The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1873.

OUR ANNIVERSARY.

ONE year has passed since the first number of *The Mail* went forth on its patriotic mission. "Not local purposes, "not local prejudices ought to guide us, "but the general good." Such was the motto wisely chosen for our scutcheon. One whose labours in the field of literature have been as varied as the admiration of them is universal, suggested to us the appropriate apothegm. No doubt he foresaw the necessity of building up some journalistic influence able to cope with the sectional prejudices and to counter the overbearing tyranny of a paper, whose strength had at that time come to be a source of alarm even to those within the scope of its patronising *ægis*. It was matter where it should have been servant, and an intolerable dictatorship stared them in the face. So heartily was this acknowledged on all sides, that no difficulty was experienced in raising the necessary capital. The first issue of this journal appeared within six weeks of the proposition to establish it. Aiming at no personal objects, with the influence of a large and scattered proprietary brought to bear on the course to be steered, it has been impossible that selfish ends should mix with the usefulness of its advocacy, or narrow the breadth of its views. We have spoken boldly and without fear; in the endeavour to protect the public more than once feeling it our duty to rise superior to the dictates of Party prejudice. It has been our earnest endeavour to make *The Mail* a Newspaper, as well as the vehicle of those political principles which we advocate. It is gratifying to reflect that while in many instances news of the greatest importance has been exclusively given to the public through its columns, we have to reproach ourselves with no omissions of a character to disappoint our readers. The political services of the paper have very recently been acknowledged by the Premier from his seat in Parliament, who at the same time took the opportunity to declare that he in no way controlled or even suggested the course of *The Mail*. To the present Administration at Ottawa and to the Opposition at Toronto, we have given a general support. That course has been more than justified by the reckless doings of the Grit Party, now controlling the affairs of Ontario and, by means of misrepresentation and contemptible, in vain seeking place and power in the councils of the Dominion.

If the wholesome fear of exposure in these columns has restrained political ill-doers from working all their will, the country must but acknowledge an obligation. Machinery of the first quality, type, paper and workmen as good as can be procured, have placed before the reading public a sheet stated by the highest authority in England to be mechanically the superior of any journal brought by post into the British Isles. Greater praise we cannot look for. An efficient and industrious staff have fully justified the selections made at the origination of the enterprise. Correspondents at a distance have lent a sustained interest to varied tales of other lands. To many standing in the first ranks of Canadian authors, statesman or scientific experts, we are indebted for elaborate contributions, and the volumes compiled from *Mail* pages, we venture to think, may be the first of a long series that will be of untold value to the future historian of the early days of Confederation.

Coming to the business aspect of the concern it starting truly to know that, though our resources are furnished with every requisite for the production of a paper second to none, there has been no occasion as yet to call in the aids of the shareholders' capital. When we consider that *The Mail* has also been thoroughly established throughout the length and breadth of Canada, at an outlay somewhat short of the expectations of the first promoters, and that a large proportion of capital is an incident in the establishment of a business confined within far closer limits than the requirements of a daily paper, we are satisfied with this record of our stewardship. Extravagance has been scrupulously avoided; but economy has never been allowed to infringe on the rights of our subscribers. A steadily increasing circulation is a more substantial proof than the flattering compliments of friends, that the career of *The Mail* is destined to be a bright one, and its hold on the esteem of the public deserved and enduring.

On about ten days have attained, by position, whence we rival the popularity and influence of journals boasting a quarter of a century's existence. To the merchants and others who have appreciated the value of *The Mail* as an advertising medium, we are anxious to express our warmest thanks, and though our present standing in the community might warrant such a course, it is not our intention to appropriate our rates to the excessive tariff is force elsewhere. Since our first issue, the price of the paper has been raised to $6 per annum; a figure which only just covers the actual expense of the material, supplied, and which, therefore, from a practical business point of view, is perhaps as indefensible as was the suicidal price of $4 prevailed in Toronto a year ago. The circulation of the paper reached a point within a few weeks, beyond which the mechanical facilities for the establishment forbade its further extension. The premises were accordingly enlarged, and new printing presses had to be obtained from England. We did not think it necessary to rush into large capitals to blazon our success to the world: but have preferred that the paper should push its own way on its own merits. There is now scarcely an agent of the Post Office or Express Company in this Province whence it is not distributed, while owing to the excellence of our reportorial staff, in Ottawa, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and the North-west, *The Mail* is the chief source whence the current history of our Provincial and Federal affairs is derived.

The success of *The Weekly Mail*, at a time, too, when the market seemed to be glutted, has, even in this reading community, been astonishing and beyond the most sanguine calculations. Upwards of 15,000 families welcome the large, well printed broad-sheet issued from this office every Thursday, and additional orders are being constantly received.

The past year has robbed us of the advice and assistance of him who was virtually our founder. Mr. SANFIELD MACDONALD's death was a heavy blow and sore discouragement, regarding him as we did in the light of a political father, or whose sagacious counsels and prolonged experience it was a privilege and a pleasure to count in the moment of need. In the recent untimely cutting off of a valued member of our staff in the very strength and pride of his manhood, there is substantial reason to know that we and his sorrowing family have the sympathy of the public.

Between man and man it has been and will be our sincerest endeavour to mete out fair justice. Only in a very few cases have our motives been impugned, and our fairness called in question. Our occasionless sequitis us of blame, and we start on another year confident, at least, that we have wilfully misrepresented nobody, and set down naught in malice.

The first year may be accepted as an earnest of the future. Our subscribers at least may depend upon this, that we shall only redouble our efforts to make *The Mail* worthy of their patronage, and shall spare no legitimate trouble or expense to meet the expectations of an appreciative public.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

IF the Canadian Government did not succeed in obtaining recognition of the "Fenian claims" in the Treaty of Washington, they have obtained advantages from the Imperial Government which go far beyond any sum which could have been drawn out of the United States' Government had these "claims" been recognized in the Treaty. The magnificent vote of our House of Commons last session on the bill to give effect to those articles of the Treaty which concerns Canada, was proof positive of the success of Sir JOHN MACDONALD's negotiations. His Government is now in a position to inform Parliament that the £2,500,000 of our bonds which the Imperial Government consented to guarantee for the construction of the Pacific Railway have been supplemented by £1,100,000. This last named amount is to be diverted from the building of fortifications—at once insisted upon by the Imperial Government, and agreed to by Mr. GEORGE BROWN and two of his colleagues, when that gentleman was a member of the Canadian Government—and turned into a more productive channel. The Imperial guarantee of £3,600,000, or some $18,000,000, represents an immense annual saving to the Dominion. It is not only very strong proof of the essentially practical character of the administration of affairs by the present Government, but it evidences a confidence in the success of the Pacific Railway undertaking which speaks well for Sir HUGH ALLAN's success with the capitalists of England.

MR. MCKELLAR'S DEFENCE.

ON the 15th August, 1872, we charged Messrs. MCKELLAR and KING with what is now popularly known as "the Elgin Bands." We did so in the firm conviction that they were guilty, and to-day we affirm all that we have heretofore published, and vivet the charge home to the accused by evidence which has never before seen daylight, for a portion of it is Mr. MCKELLAR's plea of guilty. We do not intend to make extraneous comments upon our case, nor to interlard our brief with strained deductions or improbable suppositions. We give, at a loss portion of Mr. MCKELLAR's defence which bear upon the subject as they appeared in yesterday's *Globe*, and annex thereunto our rejoinders:—

1. Mr. MCKELLAR was charged in *The Mail* on the 15th August last, 224 days ago. He promised to defend himself at the proper time; and we might fairly say that a truly innocent man would have been only too glad to have jumped at the first opportunity of making his defence public, and would have explained his case the moment Parliament met. Mr. MCKELLAR, on the other hand, postponed it, and postponed it, until His Honour was almost on his way to the House bent on prorogation—and it is a fair deduction to say that a good defence would have needed no procrastination. He defends the delay in this way:—

"It may be said that I should have made this statement at an earlier stage of the session. Well, I would have done so, but I had not then the evidence that was necessary to enable me to make the statement, and it was only to-day that I obtained a printed copy of the statement made by officers of the Elgin Association, so far as the affairs of the company are concerned. I am sure when that the printed documents have yet been distributed to hon. members. I think not, as I had to go to the printing office to procure one for myself, but without it it would be impossible for me to answer some of the accusations that have been made against me."

Unhappy man, to stumble on the threshold! The statement referred to was moved for by Mr. RYKERT, under the terms of the Act incorporating the Association on Thursday, 30th January last, the journals of the House testify. The Provincial Secretary laid a copy of the statement on the table of the Legislature on the 18th inst., as the return itself testifies. It was then public property, and, if it was the document for which Mr. MCKELLAR was waiting, he might have gone on with his defence on the 19th March. If he could not conveniently decipher the hieroglyphics of the departmental clerk, he might have taken up his defence on the 23rd inst., for on that day the printed return was distributed. We submit, therefore, that the statement referred to was at his service ten days ago, and we hold, moreover, that its contents were not indispensable to a defence of the charges made by us; so that his declaration that "he "had not then the evidence that was "necessary to enable him to make the statement" is false in every particular.

2. At the outset we have the painful satisfaction of knowing that Mr. MCKELLAR pleads guilty to our main charge, viz., the misappropriation, by himself and his associate of £2,137 10s. stg., money obtained from Mr. WILLIAM MILLAR, 49 Fenchurch street, London, E.C., and others, as their payment on account of certain shares taken by them at the inception of the Elgin Association, and in the Elgin Association, and upon which they were to receive an annual dividend at the rate of 5 per cent. *per annum* until such time as the whole payment would be refunded to them. We have, in our first and subsequent of it, and he has acted prudently, for it is always useless to enter a plea of "not guilty" when the Court is packed with witnesses of the guilt. We have, speaking of the £2,137 10s.:—

"I paid the money over to the two years, and I promised to pay it in 1863, because I felt the responsibility of having I had no less anything to do with a transaction of that kind, which results unfortunately, that he is at all events, prepared to restore the money to those who gave it. I promised to pay it in 1863, because the difficulties overtook me, and I was unable to do so; but I for one feel bound to see those who contributed to the money, and I intend to a commercial transaction recovered, and if Mr. King is not able to do it, I, if in thirty years hence, will endeavour, if possible, to restore it."

Exactly. Got the money in 1861, paid interest on it until 1863. Mr. MCKELLAR endeavouring to make Mr. MILLAR believe that Mr. KING was responsible for the misappropriation, and that Mr. MILLAR asking for it instead of from him, and receiving sometimes prayers for the punishment of the rascals, sometimes a curt reply, sometimes a vague answer, and often no answer at all. Mr. MILLAR's patience always to-morrow. Shilly-shallying, beating round the bush, ashamed to tell the truth, and yet not prepared for prison, to cover falsehood. If Mr. MCKELLAR had come out like a man ten years ago and told Mr. MILLAR that he had lost the money on Thursday night, that he, the firm of MCKELLAR & DOLSEN, and Mr. KING were of very high character, and that he had misappropriated the money, we are satisfied that Mr. MILLAR would have passed the account to profit and loss. But no man cares to be swindled by Pharisees, or to be plundered by charitable professors, and to be made the victim of sanctimonious sharpers—and of all men in creation, lawyers! Mr. MILLAR is, we hear, one of the best haters of pious fraud. We know Mr. MCKELLAR would have to admit this offence, for the account of the Elgin Bands of the Association contain no record of Mr. MILLAR's investment. And we had another reason for believing it is a very good one too—the frauds are easily traceable in the accounts of Messrs. MCKELLAR, DOLSEN and KING. In the ledgers of the Chatham and Toronto branches of the Bank of Upper Canada—the books kept by the agents in this case! Moreover, Mr. KING has a nephew, named KING BRUCE, who labours under the hallucination that he had made, on one or two occasions, swindled him. He was book-keeper of the saw-mill, and was also an accountant with the firm of the Elgin Association. When he saw our *exposé* of its affairs, he, with the instinct of a true King, thought he was swindled out of a share of it. The uncle had made money by swindling, the nephew would make money by exposing the uncle. And he wrote this letter:—

"CHATHAM, ONT., Feb. 8th, 1873.

"*Rufus Stephenson, Esq., Queen's Hotel, Toronto.*

"SIR,—I have in my possession facts bearing upon the 'Elgin Association' business, amounting to little short of swindling of foolscap.

"Would you be so kind as to ask the Editor of *The Mail* what he would give for such information as will expose the internal workings of the Association?

"The facts would be relative to amount of moneys received, history of the Buxton mill, history of some land sales, and other matters bearing upon the affairs and information relating to the Buxton mission.

"If you and the Editor think sufficiently of the transaction to warrant my coming yourself, it would oblige me very much.

"Please reply by letter to my address, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE.

"Box 1132, Chatham."

He was then asked to explain the above, and here is his reply:—

"CHATHAM, ONT., Feb. 8th, 1873.

"*Editor of The Mail, Toronto.*

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 30th ult. to hand, contents noted, and in reply beg to state, that I cannot consider that it would strengthen your case, but I am disinclined to be then out of my position at present. They are not prepared for print, so you would have to attend to that as would best suit yourself.

"I will agree to furnish you such information as I have got, and also all I can get in future, for one hundred dollars ($100), but no less.

"I have at Buxton from the spring of 1857 to the fall of 1871. I was engaged as one of the agents on the heavy lumber contract in 1867, and have a copy of the books.

"I think we can get affairs in historical order if we try.

"Please reply by return mail.

"I remain,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE."

It is a well-established Irish rule never to fight the Crown when informers are cheap; and for that reason and the other reasons above mentioned, Mr. MCKELLAR acted prudently in admitting the whole of our main charge. All we have to do, therefore, is to enter into the charges relative to the land account of the Association and to the Buxton mission, one of its numerous ramifications, to which he pleads not guilty.

3. When one scrimed employs a second party to prepare his defence, it becomes necessary to examine the agent's character, especially when he bases his case upon documentary evidence purporting to come from a Scotch gentleman. Who is Mr. MCKELLAR's agent in this case? None other, good people, than the Reverend HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS!! COCKS!! He who runs may now read the hitherto nebulous circumstances attending Mr. COCKS' appointment to the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Emigration Agent for Ontario in Great Britain. We can understand now why COCKS was appointed in the face of the report of Mr. HAGUE, Emigration Agent at Quebec, charging him with drunkenness, incapacity, and with being the pseudo representative of an emigration society which did not exist. We can understand why Mr. MCKELLAR was last year paid £365 stg. per annum. We can understand now why COCKS was also allowed to draw $1,000 from the Emigration Office vouchers, as part payment of his claim for $1,960, on account of Emigrants which he said had been sent out by the Society which he represents i. e., by the incorporate body of HORNCOCK COCKS. We can understand now why COCKS was allowed that $1,000 before the emigrants said to have been assisted had lived the necessary three months in this Province. We can understand now why COCKS was paid on a list of bogus names. We can understand now why the names of SUSAN B. ANTHONY and OLIVE BURNITT, two prominent woman's rights advocates, were passed as being the names of "two of COCKS' *protegés* without protest. We can understand now why COCKS' attempt to bully the managers of the ALLAN line out of a free cabin ticket after he had received $100 from the Department to pay his passage, was overlooked. We can understand now why COCKS' violent abuse of the Catholic population of this country before a public meeting in England, was overlooked. We can understand now why Mr. MCKELLAR was for year to give COCKS no less than $7,260 of the people's money. We say we can now fully understand why a merchant, from a disgrace alike to his cloth and his country, was made the representative of the Ontario Government in Great Britain—and we can also measure the drachm of salt with which the evidence of such a man must be taken.

4. We shall not discuss with Mr. MCKELLAR the character of his associate, the Rev. WILLIAM KING. He thinks Mr. KING is a nice man; Mr. WILLIAM MILLAR, 49 Fenchurch street, London, E.C., doesn't. The question of virtue or rascality in one's character depend to a very great extent upon the stand-point of the surveyor.

5. We now come to the gist of the land case. Mr. MCKELLAR says:—

"Well, Sir, I find the indictments laid down in *The Mail* newspaper, and I shall deal with them in the order in which I find them recorded. The editorial is headed 'Bookkeeping by Single Entry,' and it says 'To capital account as per Mr. King's letter of October 10th, 1872, $16,000.' Then it says that we sold the 6,000 acres at $2½ acre, making $29,600, and that all we paid the Government was $7,712. By this statement it would appear that the Association (and, of course as the paper would have it, Mr. King and myself) had pocketed some $27,000 of these people's money. That is the indictment made against us. Now I wish to show by documentary evidence that there is no foundation for this statement. I hold in my hand a statement from the Crown Lands Office verified by the officers of that Department, from which it appears that the settlers paid in cash altogether $17,941. That is the amount that was paid by the settlers to the Government. * * Mr. Hennin gave me the Secretary since the Association was organized. The Treasurer is the Rev. Mr. Reid. I do not remember when he was appointed, but he succeeded the late Mr. Howard, who was, I believe, Sheriff of the County of York, and was Treasurer of the Association until he died. These two gentlemen, Mr. Henning and Mr. Reid, who I have no doubt are both known to many gentlemen in the House, have given me a copy of the statement that the amount received from the stockholders for the land, and the amount they went upon the land they paid the instalments advanced in that way, and paid for the land in full, amounted to $72,49. So that in that statement alone we are charged with having received some $22,287 more than we have received. The lands are all paid for. The difference between the amount we have received from settlers and the amount which the Association paid is $4,594.78."

The return referred to shows that the settlers paid on the land account, including interest and instalments, $72,049, that is to say, Messrs. KING and MCKELLAR returned $22,072.49 as the amount they had received, and not $4,594.78. But—alas these "buts"—there is often a wide difference betwixt a statement and a fact. We have in our possession the original receipts of a very large number of the settlers, showing what their own signatures to actual amounts which they paid to Mr. KING, and it is interesting to mark the extraordinary discrepancies between their signed and attested evidence and the return made by the officers of the association to the Government. We make a few extracts from that return:—

Part of Lot.	*No. of Lot.*	*Con.*	*Acres.*	*Amount Paid by Settler.*
N ½	11	8	100	$200
	6	13	200	225
	13	13	200	320
	6	11	100	200
	10	10	100	200
	8	11	100	200
	6	11	100	200
N ½	9	11	100	200
	7	9	200	375
				$2,175

Now, here is an extract from the original list of payments relative to portions of the above lots:—

SUTTON, April 6th, 1861.

We, the undersigned, do certify that the figures appended to each of our names are to show the amount that we, being actual settlers of the Elgin settlement, have respectively paid to Mr. King for our land:—

Des. of Lot.	*Acres.*	*Name.*	*Paid.*
W ½ of S ½ of lot 10	50	Jordan Harrison his mark	$50 15
W ½ of 6, 13th	50	Peter S Hamm his mark	125 00
½ of 7, 13th	50	Huron x Johnson his mark	156 00
N ½ of 7, 13th	100	John J. Brooks his mark	167 00
W ½ of 6, A (Gore)	50	Martha x A. Ely her mark	156 10
W ½ of 9, A (Gore)	50	Jacob J. Gunn	143 00
W ½ of 8, 11	50	Alfred H. West	156 00
S ½ of 6, 11	50	Louis Pfaff (Signed by his order)	156 00
E ½ of 6, 9th	50	Daniel Dunlop (Signed by his order.)	156 00
½ of 7, 9th	50	Thomas Scott	151 00
			$1,968 15

So that while the officers of the Association returned $2,175 as having been received from settlers on the land in the above lots, the settlers themselves actually paid over to their agent $1,968.15 or only 140 acres of them paid for. Moreover, Mr. KING has a nephew, named KING BRUCE, who labours under the hallucination that he had made, on one or two occasions, swindled him. He was book-keeper of the saw-mill, and was also an accountant with the firm of the Elgin Association. When he saw our *exposé* of its affairs, he, with the instinct of a true King, thought he was swindled out of a share of it. The uncle had made money by swindling, the nephew would make money by exposing the uncle. And he wrote this letter:—

"CHATHAM, ONT.

"*Rufus Stephenson, Esq., Queen's Hotel, Toronto.*

"SIR,—I have in my possession facts bearing upon the 'Elgin Association' business, amounting to little short of swindling of foolscap.

"Would you be so kind as to ask the Editor of *The Mail* what he would give for such information as will expose the internal workings of the Association?

"The facts would be relative to amount of moneys received, history of the Buxton mill, history of some land sales, and other matters bearing upon the affairs and information relating to the Buxton mission.

"If you and the Editor think sufficiently of the transaction to warrant my coming yourself, it would oblige me very much.

"Please reply by letter to my address, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE.

"Box 1132, Chatham."

He was then asked to explain the above, and here is his reply:—

"CHATHAM, ONT., Feb. 8th, 1873.

"*Editor of The Mail, Toronto.*

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 30th ult. to hand, contents noted, and in reply beg to state, that I cannot consider that it would strengthen your case, but I am disinclined to be then out of my position at present. They are not prepared for print, so you would have to attend to that as would best suit yourself.

"I will agree to furnish you such information as I have got, and also all I can get in future, for one hundred dollars ($100), but no less.

"I have at Buxton from the spring of 1857 to the fall of 1871. I was engaged as one of the agents on the heavy lumber contract in 1867, and have a copy of the books.

"I think we can get affairs in historical order if we try.

"Please reply by return mail.

"I remain,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE."

It is a well-established Irish rule never to fight the Crown when informers are cheap; and for that reason and the other reasons above mentioned, Mr. MCKELLAR acted prudently in admitting the whole of our main charge. All we have to do, therefore, is to enter into the charges relative to the land account of the Association and to the Buxton mission, one of its numerous ramifications, to which he pleads not guilty.

3. When one scrimed employs a second party to prepare his defence, it becomes necessary to examine the agent's character. We shall not begin by the bass his case upon documentary evidence purporting to come from a Scotch gentleman. Who is Mr. MCKELLAR's agent in this case? None other, good people, than the Reverend HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS!! COCKS!! He who runs may now read the hitherto nebulous circumstances attending Mr. COCKS' appointment to the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Emigration Agent for Ontario in Great Britain. We can understand now why COCKS was appointed in the face of the report of Mr. HAGUE, Emigration Agent at Quebec, charging him with drunkenness, incapacity, and with being the pseudo representative of an emigration society which did not exist. We can understand now why Mr. MCKELLAR was last year paid £365 stg. per annum. We can understand now why COCKS was also allowed to draw $1,000 from the Emigration Office vouchers, as part payment of his claim for $1,960, on account of Emigrants which he said had been sent out by the Society which he represents i. e., by the incorporate body of HORNCOCK COCKS. We can understand now why COCKS was allowed that $1,000 before the emigrants said to have been assisted had lived the necessary three months in this Province. We can understand now why COCKS was paid on a list of bogus names. We can understand now why the names of SUSAN B. ANTHONY and OLIVE BURNITT, two prominent woman's rights advocates, were passed as being the names of "two of COCKS' *protegés* without protest. We can understand now why COCKS' attempt to bully the managers of the ALLAN line out of a free cabin ticket after he had received $100 from the Department to pay his passage, was overlooked. We can understand now why COCKS' violent abuse of the Catholic population of this country before a public meeting in England, was overlooked. We can understand now why Mr. MCKELLAR was for year to give COCKS no less than $7,260 of the people's money. We say we can now fully understand why a merchant, from a disgrace alike to his cloth and his country, was made the representative of the Ontario Government in Great Britain—and we can also measure the drachm of salt with which the evidence of such a man must be taken.

4. We shall not discuss with Mr. MCKELLAR the character of his associate, the Rev. WILLIAM KING. He thinks Mr. KING is a nice man; Mr. WILLIAM MILLAR, 49 Fenchurch street, London, E.C., doesn't. The question of virtue or rascality in one's character depend to a very great extent upon the stand-point of the surveyor.

5. We now come to the gist of the land case. Mr. MCKELLAR says:—

"Well, Sir, I find the indictments laid down in *The Mail* newspaper, and I shall deal with them in the order in which I find them recorded. The editorial is headed 'Bookkeeping by Single Entry,' and it says 'To capital account as per Mr. King's letter of October 10th, 1872, $16,000.' Then it says that we sold the 6,000 acres at $2½ acre, making $29,600, and that all we paid the Government was $7,712. By this statement it would appear that the Association (and, of course as the paper would have it, Mr. King and myself) had pocketed some $27,000 of these people's money. That is the indictment made against us. Now I wish to show by documentary evidence that there is no foundation for this statement. I hold in my hand a statement from the Crown Lands Office verified by the officers of that Department, from which it appears that the settlers paid altogether $17,941. That is the amount that was paid by the settlers to the Government. * * Mr. Henning gave me the Secretary since the Association was organized. The Treasurer is the Rev. Mr. Reid. I do not remember when he was appointed, but he succeeded the late Mr. Howard, who was, I believe, Sheriff of the County of York, and was Treasurer of the Association until he died. These two gentlemen, Mr. Henning and Mr. Reid, who I have no doubt are both known to many gentlemen in the House, have given me a copy of the statement that the amount received from the stockholders for the land, and the amount they went upon the land they paid the instalments advanced in that way, and paid for the land in full, amounted to $72,049. So that in that statement alone we are charged with having received some $22,287 more than we have received. The lands are all paid for. The difference between the amount we have received from settlers and the amount which the Association paid is $4,594.78."

The return referred to shows that the settlers paid on the land account, including interest and instalments, $72,049, that is to say, Messrs. KING and MCKELLAR returned $22,072.49 as the amount they had received, and not $4,594.78. But—alas these "buts"—there is often a wide difference betwixt a statement and a fact. We have in our possession the original receipts of a very large number of the settlers, showing what their own signatures to actual amounts which they paid to Mr. KING, and it is interesting to mark the extraordinary discrepancies between their signed and attested evidence and the return made by the officers of the association to the Government. We make a few extracts from that return:—

Part of Lot.	*No. of Lot.*	*Con.*	*Acres.*	*Amount Paid by Settler.*
N ½	11	8	100	$200
	6	13	200	225
	13	13	200	320
	6	11	100	200
	10	10	100	200
	8	11	100	200
	6	11	100	200
N ½	9	11	100	200
	7	9	200	375
				$2,175

Now, here is an extract from the original list of payments relative to portions of the above lots:—

SUTTON, April 6th, 1861.

We, the undersigned, do certify that the figures appended to each of our names are to show the amount that we, being actual settlers of the Elgin settlement, have respectively paid to Mr. King for our land:—

Des. of Lot.	*Acres.*	*Name.*	*Paid.*
W ½ of S ½ of lot 10	50	Jordan Harrison his mark	$50 15
W ½ of 6, 13th	50	Peter S Hamm his mark	125 00
½ of 7, 13th	50	Huron x Johnson his mark	156 00
N ½ of 7, 13th	100	John J. Brooks his mark	167 00
W ½ of 6, A (Gore)	50	Martha x A. Ely her mark	156 10
W ½ of 9, A (Gore)	50	Jacob J. Gunn	143 00
W ½ of 8, 11	50	Alfred H. West	156 00
S ½ of 6, 11	50	Louis Pfaff (Signed by his order)	156 00
E ½ of 6, 9th	50	Daniel Dunlop (Signed by his order.)	156 00
½ of 7, 9th	50	Thomas Scott	151 00
			$1,968 15

So that while the officers of the Association returned $2,175 as having been received from settlers on the land in the above lots, the settlers themselves actually paid over to their agent $1,968.15 or only 140 acres of them paid for. Moreover, Mr. KING has a nephew, named KING BRUCE, who labours under the hallucination that he had made, on one or two occasions, swindled him. He was book-keeper of the saw-mill, and was also an accountant with the firm of the Elgin Association. When he saw our *exposé* of its affairs, he, with the instinct of a true King, thought he was swindled out of a share of it. The uncle had made money by swindling, the nephew would make money by exposing the uncle. And he wrote this letter:—

"CHATHAM, ONT.

"*Rufus Stephenson, Esq., Queen's Hotel, Toronto.*

"SIR,—I have in my possession facts bearing upon the 'Elgin Association' business, amounting to little short of swindling of foolscap.

"Would you be so kind as to ask the Editor of *The Mail* what he would give for such information as will expose the internal workings of the Association?

"The facts would be relative to amount of moneys received, history of the Buxton mill, history of some land sales, and other matters bearing upon the affairs and information relating to the Buxton mission.

"If you and the Editor think sufficiently of the transaction to warrant my coming yourself, it would oblige me very much.

"Please reply by letter to my address, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE.

"Box 1132, Chatham."

He was then asked to explain the above, and here is his reply:—

"CHATHAM, ONT., Feb. 8th, 1873.

"*Editor of The Mail, Toronto.*

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 30th ult. to hand, contents noted, and in reply beg to state, that I cannot consider that it would strengthen your case, but I am disinclined to be then out of my position at present. They are not prepared for print, so you would have to attend to that as would best suit yourself.

"I will agree to furnish you such information as I have got, and also all I can get in future, for one hundred dollars ($100), but no less.

"I have at Buxton from the spring of 1857 to the fall of 1871. I was engaged as one of the agents on the heavy lumber contract in 1867, and have a copy of the books.

"I think we can get affairs in historical order if we try.

"Please reply by return mail.

"I remain,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE."

It is a well-established Irish rule never to fight the Crown when informers are cheap; and for that reason and the other reasons above mentioned, Mr. MCKELLAR acted prudently in admitting the whole of our main charge. All we have to do, therefore, is to enter into the charges relative to the land account of the Association and to the Buxton mission, one of its numerous ramifications, to which he pleads not guilty.

3. When one scrimed employs a second party to prepare his defence, it becomes necessary to examine the agent's character. We shall not begin by the bass his case upon documentary evidence purporting to come from a Scotch gentleman. Who is Mr. MCKELLAR's agent in this case? None other, good people, than the Reverend HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS! HORNCOCK COCKS!! COCKS!! He who runs may now read the hitherto nebulous circumstances attending Mr. COCKS' appointment to the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Emigration Agent for Ontario in Great Britain. We can understand now why COCKS was appointed in the face of the report of Mr. HAGUE, Emigration Agent at Quebec, charging him with drunkenness, incapacity, and with being the pseudo representative of an emigration society which did not exist. We can understand now why Mr. MCKELLAR was last year paid £365 stg. per annum. We can understand now why COCKS was also allowed to draw $1,000 from the Emigration Office vouchers, as part payment of his claim for $1,960, on account of Emigrants which he said had been sent out by the Society which he represents i. e., by the incorporate body of HORNCOCK COCKS. We can understand now why COCKS was allowed that $1,000 before the emigrants said to have been assisted had lived the necessary three months in this Province. We can understand now why COCKS was paid on a list of bogus names. We can understand now why the names of SUSAN B. ANTHONY and OLIVE BURNITT, two prominent woman's rights advocates, were passed as being the names of "two of COCKS' *protegés* without protest. We can understand now why COCKS' attempt to bully the managers of the ALLAN line out of a free cabin ticket after he had received $100 from the Department to pay his passage, was overlooked. We can understand now why COCKS' violent abuse of the Catholic population of this country before a public meeting in England, was overlooked. We can understand now why Mr. MCKELLAR was for year to give COCKS no less than $7,260 of the people's money. We say we can now fully understand why a merchant, from a disgrace alike to his cloth and his country, was made the representative of the Ontario Government in Great Britain—and we can also measure the drachm of salt with which the evidence of such a man must be taken.

4. We shall not discuss with Mr. MCKELLAR the character of his associate, the Rev. WILLIAM KING. He thinks Mr. KING is a nice man; Mr. WILLIAM MILLAR, 49 Fenchurch street, London, E.C., doesn't. The question of virtue or rascality in one's character depend to a very great extent upon the stand-point of the surveyor.

5. We now come to the gist of the land case. Mr. MCKELLAR says:—

"Well, Sir, I find the indictments laid down in *The Mail* newspaper, and I shall deal with them in the order in which I find them recorded. The editorial is headed 'Bookkeeping by Single Entry,' and it says 'To capital account as per Mr. King's letter of October 10th, 1872, $16,000.' Then it says that we sold the 6,000 acres at $2½ acre, making $29,600, and that all we paid the Government was $7,712. By this statement it would appear that the Association (and, of course as the paper would have it, Mr. King and myself) had pocketed some $27,000 of these people's money. That is the indictment made against us. Now I wish to show by documentary evidence that there is no foundation for this statement. I hold in my hand a statement from the Crown Lands Office verified by the officers of that Department, from which it appears that the settlers paid altogether $17,941. That is the amount that was paid by the settlers to the Government. * * Mr. Henning gave me the Secretary since the Association was organized. The Treasurer is the Rev. Mr. Reid. I do not remember when he was appointed, but he succeeded the late Mr. Howard, who was, I believe, Sheriff of the County of York, and was Treasurer of the Association until he died. These two gentlemen, Mr. Henning and Mr. Reid, who I have no doubt are both known to many gentlemen in the House, have given me a copy of the statement that the amount received from the stockholders for the land, and the amount they went upon the land they paid the instalments advanced in that way, and paid for the land in full, amounted to $72,049. So that in that statement alone we are charged with having received some $22,287 more than we have received. The lands are all paid for. The difference between the amount we have received from settlers and the amount which the Association paid is $4,594.78."

The return referred to shows that the settlers paid on the land account, including interest and instalments, $72,049, that is to say, Messrs. KING and MCKELLAR returned $22,072.49 as the amount they had received, and not $4,594.78. But—alas these "buts"—there is often a wide difference betwixt a statement and a fact. We have in our possession the original receipts of a very large number of the settlers, showing what their own signatures to actual amounts which they paid to Mr. KING, and it is interesting to mark the extraordinary discrepancies between their signed and attested evidence and the return made by the officers of the association to the Government. We make a few extracts from that return:—

Part of Lot.	*No. of Lot.*	*Con.*	*Acres.*	*Amount Paid by Settler.*
N ½	11	8	100	$200
	6	13	200	225
	13	13	200	320
	6	11	100	200
	10	10	100	200
	8	11	100	200
	6	11	100	200
N ½	9	11	100	200
	7	9	200	375
				$2,175

Now, here is an extract from the original list of payments relative to portions of the above lots:—

SUTTON, April 6th, 1861.

We, the undersigned, do certify that the figures appended to each of our names are to show the amount that we, being actual settlers of the Elgin settlement, have respectively paid to Mr. King for our land:—

Des. of Lot.	*Acres.*	*Name.*	*Paid.*
W ½ of S ½ of lot 10	50	Jordan Harrison his mark	$50 15
W ½ of 6, 13th	50	Peter S Hamm his mark	125 00
½ of 7, 13th	50	Huron x Johnson his mark	156 00
N ½ of 7, 13th	100	John J. Brooks his mark	167 00
W ½ of 6, A (Gore)	50	Martha x A. Ely her mark	156 10
W ½ of 9, A (Gore)	50	Jacob J. Gunn	143 00
W ½ of 8, 11	50	Alfred H. West	156 00
S ½ of 6, 11	50	Louis Pfaff (Signed by his order)	156 00
E ½ of 6, 9th	50	Daniel Dunlop (Signed by his order.)	156 00
½ of 7, 9th	50	Thomas Scott	151 00
			$1,968 15

So that while the officers of the Association returned $2,175 as having been received from settlers on the land in the above lots, the settlers themselves actually paid over to their agent $1,968.15 or only 140 acres of them paid for. Moreover, Mr. KING has a nephew, named KING BRUCE, who labours under the hallucination that he had made, on one or two occasions, swindled him. He was book-keeper of the saw-mill, and was also an accountant with the firm of the Elgin Association. When he saw our *exposé* of its affairs, he, with the instinct of a true King, thought he was swindled out of a share of it. The uncle had made money by swindling, the nephew would make money by exposing the uncle. And he wrote this letter:—

"CHATHAM, ONT.

"*Rufus Stephenson, Esq., Queen's Hotel, Toronto.*

"SIR,—I have in my possession facts bearing upon the 'Elgin Association' business, amounting to little short of swindling of foolscap.

"Would you be so kind as to ask the Editor of *The Mail* what he would give for such information as will expose the internal workings of the Association?

"The facts would be relative to amount of moneys received, history of the Buxton mill, history of some land sales, and other matters bearing upon the affairs and information relating to the Buxton mission.

"If you and the Editor think sufficiently of the transaction to warrant my coming yourself, it would oblige me very much.

"Please reply by letter to my address, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"KING BRUCE.

"Box 1132, Chatham."

He was then asked to explain the above, and here is his reply:—

"CHATHAM, ONT., Feb. 8th