

the unwise course resolved upon. That man was Mr. Robertson, the ex-treasurer. He had protested in a weak sort of way, it is true, saying that though the Province could afford to negotiate one loan of \$4,000,000 it would be unsafe to try a second; but he never took the stand it was his duty to take. Why did he not then rise in his place like a man, and proclaim the danger that was threatening, and which he could not help foreseeing? His voice then raised might have saved the disaster, and, at all events, if his protest had proved useless, he would now have the satisfaction of feeling that he had been faithful to his trust. Why? Because he unfortunately happened to be deeply interested in one of the roads dependent upon the Government for aid. Mr. Angers' Railway policy was already bearing its fruit; it served as a bribe for some, as a scourge for others; from that day the Railway men were under the thumb of the Government to corrupt or to intimidate, as the occasion might require.

In order to carry out this famous railway policy in a satisfactory manner, it was deemed expedient to name a Commission of three, to see after the work and be answerable for the disbursements of the heavy sums to be expended. The selection of that Commission let the country into another little secret. Though selected chiefly, if not solely, on account of his reputation for unswerving uprightness and rectitude, Mr. DeBoucherville, it soon became apparent, was not more above lending himself to a small and even an unsavoury job, when a political object was to be gained, than had been his predecessors. One man had become, through his want of tact and breeding, intolerable in the House; no less a personage than the leader, Mr. Malhiot. It had, therefore, become necessary to get rid of him, all the more so that Mr. Angers, who appears, at that time, to have exercised great influence over the Premier, was impressed with the conviction that nature had kindly fitted him out with all the necessary qualities to be the leader of the House, and modestly looked forward, at no distant date, to be hailed the Chief of the great *blue* party—the successor of the “immortal” Sir George Cartier. This conviction had been fostered, doubtless, by the fact that there were between them considerable similitudes in stature, voice and temper; there the resemblance, however, ended. Sir George Cartier, even those most bitterly opposed to him are prepared to admit, was a man not only of considerable ability, extensive constitutional knowledge and indefatigable