The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1873.

MR. GIBBS' VOTES.

THE electors of South Ontario have already on two occasions shown our Premier confidence in Mr. T. N. GIBBS. They will be as slow to believe now, as they were in 1867 and again in 1872, that his "record" has been "one of simple "and unvarying hostility to the interests "of the country." This is the Grit organ's way of speaking of one of the most upright and honourable men in the Dominion. Is there a man in South Ontario supposes, in the face of the *Globe's* championship of such an administrative nincompoop and Party scoundrel as ARCHIBALD MCKELLAR, that such language would be used of MR. GIBBS if he were a subserient follower of Mr. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE? He won't vote that white is black to please him and GEORGE BROWN; and hence those tears!

MR. GIBBS' record of last session is objected to in respect of the following questions:—

I. The West Peterboro' election.
II. Dual Representation.
III. Mr. HUNTINGTON's motion.
IV. Pacific Railway enquiry.
V. The Ballot.
VI. The Section 5 "Scandal."
VII. The Washington Treaty.
VIII. Inspector GRIFFIN's letter to the Allanburg Portmaster.
IX. Proprietary Interest in the Pacific Railway.

Let us take these questions up in the order in which they stand.

I.—*The West Peterborough Election Case.*

What is the simple fact as to this case. Why, that MR. GIBBS refused to vote for resolutions declaring that a man other than the one who was returned at duly elected by the Returning Officer should take the seat. Many years ago there was an Act passed by the Imperial Parliament—it is called the Grenville Act—the object of which was to remove all such questions from the House of Commons, and to have them decided by a Committee of the House chosen to deal with them. On the very best legal advice which he could get the Returning Officer for West Peterborough conceived it to be his duty to declare Mr. WILLIAM CLUTTON the properly elected representative of the Riding. In the face of this deliberate return the Opposition leaders sought to seat MR. BERTRAM. The majority of the House of Commons, of which Mr. GIBBS was one, declined to take upon itself the responsibility of upsetting the return. This majority voted, in the first place, that it was the business of the Committee, and not of the House, to consider the matter; and in the second place, that, Mr. CLUTTON having been seated, Mr. BERTRAM would have to justify his claim to the possession of the seat. So soon as he can do this—and if he is in the right, he will not have much difficulty in doing it—he will be declared the sitting member, and Mr. CLUTTON unseated. It is very doubtful if Mr. BERTRAM will ever be able to vitiate the Returning Officer's return. But whether he shall or not, Mr. GIBBS and those who acted with him, voted in the only proper way—in accordance with the law and precedents.

II.—*Dual Representation.*

It is not necessary to say much on this question. It is one on which men may reasonably hold different opinions, and whether it were abolished or allowed to continue to exist, it could be a no greater gain to the Party than to the country. For some the time will yet come, and that before long, when many opponents of Dual Representation will, in consequence of the growing inferiority of its local Legislatures, be compelled to admit that the principle has been the tenth part as bad as they sought to represent it.

III.—*Mr. Huntington's Motion.*

When MR. HUNTINGTON made this motion he was abused by the *Globe* for not having spoken to it, and given reasons to the House for its adoption. Was it likely that the House of Commons would accept so serious an accusation against Ministers without a little of proof? This was sample reason for the rejection of the motion. But it was not rejected on this ground alone. It was rejected in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply—and was, therefore, a vote of want of confidence in the Government, it was declared by the *Globe* to be a non-confidence motion; that paper further declared that no business could be transacted until it was voted down. In consequence, it became an imperative duty on every man who had confidence in the Government to vote against the resolution. To his credit, be it said, Mr. GIBBS voted with the majority. The motion was thrown out, without debate, by a majority of thirty-one.

IV.—*Pacific Railway Enquiry.*

The history of this matter is here fresh in the mind of the reader that it is unnecessary to refer to it at any length. On the very day following the voting down of Mr. HUNTINGTON's want of confidence motion, SIR JOHN MACDONALD rose in his place in Parliament and gave notice that he intended to move for a committee of five to investigate the charges against Mr. HUNTINGTON. The resolution; said Committee to be chosen by the House, and to have all the extraordinary powers the House could confer upon it. The *Globe* says SIR JOHN MACDONALD was "compelled" to assent to the appointment of the Committee. SIR JOHN has declared, in Parliament, that no one even suggested to him or to his colleagues, The First Minister is charged with having delayed the enquiry after the bill had passed. He asked, "Is it not a fair-minded man must say he was quite proper and reasonable, that the whole evidence should be taken, and that the proper time to do this was when the case most directly implicated, namely, Sir HUGH ALLAN and Mr. ABBOTT, had returned to Canada. Mr. GIBBS voted in favour of cutting the desire of the Grit leader to postpone partial testimony, and of the arrival in Canada of the gentlemen named before commencing the investigation; meanwhile having the emphatic declaration in the House, of the First Minister himself, that, so far as the Government were concerned, the charges contained in MR. HUNTINGTON's motion were alike vile and baseless.

V.—*The Ballot.*

Mr. GIBBS voted against the Ballot. So did ALEXANDER MACKENZIE every year before this; and Mr. MACKENZIE has declared that even now he is an unwilling convert. The Ballot was in no sense a Party one, *several Grits having voted with* MR. GIBBS *on the question.*

VI.—*Section Five "Scandal."*

The *Globe's* history of this matter is simply a tissue of falsehoods. The Railway Commissioners dealt with the contractors of this section as with all the others—acted with them throughout within the limits of their contract. Mr. ALEXANDER MACDONALD, or Co. never received beyond the bulk amount of their bargain, and, as a matter of fact, neither Parliament nor the country has, as yet, before it the material for forming a judgment on the transaction as the Commissioners and the contractors have not yet made a final settlement. The Commissioners were compelled to give all the assistance possible to the contractors, within the figures of their contract, to prevent them breaking down, and thus entailing great loss upon the country. This course was rendered necessary by a great advance in the value of labour and material.

VII.—*The Washington Treaty.*

Parliament at its previous session having agreed, by a very large majority, that the Treaty should be accepted, the Government most wisely, in view of all the complications involved, refused to reopen the question this year, over what the *Globe* itself a couple of years ago declared to be merely a sentimental grievance. That MR. GIBBS acted the wise part of voting with the Government is much to his credit.

VIII.—*Inspector Griffin's Letter.*

MR. GRIFFIN's letter, to which MR. MACKENZIE took objection in the House, was in these words:—

"(Private.)

"Post Office Inspector's Office,
"LONDON, Ont., 16th Nov., 1872.

"DEAR SIR,—Allow me to drop you a word of caution with respect to your conduct in the election now coming on in Welland. So long as it suits your interest or convenience to remain postmaster, you can not with propriety take any part against the Government whose servant you are. If you cannot support Mr. King, take no active part against him, and give no ground for complaint against yourself. Answer how this is.

"Your obedient servant,
"GILBERT GRIFFIN, jun.,
"P. O. Inspector.

"J. RANNIE, Esq., Postmaster, Allanburgh."

Never did a superior write a more harmless letter to a subordinate. Mr. GRIFFIN gave MR. RANNIE excellent advice, and the House would have been sadly hitting the position to have wanted the sitting over so petty a matter. Dr. TUPPER treated it properly when he proposed to proceed to the Orders of the Day.

IX.—*Proprietary Interest in the Pacific Railway.*

Finally, MR. GIBBS is charged with having voted against this motion, proposed by MR. MACKENZIE:—

"That it is expedient to provide that no person having a pecuniary interest in, or contract with, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be capable of being elected a member of this House."

Coming from the Grits, the inconsistency of this resolution is apparent, when they were found bending their whole energies in favour of the contract being given to a Company of which a member of Parliament was President. Even resolution was simply impracticable—was never adopted in a civilized community—and could not be carried out. Of course, as a practical, clear-headed man of business, MR. GIBBS voted against so absurd a motion.

And it is for these reasons that the electors of South Ontario are called upon to reject their old and tried representative! Bah! We shouldn't be surprised to see his majority at least 250 this time.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC.

Though the ill-omened birds of the Opposition are for ever croaking "failure," the work of the great national undertaking, the Canadian Pacific, proceeds. Mr. MURDOCH, with one party is now engaged in laying down a line from Pembina to Fort Garry, and so away in the country found to be that the road could be put in running order before winter sets in; we hope that it may. The branch of the Northern Pacific will be in readiness this fall, and emigration and transportation to Manitoba will then be transferred until the Eastern section of the Canadian road is ready. This will prove of great advantage, facilitating ingress to the country, and helping forward the chief work in a signal manner. Then Mr. E. W. JARVIS and his party have already left by the Union Pacific for British Columbia, in order to make the necessary observations to determine upon the best site for a western terminus. This work will occupy some time, but it is necessary to the proper location of the line. Thus it is the Government will know no such word as "fail" in connection with the enterprise, and even if SIR HUGH ALLAN had failed, or was likely to fail, in forming a Company, based upon English capital, the Administration is possessed of resources within itself which would enable it to promote the work to a successful issue.

THE CHURCH SYNOD.

THERE are those who regard proverbial sayings as the concentration of wisdom and quote them to settle controversies with a serene belief in there being no appeal beyond the dictum of an "old saw." Such persons must occasionally find difficulty in reconciling the glaring self-contradictions of their oracles and their opposition to the present convictions and feelings of mankind. One of the most manifest illustrations of the want of harmony between what is accepted as the speech and wise in action is seen by comparing the nominal respect paid to the proverbs which make silence a synonym of wisdom with their disdainful rejection in actual practice. Men, and times too, differ. To Saxon ears the tongue, *fuere linguae*, meant to be silent; to us now it means, specially with the Press, the favour of whose tongue is anything but silence.

In Church, and State, Grit dissent, offers, however, no ground for criticism other than congratulation. Ever a wise deference to the wish of the Leading Synod was saved from wasting its time over an impracticable abstract proposition. In one of the most elaborate and suggestive chapters of COLERIDGE he shows that "Religion, like a river, passed across the "night of Paganism like the lantern by "of the Tropics, no more than an orna- "ment of the surrounding darkness." Christianity, by cleansing the stream, brightened and enlarged the intellect. His conception of the Church as the Christian hierarchy, by which the Doctors of the Church forgos that the heart, the moral principle, was the permanent source of "when in Council and Synod they divide "humanities of the Gospel gave way to "a rigid system, and religion became a science of the dows under the "name of theology, or at least bare "skeleton of it, the living, labouring life or in- "terest, alike inaccessible and unintelligible "to the majority of Christians." We commend this definition to those Churchmen, who seem anxious to make the Synod the arena for scholastic wrangling. The suggestion is worthy of consideration in Canada, that legislative action be sought to restrain opportunities for drinking and quarrelling at ecclesiastical bodies be established, seem time by and moderate. The Church Synod in England has produced excellent results, and although the Synod seldom or never is practised here in a different manner to that of the old country, it would be further removed from its pursuit here as easy and more scandalous without suffering the liberty of those who are disposed to indulge in an occasional snarl. To question of education, in relation to a ministry is one we should like to see any Synod. The Church, however, would probably prefer its Clergy trained in its own College. But in order fully to secure this end, and to adapt it to the requirements of the Church and to the wishes of students, it would be well to direct its attention to a more ample and time essential for keeping its terms and securing its degrees. The remarks of Professor GOLDWIN SMITH on University extension" are applicable to this case. Speaking of King's College, London, he says:—"The system of giving class offices to a number of young men peculiarly open to the popular wants and temptations advantages of the greatest moral value." He proceeded to remark that "to be indifferent to "the Church's work, to make material which makes "up the rank and file of the clerical army, "is to invite contempt and justify degra- "dation. If the clergy become "illiterate the most valuable defence "on which the hierarchy must rely "for personal influence, is lost. If "The best education which can be got is "the best course to strengthen the future "clergy, we see little profit in the Church." The argument for reducing the expenses of a Collegiate course, and the suggestions which have made so earnest attention of a future Synod. The high social status of the English clergy is at this moment a strong bulwark against the assaults of the Church's foes, and that is mainly owing to their superior education, which, in no sense, has denationalized them in the old land. The Church is so potent an educating influence, apart from its high religious functions—so many have noted since Bishop BERNETT was amazed to find the poor of the west of Scotland "so able to argue &c." that to raise the culture of the clergy is to elevate and stimulate the intellectual life of the whole people. The suggestions of the consulting Church Architecture are commended. "The beauty of holiness" should be manifested in the structure of buildings consecrated to holy uses, the one must be worthy the temple, while it calls the imagination which sacred edifice should help to chasten and elevate.

The subject of the division of the Diocese is one on which the judgment of the Bishop is the most competent expression of observation. His idea that the Church naturally divides itself into north and south, and that the area was too extensive for the many comprised is very dirty changing in those characteristics which are important elements in considering changes of this kind, that it may be questioned whether any alteration can be made with a permanent success. The population of certain districts is growing so fast that they will are long take a very different place in any Diocesan Synod, which may be formed to their present standing. It may be questioned whether in the distribution of these Dioceses, the wisdom, more economical of means and labour to have delayed any division of the present diocese geographically and made a practical division by dividing the episcopal work between the present Bishop of the See, and a Suffragan Bishop. The Church, we fear, will find more and more necessary of losing sight of the high rank of the English episcopate, which, if sought to be maintained here, will be found to be the cause of serious difficulty, as most shrink far more from the idea of a false social position arising from inadequate salary to maintain it than from any labours and responsibilities from their being insufficiently rewarded. The life of WILSON supplies a pregnant illustration of what the need of the Church is in remoter districts. We find him "visiting the scattered population of a Bishop, and living on private hospitality all through his journeyings. Muskoka and Algoma, with occasional duties nearer the centre, would fully occupy the time and tax to the utmost the strength of an active clergyman in the prime of life. Such an one relieved from the burthen of a conventional social status which is most oppressive to a very active spirit, would be of infinite service in organizing missions, directing parochial work in distant settlements, and infusing throughout every corner of those regions a sense of the Church's shepherdly care. A late appointment by the Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland states:—"In very many cases "our Scottish Churches are contending "with each other in rival missions, overlapping each other, demoralizing the "poor, and filling the souls of professed Christians with such evil dis- "positions as are than possibles the good of greater activity." The Church of Canada has no a geographical status quo basis, is bound to exert its utmost influence to check this grave mischief. The extraordinary movements being inflicted here and in the States for the establishment of a number of different Churches, shows that the evil is understood and its corrective as well. The spirit of mutual conciliation and zeal displayed in the recent Synod, gives hope of its divisions being too slight to cause any real division or weakness.

THE RECORD.

JUST as we expected, the Grit print finds our remarks on Mr. GIBBS' vote last session rather hard nuts to crack. Some of them it passes over altogether; and its observations as to the others are peculiar enough to call for a few more words from us.

It endeavours to show that the West Peterborough and Muskoka cases are alike, and that as Mr. COCKBURN was declared elected by the House for Muskoka, Mr. BERTRAM ought to have been so declared for West Peterborough. This is a palpable attempt to deceive the reader, and our brief reply to it nullifies wholly the *Globe's* precedents. In the West Peterborough case Mr. CLUTTON had been *declared elected*, and the House simply declined to interfere with the return, leaving it to the member elect and to the person claiming the seat to fight out the issue before the Committee. In the Muskoka case no *return* had been made; leaving by the figures on the poll books that Mr. COCKBURN was entitled to the seat, SIR JOHN MACDONALD at once said that the House should declare him the properly elected member. This simple statement exposes the Grit organ's farrago of nonsense, and shows clearly the distinction between the two cases which produced a difference in the action taken upon each of them in the House.

With respect to Mr. HUNTINGTON's motion, the organ conveniently forgets that it was offered as a motion of want of confidence, and that if it had been accepted, the Government would have had to resign, though actually in a majority in the House of 31. Why does it hide from its readers that itself declared the motion to be one of want of confidence, and that no other business could be proceeded with until it was disposed of? Was not this a sufficient reason for the vote of the majority?

As to the Ballot, the Grit journal is also forgetful of some facts necessary to be remembered. The Ballot has never been made a Party question in Canada. Mr. BROWN has himself opposed it frequently. Mr. MACKENZIE is but a new convert to it; and several Grits voted with Mr. GIBBS in opposition to its incorporation in the Election Bill.

The organ deals with Section Five, and dwells upon the fact that the Government admitted the correctness of its figures. What has that got to do with the issue? The Commissioners, in consequence of the advance of prices, and anxious to give the mechanic and labouring man the full benefit of the advance, decided to so remodel the contracts on the intercolonial—not one contract but all—that the contractors such a way as to assist the contractors as much as they possibly could without exceeding the bulk figure of the contracts. Messrs. ALEX. MACDONNELL & Co. have not been paid beyond the value of the work done by them, according to their bargain, and the Grit sheet dare not say they have. Where is the wrong? The country has gained by the operation—not loss.

A word as to the motion of Mr. BLAKE regarding the navigation of the St. Lawrence. We have asked Mr. GIBBS "to re-open the Treaty," says the *Globe*. Read further on in the same sheet, in the well-manufactured and suggestive leader, that Mr. BLAKE's motion disclosed that "certain privileges which, by the omission of the British Commissioners, Canada did not obtain, but ought to have obtained under the Treaty, should be, if possible, secured by subsequent negotiation." Pray, was not that regarded as the Treaty? And is that sending out a fresh fire-brand, not in Canada only, but in the United States and in Great Britain, the presence of which might have been most disastrous to this country? Peace is what we desire, what we cherish as essential to our religious welfare. GIBBS voted. He declined to re-open the Treaty, the whole question having been definitely settled and adjusted.

The organ's reference to Mr. Inspector GRIFFIN's letter comes ill from a journal which supported Mr. ALEXANDER MCKELLAR in sending missionaries into Prince to coerce the poor settlers into voting for a land speculator, and in sending to Lake Valuator McINTYRE, who was then in the pay of the Government, to scour South Grey to secure a Government creature in Mr. GEORGE JACKSON, whom they had "in a tight place." Why, "its enough to" make the reader ask, in the words of the *Globe's* classical expression.

There is nothing else in the Grit print which calls for any remarks. We have already given it. Mr. GIBBS has always voted like an honest man, who has no Party interests at stake, and has acted steadily in view. So said the electors of South Ontario in 1872, and so, we are confident, they will say again in 1873 by a largely increased majority.

ANOTHER PLANK.

Now has the season of Reform pic-nics set in. Regardless of the late Mr. FARKENBRIDGE, the true lovers of themselves forgeather to hear from their chiefs about the wrongs they suffer in the "tion" are applicable to this case. Speaking of King's College, London, he says:—"The system of giving class offices to a number of young men peculiarly open to the popular wants and temptations advantages of the greatest moral value." He proceeded to remark that "to be indifferent to "the Church's work, to make material which makes "up the rank and file of the clerical army, "is to invite contempt and justify degra- "dation. If the clergy become "illiterate the most valuable defence "on which the hierarchy must rely "for personal influence, is lost. "The best education which can be got is "the best course to strengthen the future "clergy, we see little profit in the Church." The argument for reducing the expenses of a Collegiate course, and the suggestions which have made so earnest attention of a future Synod. The high social status of the English clergy is at this moment a strong bulwark against the assaults of the Church's foes, and that is mainly owing to their superior education, which, in no sense, has denationalized them in the old land. The Church is so potent an educating influence, apart from its high religious functions—so many have noted since BISHOP BERNETT was amazed to find the poor of the west of Scotland "so able to argue &c." that to raise the culture of the clergy is to elevate and stimulate the intellectual life of the whole people. The suggestions of the consulting Church Architecture are commended. "The beauty of holiness" should be manifested in the structure of buildings consecrated to holy uses, the one must be worthy the temple, while it calls the imagination which sacred edifice should help to chasten and elevate.

The subject of the division of the Diocese is one on which the judgment of the Bishop is the most competent expression of observation. His idea that the Church naturally divides itself into north and south, and that the area was too extensive for the many comprised is very dirty changing in those characteristics which are important elements in considering changes of this kind, that it may be questioned whether any alteration can be made with a permanent success. The population of certain districts is growing so fast that they will are long take a very different place in any Diocesan Synod, which may be formed to their present standing. It may be questioned whether in the distribution of these Dioceses, the wisdom, more economical of means and labour to have delayed any division of the present diocese geographically and made a practical division by dividing the episcopal work between the present Bishop of the See, and a Suffragan Bishop. The Church, we fear, will find more and more necessary of losing sight of the high rank of the English episcopate, which, if sought to be maintained here, will be found to be the cause of serious difficulty, as most shrink far more from the idea of a false social position arising from inadequate salary to maintain it than from any labours and responsibilities from their being insufficiently rewarded. The life of WILSON supplies a pregnant illustration of what the need of the Church is in remoter districts. We find him "visiting the scattered population of a Bishop, and living on private hospitality all through his journeyings. Muskoka and Algoma, with occasional duties nearer the centre, would fully occupy the time and tax to the utmost the strength of an active clergyman in the prime of life. Such an one relieved from the burthen of a conventional social status which is most oppressive to a very active spirit, would be of infinite service in organizing missions, directing parochial work in distant settlements, and infusing throughout every corner of those regions a sense of the Church's shepherdly care. A late appointment by the Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland states:—"In very many cases "our Scottish Churches are contending "with each other in rival missions, overlapping each other, demoralizing the "poor, and filling the souls of professed Christians with such evil dis- "positions as are than possibles the good of greater activity." The Church of Canada has no a geographical status quo basis, is bound to exert its utmost influence to check this grave mischief. The extraordinary movements being inflicted here and in the States for the establishment of a number of different Churches, shows that the evil is understood and its corrective as well. The spirit of mutual

A VIOLATED TREATY.

THIS is an opportune moment, while some of the members of the League are visiting South Ontario, to call the attention of the Catholic electors of that constituency to the *Globe's* covenant with Mr. BROWN and the results thereof. This is the parchment:—

1. Are you prepared in good faith to guarantee, as far as you are able, the same rights and privileges to the Catholics of Ontario their fair representation according to their numbers in the Legislatures of the Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada?

2. Name the constituencies for which the influence and support of your Party would be exerted for the election of eligible Catholic candidates at the approaching election.

3. The Catholic electors are, it is thought, strongest in the following constituencies, viz.:—Essex, Kent, South Perth, North Wellington, Cardwell, Ottawa City, East Peterboro', South Grenville, Carleton, County of Prescott, East Toronto, Welland, and Haldimand.

4. Will you support a Catholic candidate in each of these constituencies at the approaching elections for Ontario?

5. If not, name those of them in which you will sustain such candidates.

6. Give the reasons fully of your ability to secure the election of such candidates.

7. The deputation desire to add that while Catholics claim for themselves no special privileges, they do object to the political exclusion under which they now are and have been suffering.

To all of which MR. BROWN answered (*"The Globe"* Office, Toronto, 1st Nov.) that Catholic vote in the elections of 1871, but since then his interest on behalf of that Party has flagged considerably. He (BROWN) were to draw up a catalogue of what he has done in pursuance of the covenant, it would read somewhat as follows:—

1. I was prepared, but circumstances over which I had no control prevented me from carrying out the preparations. I had educated my people to hate Catholics and Catholicism, and I failed to eradicate their bigotry.

2. I ran MR. O'DONOHOE in East Toronto; but, you see, the fact of his being a Catholic prevented many of my truest benefactors from cordially giving him their support, etc.

3. Your knowledge of the Catholic census contains one of your application to the study of Canadian geography.

4. I opposed, in the interest of the Party, Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR in Kent, Mr. JOSEPH KIDD in South Perth, Mr. O'REILLY in South Renfrew, and Mr. DORION in South Victoria, and a few weeks ago I opposed Mr. HAWKINS in South Brant—but then I ran Mr. JOHN MCKENZIE in London, and from the fact that he was beaten by only 493 votes, you may judge of my determination to secure his seat at all hazards.

5, 6, 7. I never attempt to answer conundrums; but MARY BRADY, MARY MCCURRY, and JANE MCGRATH were apparently of the same opinion as myself, and they voted with me.

There is but one remedy for the aggrieved League—cultivate kinship with "Reform" members. Thomas Robinson's brother-in-law was made safe. Mr. PETER GOW's nephew was appointed to the Senate, and Mr. MACKENZIE's father-in-law was provided for. And we venture to say that if Mr. WILLIAM MCDOUGALL, or any other Colonial Minister, the simple fact is—and we take pleasure in bringing it prominently to the notice of every Grit in Canada—that Sir JOHN MACDONALD's opinions on constitutional law have invariably stood the strongest tests to which they have been subjected. We cannot say as much of any one who has ever ventured to question SIR JOHN. The First Minister has a right to plume himself a little on his success in this respect, as well as on his general conduct of public affairs.

Lest some generous Oppositionist might say that the disallowance of the Orphan Bill by the QUEEN will prevent that full enquiry before the Committee to which SIR JOHN MACDONALD pledged himself in Parliament, we desire to add to what we have already said that the Government here have offered to issue a commission to the Committee to enable them to swear witnesses. A constitutional wrong has been righted, but the powers of the Committee will be made as full and complete as it is possible for the Government to make them.

A SHORTER POLITICAL CATECHISM FOR SOUTH ONTARIO.

IF is pretty evident that MR. JAMES HOWLAND is the puppet of the Ontario Government, for that beautiful legislator, MR. ARAM FARRWELL, stands forward as his political god-father. ARAM gets up on the top of Mount Pisgah and sees a great triumph afar off. Says he in his organ of the 18th:—

"The Reform Party was drawn up in battle array on Tuesday morning—with the light of victory already in their countenance of its enthusiastic ranks."

This is big talk and small grammar, but that we have to bear in mind that the same "light of victory," twinkling in 1867 and in 1872, was decisively snuffed out by MR. GIBBS. Then comes the signal for the battle:—

"Reformers, to the front! Assert your rights like intelligent men. Show this unscrupulous politician (Mr. Gibbs) that you value your independence more than the allurings of a dollar. Better to eat a dry crust with independence, than to live in luxury at a sacrifice of your manhood."

"Reformers" to the rear! and stay there until your leaders in the Ontario Government have satisfactorily answered the following questions:—

1. Why is it now comes it that the expenditure of the Province which in the last year of SANDFIELD MACDONALD's Administration amounted to $1,816,896 has mounted up this year to the colossal sum of $3,170,013?

2. Why should MR. MCKELLAR spend $67,078 on 28,129 emigrants when Mr. CARLING spent only $29,712 on 25,842, and when Mr. MOWAT spent $18,924 for the year's work under the control of one rascal and one jail-bird?

3. Why should his departmental salaries alone have been increased by $36,815?

4. Why did Mr. SCOTT sell one-third of the national estate without the consent of the people?

5. Why did Mr. THOMAS PAXTON, M. P. P., allowed to pocket $42,000 of the people's money to the special detriment of the interpreters of Whitby, Scugog and Reach?

6.—Does any body believe that Mr. ARCHIBALD MACKELLAR resigned $2,719 worth of service to the country in 1872, or that Mr. FARRWELL's son had the best claim to the County Attorneyship of Ontario?

7.—On the 14th February, 1871, Mr. BLAKE wrote that it was inexpedient to create new offices or to increase the salaries attached to existing offices without a previous vote of the House authorizing such creation or increase. If that was "Reform" doctrine, was it proper for Mr. MCKELLAR to appoint Mr. HODGINS' brother-in-law and Mr. FARRWELL's son to lucrative sinecures without the permission of the Legislature, and so on throughout every Department, until the Ontario expenditure was increased by $36,815 for salaries alone?

8.—Was it advisable to grant $100,000 for the encouragement of a retreat for gentlemen drunkards?

9.—Was it proper to over-run the Railway Estimates to the extent of Legislature to the amount of $265,000, without the consent of the people's representatives?

10.—Was it right to remove the Agricultural farm to please Mr. Gow? Was it British fair play, Mr. Mowat to discard from the Bench? Was it proper for Mr. MCKELLAR to employ LEWIS against the settlers on Lake Valuator? Was it manly in Mr. FARRWELL to vote down his own verdict in that case?

THE LABOURER IS WORTHY OF HIS HIRE.

THE Catholic League, as represented by its organ, the *Irish Canadian*, is up in arms against the "Reform" Party. Having faithfully performed its portion of the contract with Mr. BROWN, the League naturally expected that Mr. BROWN would redeem his pledge, and Ministers. He has put forward Messrs. O'DONOHOE and MCKNOWN in constituencies where he knew perforce that they would be beaten, but beyond that he has done no more for the Catholic body than he did when he was the avowed enemy of the race and creed. A glance at the appointments of the Ontario Government affords ample evidence of his and his Party's faithlessness. MARY BRADY, MARY MCNULLY and JANE MCGRATH were appointed "dusters" at fifty cents a day, but the intrepid J. MURPHY was sent empty away. MARY MCNULLY, MARY MCCURRAN and MARY KAVNAN were requested to resign in favour of the three Irish Catholic messengers, but where is the official who was ordered to leave that J. D. MEEHICK might be happy? Where is the spot vacated by "Reform" hands for the repose of THOMAS MCCROSON? Where the sunny sinecure for Mr. DEVLIN? The cool grot for Lawyer MCNAMARA? The shady bower for Mr. BOYLE? "Not there, not there my child!"

There is but one remedy for the aggrieved League—cultivate kinship with "Reform" members. Thomas Robinson's brother-in-law was made safe. Mr. PETER GOW's nephew was appointed to the Senate, and Mr. MACKENZIE's father-in-law was provided for. And we venture to say that if Mr. WILLIAM MCDOUGALL, or any other Colonial Minister, the simple fact is—and we take pleasure in bringing it prominently to the notice of every Grit in Canada—that Sir JOHN MACDONALD's opinions on constitutional law have invariably stood the strongest tests to which they have been subjected. We cannot say as much of any one who has ever ventured to question SIR JOHN. The First Minister has a right to plume himself a little on his success in this respect, as well as on his general conduct of public affairs.

Lest some generous Oppositionist might say that the disallowance of the Orphan Bill by the QUEEN will prevent that full enquiry before the Committee to which SIR JOHN MACDONALD pledged himself in Parliament, we desire to add to what we have already said that the Government here have offered to issue a commission to the Committee to enable them to swear witnesses. A constitutional wrong has been righted, but the powers of the Committee will be made as full and complete as it is possible for the Government to make them.

A SHORTER POLITICAL CATECHISM FOR SOUTH ONTARIO.

IT is pretty evident that MR. JAMES HOWLAND is the puppet of the Ontario Government, for that beautiful legislator, MR. ARAM FARRWELL, stands forward as his political god-father. ARAM gets up on the top of Mount Pisgah and sees a great triumph afar off. Says he in his organ of the 18th:—

"The Reform Party was drawn up in battle array on Tuesday morning—with the light of victory already in their countenance of its enthusiastic ranks."

This is big talk and small grammar, but that we have to bear in mind that the same "light of victory," twinkling in 1867 and in 1872, was decisively snuffed out by MR. GIBBS. Then comes the signal for the battle:—

"Reformers, to the front! Assert your rights like intelligent men. Show this unscrupulous politician (Mr. Gibbs) that you value your independence more than the allurings of a dollar. Better to eat a dry crust with independence, than to live in luxury at a sacrifice of your manhood."

"Reformers" "to the rear! and stay there until your leaders in the Ontario Government have satisfactorily answered the following questions:—

1. Why is it now comes it that the expenditure of the Province which in the last year of SANDFIELD MACDONALD's Administration amounted to $1,816,896 has mounted up this year to the colossal sum of $3,170,013?

2. Why should MR. MCKELLAR spend $67,078 on 28,129 emigrants when MR. CARLING spent only $29,712 on 25,842, and when MR. MOWAT spent $18,924 for the year's work under the control of one rascal and one jail-bird?

3. Why should his departmental salaries alone have been increased by $36,815?

4. Why did MR. SCOTT sell one-third of the national estate without the consent of the people?

5. Why did MR. THOMAS PAXTON, M. P. P., allowed to pocket $42,000 of the people's money to the special detriment of the interpreters of Whitby, Scugog and Reach?

6.—Does any body believe that MR. ARCHIBALD MACKELLAR resigned $2,719 worth of service to the country in 1872, or that MR. FARRWELL's son had the best claim to the County Attorneyship of Ontario?

7.—On the 14th February, 1871, MR. BLAKE wrote that it was inexpedient to create new offices or to increase the salaries attached to existing offices without a previous vote of the House authorizing such creation or increase. If that was "Reform" doctrine, was it proper for MR. MCKELLAR to appoint MR. HODGINS' brother-in-law and MR. FARRWELL's son to lucrative sinecures without the permission of the Legislature, and so on throughout every Department, until the Ontario expenditure was increased by $36,815 for salaries alone?

8.—Was it advisable to grant $100,000 for the encouragement of a retreat for gentlemen drunkards?

9.—Was it proper to over-run the Railway Estimates to the extent of Legislature to the amount of $265,000, without the consent of the people's representatives?

10.—Was it right to remove the Agricultural farm to please Mr. Gow? Was it British fair play, Mr. Mowat to discard from the Bench? Was it proper for MR. MCKELLAR to employ LEWIS against the settlers on Lake Valuator? Was it manly in MR. FARRWELL to vote down his own verdict in that case?

THE LABOURER IS WORTHY OF HIS HIRE.

THE Catholic League, as represented by its organ, the *Irish Canadian*, is up in arms against the "Reform" Party. Having faithfully performed its portion of the contract with MR. BROWN, the League naturally expected that MR. BROWN would redeem his pledge, and Ministers. He has put forward Messrs. O'DONOHOE and MCKNOWN in constituencies where he knew perforce that they would be beaten, but beyond that he has done no more for the Catholic body than he did when he was the avowed enemy of the race and creed. A glance at the appointments of the Ontario Government affords ample evidence of his and his Party's faithlessness. MARY BRADY, MARY MCNULLY and JANE MCGRATH were appointed "dusters" at fifty cents a day, but the intrepid J. MURPHY was sent empty away. MARY MCNULLY, MARY MCCURRAN and MARY KAVNAN were requested to resign in favour of the three Irish Catholic messengers, but where is the official who was ordered to leave that J. D. MEEHICK might be happy? Where is the spot vacated by "Reform" hands for the repose of THOMAS MCCROSON? Where the sunny sinecure for Mr. DEVLIN? The cool grot for Lawyer MCNAMARA? The shady bower for Mr. BOYLE? "Not there, not there my child!"

There is but one remedy for the aggrieved League—cultivate kinship with "Reform" members. THOMAS ROBINSON's brother-in-law was made safe. Mr. PETER GOW's nephew was appointed to the Senate, and Mr. MACKENZIE's father-in-law was provided for. And we venture to say that if Mr. WILLIAM MCDOUGALL, or any other Colonial Minister, the simple fact is—and we take pleasure in bringing it prominently to the notice of every Grit in Canada—that Sir JOHN MACDONALD's opinions on constitutional law have invariably stood the strongest tests to which they have been subjected. We cannot say as much of any one who has ever ventured to question SIR JOHN. The First Minister has a right to plume himself a little on his success in this respect, as well as on his general conduct of public affairs.

Lest some generous Oppositionist might say that the disallowance of the Orphan Bill by the QUEEN will prevent that full enquiry before the Committee to which SIR JOHN MACDONALD pledged himself in Parliament, we desire to add to what we have already said that the Government here have offered to issue a commission to the Committee to enable them to swear witnesses. A constitutional wrong has been righted, but the powers of the Committee will be made as full and complete as it is possible for the Government to make them.

THE DEATH OF MR. BLAKE.

THE Grit orators in South Ontario are attempting to make capital out of MR. BLAKE's absence from the Dominion Parliament on the vote for the readjustment of the Provincial debt. In attacking MR. GIBBS on this question, the aforesaid are also assuming the following "Reformers" are to vote with him:—

BROWE,
COCKBURN (Muskoka),
EWART,
GIBSON,
GOWAN,
HOLTON,
JETTE,
VANKOUGHNET (Montreal West).

Other "Reformers" voted in this company, but the above are specimen bricks. Mr. BROWE is a Conservative, as evidenced by the fact that the Government was sustained, by a majority of seventy-seven votes.

THE SHAH IN EUROPE.

THE visit of the Shah of Persia to Europe is probably, in its bearing upon the interests of the Empire to which we belong, one of the most important events of the day. To the professors of what is called "fine writing" it is a perfect godsend; and we must be prepared to read, in such quarters, of the most extraordinary amount of learned allusion to the records of the Greek XENOPHON and the Hebrew DANIEL, and of philosophic speculation upon what would have been the thoughts of Alexander, if Alexander had travelled by railway from St. Petersburg across Europe, then across the Channel, and had subsequently alighted from the car at a London terminus. It will be more to the purpose, however, to consider how the living monarch now in London, whom we mentioned is likely to be impressed by what he sees and hears in this unprecedented occasion, and how position Persia will probably take between England and Russia, the two great contestants for power in Asia. Among those who are looked upon as authorities on the Central Asian question the opinion appears now to be almost fixed that the war of Persia, to the westward, rather than through the countries of the independent Khans, to the northward, that the move from Russia to British India lies, if such a road there is ever to be at all. Of what Russia, to the north-eastward of Persia, DEN-DREN we know little or nothing, at this distance, nor have we any data upon which to see the effect of the action of the brave MCKENZIE on the relations between the United States and Mexico. Of the country, which we know to show that he had, however, the tacit consent, if not the direct approval of his military superiors, for what he had done, gallant as the exploits of Mexican soil was no rash enterprise, undertaken on the spur of the moment merely, or without authority, but that it had been carefully considered, and the consequences duly subject to view. It was recollected that only a short time before the Secretary of War and General SHERIDAN had together visited the military posts at various points in Texas, and that extensive preparations were then made for what was ordered. What the Mexicans might do about it has been the subject of speculation, but so far it is certain, from what any official "remonstrance has been made. But meantime something else has been made public, which is likely to have a remarkable connection. He dare not assert that Mr. GIBBS voted or attempted to abuse the confidence of his constituents, or conducted himself in Parliament other than as a man of high intelligence and integrity. The "record" contains nothing of that kind. It only assumes that they who vote against Mr. MACKENZIE vote disgracefully, and against the country's interests, on the ground that Mr. MACKENZIE, being grand vizier to Mr. BROWN, is thereby infallible and inconsistently pure. Now, let us search for this Grit infallibility and purity where they are to be found—not in the mouthings and professions of the Party in Oppos