Carnarvon, to Mr. Cardwell, and to Mr. Brown himself, if I was not instrumental in a very great degree in carrying Confederation. But, no matter whether I get the credit or not, Confederation was carried, and I was the first Premier after Confederation, and what was then merely a union on paper has now become a fixed fact. Mr. Mackenzie said that the late Government had set class against class, and Province against Province. You know how false that statement is. Was not Nova Scotia almost in arms against Confederation? Do you not remember how Mr. Howe went home to England to prevent the union being carried? Do you not know that I induced Mr. Howe to give up his position, and to bring all his influence, and it was great, to bear on the Liberal party of Nova Scotia and to induce them to assist us to carry on the Government of the Dominion? Gentlemen, Mr. Howe came in, and bitterly was he abused for doing so, and his motives were reviled because I persuaded him to join the Government. He would not do so till he got better terms for his Province, financially, and you will remember how we were attacked for our concessions—concessions absolutely necessary for the peace of the Dominion. We were told that we had violated the constitution by granting better terms to Nova Scotia, but we held that we had not done so, and the same view was taken by the British Government and the law officers of the Crown in England, and will you believe it that Mr. Cartwright in his speech at Dunnville the other day repeated the charge against me and my Government, and stated again that we had been guilty of a breach of the constitution? The Montreal *Gazette* has already shown the hypocrisy of Mr. Cartwright's statement. Why, Mr. Cartwright was my supporter. He voted against a resolution which was introduced by the Opposition to the effect that our course was unconstitutional on two occasions, and when the bill was laid before Parliament granting those better terms Mr. Cartwright recorded his name in its favour. But that is not his only inconsistency, as I shall show you presently. Well, Mr. Mackenzie denies that the present Government is a coalition. He says he has never altered his political course, and those men who have joined with him are in accord with him in principle. Well, Mr. Cartwright was a Tory; he had always been a Tory, and he had always supported a Conservative Government until Sir Francis Hincks was brought in as Finance Minister. Mr. Scott was a Conservative, and supported a Conservative Government until he ceased to be a member of the Commons, and as I have already told you when he went into the Local Government at Toronto he still assured every one that he was a supporter and a friend of mine. If that is not coalition I do not know what is. Mr. Mackenzie says he was always opposed to coalitions; and that he did not cordially agree with Mr. Brown's coalition with us in 1864. And it appears he refused to go into the Government. Well, he was never asked to join the Government by me. He was, I presume, asked by Mr. Howland, when he and Mr. Macdougall thought it necessary to have some Reformer in the place of Mr. Brown, who from mere personal caprice retired from the Government and tried to induce Mr. Howland and Mr. Macdougall to retire; but they refused to do so, as they said they felt themselves bound to remain in till Confederation was completed. Mr. Mackenzie, in his speech, asked if I had not invited A. J. Smith to become a member of the Government, and if two members of the Cabinet were not willing to retire in his favour. He remarked that he did not say it was so, but he would like to know. Well, I am personally aware of nothing of the kind, but I would "like to know" if, when Mr. Howland asked Mr. Mackenzie to come in he was not disposed to accede, and if he did not take it into consideration, and if he did not see Mr. Brown about it, and if Mr. Brown did not bully him out of it! (Cheers.) Well, Mr. Mackenzie would not go into a coalition Government with me—(although he could join with Mr. Cauchon)—and he said it ruined the reputation of my friend Mr. Macdougall (the only one who he says remained to the end) to come in with me. Does he mean to say that it ruined the reputation of the late Ferguson Blair, who took Mr. Brown's place, and who held office till he died? Did it ruin the reputation of the Hon. W. H. Howland, who remained in until ill-health made him resign, when he was appointed to the high position of Lieutenant-Governor of this Province? Did it ruin the reputation of Sir Francis Hincks, a leading Reformer? No; all these gentlemen have retained the respect of political friends and foes. Then Mr. Mackenzie made a general attack upon the Conservative party. He was obliged to say something in Watford to his supporters, and what do you think he raked up? Why he said the Tories burnt down the Parliament House at Montreal, threw stones at the Governor-General, Lord Elgin, and raised the black flag at Brockville. I know that some of the population in Montreal rose and burned down the Parliament buildings, and more is the pity, and some of them treated the Governor very discourteously. That was thirty years ago. We might as well say that the Reform party or some of them rose in rebellion in 1837 under William Lyon Mackenzie in Upper Canada and Mr. Papineau in Lower Canada. They killed Col. Moody and fought with Her Majesty's troops. You might as well rake up those old stories. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, that won't wash, it is too thin. (Laughter.) I believe the Conservative party are a law-abiding and loyal party. I believe the Reform party is composed of loyal men, but they are neither more loyal nor more law-abiding than the Conservatives. Mr. Macdougall has spoken to you at some length upon their want of legislation. They have been three years in power, and they have had three sessions of Parliament. During the first session we could not expect them to do much; they were inexperienced; they were novices, except one or two of them who had been in for a short time before. They got fair play. We were not unreasonable; we knew the Government must be carried on, and we did not taunt them in the first session with not introducing more measures. But when the second and the third came their legislation was still absolutely *nil*. Mr. Blake last session introduced a few bills connected with his department useful enough in their way, and I gave him my support, but they were not of any general importance to the great interests of the country. They boast of their Controverted Election Act. The Controverted Election Act was carried by me when I was in power, and the Grit members of Parliament who were unseated for bribery were unseated under my Act and not under their Act. All the bribery and corruption which has been established against any member of Parliament were under the Act of Parliament introduced by myself and adapted by me from the English Act. All the present Government have done is to repeal the Act and re-enact it with a few added clauses, which they call improvements. The Act is merely a copy of my Act with a few changes. Then they boast of the Insolvency Act. That was introduced by Hon. J. Abbott, a supporter of the late Ministry; it was sanctioned by that Government, and was carried with its assistance through Parliament. Of that Act all Mr. Mackenzie can properly say is that they re-enacted it, because it was only a temporary Act. They were obliged to re-enact it, or have no Insolvency Act at all. And so they re-enacted it with some amendments, which experience has shown to be necessary. The whole object of the Government seems to have been to get as much patronage as possible into their hands, and so they took to themselves the appointment of the official assignees. They acted in the same spirit as the Ontario Government have done when they took away the appointment of licence inspectors from the municipalities and appropriated it to themselves. They do not appear to have made much by the operation. Now, if you look at the Dominion statutes of last session, you will find that although it is a volume of reasonable size it is principally made up of Imperial statutes, Orders in Council, Proclamations, and private and local Acts. The general Acts passed last session are about the size of Scobie's almanac. Among them is the Indian Act. They repealed our Act and re-enacted it with some clauses suggested by Governor Morris and the Indian Department. They also repealed our Dominion Land Act and re-enacted it with some amendments proposed by the Surveyor-General, a good Conservative appointed by us. That is all they did last session with the important exception of the Supply Bill, (the Appropriation Act), by which they raise twenty and a half million dollars out of you, and they call this legislation, and what is the cost of it? Why, every one of the 206 members of the Commons gets $1,000, and so do the seventy-eight senators. We gave the speaker $4,000, (besides the casual advantages of printing), and we gave the Speaker in the Upper House the same. Hundreds and thousands of dollars have been expended in getting three or four Acts and the Supply Bill passed, and that is a specimen of the Reform that was to be brought about as soon as Sir John Macdonald and his corruptionists were got rid of, and these heaven-born statesmen brought in. Gentlemen, I was speaking to you about coalitions just now. Mr. Mackenzie indignantly denied that there was a coalition, and said that Mr. Richard Scott had become a Grit, that Mr. R. J. Cartwright had become a Grit, and that there was, therefore, no coalition. Strange to say, he never said one word about Mr. Cauchon, who sits at the head of the Council Board. He never said one word about him. He was ashamed to say a single word about him. Who is Mr. Cauchon? He is an Ultramontane Frenchman—a man of the highest description of Tory principles and of the old school. He was the organ of the Catholic hierarchy at the time George Brown had mounted the Protestant horse, and at the time that George Brown was writing and saying all kinds of things against the nuns, and of such a nature that I could not even in decency mention them. But Mr. Cauchon found that he had no longer any chance of joining a Conservative Government, we would not take him in with us any more. Although he was an able man, and at the head of a newspaper as powerful in Lower Canada as the *Globe* is in Ontario, he had no hope from us, and he turned over, as all the rejected of John A. Macdonald's do, and became the accepted of Alexander Mackenzie. But who is Mr. Cauchon? He was charged with holding a seat in the Legislature of Lower Canada at a time when he was a contractor for the Government. He was charged with the Beauport Lunatic Asylum job. They have a very bad system down there, which existed in our time and we could not get rid of it, and it exists still, or did until lately. It was a private asylum, and the Government of the country paid so much a head for the support of lunatics in that asylum. What was the consequence? It was to the interest of the contractor who supplied the food to these poor people to starve them, and to make as much money out of them as possible; and Mr. Cauchon was the contractor, and in order to avoid being expelled from the Lower Canada House when the charges were brought against him he resigned his seat. The evidence that came out horrified the country; it horrified the *Globe* especially, as well as the Lower Canadian *Globe*—the Montreal *Herald*. And the *Globe* said he was a monster in human form, and had made his fortune out of the starving stomachs of those poor people who should be the objects of universal pity; and in just indignation said that his offences were rank and smelled to heaven. The Montreal *Herald* repeated this statement, and said that this man deserved, richly deserved, to be hanged. And yet we find this man who deserved to be hanged—whose offences smelled to heaven—(these offences are a sweet smelling savour to Mr. Mackenzie)—at the head of the Privy Council of Canada. Not one word was said at Watford by Mr. Mackenzie about Mr. Cauchon, for he knows the value of the saying, "The least said, the soonest mended." There was another thing Mr. Mackenzie forgot at Watford. While he was vindicating the character of his Government, while he was proving that he had fulfilled all his promises to elevate the standard of public morality in Canada, he forgot to explain how he let Mr. Anglin, the Speaker of the House, become the paid servant of the Government, and unconstitutionally and in direct violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, to receive $8,000 of your money as a contractor for public printing. Usually the excuse for charges brought against the present Government has been, "Well the late Government did so;" but the late Government was said to be a corrupt one, and the new Government was to cure such evils. A golden age was to succeed the iron one, a period of law and purity and morality was to succeed an era of corruption and bribery and maladministration. There was going to be a marvellous change. The age of innocence was to return, for Adam and Eve before the fall were not so pure as Mr. Mackenzie's Government was to be. (Laughter.) I think you will agree that Mr. Cauchon handed Mr. Mackenzie the apple. (Laughter.) You may remember how I was attacked because Col. Grey, of New Brunswick, a member of Parliament, a strong Conservative, and a personal friend and supporter of mine had received at the hands of my Government a sum of money for codifying the statutes. They said he being a member of Parliament it was against the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. Now he was a strong supporter of mine, and his employment did not influence his support, because his vote was as sure for me as my own was whether employed or not. And withal the cry was an unfounded one, because the employment of Col. Grey was not against the law. The difference between the two cases is that the employment of Col. Grey was not illegal—while the contract of the Speaker is in direct violation of the law passed to protect the independence of Parliament. No justification has been offered by the Ministry or the Ministerial press. The *Globe* makes the absurd excuse that the contract may have been entered into inadvertently—but Mr. Anglin won't adopt that excuse. His paper says there was no inadvertence about it. You may remember how Mr. Aquila Walsh, when he was the member for North Norfolk, was attacked because he was selected to be chairman of the Intercolonial Commission. That appointment was according to law, for Parliament passed an Act that there should be a member of the Commission in Parliament. Now they have no right to defend Mr. Anglin or themselves by quoting things within the law as a defence against things which are against the law. How did they come to give the contract to Mr. Anglin? Mr. Anglin is an able man, a very influential man in his Province, and a representative man among the Irish Catholics. That body has pressed that it should be represented in the Government of the country. I hold that it should be represented, and we had an Irish Catholic, Sir Edward Kenny, as their representative in the Cabinet. Well, it is understood that Mr. Anglin pressed his claims to be in the Cabinet. But they would not take him in for some reason or other, and Mr. Anglin began to show his teeth. In some way, sundry inconvenient articles appeared in his paper, the *Freeman*, showing that he would not allow himself to be passed over, and they were obliged to reverse their decision. It is understood that Mr. Holton of Quebec was to have been Speaker, but they put him aside and brought Mr. Anglin in and made him Speaker. But Mr. Anglin, no doubt, said, this won't do, it won't pay; the members of the Government get $7,000 a year, I only get $4,000. How am I to get the balance? And this, gentlemen, is, I have no doubt, the inadvertent way the Speaker got the contract. And this is the way that this constitutional Government break deliberately the law of the land. This is the way that those who were to teach this country what pure government was, as opposed to the wretched misgovernment and corruption of their predecessors, satisfied this man with money because he would not be satisfied without it. Now, gentlemen, I think I have occupied you long enough with talking about Mr. Mackenzie; but I may say a few words about Mr. Cartwright. But I was nearly forgetting to allude to Mr. Mackenzie's statement that he would call me to account in Parliament for stating that he had shown partiality in awarding contracts. When he does do so I shall say then as I do now that the Palen contract at Ottawa, the distributing warehouse contract at Montreal, the Denison, Belden, & Co. contract on the Welland canal, and the steel rails operations, so luminously dealt with by Mr. White, of Montreal, fully justify my statements. Mr. Cartwright gave a most doleful tale of what he had to suffer, and the state of the finances when he came into power. He found a mass of unfulfilled engagements entered into most recklessly, and which they were pledged to take up and carry out; the Government had been run into debt; and the old debt, which should have been provided for before any new schemes had been entered into, was maturing. Why, Mr. Cartwright must have thought that his audience was composed of fools. When he came into the Government the credit of Canada stood nearly equal with that of any country in the world. There was no difficulty in fulfilling our engagements, thanks to the credit of Canada, and the confidence which, notwithstanding our twenty years of misrule, the capitalists of England had in the faith of Canada. He found no difficulty in meeting our engagements. Why, the greatest punishment you could inflict upon an investor in Canadian funds was to pay him off. He did not want to be paid off; he had good security and good interest, and would be satisfied if necessary to renew his bonds. Mr. Cartwright found no difficulty in raising money, and he could have raised the amount four times over at a low rate of interest. Moreover, he said our expenditure had been reckless, and he quoted as an instance the Intercolonial railway, which he said was built in the wrong place, and that Mr. Macdougall had pronounced against it, (as my friend had done in a commercial point of view), that we had built the road along the coast of the country instead of through the centre, and that we had thereby thrown millions into the sea. Will you believe it? Mr. Cartwright voted for the Intercolonial railway, and for its construction on the line on which it has been built, and in effect against its being built on any other line, and yet the other day he charged us with reckless expenditure of public money by building the road in the wrong place. We built it in the right place. Mr. Sandford Fleming has said so in his late report on the intercolonial railway, and he is a great authority, and so great a one that Mr. Mackenzie continues him as the chief engineer of the Pacific railway. Gentlemen, it was the only place we could build it, because the British Government had said to us, "We will guarantee three and a half millions of money if you will build it where we want it." Unless we had built it along the seacoast, we would not have got the money. And why did England want it along the coast and away from the United States frontier? The British Government has pledged itself that the whole military and naval power of the Empire shall be used in the defence of Canada. (Hear, hear.) That is a pledge made by the Queen, and the pledge of the Government, the Parliament of England, has never been broken. (Cheers.) We can rest with confidence that that will be carried out. But England said she could not carry out that pledge unless the railway was built so far from the American frontier that it could not be captured by a *coup de main* in case of war. The St. Lawrence is closed for six months in the year; but troops could be sent to Halifax at all seasons, and from that place to Quebec if the Intercolonial railway were built. But England further said, that if we built it along the frontier the armies of the Americans—and we saw them raise millions of men a few years ago—would seize the railway and use it for the purpose of sending their troops into Canada, instead of our using it to transport British troops coming to our aid from England. The British Government refused for these reasons to grant the promised guarantee of three millions sterling unless the railway was built on the coast line—so we built as we were advised—and I am confident the future will show that the road is in the right place, not only for military, but for commercial reasons. I believe that our inestimable fisheries will be enormously developed, as well as the coal mines of Nova Scotia, by the aid of the railway. Mr. Cartwright the other day attacked me for the reasons I assigned for ceasing to support the late Ministry. What I said was, that Mr. Cartwright was a Tory of the Tories, that he withdrew his support because Sir Francis Hincks, who had joined us as a Reformer, had been taken into the Ministry, and that he wrote me a letter to that effect. Mr. Cartwright now says he did not object to Sir Francis Hincks as a Reformer, but because of some irregularities on his part, when formerly in office. Now, when Mr. Richard Cartwright wrote to me he gave no reasons for his withdrawal from the party; he simply said he could not support the Government if Sir Francis Hincks was brought into it, and what could I suppose was the reason unless it was that Sir Francis was a Reformer? I had the right to draw the inference that it was because he was a Reformer, because he gave no other reason. When Sir Francis Hincks left Canada he was a supporter of the McNab-Morin Administration. For his great abilities he was appointed by the Queen to be Governor of Barbadoes and afterwards Governor of Demerara. He was covered with honours by his Sovereign, and when he came back to Canada to reside with us I only thought it would be for the good of the country to get so able a man as Sir Francis enlisted in the Government of Canada. (Hear, hear.) It would indeed have been a miserable system of partizanship if I had refused to invite him to take part in the Government because he had not always entertained the same political views as I had. It would have been a political sin on my part if I had not taken the best man that I could find to assist in the Government of the country, whose prosperity I was bound to advance. That man was Sir Francis Hincks. (Hear, hear.) He at once dealt with our banking system, and introduced a measure which has given satisfaction both to bankers and people; he did away with the silver nuisance, placed our finances in a good position, and was in every respect a first rate Minister of Finance. I gained that for the country. But it did not suit Mr. Cartwright, and he withdrew his confidence from me because I gave my confidence to Sir Francis Hincks, and he wrote me a letter to that effect. He wrote me first a letter stating that there was a rumour to the effect that Sir Francis Hincks was coming into the Government and hoped it was not true. But I resolved even at the loss of Mr. Cartwright to gain for the country so able a man. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Cartwright afterwards wrote a letter to me when Sir Francis Hincks came in giving me notice that he was going to withdraw his confidence from the Government. As he was going to leave us he was right to give us notice, and I give him every credit for it. But I say he was wrong to withdraw his confidence on that ground. If he was not a self-seeker he would have rejoiced at Sir Francis Hincks' appointment to such a responsible office. He wrote me this letter, which is not marked confidential, and which I will read. I shall not read his first note, which is marked confidential, nor two other letters which passed between us and which were agreed to be considered as confidential as other parties are spoken of, but I can assure you none of his three letters gave any reason for his objection to Sir Francis Hincks. I will read this letter, and when I go to Ottawa I will place the confidential letters in the hands of any one Mr. Cartwright may select—Mr. Blake if he pleases—to decide if any reason is given.

"KINGSTON, Oct. 12, 1869.

"MY DEAR SIR JOHN,—I notice with great regret that Sir F. Hincks has been Gazetted. From the tenor of my former note on the subject you will probably not be surprised to learn that I fear I cannot support that gentleman. Of course, as in duty bound, I will wait your explanations of the grounds of this appointment, but it is so unlikely that they will be such as to enable me to concur in it that I think it only fair to notify you at once that I should inform you that, however well disposed I was, or am, towards yourself and the rest of your colleagues, I cannot feel the same confidence as heretofore in an Administration in which Sir Francis Hincks holds office. So far as you are concerned I do not suppose one supporter more or less matters much just now, and so far as I myself am concerned I am thoroughly alive to the gravity of the step I am taking, but this is a matter in which I have no option.

"Yours very sincerely,
"RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT."

Now there is not a word against Sir Francis Hincks; it merely says that he withdraws his confidence. There is the letter and the country can judge concerning it. Gentlemen, I will point you out some other inconsistencies of Mr. Cartwright. I am indebted to the Montreal *Gazette* and *The Mail* for the collation of the documents on the point. He said we had gone into a most reckless expenditure on public works, that we had agreed to that "gigantic blunder," the Pacific railway; that we had agreed to build the Baie Verte canal—and I can only say about that that his colleague, Mr. A. J. Smith, is committed at this day to get it constructed—that we had agreed to finish the Prince Edward Island railway, and to construct the Lachine and Welland canals. With respect to the latter Mr. Mackenzie took credit the other day because labour was employed profitably in the construction of the Welland canal. Mr. Cartwright said in Monck:—

"When, in 1867, Confederation was initiated, I found that the actual total expenditure for all purposes, fixed and controllable, amounted to $13,486,092. From that date up to 1873-4, when we first assumed power, the expenditure increased not by hundreds of thousands, not by millions, but by tens of millions, so that from the amount I have just mentioned in 1867, the expenditure had swollen to $23,316,316, being a total increase in round numbers of $10,000,000, in the space of about seven years."

This is all true, but the money was laid out on those great works, such as the Intercolonial railway, and they were of the utmost importance. Mr. Cartwright went home to England in order to arrange about our maturing liabilities. He published a statement of the affairs of Canada and laid it before the people and capitalists of England, and invited them to have faith in our bonds; and we presume he did not tell lies or make fraudulent statements in order to get them to invest in our securities when they were not worthy of confidence. In Monck, the other day, he said we made the debt roll up by millions. In the document he published—I have it here—he said:—"The whole of this debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public expenditure." This is the man who has been telling the Reformers of Monck that we have unnecessarily burdened millions on their shoulders after he has made the statement under his own hand that every farthing had been expended in legitimate works. He went further, gentlemen. In Monck he said:—

"They had also undertaken to construct canals here, there, and everywhere, not merely the Welland and Lachine canals, and the various canals through the Ottawa valley region, but they had even promised to construct a Baie Verte canal, upon which, before it could be put in operation, many millions must have been spent to no useful purpose. The late Government were, indeed, covering the country with a host of public buildings, some of which were useful and should be erected, but which taken collectively formed so formidable a mass of engagements that, taking into account the resources of the country, and putting aside for the moment the huge task of constructing a Canadian Pacific railway almost from ocean to ocean, the boldest financier might be appalled when he considered the enormous mass of engagements prepared for us, and the means at our disposal to meet them."

That was a formidable indictment against us. But what did Mr. Cartwright say in England?—

"The indirect advantage from these public works has already been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed, while a substantial increase in the direct returns may fairly be expected from the improvements now in progress, and to follow the steady progress of population and trade."

That is what he said in England, and that is how he tried to humbug the electors of Monck. And that is the man who ventured to use the language regarding me and concerning my Government at Monck. Then you may remember that when Mr. Cartwright was first appointed financier he came down to the House and declared there was a deficit, and said he must raise $3,000,000 in order to meet it. We knew it was not the case. We knew there was no deficiency, and for that purpose we felt there was no necessity to increase the burdens of the people. Now, what was it he said in Monck?—

"I dare say there are many gentlemen present whose evil fortune it has been to become possessed of a farm which has been ill-cultivated for many years, and they will know that the evil effects of that bad farming will not be removed during one, two, or three seasons, particularly if the seasons should happen to be adverse. That to a great extent was the position in which we found ourselves placed."

What was it he said in England?—

"The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since the Confederation in 1867, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition and organization of new territories, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion."

He went on to say:—

"The eight years since Confederation, therefore, exhibit an aggregate surplus of £2,443,111 (not including the sinking fund), which has been partially applied in the redemption of debt, and partially expended on new works."

There is the statement of Mr. Cartwright. And, more than that, he gives the figures. We went out in the fall of 1873, you will remember. He says that in 1870 the surplus was $243,066; in 1871, $742,496; in 1872, $625,070; in 1873, $356,744; in 1874, the year in which they were in, $182,626. There was a surplus in every year the whole time we were in, and the year that they came in, and yet he got up in Parliament to get us to put two and a half per cent. on the tariff under the pretext that the state of the case required it. Mr. Mackenzie said in his speech that Mr. Cartwright was a great financier. Well, he is a clever man, but finances are not his forte. He might fill many of the other departments well and creditably, but of all the financiers he has been the most unwise and the most unfortunate. (Hear, hear.) Now the last year before we went out Mr. Tilley was our financier, and he stated in the House that there was no necessity for raising the tariff then; but, he said that in the ensuing session as increased expenditure upon the Pacific railway, and upon the canals and other public works, would require additional money, the Government would be prepared in 1874 to increase the taxation and so readjust the tariff that it would give incidental protection to our manufactures. Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Cartwright pooh-poohed that. Mr. Mackenzie is a Free Trader; he got the freedom of Dundee and St. Andrew's because of that, and he promised that he would take care that the principles of Free Trade were looked after in any Government of which he was a member. We resigned before we had an opportunity of dealing with the Tariff, but our successors brought down one, and it had this unique distinction that every single article in it was objected to, and, as I said in a previous speech, the railways leading to Ottawa were making an enormous sum of money out of the deputations that were rushing to the Government to protest against it. (Laughter.) Whether it was the leather, wood, iron, cloth, grocery, spirit or any other interest, its representatives came to town and said "you have made a bungle of it." What was the result? Mr. Cartwright was forced to withdraw his tariff, for he found that no one would support it, and he came down with another proposition saying he would put on one and a half per cent more duty, making it sixteen and a half. That did not meet the views of anybody more than did the previous one. Sixteen and a half per cent was not enough. He found it would not do, and he brought down a bill making the *ad valorem* duties seventeen and a half, which they are now. Mr. Mackenzie said in his speech at Watford that Mr. Cartwright was a great financier, and that he brought down a tariff after due consideration calculated to meet the wants of the country. He did no such thing; he brought it down because he was forced to it, and he brought it down hurriedly and as the last moment, and in doing so killed our tea trade with China, and closed our sugar refineries. Mr. Mackenzie tries to take credit to himself for his tariff. Why are all the manufacturers in favour of the late Government, although when John A. Macdonald was in power there was only a fifteen per cent tariff, and now it is seventeen and a half—two and a half more? The reason is this—because the manufacturers have no confidence in the Government; they saw all the bungling about the tariff, and they knew perfectly well that that bungling would be continued. We formerly had a seventeen and a half per cent. tariff, and twenty per cent. in some instances; but in order to bring in the Maritime Provinces we reduced it to fifteen per cent.; and we could do so at that time without injury to our manufactures. If you will look back you will see that the United States had not got over the effects of the war; that the American manufacturers had been paralised by the war; that their operatives had been called off to fight in the war, and that instead of their competing in our markets we were shipping to the United States, and many of our manufacturers were making large fortunes. Now it is otherwise. With that marvellous power of restoration that the United States have, they have got over the troubles of the war. Their trade and commerce have risen again, their manufactures are in full blast, and they not only control their own markets, but they are selling largely in foreign markets. In 1865 and 1866 our manufacturers were safe; they had control of our markets, and we could safely reduce the tariff. Now is the time that the manufacturers want to be helped. Our Government was pledged to a system of incidental protection, and had we not been driven from office by calumny by the false issues raised against us there would have been a tariff that would not have driven our operatives out of the country. And this Government is pledged against Protection. When I introduced a very mild resolution last session, which did not even venture to ask for an increase in taxation, as I believe a great deal can be done by re-adjustment, so that the tariff might fall lightly on articles that we cannot produce and heavily on articles we can produce, but which expressed regret that the Government had not introduced such a measure of re-adjustment, the Government to a man and its followers, all but two or three, voted against it. They are pledged to Free Trade, and this is one of the living issues before you. But there are two questions before the country. We are pledged to build the Pacific railway; the honour of the country is pledged to construct that line. We must carry out that policy, but we are not pledged to carry it out faster than the resources of this country will admit of. There is a resolution which is passed and which is still existing, that notwithstanding the bargain with British Columbia the road should only be built in such a way as should not increase the taxation of the country. The British Columbians were satisfied with our pledge, and one of the Railway Commissioners made a speech in Ottawa, in which he said that although he did not believe it could be built in ten years they would be satisfied if we would build it as quickly as we could. And, if our scheme is carried out, that road will be built without putting any additional taxation on our people. Gentlemen, there is another issue between the present Government and the Opposition. We are in favour of a tariff that will incidentally give protection to our manufactures, that will develop our manufacturing industries. We believe that that can be done, and if done it will give a home market to our farmers. The farmers will be satisfied when they know that large bodies of operatives are working in the mills and manufactories in every village and town in the country. They know that every man of them is a consumer, and that he must have pork and flour, beef, and all that the farmers raise, and they know that instead of being obliged to send their grain to a foreign and uncertain market they will have a market at their own door. And the careful housewife, every farmer's wife, will know that everything that is produced under her care—the poultry, the eggs, the butter, and the garden stuff—will find a ready and profitable market in the neighbouring town or village. No country is great with only one industry. Agriculture is our most important, but it cannot be our only staple. All men are not fit to be farmers; there are men with mechanical and manufacturing genius who desire to become operatives or manufacturers of some kind, and we must have the means to employ them, and when there is a large body of successful and prosperous farmers and a large body of successful and prosperous manufacturers, the farmer will have a home market for his produce, and the manufacturer a home market for his goods, and we shall have nothing to fear. And, therefore, I have been urging upon my friends—I have told them that we must lay aside all old quarrels about old party doings. (Cheers.) Those old matters are matters before the flood—(cheers)—which have gone by and are settled forever—many of them settled by the Governments of which I have been a member. Why should parties divide on these old quarrels? Let us divide on questions affecting the present and future interest of the country. The question of the day is that of the protection of our farmers from the unfair competition of foreign produce, and the protection of our manufacturers. I am in favour of reciprocal Free Trade if it can be obtained; but so long as the policy of the United States closes their markets to our products we should have a policy of our own as well, and consult only our own interests. That subject wisely and vigorously dealt with, you will see confidence restored, the present depression dispelled, and the country prosperous and contented. The whole country is now dissatisfied, even the political partisans of the Government own that these men are incapable, and the whole country knows it. I have said that the agriculturalists and the manufacturers must not divide their interests. They must act together. In 1870 the Government, of which I was a member, began the National Policy and put small duties on flour, coal, salt, etc. I then told the manufacturers that they could not expect to get Protection from the farmers unless their interests were also protected. They must make a common interest of it; unless you manufacturers will protect the farmers they will not protect you. (Cheers.) When I went to Washington in 1871, that policy was repealed in my absence, and it had a prejudicial effect upon the negotiations we were making at that time. But Mr. Mackenzie says we had a majority in the House at the time. True, but the whole of the Opposition voted for the repeal of this National Policy, and some of our friends who were Free Traders from the lower Provinces voted with them. The majority of our friends voted to support the measure. But there was a sufficient minority of our friends who voted with the whole body of the Opposition, and the Act of 1870 was repealed. I told the manufacturers who favoured the repeal how selfish and unwise it was, because some few articles might be got cheaper for their purposes, to thwart the wishes of the farmers when they would probably be applying shortly for protection for themselves. Gentlemen, they will not make the mistake again; they see the error now, and are anxious to act with the farmers. And, gentlemen, if now you act together as one man, I promise you you will see your manufactures flourish, and you will get a home market. Then the depression will disappear, but it will not disappear until another very lamentable thing happens—the present Ministry must disappear too. (Cheers and laughter.) Great as the calamity will be it must happen, or the present depression will continue. You must do it or you will remain a slaughter market. The Americans have the whole control of your markets, and when they at any time produce too much for their own markets they send their surplus goods over here to sell them off at a sacrifice and bring down the price of every article in Canada, and thus our manufacturers are obliged to close their establishments or employ their workmen on half or quarter time. Why, it has not been denied that according to the statement of Mr. W. H. Howland, President of the Dominion Board of Trade, 400,000 workingmen have been obliged to leave Canada to find employment in the United States. Mr. Mackenzie attempts to deny it, and he takes credit that some had found work on the Welland Canal, work which they would never have got if we had not carried the measure for enlarging that work, and commenced its construction. Gentlemen, our workmen can be fully employed if we encourage our manufactures; they need not go over to the States to add strength and wealth to a foreign country and to deprive us of that strength and wealth. If we have work here, at home, our country will be prosperous and happy, and, gentlemen, it is a consummation devoutly to be wished for, and I pray you to take the lesson to heart and cast aside all factious and partizan feelings which may have been imbibed for the purpose of supporting designing politicians like Mr. Mackenzie or myself. (Laughter.) It has been said that party is the madness of many for the gain of a few. It may be so, when it is a mere question between the ins and the outs, but when the people divide on living questions we shall have parties of earnest men who will select the best men to carry out their views in Parliament. Speaking as I do and feeling as I do that our views are correct, I invite the calm consideration of the people of Canada, of the electors of this county, at the next general election to return men who will see that their interests are protected. It will not be by taking those who say they will vote protection, but who, like Mr. Charlton, when the question is before the House, speak one way and vote the other. That kind of thing is a humbug, and you must not elect a man because he merely promises to vote for protection. You know very well there can be no alteration in the tariff unless it is brought down by the Government. No independent member can move a rise in the tariff; it must be introduced by the Government. So you must not support a man unless he pledges himself to vote, not only for protection, but against any Government which will not bring down a measure for the purpose; or the same thing will occur as occurred in the cases of Messrs. Workman, Irving, and Wood, who vote for protection to please their supporters and vote for a Government that refuses it. (Laughter.) No, no, you must get the Government out and put in a Government that will carry it. Mr. Mackenzie is trying to frighten his own discontented friends by asserting that if they go out Sir John Macdonald and his bad men will come in. Now that does not at all follow. This is a free country and the people will choose for themselves; the electors can by calm and deliberate action elect men who are pledged to carry out this great policy intelligently, and who will only give their confidence to a Government worthy of it. There are many good men in public life besides Mr. Mackenzie and myself; if Mr. Mackenzie died—and what a loss that would be to the country—(laughter)—and if I died—I have no doubt that the country would flourish as it does now—only better, if not under the present Government. (Hear, hear.) All this cry is a bugaboo to keep themselves in. No, put them out if they are unfit and put other and better men in their places. Ladies and gentlemen, I have to thank you for the kindness and enthusiasm shown by you in this magnificent demonstration; I have to thank you from the bottom of my heart. I should be deeply insensible if I did not feel your kindness, confidence, and aid; and the consolation it will give to my friends, my wife, and my children, after all that I have borne with, when they see and read how you, my fellow-countrymen, rally round me, and how my friends in other parts of the country have rallied round me. I have suffered, and my family have suffered still more, from the continued abuse that has been poured upon us, but that is all wiped away, that is all forgotten. (Hear, hear.) If, perhaps, I am more popular than I have been in Ontario, and I believe I am—(hear, hear)—a good deal of my popularity is to be attributed to the feeling of the generous people of this country that it is unfair to heap such obloquy on a man who has worked so hard for his country. We see an instance of what calumny will do in my friend Mr. Wallace. You know how he was attacked, and how abuse was heaped upon him at the last election. He is a man who would shrink from guilt; but, for the purpose of raising his election, for the purpose of keeping him out and getting a political supporter in, they tried to make us believe that he, as a public officer, was a public defaulter. (A Voice—It was false.) Yes, it was a foul falsehood, and when Mr. Mackenzie found that the people would not believe any such a charge against honest old William Wallace, he got up in the House of Parliament and said, "I never meant to charge any dishonesty against Mr. Wallace." (Laughter.) What right then had he to send that letter to Mr. Stuart? The shot which was fired at Mr. Wallace struck the wall, reverberated against Mr. Mackenzie, and struck down Mr. Stuart. So long as the people of Canada are right-minded and honest-hearted, they will not see their fellow-subjects maligned in that way, and the effect will be as it was in my own case, and as it was in Mr. Wallace's case, that the people will rally round those whom it was intended to ruin. (Cheers.) I have to thank you for this reception. I have to thank the ladies for being present, because it gives me great pleasure to see them here. They add life, pleasure and light to the meeting. I have additional reason to be pleased to see the ladies (God save them) present, because, as I have said elsewhere, whatever man may be women are at heart Conservatives. (Cheers.) Men may differ, because they are governed by the head and the pocket; women are governed by the head and the heart,—(hear, hear)—and the heart goes in for protection to home industries, for domestic felicity and domestic prosperity. (Cheers.) I thank you all, and I think that the good old reign of corruption, happiness, and prosperity will soon be seen again. (Laughter and cheers.)

The Right Honourable gentleman was enthusiastically cheered as he took his seat.

The usual patriotic cheers were then given, after which the large assemblage dispersed.

Evening at Home.

"When the evening lamps are lighted" the children now gather with school-books around the table to con the morrow's lesson. To many of them the tasks assigned seem dreary and hopeless; definitions are hard to remember, the geography lesson is difficult to comprehend, and won't stay fixed in the mind, history is dull and dead, arithmetic a hopeless tangle of figures, and grammar more puzzling than any possible conundrum. The little folk need help; they need cheer and encouragement; and who should be so ready, so willing, so able, to give it as the parent? Even if the parent's education is imperfect, he will bring to the comprehension of the lesson in hand a wider range of knowledge and a broader manner of looking at things than the child can do, and thus greatly aid in the clear comprehension of the lesson to be learned.

Everybody almost has looked through a stereoscope, and been delighted to see how each part of the landscape or figure in the picture exhibited stands out from the flat surface. This effect is produced by taking two photographs of the same scene from standpoints a few feet apart, and by the adjustment of the two lenses of the stereoscope, throwing the two views into one. How precisely this is done in the child's mind with respect to the lesson when the parent and the teacher supplement each other in the instruction of the child. Looking through the parent's eyes at the lesson, and through the teacher's eyes at the lesson, the pupil sees it from two different view points, and all its features are thrown out, so to speak, and become salient points which he can grasp with his apprehension and retain in his memory.

There is a routine way of thinking and of memorizing and of getting at their studies that children are very apt to fall into unless energetic means are taken to prevent it. In a great many things routine is admirable, but when carried to extremes it is death to free thought and original investigation; and education, whatever else it means, does not mean compelling the fifty or a hundred minds that daily assemble in one schoolroom to move in the same intellectual path. The freedom of mental movement so desirable in all mental labour will be greatly promoted by these studies at home with the sympathetic parent. Another great advantage will be that intellectual sympathies will knit together the parent and child and indefinitely delay that growing away from each other, which is equally injurious to both. That father who keeps the range of his boy's mind, who knows what occupies his thoughts and stimulates his activities, kindles his hopes and rouses his ambitions, perpetually renews his own youth in that of his son, and may be able to supplement youthful ardour and inexperience with moderation of age and the results of observation and mature thought. There is no orphanage more bitter or more hopeless than that suffered by many a sensitive child who feels that between it and its parents mere physical tie is the only tie that unites them. So far as is possible the parent's mind should be free pasture ground for the child, and everything in it that the child can use to advantage be placed at his disposal; thus drawing into his own life the parent's life, the union between the two will become inseparable, and a source of unfailing joy and strength to both. The "parting of the ways" between father and son, mother and daughter, is frequently at the beginning of school or college life, when the young folk need to be kept in closest sympathy with the parental heart, and the parents need to have their hands strengthened and their hearts stayed with filial devotion and love.

Of course if the lessons of pupils are studied at home under the tuition of the father or mother a great deal of time is consumed, but how can the time be better employed than in training or teaching the young? We mothers rarely grudge the time given to the physical care of our children, to keeping their bodies fed and clothed and clean, but the labours more abundant bestowed on more physical nature and surroundings, if partly given to furnishing the mind and polishing its faculties, would develop many an otherwise vain and giddy girl into a sensible, thoughtful woman, with abundant intellectual and spiritual resources; many an otherwise purposeless and reckless youth into an earnest, aspiring young man.—*Tribune.*

Self-Conscious.

(From the Queen.)

The self-consciousness of vanity is one thing; the self-consciousness of shyness another. It is all very well for metaphysicians to try and prove that the two are identical, as they try to prove that charity and generosity are merely selfishness under another name, because every man does what he likes best to do, and if he likes to be generous, likes to be charitable, he is only following out his own inclinations, and no one need praise him. It is selfishness under a mask, and with another name—if a pretty one, yet always selfish. So with self-consciousness. If you are conscious at all, say the metaphysicians, you must needs be vain. But, in spite of the metaphysicians, there are two forms of self-consciousness, and that which springs from shyness is in no wise identical with that which springs from vanity.

Whoever suffers from the self-consciousness of shyness, of timidity, of sensitiveness, knows an amount of pain which no one who is without such weakness can well understand. To be perpetually haunted by the feeling that one has done something wrong, or said something foolish, is of itself a torture that would almost wipe away the stain of a serious offence by the virtue which lies in punishment. But the worst of it is, this anguish of mind is almost always about little things—mere trifles which are of really no consequence one way or another, but which the exaggerating fancy of the self-conscious makes into absolute misfortunes, or, if it should be that way, into real crimes. All of us at times speak too fast, with too little consideration of how our words may sound and be taken by the hearer; hence we say things that we regret and things that we do not mean—things that bear a double construction the farthest removed from our intention, and which strikes on our senses only when too late to be recalled. To apologise for the meaning that may be found beneath would be to flounder only the deeper in the mire. For there is just the one hope that when you speak of *les nouveaux riches*, with a sniff of disdain, to anyone, he will not take your sniff in any way to himself. But if pressed by self-consciousness you apologise and say, "I did not mean you," he can then have no doubt as to the possibility of the application and his own position in your estimate of things. You might not have really meant him when you spoke so scornfully of the new rich, and their ways and works; but to acknowledge that your words *could* have struck him is to concede the whole question, and your friend is justly annoyed at your blunder. An unconscious person who had made the same mistake would not have apologised—would probably not have seen that it was a mistake at all, because of that very want of self-consciousness; hence the feelings of the person already alluded to would not have been wounded, as he would, in the first place, have seen that he was not meant, and, in the second, would not be forced to understand that he might have been alluded to—only he wasn't. Meanwhile the poor self-conscious tripper suffers torments, has a sleepless night, and cannot look his friend in the face tranquilly for weeks after.

This is one form of misery produced by self-consciousness, when allied with a kind heart, a hatred of giving pain, and the terrible habit of believing thought to be transparent—that for every mental eye there is a hook all ready for attachment, and that the mass of mankind is as conscious as oneself. Another form is the more familiar and more personal one of thinking that everything done or said by oneself is hideous, wrong, detestable, ridiculous, and, being wrong and ridiculous, then secretly condemned and ridiculed. This is the kind of thing known to us all either in others, or, more unfortunately, in ourselves; and the anguish induced by the state of mind included in such self-depreciation is, as we said before, to be understood only by those who know and feel it for themselves. But if these poor sensitive self-conscious creatures suffer for their own parts, so are they the cause of suffering in others. It is painful beyond measure to be with these people—conscious as they are from the crown of their head to the soles of their feet, and conscious in a writhing, humble, self-abased way which it hurts one's common humanity to see. They take such a quantity of attention and assurance to satisfy! They have to be stimulated with such a large amount of moral cordial, of mental pick-me-ups, that no one's patience can bear the strain for long; and even the kindest, the most universally soothing give way before the task of perpetually and thus of perpetually stimulating them, not to self-respect, but to a momentary calm which looks something like it and is the nearest to which they can get! Life is too serious and time is too short to spend on shadows; and the miseries of the self-conscious are shadows in which the only thing that is real is the pain. But when we have assured them again and again that it all means nothing—that their sorrows come from nothing, are born of nothing, are only the sorrows of shadow—we grow weary of our task of vain convincing, and let them go on in their voluntary martyrdom, hopeless of ever doing them the smallest good.

The self-consciousness of shyness, of timidity, is painful; the self-consciousness of vanity irritating. It is at all times detestable, even when seen in a woman. The men of whom the Highland piper, the French *tambour-major*, the renowned Mr. Turveydrop are the types, are in a certain sense absurd, if also they are wearisome, by their intense vanity and display. So are the priggish men who put their salvation in one particular form of thought, and who reject as common and unclean all those who differ from them in opinion, or who have put their salvation elsewhere. The self-consciousness of these men is in itself a study that almost repays the fatigue of their society. Speak to one of them on his own subject, and you speak to a man who shows you that he accepts your interest in the matter as a compliment paid to him personally, he being to himself the soul of the whole thing. Thus, when you say to one of this kind that you delight in music, he smiles with satisfaction, because he has a fine tenor voice, and of course you must mean him; or when you say that you are fond of poetry, he, having written a few stanzas in the corner of a provincial newspaper, looks radiant with self-conscious applause, for poetry means himself, and to praise the art is to praise him and what he has done. In just the same way talk to a woman with handsome eyes of the beauty lying in fine eyes generally, and she takes the compliment to herself in particular. To one who has a pretty foot, are not "feet" the battery by which the electric current of self-consciousness is flashed through the whole being? And so on through the entire list of personal charms. Name one of which a woman knows that she is the possessor, and you see at once the smile and glance and flush of self-consciousness which tell you everything. When you find a woman who is not thus self-conscious, you have found a treasure as rare as the black swan, or as modesty in that "talented person" who has learnt many things superficially, and nothing well.

For feminine self-consciousness mothers and nurses and governesses are mostly to blame. Worse educated than boys, girls are much more manipulated. From their earliest years they are taught to think of themselves and consider their actions as boys, healthily brought up, never are. They must not fling themselves about, and they must spread their little skirts gracefully when they sit down; they are cautioned to be "modest," when what the foolish instructress reviles is in its essence modesty because it is innocence, what she teaches is in its essence less modesty than self-consciousness; and they are drilled into "elegance," which means that they are drilled out of all the gracefulness of nature, and made artificial and affected by the laws of good breeding and to suit Mrs. Grundy's views. They are taught to take care of their complexion, to venerate their clothes, and to respect their hands, when they want to play and be happy, and not to think of themselves, and then we wonder that women are self-conscious, and that they fail to attain their best capabilities because of affectation and regard for small things! It would be a miracle if they did anything else, seeing how they are mishandled from the beginning. All the same, however produced, self-consciousness is a painful acquisition, and a cause of misery to every one concerned; and the mental physician who could devise a remedy for it, when once it is fairly established in the nature of a suffering human being, would be a benefactor to his race such as not even the curer of cancer or the discoverer of a specific for consumption would surpass in value and well doing.

A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* says that the moon has no more effect on the weather than red herrings have on the Government of Switzerland.

Musical Instruments.

PIANOFORTES AND ORGANS!

Until further notice we are offering our Standard and Warranted Instruments at 40 to 60 PER CENT. LESS THAN LIST PRICES.

MATHUSHEK PIANO,
LIST PRICE $625, GOING FOR $345.

NEW CABINET GRAND,
By Fischer, best toned in the market at any price
LIST PRICE $650, GOING FOR $315.

SQUARE GRAND,
7¼ Octave; fancy mouldings; extra carved legs; all round corners; back like front; *full agraffe*,
LIST PRICE $700, GOING FOR $275.

SQUARE PIANO,
7 Octave; Serpentine mouldings; carved legs; front round corners,
LIST PRICE $350, GOING FOR $190.

PRINCE ORGANS!
NEW STYLES, GOING AT ABOUT
HALF PRICE.

Call and see them, or send for full List of Prices.

NORRIS & SOPER,
WAREROOMS - - 8 ADELAIDE STREET EAST, TORONTO.

An Indian Orator.

The first council of the Sioux and United States Commissioners at the Spotted Tail agency, Nebraska, was held a few days ago. Spotted Tail made a long speech to the special commission, in which he betrayed an appreciation of the rights of the Indians to their country and of what is best for his people, which showed him to be a good observer and reasoner. He said:—

This is the fifth time words have come to us from the Great Father. At the time the first treaty was made on Horse Creek there was a promise made to borrow the overland road of the Indians, and though I was a boy then, they told me that promises were made to last fifty years. These promises have not been kept. The next conference we had was held with Gen. Maynadier, when there was no promise made, but we made friends and shook hands. Then there was the treaty made by Gen. Sherman, Gen. Sanborn, and Gen. Harney, when we were told we should have annuities and goods for thirty-five years. They said this, but did not tell the truth. At that time Gen. Sherman told me the country was mine and I should select any place I wished for my reservation. I said I would take the country from the head of White River to the Missouri. He said they would give us cows to raise cattle, mares to raise horses, and oxen and waggons to haul logs with and to haul goods to earn money that way. He said also there should be issues of such things as we needed to learn the arts with, and, besides that, money to every one. He told me each of us should have $15 for an annuity, but I told them that was a bad amount, that we did not understand money, and that it should be $20 to each one, and he assented to that. He told me these things should be carried out, and for me to go to the mouth of the Whitestone and locate my people, and these things should be fulfilled to me. But it was not true. When these promises failed to be carried out, I went myself to see the Great Father, and went to his house and told him these things. The Great Father told me to go home and select any place in my country I chose for my home, and go there and live with my people. I came home and selected this place and moved here. They told me if I would move here I should receive a fulfilment of the promises made to me, but all I got was some very small cows and some old waggons that were worn out.

Again last summer you came to talk about the country, and we said we would consider the matter. We said we would leave it to the Great Father for him to settle. In reply to that he has sent you out this summer. You have come to visit our land, and we now ask you how many years there are for us to live? My friends, you who sit before me are traders, are merchants. You have not come here to turn anything out of the way without paying for it. When a man has a possession that he values, and another party comes to buy it, he brings with him such good things as he wishes to purchase it with. My friends, your people have both intellect and heart; you use these to consider in what way you can do the best to live. My people, who are here before you, are precisely the same. I see that my friends before me are men of age and dignity, and men of that kind have good judgment, and consider well what they do. I infer from that that you are here to consider what shall be good for my people for a long time to come. I think each of you has selected somewhere a good piece of land for himself with the intention to live on it, that he may there raise his children. My people are not different. They also live upon the earth and upon things that come to them from above. We have the same thoughts and desires in that respect that the white people have. This is the country where they were born, where they have acquired all their property, their children, and their horses. You have come here to buy this country of us; and it would be well if you would come with the goods you propose to give us, and to put them out of your hand so we can see the good price you propose to pay for it. Then our hearts would be glad.

My friends, when you go back to the Great Father, I want you to tell him to send us goods; send us yokes and oxen, and give us waggons, so we can earn money by hauling goods from the railroad. This seems to me to be a very hard day; half of our country is at war, and we have come upon very difficult times. This war did not spring up here in our land. It was brought upon us by the children of the Great Father, who came to take our land from us without price, and who do a great many evil things. The Great Father and his children are to blame for this trouble. We have here a storehouse to hold our provisions, but the Great Father sends us very little provisions to put into our storehouse; and when our people become displeased with our provisions, and have gone north to hunt, the children of the Great Father are fighting them. It has been our wish to live here peaceably, but the Great Father has filled it with soldiers who think only of our death. Some of our people who have gone from here in order that they may have a change, and others who have gone north to hunt, have been attacked by soldiers from this direction, and where they have got north have been attacked by soldiers from other directions; and now, when they are willing to come back, the soldiers stand between them and keep them from coming home. It seems to me that there is a better way than this. When people come to trouble it is better for both parties to come together without arms, talk it over, and find some peaceful way to settle.

You have mentioned to me two countries. The Missouri country I know. When we were there we had a great deal of trouble. I left hundreds more people buried there. The other country I have never seen, but I agree to go and look at it with fifty of my young men. When this trouble commenced the Great Father stopped the sale of ammunition, which has caused great suffering to my people, notwithstanding we are all sincere to do what is good for our people. My friend [pointing to Gen. Van Dever], you are a wise man. When you was here last spring you told me you would help me. I want you to do it.

The inauguration has just taken place of the canal from Amsterdam to the North Sea. It is sufficiently wide and deep to admit vessels of the greatest tonnage, and is one of the most gigantic works executed since the cutting through of the Isthmus of Suez.

One of the convicts undergoing a long term of penal servitude at Chatham Prison deliberately placed his arms beneath the wheels of the trucks on the railway in the dockyard, when one arm was so fearfully crushed that it had to be amputated.

Retail Dry Goods.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

CRAWFORD & SMITH,
49 KING STREET EAST,
TORONTO,

beg to intimate to the inhabitants of Canada that they have been appointed agents for the Gossamer Rubber Clothing Company, of Boston, Mass., and are now prepared to offer all goods made by this Company, such as Ladies' and Misses' Cloaks, Ladies' and Misses' Leggings, at manufacturers' prices delivered in Canada.

Gossamer Waterproof Cloaks and Leggings for Ladies and Misses.

The Manufacturers Claim for the Above New Style of Garments the Following:—

They are perfectly water-proof.
That four of them weigh no more than one old style water-proof.
That, if worn in the rain twenty-four hours, they will not absorb any moisture; while the old style will nearly double its weight, and not keep the wearer dry.
That, when rolled up, they will make a very compact bundle, which can be easily carried in the pocket; while the old style is as large and cumbersome as a woollen shawl.
That, being so light-weight and having no warmth, they are welcomed by ladies and gentlemen for warm weather use, or to throw over a winter cloak or coat in cold weather.
That they are not affected by either cold or heat; are a perfect protection to the most delicate wardrobe from the snow and sleet; neither will they become soft and useless with warm damp weather.
That a lady, who has a Gossamer in a pocket, can leave the troublesome umbrella at home; and, if the rain comes before she reaches shelter, she is far better protected than she could be with the umbrella.

N. B.—To accomodate those living where our goods are not sold retail, we will send by mail, post paid to any address (on receipt of money or postal order for the amount).

One Lady's Cape with hood, 56 inches long	$ 8 25
One Lady's Ulster Coat, 56 inches long	12 00
One Lady's Newport Cloak, 56 inches long	10 00
One pair Lady's Leggings	2 00
Misses' Leggings	1 75
Childrens' Leggings	1 50
One gentleman's Sack Coat, any size ordered	10 00

CRAWFORD & SMITH,
Agents for Gossamer Rubber Clothing Company and Importers of Dry Goods,
TORONTO.

PERMANENT GRASS.—However pleasant and agreeable it is in theory to possess a permanent meadow, the sod of which shall grow and thicken for a century, in practice we doubt if such a meadow could be made profitable even could it be made possible. That it could be made possible by the exercise of skill in management and the expenditure of sufficient money for manure in rare cases upon some soils well fitted for this use, we do not doubt; but, that this use of land would be unprofitable we feel very sure. It is only in very few cases that specialties in agriculture can be made to pay, and then there must be a combination of favouring circumstances to render them profitable. The dairy, for instance, is one of the most important of the agricultural specialties, and the outlet for its products is wide and extensive. For the prosecution of this industry there could be nothing more desirable than rich and permanent pastures for summer feeding and permanent meadows to yield fodder for winter—if these could be made profitable. But here the dairyman meets with a check. To say nothing of the difficulty or impossibility in most cases of maintaining grass lands in a productive condition, he finds the quantity of land that is needed to support one cow far too great at its present value to permit a satisfactory profit to be realized from her produce. Five acres of pasture and two of meadow for a cow's yearly subsistence is more than he can afford. Where land is worth $50 an acre the interest upon the cost of seven acres alone will sweep away nearly half the average income from a cow. It is very clear when we consider the average returns from a dairy cow that it does not, and cannot, pay to keep her on pasture and hay exclusively. If this is a fact we may as well abandon all thought of keeping land permanently in grass and all effort to do so. Even upon moist bottom lands "natural to grass" we are satisfied that it will not pay as well to grow grass permanently as to drain these lands and submit them to a regular rotation of cropping in which hay and pasture, or soiling crops shall alternate with grain and roots. If one cow can be kept upon every seven acres upon a farm devoted to varied crops under the best system of rotation, as we know from ample experience can be done with ease—it is then very clear that all the crops raised in excess of what is needed to subsist the cows are so much gained. If this is true, the farmer who mixes dairying with grain growing is far better off than the exclusively dairy farmer. The past season has helped to greatly enlarge the experience of dairymen, and, as is usual, the new experience has been paid for. The past summer has been very destructive to pastures and meadows over a large extent of country, and the income of thousands of dairymen who have not practised "soiling" more or less has considerably fallen off. What we have learned this season has been very much against permanent grass and in favour of a mixed system. It has long been believed by some farmers that pasturing is a wasteful practice. Many of these will now be certain of it. But the lengthened rest given to the land by some seasons of pasturing is helpful and valuable, and the fact only tends to strengthen the position we have defended in these columns, viz., that a much more extended rotation than that usually practised is desirable, and would be found profitable, and in such a lengthened rotation dairying falls naturally as one of the necessary parts of it.—*N. Y. Times.*

Books and Stationery.

BELFORD BROTHERS

BELFORD'S MONTHLY MAGAZINE

This new Canadian ILLUSTRATED Magazine will SHORTLY BE PUBLISHED. Early announcement will be made of the issue of the first number. Contributions received, and, if accepted, liberally paid for.

Books Published To-day,

THE EARNEST STUDENT. BY THE LATE NORMAN MACLEOD. Crown 8vo., paper 75 cts.; cloth, $1. "Full of the most instructive material, and admirably compiled, we are sure that a career of unusual popularity awaits it; nor can any pupil peruse it without being quickened by its example of candour, assiduity, and happy self-consecration."—*Dr. James Hamilton in "Excelsior."*

WEE DAVIE. BY THE LATE NORMAN MACLEOD. Crown 8vo., paper, 15 cents. Reprinted from the fiftieth English edition. Fifty editions of this little work should be a guarantee of its excellence.

GLADSTONE: ON MACLEOD AND MACAULAY. Two essays by the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Demy 8vo., price 25 cents.

THE ADVENTURES OF TOM SAWYER. BY MARK TWAIN, THIRD EDITION. Author of "Old Times on the Mississippi," "Innocents Abroad," etc. Crown 8vo., Cloth, full gilt, $1.25; cloth, $1; paper, 75 cents. No book issued this year has had such a large sale for the short time that it has been on the market.

Immediately Forthcoming Publications.

INFELICE. BY AUGUSTA J. EVANS WILSON. Author of "St. Elmo," "Beulah," "Macaria," "Inez," and "Vashti." 500 pages, in fine linen binding $1, cloth extra $1.25. Uniform with St. Elmo. This is the author's latest work. 50,000 copies of the American edition were sold in 8 months.

ST. ELMO. BY AUGUSTA J. EVANS WILSON. Uniform with "Infelice." Linen $1; cloth extra $1.25.

ONE SUMMER. BY BLANCHE WILLIS HOWARD. Small 12mo, uniform with "Their Wedding Journey," and "A Chance Acquaintance," chocolate boards, 75cts.; cloth, red edges, $1. This novel has run through 17 editions in the United States, inside of 12 months.

THEIR WEDDING JOURNEY. BY W. D. HOWELLS. Small 12mo, uniform with "One Summer," and "A Chance Acquaintance." Chocolate boards, 75cts.; cloth, red edges, $1.

A CHANCE ACQUAINTANCE. BY W. D. HOWELLS. *Author of "Their Wedding Journey."* Uniform with "Their Wedding Journey," and "One Summer." Chocolate boards, 75cts.; cloth, red edges, $1.

THE GOLD THREAD. BY THE LATE NORMAN MACLEOD. Square 8vo., beautifully illustrated, cloth, full gilt, $1. This will be the handsomest holiday book for the money that the Canadian market will see this year.

SECOND EDITION. EDITH LYLE. BY MRS. MARY J. HOLMES. Author of "Lena Rivers," "Darkness and Daylight," etc. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1; paper 75cts. The Canadian Press unanimously acknowledge that this, Mrs. Holmes' latest work, surpasses all her previous efforts.

DYSPEPSIA. By the late Dr. HALL, author of "How to Live Long," etc. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1; paper, 75cts. This work has been delayed by the sudden death of the author. It will be ready in a few days, and a large sale is expected for it, it being the last work of this well known writer on health subjects.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD. Anecdotes of the Hon. Benjamin Disraeli by NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN. Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 30cts.

LIFE OF THE HON. RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Member of the first Parliament of Canada. Edited by Rev. C. E. Cartwright, B.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1.

LEWIS' READINGS AND RECITATIONS. BY RICHARD LEWIS. Small 8vo. Paper, 50cts.; cloth, 75cts.

The Newest and Freshest Books.

SEVENTH EDITION. MEMOIRS OF NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D. By his brother the Rev. DONALD MACLEOD. 1 vol. Demy 8vo. Cloth, $2.50; half calf, $4; full Morocco, $6.

SECOND EDITION. GETTING ON IN THE WORLD. BY WILLIAM MATHEWS, LL.D. Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Chicago. Crown 8vo. Half-calf, $2.50; cloth, full gilt, $1.75; cloth, $1; paper covers, 75cts. "Worth any day ten times its cost for the tenth part it contains! A book fuller of sensible talk and sounder guidance we have not seen for a long day."—*Sunday School Times, Philadelphia.* "While it enforces a truth in every line, and teaches invaluable lessons on every page, it is in manner as absorbing and attractive as a bit of Eastern Fable."—*Philadelphia Enquirer.*

GABRIEL CONROY. By F. BRET HARTE. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1.25; illuminated paper covers, 75cts.

MUMMIES AND MOSLEMS. BY CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER. Author of "My Summer in a Garden," and co-author of "The Gilded Age." Crown 8vo., 450 pages, Cloth and Paper Covers.

SIXTH EDITION. OLD TIMES ON THE MISSISSIPPI. BY MARK TWAIN, Author of "Tom Sawyer," etc. Crown 8vo., Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents. "In Twain's best style."

SECOND EDITION. COMMON SENSE IN THE HOUSEHOLD. BY MARION HARLAND. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1; shoulder boards, 75 cents. A splendid book for the Fall and Winter trade.

SECOND EDITION. THOMPSON'S READINGS AND RECITATIONS BY H. L. THOMPSON. Small Crown 8vo. Boards, 50 cents; paper, 30 cents. We claim that this little work is superior to any book of the kind for the same money. It deserves a large sale this Fall.

DANIEL DERONDA BY GEORGE ELIOT. Published by Dawson Brothers. Cloth, $2.00; paper covers, $1.50. The first edition of this popular book was completely sold out in one week.

SECOND EDITION. TWO DESTINIES. BY WILKIE COLLINS. Published by Hunter, Rose, & Co. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 75 cents. The first large edition of this, his latest novel, was completely exhausted inside of two weeks.

THE PRIME MINISTER. BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Canadian Copyright Edition. 8vo., Cloth, $1.25; paper, $1. "Trollope has no superior as a novel writer. 'The Prime Minister,' his last work, is regarded, on all hands, as his best."

THE OLD LIEUTENANT AND HIS SON. BY THE LATE NORMAN MACLEOD. With Illustrations, Crown 8vo., Cloth, elegant $1; Illuminated paper covers, 75 cents. "We place 'The Old Lieutenant and his Son' in the very first rank of religious fiction."—*Daily News.*

BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED

THE PRAIRIE PROVINCE. BY J. C. HAMILTON, M.A., LL.B. Sketches of Travel from Lake Ontario to Lake Winnipeg, and an account of the Geographical position, Civil Institutions, Climate, Inhabitants, Productions, Trade and Resources of the Red River Valley, with Maps of the North-west and Manitoba, Plan of Winnipeg, view of Fort Garry and other illustrations. Crown 8vo., Paper, $1; Cloth, $1.25. The book contains a new Map of Manitoba and the North-west, and of the Dawson Route, expressly drawn and engraved for this work. The new Settlements, Reserves and Railway Routes, and Districts of Keewatin, will be shown on this map.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM, OLD AND NEW. from the stand point of the Infallibility Doctrine By John Schulte, D.D., Ph. D. Crown 8vo., Cloth, $1. Acknowledged to be the best work on this subject yet published.

WE AND OUR NEIGHBOURS. By MRS. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," "My Wife and I," Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1; Paper, 75 cents. "Mrs. Stowe possesses undoubtedly the art of story telling. It is a pity that some of our writers of fiction could not take a lesson from Mrs. Stowe. 'We and Our Neighbours' is certainly a very amusing portrait gallery, each picture being placed amid proper surroundings, and being, down to that of the dog (which is a perfect Landseer in pen and ink), unmistakably taken from real life."—*London Spectator.*

SECOND EDITION. SERMONS OUT OF CHURCH. BY MISS MULOCK, (MRS. CRAIK), Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," etc., etc. Crown 8vo. Cloth, $1; Paper, 75 cents. "These 'Sermons' have nothing of the sermonizing style about them, but are written in a practical, popular style. They deal with the many 'blisters of humanity' in a kindly loving spirit, and cannot but have a good influence on those that read them."—*The Journal of Education, Toronto.*

BETTY'S BRIGHT IDEA. BY MRS. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Author of "We and Our Neighbours," "Uncle Tom's Cabin," etc. Crown 8vo. Paper, 25 cents. "Mrs. Stowe's name is guarantee of the merits of the story."—*Kingston Whig.* "These stories are impregnated with true religious feeling and kindly human sympathy, and are therefore adapted to improve the heart as well as to afford pleasant reading."—*Christian Guardian* (Toronto). "It is the most vivacious bit of hers which we have read for a long time."—*Canadian Illustrated News* (Montreal).

MISCELLANEOUS READINGS AND RECITATIONS. BY H. L. THOMPSON. Illuminated Cover. Price, Boards, 50 cents; Paper, 30 cents. This volume contains a series of Pathetic, Comic, and Serious Selections, edited by H. L. Thompson. Many of them are quite new, and all will be found well adapted for School Exhibitions, Evening Entertainments and Temperance Gatherings.

Any of the above books may be had at the Bookstores, on the Cars, and on the Boats, or will be forwarded to any address, Free of Postage, by the Publishers.

Agents wishing to Canvass for First-class Works would do well to Address JAS. CLARKE & CO., [illegible]

Gov Gen Secretary

BIRTHS.

DENISON—At Lake View avenue, on the 1st inst., the wife of Mr. Wm. G. Denison, of a daughter.

HAMBLY—At 265 Berkeley street, on the 5th October, the wife of W. J. Hambly, of a daughter.

GREEN—On the 8th inst., at the Consolidated Bank, 322 Yonge street, the wife of Andrew Green, of a daughter.

SMITH—At Strathroy, on the 5th inst., the wife of W. Thomson Smith, Esq., Manager the Federal Bank of Canada, Strathroy, of a son.

RANNIE—At Chatham, on Friday morning, the 6th October, 1876, the wife of Mr. Wm. Rannie, of a daughter.

BRODIE—At 11 Grenville street, on 9th inst., Mrs. I. L. Brodie, of a daughter.

STOVEL—On the 6th inst., at 13 Grenville street, Mrs. Stovel, (widow of the late Joseph Stovel, Esq.,) of a son.

LAPENOTIERE—At Elora, on the 7th inst., the wife of W. H. L. LaPenotiere, Postmaster, Elora, of a daughter.

BURNHAM—At Port Perry, on the 9th inst., the wife of John Warren Burnham, of a son.

STAGG—At Brockville, on the 9th inst., the wife of A. F. Stagg, Esq., of a son.

MARRIAGES.

HELLIWELL—NEELON—At St. George's church, St. Catharines, on the 4th inst., by the Rev. Henry Holland, D.D., assisted by the Rev. Canon Dixon, of Guelph, and the Rev. H. Forrester Holmes, Howard Maughan Helliwell, to Louisa C., eldest daughter of Sylvester Neelon, Esq., also at the same time and place, William T. Benson, Manager Consolidated Bank, St. Catharines, to Annie, second daughter of Sylvester Neelon, Esq.

O'LEARY—CASSIDY—On the 4th Oct., at St. Michael's Cathedral, by the Rev. J. Cassidy, brother of the bride, assisted by the Rev. Fathers Conway, Rooney, and McCann, Mr. Louis O'Leary, of Pickering, to Kate A. M., eldest daughter of Mr. Jas. Cassidy, of this city.

PEPPER—MCGAFFIN—On the 3rd inst., by the Rev. Alexander Topp, D.D., W. H. Pepper, to Annie, eldest daughter of Jas. McGaffin, all of Toronto.

BETHELL—MARSHALL—At the residence of the bride's father, by the Rev. R. Thynne, of English Settlement and Proof Line, on the 4th inst., Mr. John Bethell, Toronto, Ont., to Miss Mary, daughter of Mr. Joseph Marshall, of the Township of London, Ont.

MORRIS—CLARK—At St. James' church, Kingston, Oct. 4th, by the Rev. F. W. Kirkpatrick, Robert Morris, Esq., teller Merchants' Bank, Belleville, to Julia Anna, daughter of J. C. Clark, Esq., Kingston.

MASON—CHEGWIN—In Dundas, on the 4th inst., at the residence of the bride's mother, by the Rev. James Gray, Mr. T. C. Mason, late of Alford, Lincolnshire, England, to Jessie, [illegible] daughter of the late James Chegwin, of Dundas.

[illegible] Sinclair, Mayor of Tilsonburg, to Miss Lillie, daughter of E. T. Tillson, Esq., of Tilsonburg.

SISSONS—INGLIS—On the 5th instant, at the bride's father, by the Rev. John Scrimger, Jas. Sissons, to Jessie, eldest daughter of William Inglis, both of Montreal.

FORD—STOTESBURY—At All Saints' church, on the 19th inst., by the Rev. A. H. Baldwin, Herbert Alfred Ford, to Cecilia White, eldest daughter of H. H. Stotesbury, Esq., of New York.

DEATHS.

LAW—At Hamilton, on the 3rd inst., in the [illegible] year of his age, Robert N. Law, Esq., eldest son of the late John Law, Esq.

LOVEKIN—At Kilcolman, Township of Clarke, on the 3rd inst., J. P. Lovekin, Junior, M.D., aged twenty-five years and seven months.

STEWART—At 23 Dundas street, Elizabeth Dixon Stewart, eldest daughter of William and Matilda Stewart.

PRICE—At Belleville, on the 3rd inst., Charles Dempsey, infant son of Rees Price, aged 6 months and 11 days.

STURDY—At Guelph, on Thursday, the 5th inst., Louisa, wife of Fredk. Sturdy, painter, aged 43 years.

EWER—In Strathroy, on Tuesday evening, Oct. 3, Louisa, wife of W. H. Ewer.

LAWLESS—At Brockville, on Monday, the 2nd inst., Isabella Rhynas, wife of Edward Lawless.

PARKER—In London, on the 4th inst., Cecil Farquhar, infant son of T. R. and M. Parker, aged 7 months and 17 days.

HARVIE—At Centreton, on the 4th inst., Mary Harvie, daughter of Mrs. Jane Harvie, aged 21 years and 6 months.

CAMPBELL—At Markham, on the 5th inst., in the 27th year of her age Jane Lydia Burk, fifth daughter of William Charles Campbell, Esq., barrister, of Carrybocrow House, County Monaghan, Ireland, and niece of Admiral Campbell, of her Majesty's Navy.

SHARON—In Southwold, on the 4th inst., Hugh Sharon, aged 81 years.

CAMERON—In Montreal, on Wednesday afternoon, the 4th inst., Isabella, youngest daughter of Hugh Cameron, sr., aged 28 years.

STURDY—In Guelph, on the 5th inst., after a long and painful illness, from heart disease, Louisa, the wife of Fred. Sturdy, aged 43 years.

STEWART—At 26 North street, Toronto, on Sunday evening, 8th inst., Agnes Fairley, wife of John M. Stewart, aged 43 years.

MULHOLLAND—In this city, on the 8th inst., at her residence, 6 Trinity street, Margaret Mulholland, of apoplexy, in the 67th year of her age.

BURK—At Markham, on the 5th inst., in the 27th year of her age, Jane Lydia Burk, wife of Daniel Burk, and fifth daughter of William Charles Campbell, Esq., Barrister, of Carrybocrow House, County Monaghan, Ireland, and niece of Admiral Campbell, of her Majesty's Navy.

PACKARD—At Thorold, on the evening of Friday, 6th October, 1876, at the residence of Dr. Palmer, his son-in-law, Ambrose Packard, Esq., formerly of Niagara Falls, N.Y., aged 83 years.

LAKE—At Belleville, on the 6th inst., Lydia Mabel, infant daughter of John C. Lake, aged 6 months and 21 days.

COLLINS—On Friday, the 6th inst., in Montreal, Mary Ann, beloved wife of Thomas C. Collins, aged 58 years.

WADE—At his residence, between Port Hope and Cobourg, on the morning of October the 10th, John Wade, Esq., J.P., aged seventy-two years and three months.

GRIGG—In Guelph, on the 8th inst., Edward Grigg, aged 33 years and 6 months.

MCGIBBON—At Montreal, on Sunday morning, the 8th inst., [illegible] Henry, fourth son of Wm. McGibbon, aged ten years, four months and [illegible] days.

The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, OCT. 13, 1876.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

BIG PUSH is fairly cornered in Gaza with Mr. ANGLIN. Periodically, however, he makes a convulsive effort to escape, but his shoulders are unequal to "the doors of the gate and the two "posts, bar and all." Tuesday he made an attempt to get out in this way:

"Then the charge is made that the independence of Parliament had been violated by Government printing having been given to papers owned by Messrs. Anglin and Vail in the Maritime Provinces, the facts being:—(1.) That the practice of having the Post Office printing done locally was an old one, and the local authorities only followed the course taken for years in that respect; (2) that whereas the late Government carried on the system for years and left it as a legacy to their successors, the present Administration put a stop to it, and have for some time caused the whole of such work to be done by the Government printers at Ottawa. It was Sir John Macdonald who inaugurated and maintained the practice objected to; it is Mr. Mackenzie who has put an end to it."

Alas! for the luckless prisoner. The point is not that Mr. MACKENZIE has followed Sir JOHN MACDONALD's practice of having the local Post Office printing done by local printers, but that he has wilfully and knowingly given eight thousand dollars' worth to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and ten thousand dollars' worth to Messrs. VAIL and JONES, two members of the House, contrary to the statute in such cases, etc., and against the doctrine of the "Reform" Party. Sir JOHN MACDONALD is guiltless of any such offence.

Moreover, aside from the breach of the Independence of Parliament Act involved, there is a question of overcharge in connection with Mr. ANGLIN's account which Mr. BROWN in his helplessness has overlooked. Mr. ANGLIN farmed out the work to CHUBB & SON, of St. John, N. B., who made their own profit out of it, and the Speaker then took twenty per cent. of the whole amount for his share of the transaction!

Would it not be wiser for Mr. BROWN to admit the inevitable, and confess that his friends have been guilty of a gross violation of their professions and that Mr. Speaker has over-reached the Treasury to the amount of twenty per cent. of $8,000? Mr. ANGLIN admits as much, contending, however, with great warmth that he is possessed of one individuality as Speaker and of another as a "middle "man" in Government job printing, and that the offences of this are not to be charged against that!

CONDEMNED FROM WITHIN.

IN recent political discussion there is, perhaps, nothing more amusing than the wriggling effort of the Grit-organ to draw a distinction between the appointment of Mr. GREELEY and that of Mr. GOW to shrievalties. The two cases are alike in every particular. The practice of a member "recommending, in other words, appointing himself," was assailed by Mr. BLAKE when he was in Opposition, and vigorously attacked by the *Globe* newspaper; yet we are now asked to believe that what was wrong in 1870 is quite right in 1876! There are some of our Grit contemporaries who refuse to be so completely drawn by the nose as to sustain the shallow contention. Of the *Globe's* laboured attempt to hoodwink the public, the Cornwall *Freeholder* says:

"Its effort to make clear that what it and its party leaders said when they were out of power was not at all what it intended should be understood after they had succeeded to office, is the most amusing thing we have seen in its columns for many a day, and is quite as successful as the average attempts to make black appear white. To our mind there is no doubt, and we regret it very much, that *The Mail* has entirely the best of it in this matter. In Opposition, our Reform friends, in their ardour, went far beyond the limits of prudence, indeed beyond the lines of common sense, in describing metes and bounds for their opponents, within which they must have foreseen they could not confine themselves."

This is hitting the nail straight on the head. The game of Phariseeism which the Grit leaders played in Opposition aided them at the time, doubtless, for the people believed in their professions, but it is slaying them with a vengeance now. They have had to come down from their stilts, and their descent is the more noticeable because of the airs they gave themselves when they were free of responsibility.

The Ottawa pocket organ takes up the

VOL. V. NO. 237.

same subject, and fancies it has got its fist on our throat. We the other day selected a few instances from among several illustrating the extent to which the Grit leaders have violated what they elevated to the dignity of a principle six years ago, noticing particularly the cases of Messrs. FOURNIER and DORION. "Oh, but," says the pocket organ, "what "right have you to complain? Didn't "your leaders appoint colleagues of their "own to office? And in condemning the "present Government don't you con"demn the previous Government as "well?" This is the veriest clap-trap. The Conservative Party never objected to such appointments—never sought to restrict the Crown in its choice of persons to fill official positions. Writing on the subject a few days ago, we said people had not thought of considering the practice improper, not to say censurable, until the *Globe* and Mr. BLAKE said so. Surely we do not go too far in holding them to their words. It is said we "garbled" Mr. BLAKE's speech; we did nothing of the kind, as his notice of motion in the Legislature, given in an- [illegible] We quoted enough of it to express the doctrine he laid down, and the remaining portion did not qualify the excerpt we made in any material sense whatever. What we insist is, that these people have no right to do what they condemned in others, and that we are justified in holding them to the strictest letter of the declarations on the strength of which they overthrew their opponents and clambered into office. Is there an honest man in the country who will say this is unreasonable? We think not. And tested by this slander, the Grit leaders, from "Big "Push" to "Copper" HUNTINGTON, are a set of arrant knaves and humbugs.

THE GRITS AND THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

THERE was a time when the Grit press was not so laudatory of Lord DUFFERIN as it is just now. Like any common mortal, the Governor-General is for it a fair subject of attack, when either by word or act he fails to aid the Grit Party in its partizan work. That respect which the Conservative Party intuitively entertains for "those placed in authority" would tolerate a considerable departure from true constitutional practice on the part of the Governor-General rather than seek to bring him or his authority into disrepute. The Kingston *Daily News*, apropos of the unctuous manner in which the Grit newspapers have seized upon Lord DUFFERIN's speech at Victoria, recalls what many of them said of his Excellency when, having other sworn advisers than those who now surround him, he stood by *them* with all the chivalry of his Celtic nature. Do our contemporaries recognize the following excerpts—which we allow to go as their own best commentary?

"We regret to say that the Governor-General has placed himself in a false position, and the sooner he prepares for his departure from the Dominion (which he will make it hot for him after his most unparalleled attack on the privileges of the House of Commons) the better."

"By accepting the advice of his Ministers, in opposition to the best established rights of the House of Commons, his Excellency has made himself accessory to all the crimes with which his Ministers stand charged."

"Words fail to express the heinousness of the outrage committed by Earl Dufferin. God help this poor country when the name of freedom can be so prostituted and outraged. Who could blame the outraged people if they should, *en masse*, proceed to the capital and make the guilty criminals flee for their lives. Her Majesty should be petitioned to recall Lord Dufferin, whose name will henceforth be held in utter execration by every honest man in [illegible]

"This is the last straw which breaks the camel's back, and now it is opportune to enquire whether our loyalty has at last yielded under the strain put upon it. * * * * The Governor-General has forced many to think whether Canadian independence is not desirable."

"What right had Lord Dufferin to plead for his Cabinet? What right had he to interpose his personal opinions at all?"

SHEFFIELD AND AMERICA.

The other day we had the news that Sheffield manufacturers had made a demand for protective duties, by way of defence of their own trade, also of retaliation upon the United States for a tariff which is shutting Sheffield goods out of the American market. Next we hear that "SANDERSON Bros. & Co., the "oldest steel manufacturing concern in "Sheffield, have determined to transfer "their English business to America, "where they will convey Sheffield work"men and Sheffield trade secrets for "steel making. For this purpose works "have been bought at Syracuse, New "York, and a new company formed with "a capital $450,000, largely held in "Sheffield. The works are already in "operation; and as the steel is guaran"teed fully equal to Sheffield make, the "heavy protective duties will be wholly "evaded." This statement is made on the authority of special information received by the Sheffield *Telegraph* from New York, and is altogether likely to prove correct. Even were it to turn out not to be true this year, it will undoubtedly be verified next year or the next again. It is merely a question of time, with regard to what must happen ere a very long time has passed. The removal, or at least the extension, of several important English manufacturing establishments to the United States is most certainly on the cards, and if not realised this year or the next, will take place shortly thereafter. Before the Centennial Exhibition opened a large English carpet-manufacturing firm was reported to have determined upon setting up a branch establishment in the United States; and already no small amount of English capital is invested in cotton mills in Georgia and Alabama. The anticipated visit of a number of members of the Imperial Parliament to Philadelphia in a body did not take place but many Englishmen largely interested in manufactures did visit the Exhibition quietly, just to see for themselves what the Americans were doing. The result, as numerous letters to the *Times* and other leading journals testify, is to spread the conviction that, for the first time in their history, American manufacturers are about to prove powerful competitors with those of England. Nor is it a mere trifling competition that is now looked for, but something on a larger scale, with the world's markets for a field. The curtain is about to rise on a scene of commercial war between the great nations, a war which will be carried on with none the less vigour for its being one of arts and not of arms. As yet we have had but glimpses through a chink, as it were, of what is going on, but we hear the noise of preparation, and we are dull observers if we cannot read the programme of events.

Some of those who have been writing to the *Times* on the subject affect to think that Protection is mainly what keeps Americans from being formidable competitors at once, and that if they would only adopt Free Trade their rapid advance in manufacturing power would follow. According to this view, such advance as America has made in manufacturing the few years past has not been because of Protection but in spite of it. But this does not appear a very logical view, after all. What we know for a fact is that American manufactures have greatly expanded under Protection, whether helped or hindered by it. Now, if we wish to make it plain whether Protection *per se* has been a help or a hindrance, we cannot do better than first to estimate and then put aside those other agencies that have been at the same time in operation. First, then, we may note that the wages and the interest paid for the use of capital have been very much higher in the United States than in England. But wages on this side the Atlantic have fallen of late, and the difference now is not less than it was a few years ago; while current rates of interest in New York, [illegible] the securities given being somewhat similar, are all the time approximating to London rates. The change now going on in these respects favours American manufactures; but that is the same as saying that the old state of things was against them. Again, English commercial houses have had the largest share of foreign commerce in their hands, and [illegible] freight has mostly been carried in English bottoms, a set of circumstances [illegible] face of it favourable to English and adverse to American manufactures.