

See how Mackenzie On the Situation. HIS LETTER TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE BROWN.

To the Hon. George Brown, Editor and Managing Director of the Toronto Globe.

Sir: You charge me in the *Globe* with having deliberately misrepresented the responsibility of the present Government for the increased public expenditure, and yet you have not had the firmness to lay the base charge or publish my denial of it, or my invitation to you and the members of the Government to appear before a competent audit tribunal, where you would have the opportunity of disproving my statements if, as you allege, they are inaccurate. The cause must be weak and bad, indeed, that can be served by tactics so unjust.

In withholding my letter from the public, especially from that portion of it who only read the *Globe* newspaper, in which your charge against me appeared, you have done me a great injustice. You have also wronged the readers of the *Globe* by concealing from them, so far as you could, my denial of your imputations, thus depriving them of the means of judging between you and me. How long will an intelligent people submit to be kept in such mental darkness?

By not accepting my challenge to an audit of my financial statements, as announced in my letter of the 19th of August, addressed to you and published in the *Mail* newspaper, of the 21st of August last, you have practically admitted what is the fact, that the truth of all my charges of Ministerial incapacity, reckless extravagance and wastefulness, as they do an appalling list, are incontrovertible. If the economic transgressions of Ministers were the only charges against them, they would call for the severest condemnation from a free and intelligent people. But I have also charged the leading members of the Government with moral transgressions—with violation of solemn pledges, personal pecuniary, and with debasing the public mind by familiarizing the people with untruthfulness and self-seeking in high places where truth, honor and patriotism only should be seen, and where the aphorism "noblesse oblige" should never be forgotten.

These moral charges are included among those the truth of which Mr. Mackenzie sweepingly denied, rudely and untruthfully declaring that there was a "falseness on every page" of my first pamphlet.

The accuracy of my financial statements contained in that pamphlet have been established by the abstention of Ministers, and of yourself, from accepting my invitation to disprove them, if you could before an impartial tribunal.

I wish it were practicable to submit the other charges to a high and highly qualified tribunal for moral audit. If Mr. Mackenzie, or any of his late or actual colleagues, could persuade two or three Doctors learned in Ethics—experts in morals—into any of my charges are erroneous or unfair, I would not only withdraw them, but humbly apologize for the wrong I had done, and do all in my power to make amends for it. But Ministers and you are well aware that such a tribunal would certify unqualifiedly to the truth, yes, and to the moderation, of my charges.

It would be instructive to see the gentlemen who have been members of the Government since 1873, come before a board of intelligent men, not only to endeavor to disprove my charges, but to give an account of the whole of their moral stewardship while they have been in office.

Messrs Mackenzie and Blake would have to defend and justify the conditions which they have entered into on every occasion on which they have been called upon to form Administrations, and to reconcile their conduct in that respect with their fervid and ostentatious denunciations of all coalitions when in Opposition.

Mr. Blake would probably repeat his spleen against his unrighteous trafficking with Scott and Wood, and his railing in Mr. Mackenzie's Cabinet associated with Mr. Cauchon and Mr. Mackenzie would urge what he could in extenuation of bringing many of his former opponents—from Cartwright to Cauchon—into his government. He would probably plead that the taking of Mr. Cartwright was an absolute necessity, because he did not consider any member of his own party competent for the Minister of Finance. That Mr. Cauchon was taken in because it was thought he would bring increased strength, mental and political, to the Government, and if Mr. Mackenzie were candid he would confess that the other opponents to whom he gave seats in the Cabinet with salaries of \$7,000 a year each were taken to weaken the Opposition numerically and to maintain the number of Cabinet Ministers at 13, a number which, when in Opposition he had denounced as excessive.

I think it would be made manifest that Mr. Mackenzie's achievements in the way of Economy, Retrenchment and Reform were not such as his professions and promises had led the people to expect.

Ministers would be invited to excuse—they could not disprove or deny, the violations of the Independence of Parliament Act by themselves and their supporters—beginning with that case of unsurpassed turpitude the corrupt contract with the Speaker of the House of Commons, under which he received about \$20,000 illegally.

It would be interesting to hear the Premier and the Ex and present Minister of Justice excusing that flagrant transaction, protesting that it was altogether an inadvertence, and that they did not know they were violating the law until it was made plain to them by the Opposition.

They might be told that while it had been said certain railway companies in the United States retained in their pay as judges to rule as they required, never before had the Government of a constitutional country been known to have entered into a corrupt contract with the

Speaker of the popular branch of the Legislature, the arbiters between the Government and the Opposition in that House, and that the offence was rightly described as a gross and undying scandal.

The Vail-Jones printing contract would come under consideration. It would be shown that a Cabinet Minister had actually entered into a contract with the Government of which he was a member, and that he and his partner, now a Cabinet Minister, had enriched themselves enormously by the venial transaction.

Corrupt contracts with many other members of Parliament for supplies and for transportation, etc., would also come under review, and their scandalous features be revealed. An anomaly of the Independence of Parliament Act might be pointed out. It is that a Member who carries on business in the ordinary way and sells goods to the Government at but to the value of \$1, or if his goods are sold by a clerk without the knowledge of the member or the sale to the Government, the seat of such member becomes thereby vacated as in the case of Mr. Currier, member for Ottawa. But this disability does not extend to partners and shareholders of incorporated companies.

For instance, the Chief Commissioner or managing partner of the largest commercial association in the Dominion sits in Parliament although his company has received about \$200,000 from the Government for supplies, rents, etc. By going through the little more than fiction of constituting themselves an incorporated company, Messrs. Norris, Seaton, Hope & Co. are now enabled to enter into contracts with the Government yet to sit in Parliament. If the present party should get a new lease of power, it would not be surprising if one of their reforms should be the passing of an Act declaring every Parliamentary supporter of the Government a body politic and corporate, a corporation, sole, connected to contract and trade with the Government and receive preferences over others and yet retain their seats in Parliament. The unfortunate Steel Mill speculation would be pointed to as involving a loss to the people of Canada of about \$2,000,000.

In connection with this transaction it would be shown that Cooper, Fairman & Co., of which firm Mr. Mackenzie's brother had been a partner, and which had been a partner in the sale of \$1,000,000 worth of steel rails, had obtained a contract for 5,000 tons of rails, also without competition.

Mr. Mackenzie would be asked to reconcile his statements that all the steel rails had been purchased by tender with these facts.

It would be shown that Cooper, Fairman & Co., had been called in to give a contract for the transportation of 10,000 tons of rails, for which they had not tendered, at a higher rate than the lowest tender, and that members of the both Houses of Parliament were interested in that transportation contract. That the Red River Transportation Company had obtained contracts at rates so much below the lowest bidder as to involve a loss to the public of \$45,000.

Mr. Mackenzie would be asked to reconcile with these facts his oft-repeated assertion that the lowest tender in connection with the steel rails had always been accepted.

I apprehend it would be unedifying to hear Mr. Mackenzie laboring to prove that these contracts were free from the taint of favoritism.

Mr. Mackenzie would also be asked to explain to an intelligent tribunal the pertinence of the comparisons which he habitually draws between the prices paid by the late Government and by his own, for rails and other supplies, while he markets the great difference in the market prices of those supplies at the different periods.

He would be asked if it was worthy of one occupying his position to compare in a misleading manner transactions of the late Government which involved no public loss with the transactions of his Government which involved the loss of millions?

The Goderich Harbor job would be inquired into, and after Messrs Mackenzie, Blake and Moore had been examined, the public would probably know why \$30,000 of their money had been given away unnecessarily if not corruptly.

Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues would be required to explain, and in view of their professions of economy and consideration for the people's pockets when in Opposition, to justify the receiving by them of the enormous salaries which they have drawn while in office. Mr. Mackenzie's own emoluments being \$8,400 a year more than Sir John Macdonald's were before 1873 (\$9,000 a year against \$5,600).

I believe that a tribunal of gentlemen unbiassed and self-seeking, would agree with me that considering all the circumstances the conduct of Ministers in this matter is unsurpassed for inconsistency and mercenaryness. It may have been because Mr. Blake was conscious of this that he omitted his own salary from the statement of the expenditure of his department which he laid before his constituents at Teeswater last autumn.

Ministers would be allowed to explain and if they could, to reconcile the enormous payment of extra clerks, whose salaries for three years exceeded by \$100,000 those for three other years, with the allegations of themselves and their supporters, that an immense number of supernumeraries had been appointed by the late Government just before they retired from office.

The Minister of Justice might find it difficult to tell the people what they have gained by the increased expenditure for the Administration of Justice, but it would be easy to show that the cost of litigation has been enormously increased by the Reform Administration

of the Dominion of Canada and of Ontario.

The Minister of Customs and the Post-master-General would be allowed to explain if they could not defend the extravagance which appears to have characterized their Administration, and the Minister of Immigration might try to excuse the costliness of his department and show why I was not warranted in designating it the "Anti-Emigration Department." The Minister of Finance would see an opportunity afforded him of craving the approval of men of honor for the use he boasted of having made in England of the two-faced shield which he admits he wears. He would be required to tell what was the precise cost to the country of his last loan including the result of the manipulation of the interest account.

If the whole truth could be ascertained and believed, it would be found that the net proceeds of the loan were even less than I have always estimated them at, viz: 87½ cents on the dollar. The Minister of Finance would be required to give also what he refused to do as Mr. Cartwright did, the loan he negotiated would have netted \$120,000 less than it did.

Considering the difference in the amount of Mr. Cartwright's loan and in the value of money, etc., when he negotiated it, the loss for which he is to blame was probably a considerably larger amount than the sum named by Mr. Tilley.

It would be satisfactory to the people of Canada to know who the parties were who were enriched so largely at their expense, and it would also be interesting to ascertain whether any portion of the great margin had been set aside for Secret Service of a "Big Push" character? Do not feign indignation! Whoever has read the history of the Administration since its accession to power in 1873 will probably be prepared to believe that even this mode of obtaining an election corruption fund might not be too nefarious for its members to resort to.

I shall not trespass upon your space by picturing Ministers on their defence for Administrative incapacity such as the unaccountable blundering in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Welland Canal, the Pembina Branch and Fort Francis, the jobs of the Georgian Bay Branch, the Kamistiquia terminals and Neeshing Hotel, the expenditure of \$225,000 on the Toronto and Peterborough Railway, after having agreed to transfer it to a private company.

It must be plain to the whole reading public that the Administrative and financial blunders committed by the Government are too numerous to be enumerated. But they have entailed a loss upon the country of many millions, and it may also be assumed that many Reformers have been misled by the more ostentatious way the Ministers have presented their platform of reform.

If Mr. Mackenzie should deny any charge of tergiversation and reassert that they had devoted themselves to securing the purity of election and "the elevation of the standard of political morality," he would be referred to the records of the Election Courts, wherein it would be seen that no fewer than twenty-nine persons, Reformers, elected to support him in Parliament, had been unseated and some of them disqualified for bribery and corrupt practices, and that the more corrupt they were proved to have been the more ostentatiously were they made the recipients of Government friendship, favor and reward.

And with respect to Mr. Mackenzie's general elevation "plea," the bare recital of a list of the Ministerial and administrative misdeeds of his Government would surely afford a complete and crushing reply.

Ministers would be reminded that they and their friends came into office promising much useful legislation, that they had been supreme in Parliament for five years, that the cost to the country of the legislation of those years had been in round figures \$3,000,000, and they would be asked what measures of public utility, what measures calculated to promote the prosperity of the people had been placed by them upon the Statute Book.

Mr. Mackenzie, in his speech at Lindsay, delivered in May last, made the following admission: "With regard to the legislation generally which has taken place under this Administration, I think we have fair reason to congratulate ourselves that during the five sessions which we have held we have managed to carry through almost every measure of importance which we promised at the commencement of our career."

I say now, and I say it with some pride, that we have been able, during our term of office, to carry out our entire programme of measures. The only measure I can recall which Mr. Mackenzie has taken special credit for enacting were the Supreme Court Act, the Controversial Elections Amendment Act, and the Independence of Parliament Amendment Act, the last being better known as the "Whitewashing Act."

I presume these are the measures on which Mr. Mackenzie has depended on himself against the charge that under his regime it practically cost \$600,000 for a year to vote the supplies (\$8,000,000 for five years).

Another measure of importance mentioned in the report of his speech at Lindsay, published in the *Globe* of 30th May last, Mr. Mackenzie said: "So with regard to the Administration of Justice they say. How was this cost increased? It was increased in the first place the year that we came into office by the establishment of a new Court of Appeal in the Province of Ontario, which necessitates an expenditure of about \$21,000 every year. The

late Government had paid the first instalment, or the first quarter's salaries before they went out, but we are, and the annual charge upon us ever since of \$21,000."

Mr. Mackenzie would be asked to reconcile this statement of his with the fact that the Court of Appeal of Ontario was not created until months after the retirement of the late, and the accession of the present Government. I may repeat that the increased cost to the public for the administration of Justice since 1873 is not less than \$166,681 a year, and that in addition to this increased charge upon the public, the judicial legislation of the Reform Government has increased the costs to suitors in Ontario fifty per cent. at least.

Mr. Mackenzie may consider it inconsistent in me, the advocate of a National Policy, the friend of home industries, to complain that increased protection should have been given to one home industry, and that an important one—the legal profession.

Mr. Mackenzie has given protection to another industry—coal-oil or petroleum. These two industries are perhaps the only ones in the country in which rings can be formed or charges made high and uniform. Mr. Colby, in his able and convincing speech last session on Protection, made this very plain so far as petroleum is concerned.

What can have moved Mr. Mackenzie to commit the inconsistency of giving Protection or increased Protection to petroleum and law? Can it have been that the favor extended to the legal profession was in any measure due to the fact that eight or nine of Mr. Mackenzie's twelve colleagues were lawyers? Or does the fact that petroleum may be said to be produced only in two constituencies of the Dominion—the two represented by Messrs. Macdonald and Mills, account in any degree for the exceptional Protection extended to that industry?

As for the "Whitewashing Act," I truly believe that the Reformers in the Legislature were unanimous in regarding it as the most important Act of the whole Parliament. It brought relief and peace to the perturbed hearts of many whom you and Mr. Mackenzie have assailed. By former Ministers of whom you would say—in the words of Mr. Mackenzie applied to the speaker at Lindsay, "they by mere accident violated technically the Independence of Parliament Act," and he might have added, "shovelled the public money into their pockets." I may say very much wanted, one creating a Court of Impeachment for corrupt Ministers.

If Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues were before a high moral court such as I have pictured it might not be out of place at this time, when they are on the verge of appealing to the people for a renewal of confidence, to enquire on what grounds they expect or can ask for a new lease of power. Have they a policy, or a platform, and if so, what are its leading features?

Mr. Mackenzie would reply that they have a platform. Well, I will give you a free interpretation of the planks of their platform.

First. Misrepresentation and persecution of Sir John Macdonald.

Second. Commercial policy unchanged, notwithstanding the universal cry of need for a change in our commercial policy, and the depression and increasing poverty.

Third. Contempt for home industries, except law and oil.

Fourth. Indifference to the exodus of the youth of the country.

Fifth. Unimproved administration, it being perfect in every department.

Sixth. Expenditure to continue unchecked, so long as loans can be negotiated, covering deficits and extravagance.

Seventh. Continued "elevation of the standard of morality," in the Reform sense, as heretofore.

Last. Misrepresentation and persecution of Sir John Macdonald.

You are aware, Sir, that this is an exaggerated, although a free rendering, of the unpatriotic platform on which you party are appealing to the country. I should like to see you before a high-minded tribunal, one that would hold you closely to the point under discussion, and to see you examined upon the merits and demerits of the present Government.

Although you have defended and commended, under editorial impersonality, every Act of the Government, you would be compelled under the circumstances, I am supposing, to admit that the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie has been characterized throughout by unexampled and incomprehensible incapacity by many scandalous episodes and transactions. That the genius of infatuation seems to have presided over the Department of Public Works, and that of fatuity over the finances. The conduct of almost all the Ministers has been notorious for unblinking violation of pledges and reckless extravagance, and the helplessness "fly on the wheel" policy of the Government has been no prejudicial to the country. So much for their past career. With respect to their only proffered Free Trade policy, their only policy, which they ask the people to sanction as that of the future of the Dominion, I believe that in an exhaustive discussion you would have to admit that situated and circumstanced as Canada is, it would prove disastrous, and would promote the continued enfeeblement of the country of its men and money.

You would be forced to confess that the Ministerial party of Canada should be influenced in framing their policy by the patriotic motives of the nation, and not the hatred of Sir John Macdonald, or of any individual or number of individuals.

Before such a tribunal as I have ventured to picture, you would be constrained to declare, in spite of your paternal affection for them, that such has been the grievous and scandalous failure of Mr. Mackenzie's Government in the past and the conspicuous helplessness of its

improvement that the best interest of Canada require its dismissal by the people regardless of who may succeed to the reins of power, that public morality and the purity of public life demand that a sentence of condemnation should descend from every polling place in the Dominion, proclaiming that the reign of the "organized hypocrisy," supported as it has been by systematic misrepresentation and bold corruption had forever ended in Canada.

The punishment by the people of Mr. Mackenzie's Government should be so signal as to serve as a warning to Canadian Governments for all time to come.

Ministers and their supporters seem to have taken as a result of the part of their position, and they are to be seen—sometimes on special railway trains run at the expense of the people—hurrying panic-stricken over the country from the Atlantic to Lake Huron in the hope of averting their merited doom, and at the end are making promises which in the interest of the country it is to be hoped, defeat will prevent their fulfilling. The raiders will do no doubt long be remembered in Bruce, but not, I fear, as the messengers of light and truth.

But what will Mr. Blake say to the Ministers of Ontario who, forgetful of the distributive alliance between the Dominion and Local Governments, have actually dared to invade Bruce and canvass for himself? Mr. Blake's friends may say that he is absent and does not know of the outrage which Ontario Ministers and the satellites of both Governments are perpetrating against his consistency and honor, that their conduct will receive his loftiest disapproval, but has he one friend who will say that he believes Mr. Blake would refuse to profit by labors which, if he were sincere in the past, he must in his heart condemn and should denounce and repudiate.

I should feel that I owe an apology to the public for appearing in print as often as I have done this summer, were it not that the subjects which I submitted were of the first importance to the people, and that the restoration of them by me has been owing to the calumnious and insulting attacks of which I have been made the subject, by yourself in the *Globe*, and by those who hold the highest official positions in the land.

Unprovoked personal abuse was heaped upon me which, for want of coarseness, was under the circumstances unexampled. My assailants not only pretended to question the accuracy of my financial statements, which they well knew were correct, but they defamed me by imputing intentional misrepresentation, and not content with that, they hurled insults at the wrong race of which I am a laudable member.

My concluding words I shall address to the numerous body of electors who, in so many constituencies in the Dominion, especially in Ontario, hold the balance of power between the two parties, voting patriotically for those whom they believe will best govern Canada.

They are the men unshackled to either the policies of Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues and expecting from them efficient and economical administration, "welcomed them to power" as I said.

We have been grievously deceived both in respect to their administrative capacity and their political morality. We have also been mocked and defamed by them for having placed trust in their professions.

The votes of the independent non-partisan electors turned the scale in many a constituency at the last general election, and did much to swell Mr. Mackenzie's majority in Parliament. I believe these electors, without exception, must be of opinion now that Mr. Mackenzie is unworthy of renewed confidence.

If they are so, and will put forth their great strength and influence to persuade the great body of disappointed Reformers among their neighbors to join them in casting their ballots for the Opposition candidates, they will render invaluable service to their country; they will bear an important part in defeating the present incapable Administration, and in giving to the country a Government that will do what ought to be done by legislation and retrenchment to restore prosperity, one that in its conduct of public affairs will actively, unselfishly and intelligently promote the true interests of the Dominion, and jealously guard its resources and good name.

Sir, you refused to publish my former communication, even although I tendered payment for it as an advertisement.

The truths contained in it must have been very unpalatable to have induced you to do what was so unfair and illiberal. I shall not go through the form of sending this letter to you for publication in the *Globe*. It will reach you through the columns of another newspaper.

I have the honor to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, D. L. MACPHERSON, Toronto, 2nd Sept., 1878.

THE HALTON NEWS IS PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY, AT THE OFFICE, MAIN STREET, MILTON, BY THE PROPRIETOR, T. J. STARRET, AT THE LOW PRICE OF \$1 PER YEAR, IN ADVANCE!

Before such a tribunal as I have ventured to picture, you would be constrained to declare, in spite of your paternal affection for them, that such has been the grievous and scandalous failure of Mr. Mackenzie's Government in the past and the conspicuous helplessness of its

will be charged if not so paid

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF HALTON.

The Liberal Conservative Association of the County of Halton, having tendered the unanimous nomination to the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, C. B., we publish below his reply to the committee who waited upon him:—

Toronto, Aug. 30, 1878.
Hon. Wm. Macdougall, C. B., M. P. P. Toronto.

Sir.—We have the honor to inform you that at a large and influential meeting of delegates of Liberal Conservatives of the County of Halton held yesterday at Milton the following resolution was unanimously adopted, viz:—

"That in the opinion of this meeting called for the purpose of nominating a candidate to contest this county in the Liberal Conservative interest at the ensuing elections for the House of Commons, the Honourable Wm. Macdougall is the most suitable person who can be selected; that in the event of his accepting the nomination which is hereby tendered him this meeting pledges itself to use its utmost exertions to secure his success, and that the undersigned be a committee to wait on Mr. Macdougall to tender him this nomination and request his acceptance thereof."

In pursuance of this resolution we beg to tender you the nomination above referred to and to request your early acceptance.

Remaining yours, &c., W. C. BEATY, Pres., D. CROSS, Vice-P. L. C. A. Co. Halton. R. S. APPELLE, W. CLAY.

Toronto, Aug. 24, 1878. GENTLEMEN.—The action of the Delegates of the Liberal Conservatives of the County of Halton, of which you gave me official notice in your letter of the 20th inst., and also verbally explained to me, is, personally, very gratifying.

I asked for a few days, which you were good enough to concede to me, to consider the matter, and I now beg to inform you, and through you the electors of Halton, that I accept your nomination. I need not, in this communication, for you have not invited me to do so, state at any length my political creed, or the grounds which I shall not only the Liberal Conservatives, but the Liberals of the old school—the Baldwin Reformers, as they are sometimes called—of the County of Halton to give me their confidence and their support.

Ample opportunity will no doubt be afforded me to meet the electors, and to discuss with them and the opposing candidate, the political issues of the present and the future, as well as the political history of the past. I shall visit your county for this purpose as soon as I am informed that meetings have been arranged for, and proper notification given to the electors.

Your offer imposes on me some sacrifice. I shall be compelled to resign my seat in the Local Legislature, and to give up some business arrangements I had contemplated. I have been engaged in 12 contests, on my own account, since 1854, and I never yet, personally, solicited a vote, except before the public, and I never purchased a voter. Yet, I am obliged to confess, that having held office in several Governments, and having always lived economically; I am by no means a rich man. If other men have found "spoils" in office, I have not, and I must therefore ask my supporters to keep strictly within the law as regards expenditure, and I shall expect the Committee to provide for all expenses, except those which are personal to myself. On these terms I am ready to enter the field, and, if possible, I will carry your standard unassailed, and elevated—but not in the Mackenzie sense—to victory.

Yours in a common cause, W. M. MACDOUGALL. Messrs. W. C. Beaty, D. Cross, R. S. Appelle, W. Clay.

MILTON LIVERY & SALE STABLES. D. C. ROBERTSON BEGS TO ANNOUNCE THAT HE has now got his new Livery Stable in complete order, furnished with a stock of entirely new, stylish, covered vehicles, and first class driving horses. The travelling public will find it to their advantage to give the new Livery their patronage. Terms reasonable. Stables at the rear of the Thompson House, Main St. D. C. ROBERTSON, Proprietor. July 25, '78.