The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1877.

NOTICE.

Subscribers are reminded that the coloured address label of each paper sent them shows a figure which indicates that future number of the paper to which their subscription has been paid, serving, in fact, as a date. The current weekly number can readily be ascertained by reference to the volume and number printed on the title page.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Subscribers to the *Weekly Mail*, a paper already affording more reading matter than any other weekly published in Canada, may for the future rely on an extended report of Parliamentary proceedings appearing in our columns. Beautiful new bright type, smaller than that hitherto used for Parliamentary reporting, has been procured, and while the added difficulty of reading will not be increased, the amount of matter which we are able to provide in this department of the paper will be doubled.

There is more news and reading matter in the broadsheet of the *Weekly Mail* than in any of the new-fangled weeklies, some of which are printed in shape purposely intended to mislead the public as to the quantity of their contents. The *Weekly Mail* costs only $1.50 per annum for a single copy, and is supplied at much lower rates to clubs and Agents. Send for terms and specimen. An energetic man can get up a club of weekly subscribers in one day, which will give him the *Daily Mail* GRATIS, or a cash bonus as he may prefer.

The full news and gossip of the week are interspersed with tales and agricultural information of inestimable value to farmers and others. If you would be abreast of the times and know what is going on in the world take

THE WEEKLY MAIL.

MR. MACKENZIE AT KINGSTON.

TROUGH no doubt occasion will be taken by prominent men in the Conservative ranks to reply at length, before the people, to the speeches of the double-combination which commenced its exhibitions at Kingston last week, it is incumbent upon us, brief though our references must necessarily be, to correct at once some of the gross misstatements of the leaders of the "show." Mr. MACKENZIE calls for some attention to-day.

Any one who recalled Mr. MACKENZIE's speeches on former occasions, would (were he a betting man) have wagered any amount that he would talk about the burning of the Parliament Buildings at Montreal, Lord Elgin, hoisting the black flag at Brockville, and the Pacific Scandal. We can only say of all that sort of talk, "if it pleases she it don't hurt I." We are quite willing to give him a monopoly of all the capital he can make out of it, simply remarking that we have a very strong belief that the public mind is set upon matters of more recent date and more immediate interest.

Mr. MACKENZIE tells us he has always tried to make party warfare more respectable. A greater piece of mendacity could not be uttered. He did declare, certainly, that it would be his business to carry his professional and principles into the Government with him, and that there he would labour to elevate the standard of public morality. Is any honest man say he has done either? There is no man in Parliament whose language is coarser or more insulting than Mr. MACKENZIE. His perversion of facts has become notorious. Will the reader recall the Frederickton speech of two years ago? Mr. DONVILLE, who was in possession of the facts from outside sources, asked Mr. MACKENZIE if the lament if the Government had sold any of the Ordnance lands in Frederickton. Mr. MACKENZIE replied with an emphatic no, though at the very time he was making the denial he had not only been a party to the passage of an Orders-in-Council selling the land to some members of the BURPEE ring, but the money had actually been paid, and the receipt therefor given to the purchasers. Mr. PICKARD, one of the interested parties, told the whole story afterwards, declared in the face of Parliament and of the Premier that he had the receipt in his pocket, and that he would keep the Government to the bargain. Several times Mr. MACKENZIE was challenged in Parliament to state the facts of the case, but flippantly refused to do so. He followed him to call the attention to some members of the BURPEE ring, but the money had actually been paid, the receipt therefor given to the purchasers. Mr. PICKARD, one of the interested parties, told the whole story afterwards, declared in the face of Parliament and of the Premier that he had the receipt in his pocket, and that he would keep the Government to the bargain. Several times Mr. MACKENZIE was challenged in Parliament to state the facts of the case, but flippantly refused to do so. He followed up such an acknowledgment of helplessness.

His steel rails bungling, involving an immediate loss to the Dominion of $1,500,000, or a loss for all time of $75,000 a year, Mr. MACKENZIE meets with his usual boldness and recklessness of statement. "Then again," he says, "as to "the purchase of steel rails without tenders, and as to the charge that his "brother was interested in one of the "contracts; tenders were asked for all "the steel rails obtained, and there was "no reason, if it were true, why his "brother should not have put in a tender "if he desired to do so. But it was not "true; it was a deliberate falsehood and "a cowardly attempt to stab the reputation of a public man." We make no attempt to discuss here a question which has so many ramifications of corruption, and which would require columns to expose. Let not Mr. MACKENZIE go too much upon the comparative immunity with which he has so far escaped Parliamentary enquiry on this subject. He will get his fill of it yet; and we venture to think that even he will find it necessary to use words which are not quite so emphatic as those we have just quoted. The evidence now before the public shows that his statement as to his brother is utterly untrue. CHARLES MACKENZIE was a partner in the firm of COOPER, FAIRMAN, & Co. for a very considerable time after they were favoured by Mr. MACKENZIE with steel rails purchases. We put a few questions to Mr. MACKENZIE, and ask him for a plain, straightforward reply. Is he aware, is it is a fact, that prior to the steel rails purchases, the firm of COOPER, FAIRMAN, & Co. made representations to a Mercantile Agency which, if they did not absolutely declare the firm to be in insolvent condition, proved it to be in a very and state financially? Is he aware, or is it a fact, that when Mr. CHARLES MACKENZIE went out of the firm, after it had entered into a contract with the Government for the supply of steel rails, he received from the firm of Cooper, Fairman, & Co. the sum of $10,000 or thereabouts? We think Mr. MACKENZIE is in possession of information on these points. We wait in the hope that he will fully give it to the public. That he accepted the lowest tender, as he "insinuates, rather than asserts," we declare to be a gross misrepresentation. That in various ways he favoured the firm of COOPER, FAIRMAN, & Co. we affirm to be a fact susceptible of the plainest proof. And, to these observations we but add one more at present, that at the time Mr. MACKENZIE was purchasing two millions and a half worth of steel rails in a falling market, Mr. BURPEE was penning an official report in which he declared that no prudent man would have our hand rails at such a time. This one transaction, so plainly stamped with corruption throughout, ought to be enough to drive any man, its perpetrator, out of public life.

There are steel rails and steel rails. Just like his organs, Mr. MACKENZIE falls back upon Mr. CARVELL's purchases for the intercolonial railway. We had occasion to review this matter not long since, and we must say that with the facts which are known to the Premier we stand in utter amazement that even he would dare to use such language as this: "The last "few months, they [the old Government] "were in office they purchased rails "enough, and through a brother-in-law "of a then Minister, 6,000 tons of steel "rails, and on them the last day of the "Minister received two and a half per "cent. commission. In addition to that "they changed the Government specifications "entering more per ton for the rail than "he paid the manufacturer. Since he "has come into office he has not even "instituted legal proceedings against "that man for the amount of the overcharge, and already they had recovered "over £4,000. Another suit was pending, and it would undoubtedly result "in favour of the Government for more "than £5,000. The late Government "paid $85 per ton for rails." Mr. MACKENZIE and his organs talk about misstatements in others; here we have misstatements of the most infamous character. The man who could so degrade his office as to be guilty of uttering the words we have quoted places himself beyond the pale of belief in respect of any statement he may make. "The last few "months they were in office they purchased, without tender, and through "a brother-in-law of a then Minister, "6,000 tons of steel rails." In these few words there are three untruths, and Mr. MACKENZIE knows them to be untruths. The late Government did not make the purchases, the purchases which are referred to were not made within the last few months the late Government were in office; and the quantity purchased before the resignation of the late Government was not one-half the amount by Mr. MACKENZIE. The 6,000 tons of rails referred to were purchased by Mr. CARVELL, at the time superintendent of the Maritime Intercolonial Railway. He had absolute authority to purchase all supplies for the railways, as Mr. BURPEE has done for the Intercolonial Railway. In his testimony before a Committee of the House of Commons Mr. CARVELL gave the fullest and most plenary powers in this respect, and added that no Minister knew anything of his purchases of rails. That evidence he took to prevent one who has as many brothers as Mr. MACKENZIE insinuating that Mr. CARVELL's relation to a late Minister has anything to do with his transactions in rails. But the important question is as to the time the purchases were made. Mr. MACKENZIE says they were made in the last few months the late Government was in office. Now, here is the facts as told before the Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry by Mr. BURPEE, a Government officer:—"Purchases of rail roads "were made in 1873 and 1874 amounting altogether to 6,000 tons. In 1873, "500 tons were purchased from the "Ebbw Vale Co. and charged for at "£16 12s. per ton, delivered at Liverpool. "In the same year 2,000 tons were purchased from GUEST & Co. and invoiced "to the Government, and paid for by "them at £17 per ton, delivered at Liverpool. *In 1874 two lots were purchased—one of 1,750 tons from the Merseys Steel and Iron Co., and a similar quantity from Bolckow "Vaughan, & Co.*" Mr. MACKENZIE says the late Government purchased 6,000 tons. Mr. BURPEE affirms that *3,500 tons, or more than one-half the quantity, was purchased before Mr. MACKENZIE came into office!* It is not material here to enquire whether Mr. CARVELL was acting for or against, when he was dealing with Mr. MACKENZIE's statement, and out of the mouth of the General Manager of the Intercolonial Railway, a high officer of the Government, we have no difficulty in proving that it is a false statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE touched on the FOSTER rails matter. There had been a considerable flow and ebb of Government favour the fact that he had loaned Mr. FOSTER some of the rails he had paid him a sweet sum for, and that he had kept them for a short time. Now, we ask, what is the fact? The value of the loaned rails was only $8,000, and he had security for the very value of the amount he had taken. The looks very plausible; and it would be a capital reply only that it lacks the essential element of truth. The loaned rails Mr. FOSTER was allowed "to borrow"—in other words take undue as he likes—and "to return" Mr. FOSTER knew that he was master, and not Mr. MACKENZIE, and so he walked off with 227 tons. Mr. MACKENZIE, by the terms of the FOSTER contract for the Canada Central Railway, was limited in his payments to the contractor to three-fourths the value of the rails laid on the line of railway. He paid Mr. FOSTER $48 per ton for rails; full price; which left the rails (iron rails be it remembered) as dumped down ten miles from the Canada Central Station, worth $60 per ton. Now, as Mr. FOSTER walked off with 227 tons, a simple calculation shows that he carried away from Dominion property worth $13,620, not $8,000 as stated by Mr. MACKENZIE. But, as the premier seems to be in "consequence, haven't the Government "got $30,000 worth of bonds as security?" It wouldn't be of much consequence if the bonds were worth $30,000, or half the sum. When Mr. MACKENZIE was interrogated in the Public Accounts Committee as to their value, he said he didn't know they were worth a dollar. We believe they are not worth a dollar. Just as Mr. MACKENZIE took Mr. FOSTER himself—without inquiring into the financial standing, though required by the law to have done so—he took these rails without, he knows to-day that they are worthless, or next to worthless, and yet he stands upon a public platform and insinuates that the honesty of this Dominion that he holds $30,000 of security! And this is the man who talks about his opponents and his opponents, and alleges that it has always been his desire to make party warfare in Canada respectable! Oh Sancta Simplicitas, thy name is hypocrisy, and ALEXANDER MACKENZIE is its personification!

Sir JOHN MACDONALD having stated that Mr. MACKENZIE's majority in the House of Commons had dwindled from 101 to 45, Mr. MACKENZIE rises to correct the Opposition leader. He says he never had a majority of over 76, and that he still has 52. We wonder he would have dared to have told the Premier in the early part of February, 1874, that he had a majority of but 76, would have received a very pointed reply. Only after day the claim was made that his majority was over 100, and no doubt it was. The *Globe*, on the 16th February, showed there were only a few constituencies in British Columbia to be heard from, classified the members elect thus:

Ministerial	149
Opposition	41
Independent	1

Even if every one of the Independents had gone with the Opposition, Mr. MACKENZIE's majority would still have been over 100—101, as stated by SIR JOHN MACDONALD. Mr. MACKENZIE surely does not want to fasten a lie upon his organ. It is quite true that he may never have had a large majority, say 100 in any division, but that was because the House was not full at any time when a division was taken. The House was ready, however, had they been wanted, for an emergency—which, with such a majority, could not arise.

Mr. MACKENZIE endeavours to establish his point as to his majority now and then by alleging that the Conservatives have gained but 13 seats, while the "Reformers" have gained 4. The difference between the two would make 18 on a division. Mr. MACKENZIE is wrong in his figures. We do not see how he makes out that the Grits have gained four seats. Probably he counts Provencher, but surely he does not put down as a supporter of the Government (and we feel very confident that our statement is correct, though we shall be happy to have it put right if it is not) have only gained two seats since 1874—Argenteuil, where Dr. CHRISTIE sits in Mr. ABBOTT's place, and Montmorency, where Mr. DEVLIN succeeded Mr. M. F. RYAN. If there is another one we have failed to discover it. The Opposition gains were 16, not 13. We have to admit that the Conservative Party was deserted as to one of these 16 men, Mr. GREENWAY, of South Huron, but in our case Mr. MACKENZIE cannot count him as a gain to his side, for his Party held South Huron before Mr. GREENWAY's election in the person of Mr. MALCOLM COLIN CAMERON. The Opposition have made the following undoubted gains, viz.:

Bellechasse—Blanchet, *vice* Fournier, elected to the Senate.
Berthier—Cuthbert, *vice* Paquet, made Senator.
Chambly—Benoit, *vice* Jodoin, disqualified.
Charlevoix—Langevin, *vice* Tremblay, unseated.
Kamouraska—Roy, *vice* Pelletier, elevated to the Senate.
London—Fraser, *vice* Walker, disqualified.
S. Norfolk—Wallace, *vice* Stuart, unseated.
N. Ontario—W. H. Gibbs, *vice* Gordon, deceased.
S. Ontario—T. N. Gibbs, *vice* Cameron, deceased.
Queen's (P.E.I.)—Pope, *vice* Laird, made Governor.
E. Toronto—Platt, *vice* O'Donohoe, unseated.
W. Toronto—Robinson, *vice* Moss, elevated to the Bench.
Two Mountains—Daoust, *vice* Prevost.
Victoria (N.S.)—Campbell, *vice* Tremaine, made County Judge.
Victoria (Ont.)—Cameron, *vice* Maclennan, unseated.

The gain to the Opposition from a change in the political complexion of the constituencies was 15, not 9, or 26 in a division, not 18. Besides this change of seats there are several members of the House who were returned to sap ort the Government who now vote steadily with the Opposition, and a number of others who vote with them occasionally. Mr. MACKENZIE's figures are, like the rest of his speech, not correct.

Having taken up the Opposition's charges of debt, Mr. MACKENZIE makes an attack upon them in bulk. There is nothing in fact they would not do. One day they tell Sir FRANCIS HINCKS was steeped to the lips in corruption, and the next day they took him into the Cabinet. Mr. MACKENZIE should avoid suggesting so plainly the character of his own menagerie. The animals did not always constitute a happy family. Didn't the Grits say of Mr. CAUCHON that his corruptions were rank and smelt to Heaven, and that for his many crimes he should have been hanged? Yet to-day he is their colleague, highly honoured and elevated in office! Purity sounds strangely in the mouths of these unanimous corruptionists. Perjured and unscrupulous they are to a degree.

THE SCRATCH-ME-AND-I'LL-SCRATCH-YOU POLICY.

The interested reader of political events will readily recall the difficulty Mr. ADAM CROOKS had in finding a seat in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario after his crushing defeat in Toronto. For many months he endeared about, seeking rest and finding none. Finally, as the session approached, Mr. ADAM OLIVER made way for him in North Oxford. Mr. OLIVER had thereby established a claim. Kamanistiquia tells the story of his reward. But, with refreshing *nonchalance*, the organ of the two Governments which are now hunting in couples asks us to believe that Premier MR. OLIVER did a favour to Messrs. MOWAT and CROOKS that is no reason whatever why he should be considered by Mr. MACKENZIE. People generally will think the reverse, and say it is a most substantial reason. The fact that Mr. OLIVER resigned favour from Mr. MACKENZIE is a proof that both Mr. MACKENZIE and Mr. MOWAT have claims upon him. The Premier declares that for the two Governments to work together is a circumstance fraught with public advantage. We think it would be a thing to be frowned down. Exactly what they condemned others for doing they are now doing themselves. The facts are established in the present case, we have a right to call upon Reformers to discard the party that have proved so untrue to their professions.

For Mr. OLIVER and Mr. MACKENZIE, Kamanistiquia has nothing but praise. "O, "but it's quite a little thing. Mr. "OLIVER was interested in the Kamanis-"tiquia job only to the extent of "$3,000." This is plainly an equivocation. Mr. OLIVER may appear on the records of the Government as having received only $3,000 from the Dominion Government. But the organ withholds the fact that Mr. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE appeared beneficiary by the transaction, is a partner of OLIVER'S. Between them they have made a handsome job out of this Kamanistiquia affair; and the public will readily come to the conclusion that a London hackney coachman would have been better for Fort William to value the lands, and that such exorbitant sums would not have been paid to MESSRS. OLIVER and DAVIDSON, but for the excellent understanding which subsists between the Ottawa Government and the Government of Ontario.

Turn about, too, is fair play. In the Kamanistiquia job we find Mr. MACKENZIE coming to the aid of Messrs. MOWAT and CROOKS. It is now Mr. MACKENZIE's turn to help his friend Mr. MACKENZIE; and he has certainly given evidence of his desire to live up to the terms of the compact. All the world knows how nobly Mr. G. W. ROSS, member for West Middlesex in the House of Commons, helped Mr. MACKENZIE out by hunting the Temperance people on the Prohibition question. His one great object in Parliament, for the past three years, would appear to have been to prevent the Prohibition question from being brought squarely before the House of Commons. Such dirty work as this drew largely on the self-sacrificing part of Mr. ROSS's character. Necessarily his conscience with humbuggery must have affected his popularity among the people whom he so grossly deceived. But there is a way out of almost every wound of this kind. And Mr. ROSS has received *his solatium*. Though the Independent Parliamentary Reporter has not stood in the way of Mr. MACKENZIE bribing a great many members of the House of Commons, he could not give a member an office to which is attached a stated salary. But there was nothing to prevent Mr. MOWAT giving Mr. ROSS an office and a good salary; and as Mr. MACKENZIE had rewarded OLIVER for his devotion to the Party, Mr. MOWAT rewards ROSS for his noble act of self-sacrifice, by appointing him Inspector of Teachers' Institutes and Normal Schools in Ontario. It is a delightful bit of double shuffle, which sets upon a pinnacle, so high up that all mankind may see it, the transparent hypocrisy with which government is carried on in the Dominion and Ontario by Messrs. MACKENZIE and MOWAT.

THE PICNIC AT MARKHAM.

The picnic at Markham was one of the most successful ever held. Markham is a place that does not, perhaps, generally regard as the Garden of Canada, and any one who attended the picnic on Wednesday must have been struck by the character of those who trooped in to hear and see the speakers, but especially Sir JOHN MACDONALD. Every eye was eloquent of sincerity. There were hundreds present who could remember when not a man about had a buggy or a carriage. Now every farmer drove on to the ground with a neat trap, and there were more than one handsome turnout which might be driven in Central Park or in Rotten Row. The horses were remarkably fine; well bred and well fed and well kept. The farmers themselves formed a most intelligent assembly, and their cheerful, contented, happy, enlightened faces and symmetrical shoulders, like everything else, evidence of their prosperity. The way the arches were built and the speeches were delivered showed the people was perhaps exceptional in the indication not only of enthusiasm but of humour. Mr. MACKENZIE assumed that his steel rails would not rust remained one of the farmers of an answer of a man young lady of Markham who asking as to her department in Toronto when it was crowded with military and the sleighing was good: "Take care how you "cross the street lest you should be "knocked down," was the advice of a Markham Politician. "Do you think any "horse would dare run over me?" was the indignant reply. Equally ludicrous was the Prime Minister's statement that his rails would not rust, nor could anything have been more effective than the suspension of a rusty rail and the legend underneath—"Steel rails *will* rust." Steel rails have never read GREENFIELD. They have not the least politeness. Whether Reformers who can't reform or Conservatives who can both reform and conserve are in power the question of oxidation will go forward. Mr. MACKENZIE at a picnic may charm the people of Canada, for who could resist

"He pretty pert provoking ways,
"Dear Jenny thinks he's no end of."

His delicate humour and heroic power of assertion may do much with humanity. But steel rails? Oh, rust, rust, as the farmers of Markham assure us.

Very noticeable, too, was the intelligent attention with which the audience followed or, so to say, took part in the discussion of the events of the day. There are few more pleasant or more gratifying sights could be witnessed. Here was an audience of some five or six thousand people, composed of old man grey-headed men of ninety and ninety-six years of age, middle-aged men and women, and young girls—all of them with "erected ears," as the chairman would say, and their attention suspended on the lips of the speakers. Mr. CAMERON spoke with great force and humour and put his points with a clearness that could not be misapprehended and the other speakers were persuasive and gained their hearers' applause. But when Sir JOHN MACDONALD rose it was evident that the one object the crowd came for was to hear and see "Sir JOHN," or "JOHN A." as he was called on one of mottoes, and "MAC" as some affectionate Conservatives in the crowd ventured to speak of him. Sir JOHN MACDONALD's relation to the field of popularity is "Eclipse first and all the rest nowhere." This is partly owing to the fact that he has been so long before the public; partly to the unjust attacks on him which have created a revulsion, but chiefly to his amazing magnetism, his *bonhomie*, his ready wit, and extraordinary power of identifying himself with his audience. He has not been seen to be compared to DISRAELI. An Englishman who was present at Markham said he reminded him more of Lord PALMERSTON, and in Sir JOHN's manner (we do not speak of his appearance) addressing a popular audience or the Assembly at Ottawa there is a greater similarity to the genial capable man who "ripe in his spring and in his autumn "green"—was the heart of the English people, than to any other English statesman. In extensive knowledge, in good humour, in strong sense, Lord PALMERSTON and Sir JOHN may be compared.

In no respect, however, could the parallel be so thoroughly made as in genuine sympathy for the poor. The friend of the working man is a character in which both appeared to the popular imagination. A beautiful incident is recorded of Lord PALMERSTON during the agitation for the protection of the factory workers. Some operatives were received at Lord PALMERSTON's home and in his own drawing-room showed him by practical experiment how grinding was the toil of the poor factory children. One of the operating-wheel chairs was used as a "spinning mule," Lord PALMERSTON helping to set it in motion. The child had the little girl seated to the poor children, he gave benefaction all his weight to the cause Lord ASHLEY (the present Lord SHAFTESBURY) had at heart. Cannot the reader fancy Sir JOHN MACDONALD giving an example of the same quiet and impulsive generosity? Lord PALMERSTON loved a contest with an interrupter. There was one interrupter at Markham, but after a long and furious battle he left the field. Purity sounds strangely in the mouths of these unanimous corruptionists. Perjured and unscrupulous they are to a degree.

THE SCRATCH-ME-AND-I'LL-SCRATCH-YOU POLICY.

Mr. MOWAT was received by the Markham people with a cordiality and a heartiness that must have been very gratifying to him. Mr. OLIVER did a favour to Messrs. MOWAT and CROOKS that is no reason whatever why he should be considered by Mr. MACKENZIE. People generally will think the reverse, and say it is a most substantial reason. The fact that Mr. OLIVER resigned favour from Mr. MACKENZIE is a proof that both Mr. MACKENZIE and Mr. MOWAT have claims upon him. The Premier declares that for the two Governments to work together is a circumstance fraught with public advantage. We think it would be a thing to be frowned down. Exactly what they condemned others for doing they are now doing themselves. The facts are established in the present case, we have a right to call upon Reformers to discard the party that have proved so untrue to their professions.

For Mr. OLIVER and Mr. MACKENZIE, Kamanistiquia has nothing but praise. "O, "but it's quite a little thing. Mr. "OLIVER was interested in the Kamanis-"tiquia job only to the extent of "$3,000." This is plainly an equivocation. Mr. OLIVER may appear on the records of the Government as having received only $3,000 from the Dominion Government. But the organ withholds the fact that Mr. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE appeared beneficiary by the transaction, is a partner of OLIVER'S. Between them they have made a handsome job out of this Kamanistiquia affair; and the public will readily come to the conclusion that a London hackney coachman would have been better for Fort William to value the lands, and that such exorbitant sums would not have been paid to MESSRS. OLIVER and DAVIDSON, but for the excellent understanding which subsists between the Ottawa Government and the Government of Ontario.

Turn about, too, is fair play. In the Kamanistiquia job we find Mr. MACKENZIE coming to the aid of Messrs. MOWAT and CROOKS. It is now Mr. MACKENZIE's turn to help his friend Mr. MACKENZIE; and he has certainly given evidence of his desire to live up to the terms of the compact. All the world knows how nobly Mr. G. W. ROSS, member for West Middlesex in the House of Commons, helped Mr. MACKENZIE out by hunting the Temperance people on the Prohibition question. His one great object in Parliament, for the past three years, would appear to have been to prevent the Prohibition question from being brought squarely before the House of Commons. Such dirty work as this drew largely on the self-sacrificing part of Mr. ROSS's character. Necessarily his conscience with humbuggery must have affected his popularity among the people whom he so grossly deceived. But there is a way out of almost every wound of this kind. And Mr. ROSS has received *his solatium*. Though the Independent Parliamentary Reporter has not stood in the way of Mr. MACKENZIE bribing a great many members of the House of Commons, he could not give a member an office to which is attached a stated salary. But there was nothing to prevent Mr. MOWAT giving Mr. ROSS an office and a good salary; and as Mr. MACKENZIE had rewarded OLIVER for his devotion to the Party, Mr. MOWAT rewards ROSS for his noble act of self-sacrifice, by appointing him Inspector of Teachers' Institutes and Normal Schools in Ontario. It is a delightful bit of double shuffle, which sets upon a pinnacle, so high up that all mankind may see it, the transparent hypocrisy with which government is carried on in the Dominion and Ontario by Messrs. MACKENZIE and MOWAT.

THE PICNIC AT MARKHAM.

The picnic at Markham was one of the most successful ever held. Markham is a place that does not, perhaps, generally regard as the Garden of Canada, and any one who attended the picnic on Wednesday must have been struck by the character of those who trooped in to hear and see the speakers, but especially Sir JOHN MACDONALD. Every eye was eloquent of sincerity. There were hundreds present who could remember when not a man about had a buggy or a carriage. Now every farmer drove on to the ground with a neat trap, and there were more than one handsome turnout which might be driven in Central Park or in Rotten Row. The horses were remarkably fine; well bred and well fed and well kept. The farmers themselves formed a most intelligent assembly, and their cheerful, contented, happy, enlightened faces and symmetrical shoulders, like everything else, evidence of their prosperity. The way the arches were built and the speeches were delivered showed the people was perhaps exceptional in the indication not only of enthusiasm but of humour. Mr. MACKENZIE assumed that his steel rails would not rust remained one of the farmers of an answer of a man young lady of Markham who asking as to her department in Toronto when it was crowded with military and the sleighing was good: "Take care how you "cross the street lest you should be "knocked down," was the advice of a Markham Politician. "Do you think any "horse would dare run over me?" was the indignant reply. Equally ludicrous was the Prime Minister's statement that his rails would not rust, nor could anything have been more effective than the suspension of a rusty rail and the legend underneath—"Steel rails *will* rust." Steel rails have never read GREENFIELD. They have not the least politeness. Whether Reformers who can't reform or Conservatives who can both reform and conserve are in power the question of oxidation will go forward. Mr. MACKENZIE at a picnic may charm the people of Canada, for who could resist

"He pretty pert provoking ways,
"Dear Jenny thinks he's no end of."

His delicate humour and heroic power of assertion may do much with humanity. But steel rails? Oh, rust, rust, as the farmers of Markham assure us.

Very noticeable, too, was the intelligent attention with which the audience followed or, so to say, took part in the discussion of the events of the day. There are few more pleasant or more gratifying sights could be witnessed. Here was an audience of some five or six thousand people, composed of old man grey-headed men of ninety and ninety-six years of age), middle-aged men and women, and young girls—all of them with "erected ears," as the chairman would say, and their attention suspended on the lips of the speakers. Mr. CAMERON spoke with great force and humour and put his points with a clearness that could not be misapprehended and the other speakers were persuasive and gained their hearers' applause. But when Sir JOHN MACDONALD rose it was evident that the one object the crowd came for was to hear and see "Sir JOHN," or "JOHN A." as he was called on one of mottoes, and "MAC" as some affectionate Conservatives in the crowd ventured to speak of him. Sir JOHN MACDONALD's relation to the field of popularity is "Eclipse first and all the rest nowhere." This is partly owing to the fact that he has been so long before the public; partly to the unjust attacks on him which have created a revulsion, but chiefly to his amazing magnetism, his *bonhomie*, his ready wit, and extraordinary power of identifying himself with his audience. He has not been compared to DISRAELI. An Englishman who was present at Markham said he reminded him more of Lord PALMERSTON, and in Sir JOHN's manner (we do not speak of his appearance) addressing a popular audience or the Assembly at Ottawa there is a greater similarity to the genial capable man who "ripe in his spring and in his autumn "green"—was the heart of the English people, than to any other English statesman. In extensive knowledge, in good humour, in strong sense, Lord PALMERSTON and Sir JOHN may be compared.

In no respect, however, could the parallel be so thoroughly made as in genuine sympathy for the poor. The friend of the working man is a character in which both appeared to the popular imagination. A beautiful incident is recorded of Lord PALMERSTON during the agitation for the protection of the factory workers. Some operatives were received at Lord PALMERSTON's home and in his own drawing-room showed him by practical experiment how grinding was the toil of the poor factory children. One of the operating-wheel chairs was used as a "spinning mule," Lord PALMERSTON helping to set it in motion. The child had the little girl seated to the poor children, he gave benefaction all his weight to the cause Lord ASHLEY (the present Lord SHAFTESBURY) had at heart. Cannot the reader fancy Sir JOHN MACDONALD giving an example of the same quiet and impulsive generosity? Lord PALMERSTON loved a contest with an interrupter. There was one interrupter at Markham, but after a long and furious battle he left the field. Purity sounds strangely in the mouths of these unanimous corruptionists. Perjured and unscrupulous they are to a degree.

SUMMARY OF NEWS.

BY ALLAN STEAMER.

From Liverpool, June 21st.

THE BRADLAUGH PROSECUTION.

This case, reported at great length in the London papers, has come to a conclusion. After the evidence had been concluded, proving the sale of the "Fruits of Philosophy," and the addresses of counsel, counting chiefly on the law and the facts of the public morals, Mr. Bradlaugh addressed the Court in a long and able address for the defence. They argued that not one sentence in the pamphlet was directed against marriage, and that the subjects in question were discussed quite as fully and less delicately in "Carpenter's Physiology," a book placed in the hands of boys and girls. The Judge, the Recorder who charged the Grand Jury against the publication of the pamphlet, and Lord Chief Justice Interposed, observing that the Solicitor-General's contention was almost in accordance with the law, it was unnecessary in a book for the public, and that the subjects were treated in a medical manner, the contention amounted to this, that a rich lady might obtain from her physician knowledge which it was criminal to communicate to the poor, to whom it was denied by the high priests of the profession. Mrs. Besant, deposed that she had examined the book, and considered it fit for medical students and for a wife, and that she did not consider there was anything prurient in the work. Mr. Bradlaugh, pathetically argued that if medical and other medical books, stated he had never restricted their circulation, the Bible might be burned, he urged that the scope of the book which, in the assumed interests of poor people, unable to procure medical advice for their large population, was contrary to the law of God and the law of man, and if the Jury thought choose to circulate a work of that kind, which he contended was an obscene book, they ought to be condemned by any jury before whom it was brought. It was a dirty and a filthy book, and no decently trained English husband would allow his wife or daughter to read it, and it was not right to be sold in the streets of London, where young people could buy it. The Lord Chief Justice, in summing up the case to the jury, said there was one point in which he thought every one should up and ran into the yard. Some little time, however, had elapsed in quarrelling with the dog, and he had knocked at the door