

ture of large sums, part of which, according to our lights, must have been needed for bribery purposes. It is also true, that if the opposition could show no more criminality than this, if they failed to connect the subscription more closely with the Railway Contract, if they could not shew by good and probable evidence that the *quid pro quo* was the influence of the Premier in procuring the Railway Contract for Sir Hugh Allen and his party, they must feel that they had done nothing to prove, on the part of the Premier, any guilt save what they were themselves generally chargeable with. But though they, convicted of like crime, in their own conscience and practice, are precluded from casting stones at their co-partners in guilt, though opponents in politics, that is no reason why others should palliate the tremendous accusation. The galled jade may wince, but why should we whose withers are unwrung. There must be an end put to these great bribery funds; these secret society corruptionists. It should be taken as proof positive, that the crime of bribery has been committed when ten, twenty, or fifty thousand dollars, have been proved to have been expended on an election of a member of Parliament, because such a fund could only be needed for one purpose—the committal of the crime of purchasing votes which ought to be given without fee or reward; and which cannot be given otherwise, without detriment to the voter's own conscience, and to the State which has endowed the Electors with the sacred trust.

We shall not at present, nor until the evidence has been entirely sifted, not merely before the Commission but upon the floors of the Parliament, give an opinion on the more specific charge against the Government, or members thereof, of having more definitely engaged to give the Pacific Railway Contract in return for the large subscriptions by Sir Hugh Allen to their election fund. But we cannot avoid stating our opinion that Sir John A. McDonald and others in the Government and Parliament would be more or less than men if they were not influenced by these immense subscriptions in the day of their political needs, in favour of the man who gave them. Every one understands this. No man who accepts large sums from another man *can* feel himself free to refuse favours in return to his benefactor. No great harm may arise in private life from this reciprocity of action. But the case is different where the recipient of bounty is entrusted with the dispensation of public patronage for which the giver is earnestly seeking, and without any doubt giving his money for the very purpose of securing. It may be that Sir Hugh Allan was the best qualified to preside over the Pacific Railway; but it may also be that he was not, and it may be that the money and lands were by far too great a price to pay for the proposed work. But by the receipt of such large sums from Sir Hugh Allan was not the judgment of the Premier and his co-receivers liable to be warped? were not their eyes very naturally blinded so that they could not