

OTTAWA LETTER.

Some Important Facts Regarding the West Huron Steal.

Father of Tart's Son's Wife Given a Chance to Salt Away Some Ten Thousand Dollars.

Charleson, Who Figured in the Mercier Carnival of Corruption, is Cutting a Big Swath in the Yukon.

OTTAWA, Aug. 8.—The despatches have already stated how the West Huron investigation terminated and how ten or a dozen witnesses whose evidence might have been taken in an hour were sent off after the country had passed them by. The majority of the committee declined to allow any more witnesses to be examined. There was no reason for this hurry, for though an agreement had been made to close Monday, it was made under the impression that the business of the house would be about through at that time. The business of the house will not be through for two or three days later, and another day could well have been spared, even if a whole day instead of an hour were needed. The exclusion of these witnesses may enable the machinists to say that Mr. Borsten failed to prove fully and completely the number of ballots which were stolen or stuffed at Farr's poll. He would have been able to prove that 55 voters had marked their votes counted. As it is, he has brought in more than were counted and declarations have been made by a number of others. Besides this there is the proof of the excess of ballots in the box, and the evidence of the ballots themselves, which prove that they did not come from the pad and did not belong to the stub from which they should have been torn. There is the fact that the foreign ballots were not all initiated and the statement by Farr that he voted 22 times, while 21 ballots seemed to be missing from the unused lot at another poll. The case is complete as to the ballot box stuffing and the ballot stuffing. But the number stolen might have been more definitely established if Mr. Russell had not insisted on heading off the investigation.

One important point was established yesterday. Setting aside the statements which witnesses say that Farr made to them, we have certain independent testimony as to what occurred after the election. Farr told more than one witness that he had conversation with Mr. Holmes before and after the election, and that Mr. Holmes expressed his gratitude for the services rendered. Holmes denies that he made any such expression. Though there is no doubt that Holmes could bring Farr here if he wished, the fact that he has not done so establishes a complete absence of complicity on his part. But suppose we accept the statement made by Holmes, what remains? It is proved that Farr went to Toronto and that he was there when the enquiry began. It is known that the officers who went to his residence to summon him could not find him, and that he told the man for whom he worked that he was obliged to get out of the way because of this election trouble. Afterwards Mr. Farr disappeared from Toronto and witnesses testify that they saw him in other towns and that he told them he had been in Oshawa, Withby, Brooklin and other places escaping service.

Now, who caused Mr. Farr to disappear in this way? Who paid his expenses and shaped his course? Mr. James Nelson, who boarded with Farr at 414 Church street, Toronto, describes Farr's movements so far as he knew them. He went to Farr's room and talked the whole matter over on two occasions. Farr told him that he was in trouble about the election, and would have to go away. Mr. Nelson saw one Mr. Vance, who came to visit Farr on two occasions. This fact does not rest on Nelson's testimony, but is established conclusively otherwise. On one of these visits Vance did not find Farr at home and arranged with Nelson that Farr should go to Vance's house on his return. Nelson had gone to bed when Farr came in, but he got up and they two went to 95 Howard street, Toronto. It was after midnight and Nelson was not allowed to go into the house. After the interview with Vance, Farr disappeared and was not seen for nearly a fortnight. When he came back he said he had been on a long round to various towns and had a pretty hard time of it keeping clear of the officers of the house.

Passing from this direct evidence, we have certain hearsay testimony. Mr. Farr cannot be got and therefore it is inadmissible to hear evidence of his own statements. Nelson, who seems to be a very reliable man, says that Farr told him that Vance had arranged for him to escape service and had bought him tickets. Farr also said to Nelson that Vance had explained why he was sending Farr out of town. It was because Vance had received a telegram from Ottawa saying, "keep your man low." Nelson says that he asked Farr if Holmes could have been elected if the election had run straight, and Farr said "never on your life." One other statement made by Farr to Nelson implicates Holmes, but this statement Holmes contradicts. Now, there is no doubt that Vance did make these visits to Farr; that he did cause him to be sent out of the place and kept him hiding; that he provided him with means to travel, and no doubt he was acting under instructions from Ottawa ordering him to keep his man low.

This brings us to the question of Vance. Who is he? Mr. Vance is the chief and permanent assistant to Alexander Smith, the liberal organizer for the province of Ontario. He is, therefore, a regular accredited, and paid officer of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's party in this great province. According to the testimony of a witness called by the government, no less than Mr.

McMillan, editor of the Goderich Signal, printer of ballots, contractor under Farr, this Mr. Vance had charge of the campaign in West Huron. He has also figured as organizer in all the other campaigns. So far as the government is responsible for the conduct of the party it leads, it is responsible for Mr. Vance.

We have therefore this state of affairs. While the premier was professing his desire to have a full investigation of the conduct of returning officers, and promising to punish all offenders, the chief offender was kept out of sight by the act of the government's own political agents, and on instructions sent from Ottawa by persons directing the conduct of affairs. We have this further fact that according to the testimony of the chief government organ the postmaster general (Mulock) had the oversight of the West Huron election. That Mr. Mulock knew of these arrangements by which the seat was stolen is not shown. We know that Mr. Mulock has permitted his assistants to get the culprit out of the way and to hide away the witnesses whose testimony was most important. Moreover all the ministers in the committee and three or four of their legal supporters have long every-thing that they can do to prevent Mr. Borsten from getting at the main facts of the case. Whatever has been established has been established in spite of every possible attempt that may be made by ministers at Ottawa to burke the enquiry in the committee room, and by the servants of ministers who were engaged in keeping the criminals "low."

"Keep your men low." This is the latest motto of the great liberal party. "Business is business" is an important and useful watchword. "Wait till you see next year" is a motto which deserves an honorable place on the banner. The theory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that the business of a government "is not to benefit but to satisfy" explains many things. But they all must stand under this last great declaration of policy and practice: "Keep your men low." Mr. Vance, the assistant organizer, is not here. He could tell a very good story if he were present, but he stays away in the greatest of the great. His ways declared that he had no concern in the matter at all. He did not know who was in it. He did not know whether his son was connected with the company, but did not believe it could be proved positively on this question. Mr. Pugsley knew as a perfectly honorable and scrupulous man, but the minister had never done much business with him.

Mr. Blair was asked whether some members of parliament were not concerned in this subsidy, and it was suggested to him that his son, and perhaps he himself, had some connection with the matter. He said he had no concern in the matter at all. He did not know who was in it. He did not know whether his son was connected with the company, but did not believe it could be proved positively on this question. Mr. Pugsley knew as a perfectly honorable and scrupulous man, but the minister had never done much business with him.

In a wider sense the doctrine is applied to the whole party here at Ottawa. It is rather a poor business one would think to organize a party on the privileges committee into a body of accomplices apparently engaged in no other service than chocking off an enquiry into a crime against the rights of the people and the institutions of the country. But the necessity of a government party seems to have required this degradation on the part of some of the ablest men in their ranks. It is necessary to keep their men low. When there is Mr. Mulock, and Mr. Paterson, who took a leading part in the Huron campaign, and who to vindicate themselves, ought to have been eager to bring any wrong doing to light, that would have been the course that ministers with a high sense of principle would have pursued, but they seemed to prefer to keep themselves low. Mr. Holmes must now be conscious that he was not honest in the election. Even the organs of his own party have told him that he could not, consistent with his own self-respect, continue to hold the seat. A high-minded man would give it up at once, but Mr. Holmes has adopted the policy of his leaders and keeps himself low.

McMillan, editor of the Goderich Signal, printer of ballots, contractor under Farr, this Mr. Vance had charge of the campaign in West Huron. He has also figured as organizer in all the other campaigns. So far as the government is responsible for the conduct of the party it leads, it is responsible for Mr. Vance.

The able speech of Mr. Mills is to be circulated by wholesale. The senate has ordered a great many handbills to be printed and sent out for the general information of the public. It is a new departure to make a vote for the circulation of Hansard literature and Mr. Ferguson had some doubts whether the precedent might be inconvient. The next senator who makes a historical speech of an unlightening tendency may desire to unload a hundred thousand copies on an ignorant world at the expense of the treasury. On the other hand, Senator Primrose, Senator Glenow, Senator Gorman and other good conservatives were anxious to give Mr. Mills and his Transvaal speech a good send off, regardless of ultimate consequences. Senator Ferguson did not press his objections to a division or it is said they might have prevailed. So if there is any person who wants to know what happened in the Transvaal before the beginning of previously recorded history, he has only to communicate to the Hon. David Mills, the department of justice in Ottawa, without enclosing a stamp, and he will receive the desired information.

The railway subsidies were yesterday under discussion in the second reading of the bill. A long debate took place over the Edmonton line, and the subsidy to the company was the subject of a long speech. Sir Wilfrid Laurier meets all objection with the statement that the president, Mr. George McAvity, is a business man of very great wealth, who is sure to build any railway through the Rocky Mountains, but are sure to be a great benefit to the province with a view of transferring it to Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. Blair was asked whether some members of parliament were not concerned in this subsidy, and it was suggested to him that his son, and perhaps he himself, had some connection with the matter. He said he had no concern in the matter at all. He did not know who was in it. He did not know whether his son was connected with the company, but did not believe it could be proved positively on this question. Mr. Pugsley knew as a perfectly honorable and scrupulous man, but the minister had never done much business with him.

Mr. Blair was asked whether some members of parliament were not concerned in this subsidy, and it was suggested to him that his son, and perhaps he himself, had some connection with the matter. He said he had no concern in the matter at all. He did not know who was in it. He did not know whether his son was connected with the company, but did not believe it could be proved positively on this question. Mr. Pugsley knew as a perfectly honorable and scrupulous man, but the minister had never done much business with him.

Mr. Mills, minister of justice, is quite pleased with his Transvaal speech. The senate had only an hour and a half for the discussion of the resolution and the philosophical minister took up most of the time. His speech was five times as long as the whole discussion in the commons and ten times as elaborate. When Mr. Mills spoke on redistribution he began with the reign of Edward III. When he speaks on the Drummond railway he begins with the discovery of the steam engine. When he deals with the criminal code he goes back to the Draconian code. When he discusses constitutional law he begins with the glacial period. When he speaks on iron bounties he goes back to the stone age. The Transvaal speech does not go so far back. It takes up the question at the comparatively recent time of Vasco di Gama, who was reported to have circumnavigated the Cape of Good Hope several centuries ago. Passing by easy and deliberate stages down to the Dutch colonization, the establishment of British power in South Africa, the establishment of the Transvaal state, Mr. Mills makes a slight digression to deal with the infancy of Kruger, the discovery of gold and diamonds and various other incidental elements in the controversy. Then he gathered in all the threads of his discourse and discussed the Transvaal as it is and as it ought to be. Mr. Ferguson points out that there are large dis-

crepancies between the census returns and the facts stated by Mr. Mills. That, however, is a matter of small consequence so long as the ancient stories are right.

All this criticism might be justified far as the premier is concerned, if he had really given such an answer as is reported to an official invitation, but it is fair to the premier to acquit him of any such indecency. The fact is he had no official invitation either to himself or Lord Minto and therefore did not refuse one. In the quiet of his own home he talked perhaps a little more freely than would be wise except among intimate friends, and the remarks were really taken in the character of his audience.

The facts at the bottom of all the hubbub appear to be these. Mr. Fitzpatrick of the U. S. treasury department has a French-Canadian mother and one of his near relatives was at one time a law partner of the premier. When, therefore, the official visitor arrived and called upon Sir Wilfrid, explaining his origin, the premier took him to his home to heart. Mr. Fitzpatrick accepted Sir Wilfrid's hospitality and remained some days under his roof. Doubtless they talked over many things, and Sir Wilfrid has no reason to be ashamed of confiding that he is in his communications to parliament. What Mr. Fitzpatrick says may not be a verbatim report of a breakfast table conversation, but it is sufficient to make it impossible for the premier to give a contradiction. Why Sir Wilfrid should have thought it unwise for himself or the governor general to go to Chicago, or what possible reason he could have for opposing that Lord Minto would be treated uncivilly there, is a mystery. One would suppose that the time was quite opportune for the cultivation of social relations and the display of a neighborly feeling, which would be a most proper way of softening down any asperities there may be in the international relations.

But the premier certainly did not in his own mind announce his willingness to support an additional salary for the premier, which concession Senator Landry attributes to the fact that Sir Mackenzie is a premier himself and stands by his own order. But Sir Mackenzie is never expected to do so, and all or nearly all the senators who discussed the question object to the payment of an extra amount for last year. They say that the government should have brought in a bill last year which was intended to commence the payment of salaries at once. If the ministers were afraid to do that, they should now be afraid to charge up the back pay to the country. According to this reasoning there is no more reason why Mr. Paterson and Sir Henri Joly should receive \$7,000 a year during the period when the law authorized the payment of only \$5,000, than that Clarke Wallace and Mr. Prior should receive a similar present disguised as arrears.

A queer feature of this case is that a large number of grit members of parliament who voted for "the salary grab" have been besieging the senators to throw out the bill. It is rather unhandful for a member of parliament to vote for a bill and then try to kill it by this kind of treachery. But many unhandful things are done on this hill, and in this case there is a motive. The government is not allowing an extra indemnity to the members who have been five months here and who think they have earned \$1,500 better than the ministers earn \$8,000 in a year. The members have an idea that the ministers are taking very good care of themselves and not that of their supporters, and that some of the dissatisfied seem to have had an idea that if the senate should throw out the bill the extra vote for ministers would be put in the supply for not having relieved Mr. Tarte of this department, or giving him some easy, such as the portfolio of inland revenue, or trade and commerce, or state, or privy council. Since the public works department is responsible for more doubtful items of expenditure than any other, and must necessarily require more examination in supply, it will hardly do for a government to leave the department with an absent minister and then evade criticism by having no one in the house to explain how money is spent.

One thing seems to be certain, and that is that Sir Wilfrid and Lord Minto will now have to go to Chicago. They are certainly less willing to go than they would have been in the first instance, and the awkwardness and very largely careless remarks in regard to such Chicago eccentricities. But there is no escape for the prime minister. He must now square himself with the United States and the city of Chicago by taking the greatest possible interest in the fair, and especially in the corner stone. It will go hard with Sir Wilfrid if he cannot find among his sunny ways some process of persuading everybody concerned that he has had from the day of his birth a taste and overwhelming desire to attend the post office corner stone laying in the western metropolis. He will describe the event as the dream of his boyhood, the hope of his youth, the consuming desire of his mature years and the crowning felicity of his great career. No doubt he will come away leaving the people of Chicago under the impression that the silver trowel they gave him will be stored away in the most sacred place of his home, along with the Cobden Cup medal and the Saskatchewan musket.

Sir Henri Joly and Mr. Paterson had a fearful escape yesterday. While the minister of inland revenue was trying to work through the house a weight and measures bill with a particular clause providing that after the proclamation of the act no Canadian hen should lay eggs weighing less than eight to the pound. The clause was contemplating a proceeding which would have taken \$4,000 out of Sir Henri's pocket. Senator Miller had moved the six months' hold to the bill increasing the salaries of Mr. Paterson and Sir Henri, and only the vote of the speaker saved the minister from losing money enough to buy at least 30,000 dozen of the biggest eggs that can be purchased in his riding of Portneuf.

After all, the ministers could have found very little fault with Senator Miller and those who voted with him.

They only proposed to carry out the policy declared by Sir Wilfrid himself two years ago and at his request enacted into law. The act of 1887 provides that the salary of the ministers of customs and of inland revenue shall be \$5,000 a year, but the number of ministers is made less. Mr. Miller was asking the senate to sustain the decision then reached by the government and approved by both houses of parliament. But since two years ago the premier has changed his mind. He cannot get rid of the superfluous ministers. The three that have no work to do are anxious to stay in the government as those who give value for their money. He has not been able to persuade Sir Richard Cartwright, and even if he could there are about a dozen members crowding for the place. Mr. Fielding, who was very proud two years ago to be able to inform the senate that he had no work to do, has taken to reduce the cost of government, now says that this was "a mistake." Mr. Mills, who used to insist that it was not necessary for all parts of the government to be geographically represented in the cabinet, has changed his mind. He explained the change in a speech which began with the Premier, but stopped short of the main point. The only reason given for the change of opinion is the discovery of the Yukon.

Some reflections have been made to the effect that a secretary of state has no work to do. Senator Ferguson will not take the responsibility of showing that he has to be about eight ministers in the course of the summer when the others are amusing themselves on holiday tours. One day the secretary of state is minister of railways, the next day he is minister of finance, and minister of marine, minister of justice. He is everything that the law allows except premier and solicitor general. Instead of cutting down Mr. Mackenzie's salary it is suggested that each of the other ministers allow him \$1,000 a year out of their income and bring his salary up to about \$20,000.

Sir Mackenzie-Bowen is willing to allow the number of ministers to remain and the salaries to be raised. He voted against the Miller amendment, as did several other conservatives. The conservative leader in the senate has announced his willingness to support an additional salary for the premier, which concession Senator Landry attributes to the fact that Sir Mackenzie is a premier himself and stands by his own order. But Sir Mackenzie is never expected to do so, and all or nearly all the senators who discussed the question object to the payment of an extra amount for last year. They say that the government should have brought in a bill last year which was intended to commence the payment of salaries at once. If the ministers were afraid to do that, they should now be afraid to charge up the back pay to the country. According to this reasoning there is no more reason why Mr. Paterson and Sir Henri Joly should receive \$7,000 a year during the period when the law authorized the payment of only \$5,000, than that Clarke Wallace and Mr. Prior should receive a similar present disguised as arrears.

A queer feature of this case is that a large number of grit members of parliament who voted for "the salary grab" have been besieging the senators to throw out the bill. It is rather unhandful for a member of parliament to vote for a bill and then try to kill it by this kind of treachery. But many unhandful things are done on this hill, and in this case there is a motive. The government is not allowing an extra indemnity to the members who have been five months here and who think they have earned \$1,500 better than the ministers earn \$8,000 in a year. The members have an idea that the ministers are taking very good care of themselves and not that of their supporters, and that some of the dissatisfied seem to have had an idea that if the senate should throw out the bill the extra vote for ministers would be put in the supply for not having relieved Mr. Tarte of this department, or giving him some easy, such as the portfolio of inland revenue, or trade and commerce, or state, or privy council. Since the public works department is responsible for more doubtful items of expenditure than any other, and must necessarily require more examination in supply, it will hardly do for a government to leave the department with an absent minister and then evade criticism by having no one in the house to explain how money is spent.

One thing seems to be certain, and that is that Sir Wilfrid and Lord Minto will now have to go to Chicago. They are certainly less willing to go than they would have been in the first instance, and the awkwardness and very largely careless remarks in regard to such Chicago eccentricities. But there is no escape for the prime minister. He must now square himself with the United States and the city of Chicago by taking the greatest possible interest in the fair, and especially in the corner stone. It will go hard with Sir Wilfrid if he cannot find among his sunny ways some process of persuading everybody concerned that he has had from the day of his birth a taste and overwhelming desire to attend the post office corner stone laying in the western metropolis. He will describe the event as the dream of his boyhood, the hope of his youth, the consuming desire of his mature years and the crowning felicity of his great career. No doubt he will come away leaving the people of Chicago under the impression that the silver trowel they gave him will be stored away in the most sacred place of his home, along with the Cobden Cup medal and the Saskatchewan musket.

Sir Henri Joly and Mr. Paterson had a fearful escape yesterday. While the minister of inland revenue was trying to work through the house a weight and measures bill with a particular clause providing that after the proclamation of the act no Canadian hen should lay eggs weighing less than eight to the pound. The clause was contemplating a proceeding which would have taken \$4,000 out of Sir Henri's pocket. Senator Miller had moved the six months' hold to the bill increasing the salaries of Mr. Paterson and Sir Henri, and only the vote of the speaker saved the minister from losing money enough to buy at least 30,000 dozen of the biggest eggs that can be purchased in his riding of Portneuf.

After all, the ministers could have found very little fault with Senator Miller and those who voted with him.



Thrift people look for low cost and high value when buying soap. Surprise Soap is good hard, solid pure soap that makes its value. The price is low, 5 cents a cake. SURPRISE is the name of the soap.

therefore have saved some half a million dollars on the ten million pounds of twine they used, all of which went in the shape of profits to the contractors with whom the government dealt, and to the United States combine, which supplied more than half of the twine used in Canada.

The other day a supporter of the government boasted that under the present tariff the Farmers' Cordage company paid 60 per cent. dividend on its capital. This is a fine thing for the company, which departed from its original intention and is joining in the combine for high prices and big profits. But after all the farmer had to pay the bill. The government gets little profit, while other manufacturers gather in 40 per cent. The treasury loses the revenue that might have been collected. The twine imported displaces goods that ought to have been produced in Canada. And after all, the price paid by the horny-handed farmer is twice as high as it would be if the goods were sold at a fair margin of profit. However, the majority of parliament has sustained the action of the government, and the sale of binder twine in one lot to one person, leaving him free to combine with other operators and squeeze the farmer to the last extreme, is endorsed by the great liberal party as represented at Ottawa.

We have a clause in the tariff of which Mr. Fielding has done some tall boasting. This clause professes to protect the conditions that result in investment to unduly enhance prices. The law has never been enforced in any particular, and it is a singular commentary thereon that the most injurious combine of last year was the product of the government's industry at Kingston. If the government as a producer had got the benefit of the high prices, the gain would have come back to the taxpayer, but the benefit is given to the favorites to whom the product is sold, and who hold up the price at the expense of the consumer.

OTTAWA, Aug. 10.—Some of Mr. Tarte's business expenses were before the house yesterday. The committee got pretty well through supply and would have got through quite early in the day instead of at 3 o'clock this morning if Mr. Tarte had carried on his business in the regular way. But when a minister goes to peddling out contracts among family connections, he is likely to establish conditions that require investigation, especially when that minister is Mr. Tarte. Mr. McMillan says that Mr. Tarte is seriously ill and a long way off, and therefore the house should not be severe on his management. This does not mean that the members as good reasoning. Mr. Fielding has charge of the department of public works, as acting minister, and is responsible to the house for all that has been done in it. If Mr. Tarte is not able to do his department, it is to defend it, and if the acting minister has not been able to find out what the real minister has been doing, it is obvious that the premier is to blame for not having relieved Mr. Tarte of this department, or giving him some easy, such as the portfolio of inland revenue, or trade and commerce, or state, or privy council. Since the public works department is responsible for more doubtful items of expenditure than any other, and must necessarily require more examination in supply, it will hardly do for a government to leave the department with an absent minister and then evade criticism by having no one in the house to explain how money is spent.

In the matter of the dredging at Coteau, the explanation is simple. The members understand it very well. The facts are these: Mr. Tarte's son married the daughter of Mr. Gauthier, a real estate agent and broker in Montreal. Father-in-law Gauthier made the first advance. He ordered a dredging plant and never had anything to do with work of that kind. It was, therefore, a little startling when Mr. Tarte announced last year in the house that he had given the contract for dredging to this connection of his. Mr. Tarte explained that Mr. Gauthier had come to the department stating that he had an equipment for dredging and would take the contract at the regulation rate of eight dollars an hour. There is no such regulation rate; the proper and legal way of giving out dredging is to do it by tender and contract. But Mr. Tarte explained that eight dollars an hour was cheap, and that Mr. Gauthier's dredge would take out a thousand yards a day, so that the cost would be only eight cents a yard. Since then additional light has been thrown on the matter. A return brought down shows that Mr. Tarte made the first advance. He ordered a letter to be written to Mr. Gauthier offering him eight dollars an hour to dredge at Coteau. Mr. Gauthier replied stating that he would accept the price and was provided with an equipment.

What Mr. Gauthier did was to go to a certain Mr. McDonald who is a contractor and ordinary product outside of the combine it could not only have furnished the farmers with this 600 tons at some 8 or 9 cents a pound retail, but could have kept the price of the imported product down to the same figure. The farmers would

attention completed \$40,000 of doubtless turned over. The additional light cost Mr. Tarte cents a yard did the v have done same price chance to this \$10,000 in order for the hangers made last will all has been eration, probably well by d as by the fath

Mr. McMillan says that Mr. Tarte is seriously ill and a long way off, and therefore the house should not be severe on his management. This does not mean that the members as good reasoning. Mr. Fielding has charge of the department of public works, as acting minister, and is responsible to the house for all that has been done in it. If Mr. Tarte is not able to do his department, it is to defend it, and if the acting minister has not been able to find out what the real minister has been doing, it is obvious that the premier is to blame for not having relieved Mr. Tarte of this department, or giving him some easy, such as the portfolio of inland revenue, or trade and commerce, or state, or privy council. Since the public works department is responsible for more doubtful items of expenditure than any other, and must necessarily require more examination in supply, it will hardly do for a government to leave the department with an absent minister and then evade criticism by having no one in the house to explain how money is spent.

Yesterd upon that Mr. Nearly e controlled leson. E were pro of the pcess is ment. T Yukon ar there is a right of explain it committee of what I during the come out, beforehand accordanc The bank night or leson is these five sent a pa Fielding over the explain it an ex A right of the fact in three he could Mear, will money, bil unutilized bank of that his d themselves searching

This M of Mr. T to those study the crime in corruption. Mr. Char as soon as he was p tion that sired. At rector of in his g magnifice ncy, he should rivers, 10 lines and that usu knowledge great in subline careles of book- and a d and lette man for gther in comes h great ad self con Blair. E attaches worth all