"LACK OF TIME."

With regard to Col. Prior's bill for the resubdivision of Victoria electoral district the Times asked the Hon. Senator Macdonald to explain "How it happened that this measure, said to be so much needed, was not introduced before the last week of the session when parliament had already far more business than it could dispose of." To this Senator Macdonald has replied as follows:

1. That this bill was not one of much consequence.

2. Frequently very important bills are introduced in the last days of the session; this cannot be avoided.

3. The supply bill, involving $40,000,000, comes in and is passed the last hours of the session.

3. The printing department was overworked last session printing long speeches.

5. Parliament was to some extent demoralized last session, and its mind given almost entirely to one subject—rendering the consideration of other business impossible.

6. Whether the bill in question was brought in early or late, it was not from any sinister motive, but owing to the reason now stated.

To those who read the first paragraph the question will naturally occur: Why so much fuss if the bill was not of much consequence? Why have such bitter attacks been made on Mr. Martin and the Liberals for refusing to allow the bill to be "railroaded" through? We should think, in view of the reply number one, that the senator's good sense must have led him to deplore the balderdash that has been written and spoken on the subject. With all due respect, it must be said that the senator's other replies are in the nature of begging the question. Col. Prior reached Ottawa about the middle of January, but his bill was not introduced in the senate until after the middle of April. Senator Macdonald will not say, for he knows that it is not the fact, that there was no opportunity in the three months' interval to have the bill introduced and discussed. The plea of lack of time is too ridiculous to be entertained, because we all know that the senate had plenty of time on its hands throughout the session. Senator Macdonald asks: "Would the proposed bill have given an unfair advantage to the Conservatives?" We answer that it undoubtedly would, if passed at so late a date. Conservatives in this city have openly boasted that it would give their side an advantage and throw the Liberal campaign work into confusion. Their own work, they said, had been done on the lines of the proposed new arrangement. These boasts most naturally aroused suspicion on the Liberal side, and all the circumstances quite as naturally tended to aggravate the suspicions. As we have said before, if a reasonable bill had been introduced at a reasonable time it would have met with help instead of opposition from the Liberals.

A $3500 STEAL.

Messrs. Prior and Earle, and other members of the late parliament, were very kind to their colleague, Mr. Ryckman, ex-M. P. for Hamilton. In fact they were parties to a job by which Mr. Ryckman was helped at the expense of the postal revenue.

It came about this way: The Hamilton ex-M. P. conceived the idea of bringing out a document which on one side would bear a puff of the patent medicine of which he is the proprietor, and on the other a puff for the Conservative government. In consideration for the latter puff the Conservative members undertook to "frank" the fly-sheet, which would thus circulate through the mails free of postage.

The scheme was carried out, and 350,000 of the flysheets went through the mails, bearing the members' "franks." Messrs. Earle and Prior did their share of this free circulation, as many people can testify. Those 350,000 documents should each have paid one cent postage, so the postal revenue was cheated out of $3500.

Victorians who remember how hard it was for the postoffice employes to secure their hard-earned wages will please take note of the facility with which Mr. Ryckman was able to get the better of the postoffice service. They will also observe the readiness with which Messrs. Prior and Earle took part in this disgraceful job.

The postoffice clerks and carriers may be excused if they reflect on the fact that while their wages are kept down to or below the bare living limit on the plea of economy, it is easy for a patent medicine vendor, by a little trickery, to "do" the revenue out of $3500. That sum would add $100 a year to the salaries of 35 men.

Of such nefarious works has the Ottawa administration been made up during recent years, and it is likely to be much worse if the Tupper gang can keep their paws on the treasury.

THE CIVIC ADVERTISING.

The Colonist's report of Ald. Williams' motion on the city advertising, and his remarks thereon, is as follows:

"Ald. Williams moved that tenders be called for the civic advertising for the balance of the year 1896. He said that tenders are called for everything else, and as the advertising comes to $300 per month he thought the council might save $100 a month.

Ald. Williams sometimes talks at random. The total amount paid for printing and advertising for 1895 was $3,560.87, or about $300 per month. Of that sum over $1,500 was paid for printing, and of the amount expended for advertising several hundred dollars were paid to the B. C. Gazette, neither of which sums would be affected by the motion for tenders. Deducting these two sums from the total, it will be found that the city paid an average of $153 per month for advertising, and not $300 as stated by Mr. Williams. How it is possible to save $100 per month—unless the newspapers cut the wages of their employes about fifty per cent—we confess we do not understand.

SENSE VS. SENTIMENT.

The request of the mayor of Seattle that an unfortunate leper of that city should be provided for at the Darcy Island lazaretto, which was established and is principally maintained by the city of Victoria, was refused by a majority of our city council. This action has occasioned some adverse criticism, the milk of human kindness with which the morning paper is surcharged fairly boiling over with indignation at the heartless and unneighborly act. Our contemporary is unfortunately given to gushing. Whenever by magnifying the act of an opponent, or by misrepresentation it believes it is possible to place that opponent in an unfavorable light, it does not hesitate an instant or give the slightest heed to the consequences. In asserting that a majority of our aldermen were actuated by an unneighborly feeling towards the city of Seattle, our contemporary is certainly guilty of misrepresenting their motives, and is itself doing much to create an unfriendly feeling between the two cities.

It would unquestionably be an evidence of a neighborly feeling were Victoria to care for a Seattle leper, even at the expense of the latter city. But it cannot be asserted with truth that, because she declines to do so, unfriendliness exists towards that city. As it was pointed out by an alderman, the care of lepers ought to be a charge on the Dominion government, and application should have been made by the Seattle authorities to Ottawa. To grant, without consideration or inquiry, Seattle's request, solely on the ground of humanitarianism would have been highly creditable to the aldermanic heart but would it have been equally so to his judgment or to his knowledge of the law and his powers as a civic legislator? The council may stop lepers from coming into the city, but can it, without violating the Dominion quarantine laws, be a party to the importation into Canada from another country of unfortunate victims of that terrible disease? It would seem to us that however willing the mayor and council might be to do a friendly turn for Seattle the Dominion quarantine official would be bound to step in and defeat their good intentions. The question would seem to be one for the governments of the two countries to deal with, rather than for the city of Victoria with its limited jurisdiction and powers. It cannot be settled off-hand or solely on the ground of neighborliness. It is not properly a civic question, and had the request of Seattle's mayor been acceded to Victoria's claim that the Darcy Island lazaretto should be maintained by the Dominion would have been greatly weakened.

TIRED OF THEIR PARTY.

Yesterday we noted the fact that ex-Mayor Mulhern of Cornwall had resigned the presidency of the Stormont and Cornwall Conservative Association and joined the Liberals. Mr. Mulhern has plenty of company in his change of position. At a recent Liberal meeting in Halifax the chair was occupied by Mr. J. A. Chipman, one of the most prominent of Nova Scotia merchants, who has hitherto been an active worker on the Conservative side. Mr. Chipman in explaining his action said:

The last occasion on which I spoke in the interests of the Conservative party was at a meeting at Jeddore, and the Hon. Mr. Fielding, who was present, may recall the remark I made on that occasion. I then said that unless there were remedial measures applied to the fiscal policy of the government, it would be the last time I would speak in their defence. I watched with no small degree of anxiety the developments of that policy, and when Mr. Foster brought down his reform tariff I said: "Now is the opportunity of the Conservative government," the Conservative leader having in 1878 started out with the pronounced utterance that the National Policy was to give an incidental protection to infant industries. When he had finished his budget and reformed his tariff, I went to the exponents of that tariff in this city when I soon learned that the combines had their hands so firmly upon it as to make reform impossible. (Applause.) Instead of reform it was more pronounced protection. It was then I felt I could no longer follow in the tracks of the Conservative party. Of course there are little things to be met in making a break of this kind. I had to meet the name of "the third party" (laughter) and found it somewhat difficult to sever entirely from the party I had been attached to for so many years. But I felt with a large number of sober-minded Conservatives that that policy was leading to a policy of corruption, that it was robbing the masses to enrich the few. (Applause.) It is true of Canada as it is true of the United States that a man who forsakes his party is a marked man. This is unlike Great Britain where, when a government does not do right the people turn them out. Here, however, a man seems to be under an obligation to adhere to party—to support it in its corruption. (Applause.) I might have remained in the retired position of a man who would sit still and watch the battle, but the affairs of the last session of parliament finished what had begun. When I saw the great autocrat of the people, almost a resurrection from the dead, spring upon the platform, seize the coercion bill, and undertake by fair means or foul to force it upon the people of Manitoba, I decided not to sit still. He tried to force this measure on the people in the face of and against the protestations of the greatest patriot Canada ever saw, the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. (Cheers.) Mr. Laurier distinguished himself for the honorable and able manner in which he handled this great question. He was a French Roman Catholic, who would do all and seek to do all that was in reason for his own people. But when he said, "you cannot by coercion remedy the grievance, but must use conciliation," I say the Honorable Wilfrid Laurier stands to-day the noblest patriot Canada ever saw. (Cheers.) When I read that great speech of his the blood in my frame tingled from the soles of my feet to the crown of my head in admiration of that great man. They will say, and they do say, he is not honest. No man could face parliament and the country with that speech and be false. (Applause.) I have nothing to say against those I am leaving, but I will say that one of the greatest blessings that could befall Canada and the Conservative party would be to give them a chance to wash the stains which had adhered to their garments during the past 15 years. (Applause.) There are many Conservatives throughout the province who will poll a silent vote for the patriotism of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. (Applause.)

At the same meeting it was announced that Mr. Forbes, head of the celebrated Forbes Manufacturing Co., had changed his allegiance from the Conservative to the Liberal party. In St. John, N. B., a prominent supporter of the Liberal candidates is H. A. McKeown, a rising lawyer, who was an active campaigner on the Conservative side. It is also stated that the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, lately the Conservative candi ate in King's, N. B., has turned Liberal in his sympathies. Dr. McLennan, the Liberal candidate in Inverness, N. S., was until recently a Conservative. Controller John F. Wood is opposed in Brockville by W. J. Cluff, who was at last election one of his strongest supporters. And so it goes all along the line. Honorable Conservatives, men of weight and standing in the community, feel that they cannot identify themselves with the party while its policy and its actions are dictated by the unscrupulous tricksters and charlatans now at its head.

MR. HAGGART'S REPLY.

Mr. James Haggart's reply to the signers of the requisition asking him to become a candidate in Vancouver electoral district is a remarkable document. Mr. Haggart is supposed to be a Liberal-Conservative, which party he says he has supported for seventeen years. He says, in this reply: "I am thoroughly in accord with its (the Liberal-Conservative) policy—a reasonable protective tariff," and immediately declares himself in favor of "a tariff sliding scale which would accommodate the duties to the needs of the country. Such a policy and the gradual reduction of the tariff in the interests of the country at large, have met with the approbation of the people generally." Evidently Mr. Haggart is not very certain of his position on the tariff question and is trying the dangerous feat of riding the high protectionist horse and the revenue tariff horse at the same time. His utterance on the Manitoba school question is not less extraordinary as coming from a supporter of the Liberal-Conservative party "for the past seventeen years." It is simply unique, unapproachable and unassailable, and worthy of a place in our columns, if only as a curiosity. Here it is in all its original ingenuousness:

On the Manitoba school question I consider that the Manitoba legislature in passing the public school act failed to make the measure satisfactory to the minority, who had rights embodied in the constitution of the province. The Dominion government in trying to pass the remedial bill has not been sustained by the country. After the minority had appealed to the privy council of Great Britain, and they (privy council) decided that the minority had a grievance, conciliation should have been used until the Manitoba government settled the matter to the satisfaction of all concerned. On Manitoba rests the responsibility of all the religious feeling that has been manifested lately. While my sympathy has been with the Dominion government (considering the position in which it has been placed) I could not support it in its remedial bill.

"MINISTER IN ONE SENSE."

"It is understood that at an early date the departments of customs and inland revenue will be restored to their former status. This will give Mr. John F. Wood and Lieut.-Col. Prior full ministerial rank. They are ministers now in one sense, but not the ministers over their own departments. It was thought at one time during the reconstruction that Mr. Wood would become a minister, and the new man take the controllership, but the special aptitude Mr. Wood has shown for the administration of the customs department made it unwise to effect a change at this juncture. When the present plans are carried out, however, the customs and inland revenue branches, which are both highly important, will be again full-fledged departments." So said the Ottawa correspondent of the Toronto Mail and Empire, the chief government organ. We had expected to see this gentleman utterly crushed, withered up and utterly abolished by a blast of fiery indignation from the Victoria organ, but strange to say he has been entirely left alone. That is mistaken leniency, because some people may come to believe that he spoke the truth. Even the "callowest simpleton" may be led to entertain doubts. There is the more danger of this because of the admission made by Col. Prior last evening that the government would like to change the present arrangement and make the customs and inland revenue branches, to use the Mail correspondent's phrase, "full-fledged departments." It seems strange, by the way, that there should have been some talk of promoting Mr. Wood to be head of a department, but none of promoting Col. Prior. Sir Charles Tupper does not seem to have entertained the idea for a moment. It is not even suggested that this oversight was due to the colonel's peculiar efficiency as head of the inland revenue subdepartment.

THE DITCH THAT HAGGART DUG.

Hon. John Haggart, minister of railways and canals, represents South Lanark in the house. He was a mill owner in the town of Perth, which is situated on a small stream called the Tay, and about six miles from the Rideau canal, which connects Kingston and Ottawa. The town of Perth has had railway connection for thirty or forty years and the canal gave the merchants a competitive line in summer, necessitating, however, the teaming of freight over six miles of good roads. Perth is not a very big place—probably it contains 3000 people—but it was the home of Haggart, who had inherited an old custom flour mill that never returned large dividends to its owners. Haggart conceived the idea of "bringing grist to his mill" by inducing the government to construct, at public expense, a canal from his mill to the Rideau Canal. The estimated cost was $132,660, but the actual cost has amounted to the enormous sum of $476,128. Not a dollar had these public plunderers for British Columbia but they could find hundreds of thousands as in this case, and millions as in others, to waste in works that were absolutely useless.

The Tay branch of the Rideau Canal, or Haggart's Ditch, as it is familiarly named alike by Perth Grits and Tories, was navigated, during twelve months, by several pleasure skiffs, one scow, two yachts and two tugs. The total revenue from this canal for the year ending January 1st, 1894, was $135.76, while it cost the country to maintain it during the same period $2486. Last year the expense of maintenance was $3189 and the revenue only $120.

This was the work of Haggart, the colleague of our alleged "cabinet minister," but Haggart could not have succeeded in squandering about half a million dollars if he had not been supported by Messrs. Prior, Earle and others. The people of Perth did not need the canal, they do not use it and never will use it for freighting to or from Montreal, for the simple reason that it is a slow and circuitous route and they have a first class railway service. No doubt they were pleased that half a million dollars should be expended in their sleepy little town and they did not protest against the waste of public moneys; but they never claimed that Haggart's Ditch was built because it was required by the public.

A resolution condemning this expenditure was moved in the House of Commons in 1894 by Mr. John Charlton, M. P., but it was voted down by the government majority. If any elector wants to know how Messrs. Earle and Prior voted let him ask those two valiant defenders of all that is corrupt and indefensible in the government's policy of the last seven or eight years. All that we have to say is that they did not support Mr. Charlton's resolution.

MISINFORMED.

Col. Prior said at last night's meeting: "Since he had returned to Victoria he had heard that the opposition are putting it about that a wise thing to do would be to send to parliament one man from each side, so that whichever party might be in power Victoria would have a friend at court." The colonel's informant was most decidedly mistaken, for the opposition are not "putting it about" that it would be wise to elect a man of each party. They are firmly of the belief that it would be a wise thing to elect the two Liberal candidates, and they will cordially agree with Col. Prior that "it would be simply folly to split the vote." Victorians want no supporter of Tupperism to represent them in the next house.

A STATEMENT AND ANSWER.

"A declaration in favor of the Liberal party will undoubtedly lead to a reversal of the fiscal policy which has obtained since 1878, and to a disastrous revolution in the general business of the country."—Sir Charles Tupper's manifesto.

"Sir, the Liberals of Canada are not revolutionists, but reformers. They are reformers of the English school, as I have had occasion to proclaim more than once, and when Sir Charles Tupper tells us that change means revolution I answer him that change in the tariff does not mean revolution, but the good old Anglo-Saxon word reform, reform and nothing else. Are we to understand from Sir Charles Tupper that if the Canadian people once endorsed a vicious policy they must submit to it forever, because reform would lead to revolution? As my friend Mr. Stephens has told you, there is a vast amount of money invested, and it would be madness to endanger its security. We can deal with protection without causing any disturbance of any kind whatever."—Mr. Laurier at Quebec.

Toronto Mail, June 9, 1891: Of the system which Mr. Blake deplores, Sir Charles Tupper has notoriously been the chief agent. All that is worst in it and has tended most to debase the national character is familiarly connected with his name and which may be said to be a household word of corruption. His name is at this moment unpleasantly connected with suspicious commercial affairs in England. He will protest his innocence, of course, but his word, unhappily, is that of a man whose veracity is much impugned and who does not scruple to use stolen letters. It is evident what sort of a scene would be opened by his accession to power. He is the prince of political cracksmen, no doubt, but we cannot afford to purchase ability, even of so rare a kind, at such a price as that of continued and increased demoralization. The appointment of such a man at the head of the state would be not merely the inauguration of violence and corruption, unredeemed by any true wisdom or statesmanship, it would be the signal for the disruption of the community and for a moral civil war.

In his address last evening Col. Prior, referring to the four French ministers from Quebec, made the following extraordinary statement: "These are four men against whom the finger of scorn has never been lifted." Is Col. Prior really ignorant of provincial politics in Quebec, or does he presume that Victorians are? The public has some recollection of a loan privately floated by Hon. L. O. Taillon, by which the province lost, and somebody made a profit of nearly two millions, and this in defiance of a solemn promise to his finance minister, Hon. John Hall, who was very ill at the time, and who, on his recovery, resigned his seat in the cabinet. On this account the city of Montreal at a bye-election condemned Mr. Taillon's action by returning a Liberal to the provincial house by a majority of over twelve hundred. Mr. Taillon now has to go to Terrebonne, Mr. Chapleau's pocket borough for a seat in the cabinet of the Great Stretcher.

The Rev. Wm. Cochrane, an ex-moderator of the Presbyterian church in Canada, has given his views on the Manitoba school question. He says:

As the discussion of the Manitoba school question goes on, it is evident to all, save the bitterest partizans, that a final settlement can only be made along the lines suggested by the Greenway government. By the secularization of the public school system, leaving the denominations that desire it, to give religious instruction at certain hours, either under statutory enactment or by arrangement with the school trustees.

This would satisfy all parties—those who maintain that the state has no right, as such, to interfere with religion, and those who desire that, in some way, provision should be made for religious teaching. Under such an arrangement, so far from the schools becoming Godless or non-Christian, as alleged, religion would become a thing more real and practical than is possible by a formal prayer, and the reading of a few verses of Scripture.

To force the remedial bill upon Manitobans seems madness; serfs under Russian despotism may submit to such treatment—Canadians never will.

WM. COCHRANE.

Montreal Witness: Did Mr. Chamberlain's straight declaration that the adoption by the colonies of a revenue tariff, so far as the United King om was concerned, was an absolutely necessary preliminary for such a project prove a deathblow to it, as a Conservative project as well as a protectionist scheme? Do the Conservatives prefer protection to imperial preferential trade, as well as the union and consolidation of the empire, which they declared was dependent upon the adoption of some such project? It appears so. Anyway, the protected manufacturers could not be expected to contribute funds in order to carry into power a party pledged to an imperial preferential trade project based upon the abolition of protection. Well, it is better to drop the project than to pretend to favor it in order to carry the elections. So, even Sir Charles's course in this regard we commend. Though we advocate and urge imperial preferential trade on Mr. Chamberlain's basis of revenue tariff, it ought to be carried only on a fair understanding; neither the protected manufacturers nor the agriculturists ought to be betrayed, as one or the other would have to be were the project adopted by a protectionist government.

Sir Charles Tupper is opening his campaign very well. He has already promised seven lines of railway for Prince Edward Island, the Hudson's Bay railroad to Manitoba, and at Port Arthur yesterday he promised that the Ontario and Rainy River railway would be at once constructed. Before the campaign is over in Victoria it will probably be found that Sir Charles has heard about the British Pacific railway and will promise that it will be at once built. The prince of political crackmen apparently believes that he can fool "all the people all the time." Judging from his past success in the art of promising, he has some slight ground for nursing that belief, but it is likely he will experience a rude awakening about the middle of June.

W. W. B. McInnes, the opposition candidate for Vancouver Island electoral district, left Victoria this morning for Mayne Island to meet the electors there. A series of meetings, which will occupy every day up to the 23rd of June and cover the entire constituency, has been arranged; and when they are finished the electors of the district will have good reason to thank the opposition candidate and his friends for introducing a new system of political warfare. The reason of the electorate will be appealed to and judgment will be asked on the merits of the case.

Allen Pringle, of Selby, Ont., prominent among the Ontario Patrons, says the most pressing needs of the country are:

(1) "A vigorous onslaught on that extravagant, incompetent and corrupt government at Ottawa, to be carried out by good Liberals, Patrons and McCarthyites about June next led by Wilfrid Laurier.

(2) "A 'first-class' government service' by the aforesaid parties, with the aforesaid Wilfrid as premier, who are to succeed the present 'Troupe' there.

(3) "The protection of the interests of th Dominion thereafter by lifting the N.P. off the backs of the farmers and others, and by giving the people competent, honest and economical government.

The Toronto News, a paper closely allied with the Mail and Empire, is authority for the statement that Sir Charles Tupper offered to appoint Sir Oliver Mowat lieutenant-governor of Ontario and that he offered a senatorship to Hon. David Mills on condition that he should take no part in the present campaign. Sir Charles went to the wrong quarter with his bribes, making the mistake of judging those two men by his own standard. The incident shows how ready he is to use any form of bribery he thinks will prove effectual.

A. F. Mulhein, president of the Stormont and Cornwall Conservative association, has addressed a letter to the press in which he expresses disgust at the action of the government last session and adds he is now in full sympathy with the Liberal party. He is only one out of the many taking the same course.

The prsesence of Premier Turner on the Conservative club platform is not intended so much for home consumption as for effect abroa . The premier's name evokes no enthusiasm in Victoria these days, but it looks a big thing in an eastern paper.

Mr. Laurier congratulates Premier Tupper on the acquisition of Mr. Taillon, whose borrowing proclivities, he says, will make him a fit companion. To make the cabinet really complete in this respect and the strongest the country can produce, he should have secured Premier Turner.

It is pointed out that the only English speaking merchant of Quebec who ever opposed Mr. Laurier was upon his platform at the demonstration last week.

THE POPULATION TEST.

A correspondent writing from Mission City, who signs himself "Politics," asks: "Will you please state in your next edition of the weekly, if you can, what is the natural increase in population of the country. It is to settle an argument. I claim that the increase of Canada's population from 1881 to 1891 (11.76 per cent.) is just about what the births would be, and that there are as many Canadian born leave Canada for the States as there are foreign immigrants come in."

Our correspondent is decidedly on the moderate side in both his claims. The increase of Canada's population during the decade of the Nation Policy between 1881 and 1891, as shown by the census of the last named year (11 and some odd per cent., as our correspondent has mentioned), was considerably less than the average natural increase, which has been placed by statisticians at 14 per cent. in ten years. It has been estimated, however, from the census returns, that the natural increase of population in Canada during the decade in question was greater than the average, that it was about two per cent. a year, or a total of 900,000 for the ten years. Besides this natural increase, the statistics of the department of agriculture show that over 800,000 immigrants came into Canada during the ten years from 1881 to 1891. This would be a total increase, it will be seen, of 1,700,000. The actual increase during the decade in question, as shown by the census, was only 500,000—400,000 than the natural increase 000 immigrants, a tota were thus lost to Can ten years of the Nation 1881 to 1891. In other tire natural increase of 300,000 of the immigran joined the exodus during th able decade in which the Nati.... Policy was supposed to be getting in its benevolent work of making the people rich.

It is worth mentioning in this connection that the previous decade, during which the country was for the greater part of the time under the Liberal revenue tariff, showed an increase in the population of the Dominion of 18 per cent., against the 11 per cent. of the N. P. decade. And yet, in spite of all this weight of evidence, and much more that might be cited, going to show that the N. P. might more appropriately be labelled N. G. Sir Charles Tupper, in his recent election manifesto to the people of Canada—which we shall notice more fully when convenient—has the assurance to "point with pride" to the "happy conditions everywhere apparent" in Canada to-day (this surely must be ironical), and to credit the N. P. with giving "effective and general stimulation to the life of the Dominion"—Columbian.

PREDICTS A LIBERAL VICTORY.

In the course of an able speech delivered by Dalton McCarthy at Owen Sound a few days since he said: "I want to see that government voted out. I would be well pleased to see Mr. Laurier come in. Any change must be for the better. No change can be for the worse. If the Liberal party goes in, and I think they will, I shall do what lies in my power to keep them straight as I did the Conservatives." After stating that the Conservative party in Upper Canada had once before been wrecked, he said: "I say now that when the 23rd of June is over Sir Charles Tupper will find himself without a corporal's guard west of the Ottawa river." He praised Hon. Mr. Laurier for his utterances on the remedial school bill and stated that they were the sentiments of a wise man.