

while he holds such office, sit or vote as a member of the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada he shall thereby forfeit his said office of Executive Councillor, and his appointment as such Executive Councillor shall, from thenceforth, be and become null and void, and he shall be incapable of being reappointed to, or holding the office of Executive Councillor so long as he shall be a member of the House of Commons of Canada." (This section was to come into operation at the end of the then existing Assembly or House of Commons.)

So it was Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, patronisingly pronounced by Senator Macpherson to be "an honest Reformer" (see Letter, p. 6), who first "passed an Act strangely inconsistent with Reform principles.

In the session of 1872 (Mr. Blake's Government) the Act was passed to which the rather muddled Senator refers. This was 35 Victoria, cap. 4, which, in its first section, provided that, if any person, after the dissolution of the then existing House of Commons, being a member of the Legislative Assembly, should sit or vote as a member of the House of Commons, he should be disqualified from sitting in the Local Assembly.

This went a step farther than Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's Act, but the former Act of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald would have certainly had the effect of excluding some of the most prominent members of the Local Legislature from one House or the other, and so doing that which the Senator professes to deprecate.

The Tables Turned.

But, it so happens, that the separation of the most able and prominent men in the Local Legislature from that body was not effected by either of these Acts, but by a *Dominion Statute passed with the concurrence of Sir John A. Macdonald at Ottawa, and approved by the vote or silence of Senator Macpherson himself.*

Sir John A. Macdonald had always opposed the abolition of dual representation, but, as Mr. Costigan, one of his followers, in 1872 introduced, for private reasons, into the House of Commons, a wretched little measure which decreed that no member of a Local Assembly should be *eligible for election, or even for nomination* as a member of the House of Commons, Sir John, hoping to embarrass the Ontario Government, of which Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie were both members, supported the Bill and it became law. See *Statutes (Canada), 1872, 35 Vic. c. 20.*

It was under this Act that Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie resigned their seats in the Ontario Assembly, prior to their respective elections to the Commons in 1872, and, on Mr. Blake's return from Europe shortly afterwards, the Cabinet in Toronto was reconstructed.

So much for the inconsistency of Reformers and the Senator's crazy and ridiculous discovery in this business, of the machinations of "Mr. Brown."

The Senator the only True Prophet.

The Senator attacks Mr. Mowat (p. 7), for descending from the Bench to become Premier of Ontario.

Mr. Mowat's acceptance at a great personal sacrifice of what

he felt to be a more useful public position than even the honourable one he left, was fully approved by the people at the polls in 1875. Senator Macpherson's voice was not then heard in protest. His silence then, if he is in earnest, proves his patriotism in the past, to have been less conspicuous than is his impertinence to-day.

The Senator Collides with the Crown and People.

The Senator (p. 8), thinks Messrs. Matthew Crooks Cameron Mr. Stephen Richards, or Mr. John Carling should have been Premier of Ontario, instead of Mr. Mowat.

Mr. Cameron, as leader of the Opposition, appealed to the verdict of the people, as against Mr. Mowat in 1875. The people sustained Mr. Mowat, and refused to replace him by Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Richards retired from political life and did not even seek re-election, in 1875. Mr. Carling has never, since 1872, sought to connect himself with local affairs. That Senator Macpherson should suggest either of the two last named gentlemen as Premier of Ontario is only one more proof that he is "out of gear" with all the rest of mankind.

Besides, it was the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor to call Mr. Mowat to the Executive Council. It will hardly be said that the incumbent of that office in 1873 was likely to be influenced by "Mr. Brown." The Senator 'uld know better than to show disrespect for His Honour's good judgment.

The Senator on the Members' Indemnity.

The Senator falls foul of what he elegantly designates "the Salary Grab," otherwise the increase of the Members' Indemnity in 1876. He says:—"In 1873, Mr. Mowat doubtless desiring to propitiate Reformers raised the indemnity to \$600, and, again I presume further to appease them he raised it in the session of 1875-6 to \$800." Letter, p. 31.

The impartial critic who "eschews partisanship," cannot help making a mean innuendo to the disparagement of political opponents.

His dishonesty is the more to be condemned because he knows, as everybody else knows, that the increase of the indemnity on both occasions, was the result of representations made by members on both sides of the House, and that, while nobody ever demurred to the first increase, every Conservative in the Legislature pledged himself to support and defend the second.

However, as this champion of the Conservative party chooses to affix the responsibility of the increase on Reformers, it may be as well to recall one or two facts.

In February, 1876, Messrs. M. C. Cameron, who should, according to the Senator, have been Premier of Ontario; Mr. Wm. Macdougall; Mr. Meredith, the present leader of the Opposition; Mr. Scott, the member for Peterboro'; Mr. Creighton, a rival of the Senator in financial criticism; Dr. Boulter; Mr. Lauder; Mr. Broder, and other Conservatives, all openly from their places advocated the increase from \$600 to \$800.

Moreover, when, in 1877, the Government, to give the House an opportunity of exercising its free discretion in the matter, submitted a resolution to take off \$200 from each member, the