The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1877.

NOTICE.

Subscribers are reminded that the coloured address label of each paper sent to them shows a figure which indicates that future number of the paper up 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 actual 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 a shape purposely intended to mislead the public as to the quantity of their contents.

The *Weekly Mail* costs only $1.00 per annum for a single copy, and is supplied at much lower rates to clubs and agents. Send for terms and prospectus. 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 up abreast of the times and know what is going on in the world take

THE WEEKLY MAIL.

ONTARIO IMMIGRATION.

The session being nicely over, the chief Departmental reports are now being submitted to the country by the industrious, active and profoundly vigorous Administration of which Mr. MOWAT is the head. The Immigration report for 1876 is to hand, and probably by Easter we shall have the Public Accounts.

The number of immigrants who settled in the Province last year was 11,432, composed as follows:

English	5,722
Scotch	1,356
Irish	1,266
German	654
Other countries	2,734
	11,432

The expenditure for the year was $45,563.

The following is a statement of the number of immigrants settled in Ontario since 1871:

1871	25,842
1872	36,139
1873	39,184
1874	25,146
1875	17,655
1876	11,432

The expenditure has been as follows:

1871	$29,712
1872	57,750
1873	159,176
1874	154,640
1875	94,060
1876	45,563

Hence the *per capita* cost of each immigrant has been as follows:

1871	$1 15
1872	2 02
1873	4 06
1874	6 12
1875	5 33
1876	3 99

The year 1871, when the *per capita* cost was only $1.15, was the last Liberal year, and extravagant years of Mr. SANDFIELD MACDONALD.

THE GODERICH HARBOUR WORKS.

THE return in reference to these works which has just been brought down to Parliament, is both interesting and instructive. In the session of 1874 tenders for the works were invited by the Public Works Department. The amount of the highest tender was $301,185; of the lowest $182,630. The first four on the list were as follows:

John S. Tolton, Walkerton	$182,630
George Neilson, Belleville	200,375
W. H. Hills, Toronto	212,135
Morris, Clendenan & Wilson, Walkerton	212,540

On the 22nd February the works were awarded to Mr. Tolton, who is alluded to in the Order-in-Council as "the third "lowest" tender, and it was ostensibly given to him on the ground that "he appears to be in a position to execute the "work satisfactorily, and that his accu- "rities appear to be good and solvent." Despite this recommendatory notice of Mr. ELLIS we find that four days later Mr. BRAUN, Secretary of the Department, telegraphs to Mowat & Co. asking them if they were prepared to deposit 5 per cent. of the contract amount, and if their sureties were of ample means and property. They reply in the affirmative, and add that a member of the firm will immediately proceed to Ottawa. The result of this visit we find in a second Order-in-Council passed on 7th March, which, after stating that ELLIS had "info "the country," recommends that the work be given to MOWAT & Co. at their figure. Then arose the question of security. The Department agreed to forego the money deposit asked for in Mr. BRAUN's telegram, and accepted other property security. After a good deal of higgling as to the value of certain properties, the Department satisfied itself that it was secured in this way to the extent of $7,500, and entered into a contract with MOWAT & CO.

There is a lapse of over two years now. The work was supposed to be going on, and no doubt was. The next document we find is a telegram from Mr. PAGE, engineer of the Department, dated July 2nd, 1876, and addressed to MOWAT & CO., telling them to stop all dredging operations, except such as were required for the foundation of the crib. On 17th July MOWAT & CO. sent a letter to the Department, protesting against being stopped in the prosecution of the work. On the 2nd August Mr. BRAUN writes informing them that the appropriation for Parliament is exhausted, and that the work must be discontinued. There is also a letter from Mr. PAGE to Mr. MACKENZIE, dated 16th Feb., 1877, in reply to the Premier's application to that gentleman to be informed of the reasons why the work was not awarded to Mr. TOLTON in the first place. Mr. PAGE says it was feared that there would have been trouble with the sureties, and also that "JOHN S. TOLTON's tender was at "that time looked upon as so low that "some trouble was taken to ascertain "whether he was a person acquainted "with such work, but no information "could be obtained about him." Mr. PAGE adds that it was thought if Mr. TOLTON obtained the contract it would have proved ruinous to him, and a loss to the Government. There is also a letter from Mr. BRAUN to Mr. MACKENZIE, asking him to include in the return the private letter written by him on the subject to the Premier, in January, 1874. This letter of January, 1874, says: "DAVID MOWAT, of Walkerton, asks me "to inform you that he is about to tender "for the Goderich works, and I do so accordingly. I told my friend MOWAT that "an introduction was unnecessary, as you "would let the work fairly without re- "spect to persons." This letter is not marked "private" or "confidential," notwithstanding its close.

What will probably at first blush strike most readers of this summary of the papers is, the total absence of all consideration of Mr. NELSON's tender. Mr. NELSON is known to be a contractor of repute. His tender was $12,000 less than Mr. ELLIS'. Why was he passed over altogether? Some light is required on this point.

It is very remarkable that immediately Mr. ELLIS is informed that his contract is accepted he "leaves the country," and that Messrs. MOWAT & CO. are at once taken under the tender protection of the Department.

They are asked to make a deposit of cash to the amount of 5 per cent. of their contract price—some $10,000. They telegraph that they are prepared to do so, but eventually they make no deposit at all, and the Department accepts a property security valued after some dickering at $7,500. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that there was a good deal of favouritism in this.

It was not until the return was asked for by Parliament that Mr. MACKENZIE bestirred himself. Then—dear, innocent man!—he proceeds to get Mr. PAGE to write out some reasons which will at least make an appearance of justifying the injustice done to Mr. TOLTON and the unquestionable loss which the country sustained in the favour shown to Mr. BLAKE's friends. What are these reasons? Briefly, that the securities were not considered good; that the price was too low; that Mr. TOLTON was so low that, in order to save him from loss, the Department declined to give him the job; and that though enquiries had been instituted as to Mr. TOLTON's financial standing and capability as a contractor no information could be obtained.

Mr. MACKENZIE ought to hide his head in shame for permitting the Engineer of his Department to pen such a letter. *He* at all events knew that it was false in every particular. He knew, we feel assure, would not have written it if Mr. MACKENZIE had not kept out of sight a portion of the correspondence in his possession respecting this matter. *He* knew that Mr. TOLTON was a capable contractor, and strong financially, and that his securities were first class men.

Why did Mr. MACKENZIE not include in the correspondence the telegram dated January 7, 1874, which he received from Mr. DAVID STRACHAN, M.P., and the letter which immediately followed it from the same gentleman? We are in possession of their contents, however. Mr. STRACHAN's telegram was in these words:

"Mr. Tolton is a thorough, practical, honest, and reliable man, financially able and accustomed to the construction of public works. The securities named (they being Sheriff Sutton and Mr. Henry Tolton.—Ed. *The Mail.*) are reliable, sound men."

Mr. STRACHAN, as we have said, followed this up with a letter of at least equal strength. Did Mr. MACKENZIE publish this letter and telegram when the tenders were being opened? If he did, it is to be presumed Mr. PAGE took care not to write a letter he penned on 16th February. If he did not he was guilty of as gross an act of impertinence as a clerk in a Department could possibly commit.

Mr. STRACHAN's recommendation of Mr. TOLTON was sustained by Mr. ALEX. STROAT, Manager of the Merchants' Bank in Walkerton. He declared Mr. TOLTON to be one of the most extensive contractors in Canada, possessed of very considerable means, punctual in meeting his engagements, and capable of a good deal of commanding the names of the strongest men.

With Mr. STRACHAN's letter and telegram in his possession—presumably hid away from the officers of his Department—Mr. MACKENZIE goes to his Chief Engineer and permits him to pen what is grossly untrue. With the information now before us, we accuse Mr. PAGE. Not so the Premier, who has been guilty of conduct which proves him to be unworthy of the high position he holds, inasmuch as it establishes, what has been insinuated against him, that he manufactures reasons, in the best way he can, to help his political friends at the country's cost.

Mr. BLAKE displayed some anxiety that his letter to the Premier should appear in the correspondence. It looks so very harmless that is irresistibly falls to mind the well-known piece of advice, "*Don't* nail his ear to the pump." Mr. BLAKE was at the time a member of Mr. MACKENZIE's Cabinet, and the Premier evidently understood what was required of him in this instance. The Cabinet, when it was called upon to settle other known facts not brought out in this correspondence with which we do not now propose to weigh this article. We rest our accusation of corruption upon the papers which have been brought down, and those which we have brought down, though in his possession, Mr. MACKENZIE has seen fit not to include in the return. We submit the case to the public, and are quite willing and ready to abide its verdict, without offering a particle of further evidence.

NATIONAL RETRENCHMENT.

In these dull times, when the profits of every business are greatly reduced, and a continued shrinkage in values go on, it is not too much to ask that the public expenditures should be in harmony with the expenditures of private individuals. All round there is a cutting down. Everything which can be done without is lopped off; all luxuries are discarded. Sir JOHN MACDONALD's Government in its declaration that this principle should be carried into national affairs. Some say it is an abandonment of the policy of the Opposition for years. But it is a slander, pure and simple. Sir JOHN MACDONALD, in introducing his amendment, said that it was his hope that then with a view to testing the sense of the House as to the best way of meeting a temporary deficit, but that he feared it was premature, he would submit another amendment embodying more distinctly the commercial and fiscal views of the Opposition. The amendment affirms the necessity for greater economy. They was no need to shake his head when Finance Minister could show a surplus of millions year after year, at the same time that he was reducing taxation to the vastly different way, when, instead of a surplus, there is a deficit of two millions to be faced. The times are not propitious for additional taxation. It is sometimes charged against the Opposition that their policy involves additional taxation. It most nothing of the kind. They simply demand such a re-arrangement of the tariff as will give encouragement to native industries, and to such an emergency as we are now face to face with they say it is better to apply the revenue in the shape of duties than taxes. Mr. MCCARTHY has shown that last year on ordinary items of expenditure the Government spent nearly $600,000 more than the old Government in 1872 3. It is this extravagance that has led to the clamor for Retrenchment that has to be reduced. In this way the Opposition propose to meet a temporary deficit, while adhering firmly to their general policy with respect to the tariff and the rearrangement of the tariff.

FIFTY CENTS ON THE DOLLAR.

THE fact that two bills providing for the total repeal of the Insolvent Acts now in force have been brought in, may be accepted as showing that there is something seriously wrong with the law as it now stands. We believe it to be the case that no small number of Ontario wholesale merchants, who a year or two ago were clear for maintaining the present law, with modifications, do now actually talk of total repeal as preferable to the way things are at present going on. We may, however, account for much of this sentiment on the ground of quite pardonable irritation, and hope that after all the general verdict in favour of some insolvency law or other will be sustained. That it will be sustained, and by an overwhelming majority of business men's votes, too, is certain; but still it is desirable that a measure which will not greatly offend the minority should be adopted. In Parliamentary government majorities rule, and we know that under our system the verdict of the majority must be accepted, but we merely go so far as pressed so far as to say that some of the minority asking for the total repeal of the insolvency laws is entitled to consideration. We cannot believe that an amendment should be fairly debated.

The same consideration, it is fair to say, should be given to the resolutions laid down in the shape of a notice of intended legislation. Yet, after every allowance made in this way, we must confess that virtue of intolerance towards any proposal which is so mischievous and unpractical that it is entitled to scant "sight" the condemnation of business men generally. Mr. BLAKE's proposed rule of fifty cents on the dollar as a compulsory discharge will have to be abandoned. The remonstrances which have poured in upon him from all quarters convince him that we are taking dangerous ground, and he may have found reason for suspecting that we would submit another amendment embodying more distinctly the commercial and fiscal views of the Opposition. The amendment affirms the necessity for greater economy. There was no need to shake a head when Finance Minister could show a surplus of millions year after year, at the same time that he was reducing taxation in the vastly different way, when, instead of a surplus, there is a deficit of two millions to be faced. The times are not propitious for additional taxation. It is sometimes charged against the Opposition that their policy involves additional taxation. It most nothing of the kind. They simply demand such a re-arrangement of the tariff as will give encouragement to native industries, and to such an emergency as we are now face to face with they say it is better to apply the revenue in the shape of duties than taxes. Mr. MCCARTHY has shown that last year on ordinary items of expenditure the Government spent nearly $600,000 more than the old Government in 1872 3. It is this extravagance that has led to the clamor for Retrenchment that has to be reduced. In this way the Opposition propose to meet a temporary deficit, while adhering firmly to their general policy with respect to the tariff and the rearrangement of the tariff.

A PRACTICAL POINT IN THE COAL QUESTION.

It may be some satisfaction to our friends "down east," where the wash of the Atlantic almost touches vast stores of black diamonds, to be informed that public opinion in the west is coming to a very practical stage in the coal controversy. We have got this length, that we are debating amongst ourselves whether there should be a duty upon anthracite coal, that being something which Nova Scotia does not produce. Some of our western Protectionists are of opinion that the duty should be put upon all kinds of coal alike, but others see a difference, and contend that as Canada has no hard coal, this side of the Rocky Mountains, we might, without injustice, and should as a non-competing article be admitted free. Free Traders are welcome to make the most they can out of the difference of opinion, but it is our knowledge to exist on this point, but we may suggest to them that "crowing" over it may be premature. We cannot believe Protonists intend to be consistent, and they feel certain that on the point indicated a compromise that will recommend itself to the country will be arrived at. And our Nova Scotia friends may even take as a proof of honest intention in the sense the fact that the question as between anthracite and bituminous coal has not arisen between us. When we have got this length, it shows that we are really coming down to business. How the point is to be adjusted we do not say as yet; but we invite attention to the fact that the manufacturers of Ontario are coming to understand the question, with good hopes of coming to a decision thereupon which will be in accordance with true National Policy.

It is stated by practical men that both for reducing iron ore and for melting pig in the foundry anthracite is the best fuel. Where soft coal only is to be had, it has to be coked for these purposes, and this is a serious drawback, inasmuch as it is not ready made at pimics. It is certainly not easy to satisfy these gentlemen. One and another they charge at one another cries out: "Keep your accumulations for pionics, don't bother us with your chimneys." But the Opposition is likely to be moved by these growlers who differ so much among themselves. As Mr. MCCARTHY said the other day, the Opposition have made no charges against the Government out of Parliament that they are not ready to make in it. If the Ministry think there is any neglect in this respect, if they feel that they have been challenged, they have ample remedy in Parliament. We venture to express the belief that when the session is closed they will have nothing to complain of in this score. The record against the Ministry is a full one, but there will not be much of it this session, which compared it left untouched when members disperse for their homes. The Opposition is strong and vigorous. Additions made to it since last session materially strengthen its debating power as well as its numerical strength. Why it is fighting the people's battle in Parliament, and such return as the public can make for its labours will be given not very far hence.

A PRACTICAL POINT IN THE COAL QUESTION.

	Collections.	Charges.	Cost of Collecting each $100.
Ontario	$4,387,000	$183,000	$4 17
Quebec	2,308,000	177,000	7 67
New Brunswick	1,264,000	78,000	5 77
Nova Scotia	1,175,000	92,000	7 20
For 1876, a period of economy forsooth, they were as follows:			
Ontario	4,500,000	$227,000	$5 12
Quebec	3,116,000	211,000	4 12
New Brunswick	1,053,000	92,000	8 83
Nova Scotia	1,245,000	105,000	8 43

The terrible logic of these figures renders it necessary for the Reform Party to look out of its forms professed love of economy, for how can one talk of his economy when instead of cutting down expenditure, he increases it? As MOSES would say to it?

A word or two to the organ's statement that "corruption and tyranny go together" both, can only be made out by tracing carefully each item of the public expenditure, and showing that it was devoted "to a wrong or an unwise purpose."—*The Globe March 8.*

WHAT a fall for the Party of Economy!

"It was never claimed for Reformers "that they could very greatly reduce the "public expenditure." Shade of BALDWIN! that was their principal claim. Else why the cries that Sir JOHN MACDONALD was running the country into bankruptcy? Else why did Mr. MCKENZIE flood the country with the Parliament Buildings and the Civil Service were overrun with employees who were eating up every green thing? Else why the *Globe's* black lists in which the figures for Civil Government, Immigration, Departmental Salaries, Charges for Revenue Collection, &c., were placed in large mourning drapery, as if to show how sorely not merely the country was grieved at the Tory extravagance, and to print indelibly on the public mind the ten thousand outrages, which it represented the Tory abode only with Mr. BROWN and his men!

This false pretence that the cutting down of the annual expenditure to such a Reform plank has been resorted to because the figures which never lie tell tales which are fatal to the Reform cause, is not cut confusion. Take Civil Government, and look at the difference between 1873, and the last of the seven fruitful years of the MACDONALD Government, and 1876, the third of the "thin and ill-favoured" seven under MACKENZIE-CAUCHON CABINET:

1873	$750,874
1874	811,995
1875	827,368
1876	772,000

Or take Immigration, for it tells the same story of broken pledges and inordinate extravagance on the part of the purists:

1872	$277,368
1874	318,146
1875	362,770
1876	383,845

Where the amazing increase of $105,000 in the outlay for 1876 as contrasted with that of 1873, and then note the fact that there has been a proportionate decrease in the number of immigrants:

	Immigrants.
1873	36,901
1874	23,934
1875	22,824
1876	16,036
1877	10,901

Or take Departmental Salaries:

1873	$452,291
1874	521,202
1875	560,937
1876	556,776

Here between 1873 and 1876 there is a difference of $104,500, against the Party of Economy.

Or take the cost of collecting the revenue. The Customs collections, and the charges in the 1873 were as follows:

	Collections.	Charges.	Cost of Collecting each $100.
Ontario	$4,387,000	$183,000	$4 17
Quebec	2,308,000	177,000	7 67
New Brunswick	1,264,000	78,000	5 77
Nova Scotia	1,175,000	92,000	7 20

For 1876, a period of economy forsooth, they were as follows:

	Collections.	Charges.	Cost of Collecting each $100.
Ontario	4,500,000	$227,000	$5 12
Quebec	3,116,000	211,000	4 12
New Brunswick	1,053,000	92,000	8 83
Nova Scotia	1,245,000	105,000	8 43

The terrible logic of these figures renders it necessary for the Reform Party to look out of its forms professed love of economy, for how can one talk of his economy when instead of cutting down expenditure, he increases it? As MOSES would say to it?

A word or two to the organ's statement that "corruption and tyranny go together" both, can only be made out by tracing carefully each item of the public expenditure, and showing that it was devoted "to a wrong or an unwise purpose."—*