

Not a word of independent and faithful advice has the country been able to receive, on a question of overwhelming importance, from any of its public men. The leading organs of the Opposition had furiously condemned the Agreement before it was made, and with its production a faction fight began. Deliberation there has been none, but only thrust and parry. It is edifying to see journals which are vehement defenders of the Party system broadly insinuating that Ministerial members are kept away from the debates, and that their intellects are being drowned with liquor, to prevent their being converted by the arguments. In the Press, we beg zealots for the dignity of Parliament to observe, there has been something more like discussion. The *Newmarket Era*, for example, considers the question with perfect fairness. Looking upon the debate as a combat, and measuring praise accordingly, we may say that the speech of the Minister for Railways was eminently strong and skilful: he did wisely in opening with a full history of the transaction and pinning his enemies to their own acts and declarations. Mr. Blake's great effort was somewhat marred by a tendency which besets lawyers, and Chancery lawyers especially: he laboured all the points of the case, great and small, as he would be bound to do in pleading before an Equity Judge. He deserves gratitude, however, for having kept clear of the Pacific Scandal and for having stooped to no personalities. Sir Richard Cartwright did not follow the good example of his leader. His insinuation that Sir Charles Tupper had taken a bribe reproduced, in a condensed form, all the libels of the organ with which he and Mr. Mackenzie have the misfortune to be identified. If Sir Charles Tupper struck fiercely in reply, he might plead the most intolerable provocation. His allusion to a stranger present at the debate was wrong: but Mr. Gordon Brown, who has been all his life making butcherly attacks on helpless men, has felt, for once, what it is to be held up to public odium without the power of reply. Sir Charles Tupper has tendered before the Pacific Railway Commission an explanation of his conduct in the matter of the