

does it derive any benefit whatever from the act, directly or indirectly. Where then could any moral obligation arise for it to make compensation, even if it were an individual? The law, it is true, has in such cases imposed a legal liability, but to attempt to escape a merely legal liability on legal grounds cannot properly be said to be dishonest.

The popular view of the matter is that whenever someone has been injured or killed, compensation should be made by someone, and as the person who actually does the injury is ordinarily financially no good, in popular estimation, resort should be had to his employer if he happens to have one, though he be personally innocent of any wrong-doing. This view is largely adopted by judges and the legislature, but it seems ridiculous to place that liability if it be imposed by either judicial decision or legislative enactment, as resting on any moral ground. There are some obligations which are both moral and legal, and to attempt to evade such an obligation by any means may clearly be said to be dishonest, but the case seems to be wholly different where the obligation is purely legal. To escape from such an obligation, any defence which the law allows may properly be resorted to, without the breach of any moral law.

But it may be asked, is counsel acting for a corporation guilty of any moral wrong in setting up or insisting on any such defence on behalf of a corporation? It is obvious that he, as the servant of the corporation, is the person to whom any moral delinquency, if any there be in this respect, must attach. The corporation as we have seen is not a moral being. Its servants and agents are, and they may be guilty of immoral acts. For instance, it would be a distinctly immoral act for a servant of a corporation to tell lies or commit frauds on its behalf. But it is he and not the corporation which is guilty of the immorality. So, therefore, any charge of immorality against a corporation is really levelled against those who, as its agents, commit in its name the acts for which blame is imputed to the corporation.

When, therefore, it is said that a corporation is dishonest, what is really meant is that those who are acting on its behalf