

malefactors who were far less sorely tempted than the member for Lincoln, and have betrayed far less sacred trusts. The sophistry of the advocate argues that Mr. Rykert's delinquency was private and therefore beyond the cognizance of Parliament. It is nothing of the kind. How can the dealings of a member of Parliament with the public departments respecting public property be otherwise than public? But supposing it were, is private roguery no disqualification for a public trust?

—To name the case of General Middleton in the same breath with that of Mr. Rykert would be preposterous. Nobody, we apprehend, doubts the General's honour or imagines that he would wilfully do anything unbecoming a soldier and a gentleman. His unselfishness he showed by risking his military reputation to spare the blood of our citizens, for no one apparently doubts that had he been reckless of blood he might at once have carried Batoche. In the heat and confusion of war he assented to what was certainly a wrong suggestion as to the disposal of property believed to belong to a rebel and practically derelict, so that it would have been almost certainly looted in any case. He never received the furs or inquired after them. If he had received them, it is reasonable as well as charitable to believe that he would have been well advised and have disposed of them rightly. Of any other furs which have been in his possession he seems to be able and willing to give a satisfactory account. After the lapse of five years he may well have forgotten, as he says he had, an order which had never taken effect. The horse which he took for the public service he handed over at the end of the campaign to be sold at auction for the Government. We may safely say that this was a scrupulosity exceeding any that he had seen exhibited at the storm of Lucknow. Perhaps the wild scenes through which he went in the great Mutiny may have somewhat impaired his ideas of strict legality in a war with rebels. As soon as he knew that his