The *Outlook* makes the sensible suggestion that the moral sentiment of the nation demands absolute publicity for all campaign contributions. The remedy is simple. Is the moral sentiment of the nation strong enough to apply it? The same publicity is needed in Canada. We as well as our cousins have to pay more for our sugar by reason of monopolies bolstered up by tariff protection. Is Canadian moral sentiment strong enough to insist on the right remedies?

In the death of Archbishop Tache, not only has the Church of Rome in Canada lost one of its most distinguished prelates, but the Dominion one of its ablest and most influential diplomatists. Whatever may be our views as to the character and tendencies of the religious system of the

Church of which he was a member, it is impossible not to admire the self-sacrifice, bravery, and enthusiasm, which stand out on every page of the story of the young priest's missionary labours among the savage tribes of what was, in his earlier years, the Hudson Bay Territory. The hardships and privations he endured, the dangers he faced, during the long journeys he made in the depths of winter, in order to make known his message and perform the rites of his church for the benefit of the poor savages, are worthy to be recorded by the side of those of his ancestors, whose annals form so romantic and inspiring a part of early Canadian history. His missionary and priestly labours during all the years both preceding and following his elevation to the Bishopric in 1851 had secured him such a position of influence among the Indians and half-breeds of the North-West, that his counsels seem to have had almost the force of law throughout the whole Red River country. A remarkable tribute to this influence was paid by the Dominion Government when, in 1869, he was summoned in all haste from Rome, to quell the dissatisfaction caused by the too high-handed methods of the Government in trying to take possession of the territory, after terms had been made with the Hudson Bay Company. The details of that affair and of the part which the Bishop took in it are still fresh in the minds of many of our readers, as are also those of the active opposition he was still waging up to the time of his death, against the school legislation of the Province of Manitoba. We need not now discuss the question whether he exceeded his powers in offering amnesty in Manitoba after the death of Scott, or that of the soundness of his views on the school question. That he was not only a man of great ability, but honest and sincere in contending for the faith in which he had been brought up, fair-minded Canadians will generally admit.

Should the result of the great contest, which result will be known all over the Dominion long before these words see the light, be, as is probable, the return of a majority of supporters of the present Government, it is to be devoutly hoped that the fact will not be regarded as an endorsement of the disingenuous political methods, some of which have been so clearly brought to light during the campaign. We may refer specially, by way of example, to the traffic in patronage, as revealed in the Leys correspondence. Facts subsequently brought out, it is but fair to say, have shown conclusively that Sir Oliver Mowat's interview with Mr. Leys was not the origin of the proposal to appoint the son of the former to the lucrative position then open. These facts, showing that the appointment had been discussed and approved by prominent members of the party for some days before the date of that interview, make it probable

that the suggestion did not emanate from Sir Oliver in the first place. They do not, however, do away with the unpleasant certainty that the aged Premier did consent to act a part, when, on the receipt of the deputations and on subsequent occasions he helped, not only tacitly but by word of mouth, to convey, or to strengthen, the impression that he was yielding, under pressure, a reluctant consent to the appointment of his son, when he had not only consented to that appointment but had personally helped it forward.

Every generous mind must regret to have the venerable Premier revealed in such an attitude. But far worse than this lapse, let us hope in a moment of weakness, is the public aspect of the revelation. We remarked, in our former note, on the absence of any reference in the correspondence to the public interests, which the unsophisticated citizen would suppose to be always the first and chief consideration in a Government appointment. Severe but just comment has since been made by independent contemporaries on this aspect of the case. The whole correspondence, it is pointed out, is based on the assumption that the sole ends kept in view in such an appointment are, first, the reward of party services and, second, the effect upon the future of the "Party." No argument is needed to show that the state of things which places the Premier and the Government under such temptation to forget public duty under the pressure of personal and party considerations, is wrong and demoralizing. The effect would be bad enough were the offices in question demanded only by party friends outside of the House. It is still worse when it becomes quite the custom to use the offices for the reward of the faithful legislators themselves. According to the *Mail's* reckoning, in a recent article, no less than forty-five members of the Ontario Legislature, including four Cabinet Ministers, have accepted Government appointments during the Mowat regime. Most dispassionate citizens will, we think, perceive an objectionable element, not to say a source of positive danger, in the arrangement which renders such a distribution of remunerative positions to party supporters possible. The *Globe* may ask, "Would you then have it made law that the fact that a man may have served for a term as member of the Legislature shall for ever incapacitate him for serving his fellow-citizens in any public office in the gift of the Government?" The *Globe* would be the last, we fancy, to consent to the doing away with acts for preserving the independence of Parliament. No paper more emphatically denounces both the Government and the individual member, when it is sometimes rumoured that a representative in Parliament is voting virtually with a commission in his pocket! Surely there is some better way.