

in that direction, if thought advisable, and if it be deemed inadvisable to include the two classes of offenders in the one bill, all that is necessary is that some member should introduce an equally stringent measure for the punishment of the bribe-givers. If the session closes without Dr. Weldon's Bill having become law, there will be only too much ground for the cynic's sneer at the fervent aspirations for purity of elections which so often ascend from honourable members on both sides of the House.

Apropos to the foregoing is a remark ascribed in the Globe's report to Mr. D'Alton McCarthy, which we have hoped to see repudiated. He is reported as having said that "he thought no one of them who had gone through elections and been long in political life could say he had not committed acts in contravention of the Elections Act". Did Mr. McCarthy really make that damaging admission? And did no one member in all that "honourable" body spring to his feet to repudiate the soft impeachment? Shall the public be left to infer that every member of that august assembly was in the same predicament as the individuals in a certain virtuous and indignant crowd who, on a certain memorable occasion, were requested to wait for the one without sin to cast the first stone at the convicted culprit? Are we to understand that our law-makers are without exception law-breakers? It seemed bad enough when Mr. Jeannotte was reported as having declared in effect that every member bought votes, that he himself had done so, but we consoled ourselves with the reflection that the standard of political morality in certain districts of French Canada was not yet up to the normal level, and found an additional argument in favour of the Bill in the fact that it was needed to educate the consciences of the electors and representatives of such districts. Mr. Jeannotte had, however, the grace to deny having used the expression, though Hansard seems to be against him. But now a member whose reputation for honour and integrity is among the very highest in the House makes practically the same admission and no notice is taken of it. Surely there must be many members in the Commons who can indignantly refuse to be included in a statement so significant and sweeping. Can it be that they are lacking in the moral courage necessary to resent and repudiate such a charge and to face the sneers with which their repudiation would be sure to be met by a certain class of moral sceptics who unhappily abound in all such assemblies.

"The unspeakable Turk" has apparently once more broken loose from the leash in which he is held by the fear of more civilized nations, and is perpetrating outrages of various kinds upon Armenian and other Christians within the boundaries of his misrule. Two or three weeks since we had

accounts of outrages inflicted upon Christians by Turkish officials. Then came news that Cesarea was in the hands of Moslem fanatics, who were robbing and killing hundreds of Armenian citizens in the churches and on the streets, and had established such a reign of terror that business was suspended and most of the prominent Armenians in the city thrown into prison, a few only having escaped by the payment of large ransoms. Later despatches tell of indignities perpetrated upon American citizens, not only missionaries but United States officials, whose mails and telegrams are said to have been interfered with. Representations are being made at Washington and it is likely that the truth of the matter will be rigorously enquired into. The Turk has long been in Europe on sufferance and is tolerated there only as the less of two evils. But even the dread of Russia taking his place may not long save him if he tries the patience of other nations too often or too far.

In his appointments to office, both at home and abroad, President Cleveland is maintaining and even surpassing his former record for independence in judgment and action. He sends, for instance, as Minister to France, in the person of ex-Senator Eustis, a man who is not only without political backing of the kind which has hitherto been supposed indispensable, but who some years ago made a strong and outspoken attack upon the President himself. Of Mr. Runyon, who goes to Germany, and Mr. Risley, who goes to Denmark, it may be said that neither was in a position to bring to bear any powerful political influence, or to claim the reward of distinguished party service. In regard to the home civil service he has disgusted many by his strange innovations, such as refusing to appoint his own nephew to a position for which he was influentially recommended, causing to be published the names of all applicants for office, intimating that none of those who held office during his former term need apply for re-appointment, etc. It is not to be supposed that all his appointments are equally wise, though most of those whom he has chosen for important positions are generally admitted to be men of high character and ability, but his firmness in refusing to reward the party "heelers," and in discountenancing the "machine" politicians is worthy of all praise, and will, in connection with the reforms made by himself during his previous term, and those inaugurated by President Harrison, go far towards completing the emancipation of the Republic from the disgraceful thralldom to its most selfish and unprincipled classes in which it was so long held as outcome of the political motto, "To the victor the spoils."

The policy of obstruction so ruthlessly pursued by the Opposition in the British Commons has been for the time being successful. Whether the delay in the second

reading of the Home-Rule Bill which has resulted will increase or diminish the difficulties with which the Government has to contend in getting the Bill through the lower House remains to be seen. It certainly gives the opponents of the Bill the valuable gain of some additional time in which to marshal the various feelings and interests, not to say prejudices and passions, which can be called on to strengthen their hands, though the value of this advantage has been considerably reduced by the brevity of the Easter holidays. On the other hand, the delay will not be without some compensating advantages to the Government. Even had it been in its power to do so, there would have been considerable danger of creating some revulsion of feeling had the slender majority been too often called on and the cloture too vigorously applied in pushing the Bill through the House with what might have seemed to many, undue and undignified haste. More important still, the delay has enabled the Government to bring to their aid a most powerful ally in the shape of the Parish Councils Bill, with its surprisingly advanced provisions. It is not unlikely that the effect of this measure upon the popular mind, reinforcing that produced by the resolution adopted in favour of payment of the members of the House, will more than offset any unfavourable impression that may be made even by the intensely earnest crusade of the Opposition against the Home-Rule. A remarkable evidence of the great change wrought in the tone of British politics by the successive extensions of the franchise is seen in the fact that even the Conservative leaders are not prepared to take up arms against such startling innovations as those proposed in the Parish Councils Bill, which seems meant to reduce the influence of both Squire and Vestry in local politics to the level of that of ordinary citizens.

Does anyone believe that Sir Adolphe Caron would have received the \$25,000 from Mr. Ross for the Election Fund but for the subsidies received and in prospect from the Government of which Sir Adolphe Caron was a member? Can anyone doubt that Sir Adolphe Caron, at the time of soliciting and receiving the subscription, — subscriptions, if, as Mr. McCarthy suspects, — not without a good deal of reason, there was a second \$25,000 from Mr. Beemer himself — was not fully cognizant of the business relations between Messrs. Ross and Beemer? These queries seem to us to put the question of Sir Adolphe Caron's fitness or unfitness to be a member of the Dominion Cabinet in a nutshell. We say nothing of the more doubtful point as to whether the Minister was or was not personally interested in securing the subsidies for the Company. We do not believe that there is a single intelligent member of the House, or reader of the evidence, who doubts that there was a real