

OTTAWA LETTER.

The Government Damaging Canada's Reputation in England.

No Comfort for Laurier and Sifton in the Parnell Case.

The Infamous Gerrymander - Grand Trunk Lobby Trying to Canvas the Senators - Greenhills on Deck.

OTTAWA, July 4. - There are no more private members' days. From this on the government has control of the whole time of the house.

The capture of Monday from private members means the slaughter of a large number of innocent and well meaning measures and resolutions which are partly through the house.

Some of them have passed the second reading. Some are in committee. Some have been introduced. But whatever stage they have reached, whatever their merit, whatever experiences they have undergone, they are all out off a blow in their youth and beauty.

Among the bills which have gone the way of other innocents are:

Mr. Richardson's bill to enable clerks to attach the salary of civil servants.

Mr. Douglas' bill about seed grain indebtedness in the Northwest.

Several bills to amend the Criminal Code.

Two bills of Mr. McInnes about immigration and naturalization.

Mr. Maxwell's bill to increase the tax on Chinamen coming into this country.

Mr. McMillan's measure to reform the civil service.

Several of Mr. Davin's relating to the Mounted Police and the Northwest generally.

Mr. Britton's measure to provide voting machines for Dominion elections.

A number of amendments to the railway act.

Mr. McMillan's bill compelling hens to lay eight eggs to the pound.

Mr. Ellis' measure respecting canned goods.

Several amendments to the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. Cannon's bill regulating the horshod of fish.

Mr. Ingram's bill to prevent fraud in Dominion elections.

Then there are a great number of resolutions, including Mr. Rutherford's for the appointment of railway commissions.

Mr. Davin's about grain standards.

Mr. Fournier's Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal resolution.

Mr. Sproule's in favor of beet sugar bounties.

Mr. Davin's accusing the government of want of faith in increasing the duties on agricultural implements.

Mr. Moore's in favor of reduced duty on oil.

Mr. McInnes' requiring the establishment of a mint.

Mr. Donnelly's about preference with the British West Indies and also in favor of a bounty for steel ships.

Mr. Quinn's in favor of an eight hour day.

Mr. Gillies' resolution condemning the high duty on tobacco.

Some of these measures may possibly be rescued from an untimely death by the intervention of the government on their behalf. But so far as is known, Mr. Platt's resolution in favor of provincial prohibition is the only one that has a promise to that effect. Mr. Platt will get his day some time after the government has put through its urgent business and most of the members have gone home. He does not seem to be very much excited about it, however, as he is not nearly so aggressive a prohibitionist as he was before the change of government.

It should also be mentioned that the franchise bill of last year, which was declared to be so perfect a measure, is to be amended by a bill, of which the government has already given notice. It is not known what the bill will contain, but it is a long measure and includes a great number of amendments, which are found necessary to make the measure at all workable. Mr. Fitzpatrick put his name to the bill and then went away. He is on the brink deep and will probably be in Rome about the time his colleagues are trying to make head or tail of his new franchise act.

Mr. Fielding and Mr. Foster had a day on a hearing of the members who Mr. Fielding is trying to put into effect the good intentions of Mr. Fitzpatrick, the superintendent of insurance, who would like to give greater security to the people who insure their lives. The bill provides against the delusions of some fraternal societies which undertake to insure people's lives for less than the cost as scientifically determined. It also makes a conservative regulation as to the interest to be computed on reserve, so that companies shall not pay dividends and bonuses on the assumption that the assets in their hands are earning four and a half per cent, when the actual earnings are less. Finally it undertakes some supervision as to the character of investments made by companies. All Canadian companies are obliged to make a return every year of their assets and to give in detail the investments. The bill gives a long list of classes of securities in which insurance companies may invest. It is so long and so general that Mr. Foster thinks the parliament might almost as well give companies a free hand, seeing that there are very few possible investments excluded.

Mr. Fielding is inclined to think the same way, and is undoubtedly glad to find in Mr. Foster an influence behind him. Apparently the finance minister has been trying to make the regulations more strict than some of the companies liked, and has included

some securities against his will, but with Mr. Foster's backing he will be able to make a better fight, and to defend the investment classes in left over in committee for further amendment. Obviously there is no positive kind of guarantee for policy holders in the regulations professing to prohibit wild investments and allowing companies to purchase indiscriminately the bonds of railway companies, rolling stock companies and harbor trusts. For example, the bonds of the Chignecto ship railway will be good under this clause.

There was a rather lively discussion about the proposal of the minister of the interior to issue a new budget scrip to Northwest half-breeds. The participants in this case are to be all those born between 1870 and 1885; that is to say, all between 14 and 30 years of age. The Manitoba half-breeds have already been dealt with, and those in the Northwest are claiming equal treatment. Mr. Sifton is afraid that there will be another rebellion if they are not satisfied. He proposed that each Metis shall have 240 acres of land or scrip which will enable him to claim that area at any time. There is no objection to the grant of land. Everybody is in favor of that. But there are objections to giving the issue of scrip, as these certificates are usually captured by speculators at very low prices. The scrip is supposed to have a face value of \$240, but it is said that the half-breeds who are looking for it have already in many cases sold out their claims for \$40 or \$50. Now the land which would be given out to these people cannot be bought in any case for less than \$2 an acre. It therefore comes to this, that a speculator or white farmer who wants to get a farm of 240 acres, and would have to pay to the government \$720 for it, will be able to capture a half-breed with scrip and supplying him with liquor, to get the land for perhaps less than \$100.

Mr. Foster and Mr. Davin contended that though the half breed might be satisfied for the time with this provision, it is not in their interests to give them negotiable scrip. They favor giving them the land, and, if necessary, some other encouragement to settle on it. But if the Metis are determined to sell the land and turn their claim into money, Mr. Foster thinks it will be better to give them the value of their land in cash on the spot, or annual instalments, rather than give them scrip which they will sell for a trifle to some white man who will get all the benefit of the government bounty. It is argued that the half-breeds will not be permanently satisfied with anything less than justice, and that it is not justice to make the speculator rich out of a half-breed's claim, even though the scrip should in a rash moment consent to the operation.

Mr. Sifton claims that he has put in some safe guards. The scrip cannot be transferred except by those half-breeds who have come of age, and only then by a legal document signed in the presence of witnesses. It happens, however, that more than half of the persons concerned are already of age and the formalities of the transfer are matters which the land speculator can arrange in a very few minutes. The bill has been introduced at the second reading, and will probably become law. It authorizes the issue of \$700,000 for the scrip or an equal number of acres of land, and contains great possibilities for the benefit of speculators who can get a half-breed in his debt. Dr. Montague mentioned a case where a man bought land from the government for less than \$1300, of which \$1200 was paid in half-breed scrip. To his knowledge this scrip cost him \$60. The half-breed family which had it should have had 1,200 acres of land or \$1,200 in cash. The government is out \$1,200 in cash, as the white man would have paid that for the land. This has happened, and is probably as dissatisfied as he would have been if he had never got anything, and just as ready to join the riot if occasion should arise, but the white man is happy.

No doubt Mr. Sifton's measure of this year will have the support of a large number of land buyers and speculators in the wild and woolly West.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, July 5. - The redistribution of the gerrymander bill has again to the front, and will constitute the order of the day for some time to come. Mr. Clarke Wallace had the floor and opened up a vigorous attack on the measure. He pointed out that the minister of customs, who made the speech which was very long and very loud, had devoted very nearly his whole time to the alleged iniquities of the bill of 1882. Mr. Wallace denied that this measure was a gerrymander at all, and especially he denied that the arrangement was made by party heeled for party purposes. He had understood that Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Hon. J. C. Aikens had been the members who had changed the conservative redistribution for Ontario. They were both honorable men, but the redistribution now proposed had been made with the assistance of such heeled as Captain Sullivan and Simon Hewitt, two citizens who had become famous in connection with recent election trials. The West Elgin trial is a sore point with the government just now, since the party machine has been convicted of not only personating voters, but of personating returning officers and of an array of election frauds which the court has declared to be the worst ever exposed in Canada. This "Cap. Sullivan," who, according to Clarke Wallace, "was cheek by jowl with ministers for weeks while they were drafting this measure," was one of the chief operators in the West Elgin outrages.

Mr. Paterson was restless over this matter, and replied that he did not know Sullivan. Mr. Wallace retorted: "It is most remarkable that the minister of customs should tell precisely the same story as the Hon. John Dryden in South Ontario and the immaculate McNish in West Elgin. Neither of them knew anything about the heeled or the bribery that was going on. All the minister needs now to do is to exclaim, in the words of Preston, 'Ting the machine for me!'"

Mr. Wallace objects to the statement that the conservative gerrymander was intended to assassinate the late James Trow, Alexander MacKenzie or Mr. Mills. The fact was that the gerrymander was intended to give the political party which Mr. Mackenzie was crowded out of East Lambton to make a place for other grits, and compelled to run in York, where he was elected by a conservative vote out of sympathy, while David Mills and Mr. Paterson had been elected after the gerrymander, so called, and were only defeated in 1896, when the people learned that the wretch trying to raise two horses moving in opposite directions. Mr. Wallace showed that the government had disregarded county boundaries while professing to restore them. Even this city of Ottawa afforded an instance. New Edinburgh, which is a part of the city, is left in the county of Russell, to which two other townships are added from outside. Two townships in the county of Carleton, in which Ottawa is situated, are left in North Lanark. If the government had restored county boundaries it would have been necessary to give two members to Carleton, and two to the county of Russell. There would have been conservative. Therefore the government departed in this case from the principle of restoring county boundaries.

Mr. McMullen praised the proposed measure as a wise and just bill, which, according to him, corrected a grave injustice. He explained the defeat of Mr. Trow by saying that Sir John Macdonald had written a letter expressing regret in his own name, and hoping to see him again in the house. In spite of this letter other ministers had gone into the county campaigning against Mr. Trow. Mr. McMullen would not allow an explanation, and so it was not that time men, but that Sir John Macdonald was dead some months before Mr. Trow was elected.

An able and moderate speech against the bill was made by Mr. Clancy of Bothwell, whose constituency is abolished by this measure. Mr. Clancy said that he was not in a position to discuss the measure on broad lines. He corrected a number of Mr. Paterson's misstatements, as for instance that the bill of 1882 was voted through by the conservatives "in dumb silence." As a matter of fact, 29 conservatives spoke in favor of the bill and 17 liberals against it, and one of the clauses which Mr. Paterson particularly denounced had been inserted through the consent of Mr. Paterson himself. Mr. Clancy showed the absurdity of the calculations made by Mr. Mulock on the basis of majority. The same argument would prove that the conservative gerrymander of 1882 was a great number of seats by the vote of a bill. Five constituencies at the last election gave a conservative majority of 815 and a liberal majority of 94. According to Mr. Mulock's argument they ought to have given 23 seats to conservatives. As a matter of fact they did return three liberals and two conservatives. Mr. Clancy proved beyond question by the computation of the seats in the present bill, that the arrangement gave the liberals a representation in the house that their strength in the country called for. Still they were not satisfied and were trying to give themselves more seats by means of the present bill, at a time when the constitution did not call for it.

Mr. Clancy affirms that there is no principle in the present bill. It does not respect county boundaries. It does not give an equitable representation by population. It is not called for by any unfairness in the present arrangement. It is a measure of convenience. It is unjust, unconstitutional, and unnecessary.

Mr. Bell of Prince Edward Island spoke at considerable length in attack on the measure. This he did, and professed to distinguish between gerrymandering and a gerrymander. He made an argument for the constitutionality of the bill, but was not very successful in his discussion of the measure itself. In fact, he was hardly the last quater of his speech that he got to it at all.

Mr. Ross Robertson made a rather striking speech against the bill. He had denounced the measure of 1882 because he thought it was loading the dice. He thought then the conservatives were strong enough to go in without the measure. He thought the same thing about the liberals in the last legislature of Ontario. As a matter of fact, the constituencies which were carved to return conservatives for Ottawa had given a majority of the seats to the conservatives. He thought that the same thing had happened with regard to the constituencies which were carved to return liberals to Toronto. He did not believe in winning elections by loaded dice, and he thought that it was better for a party after loading the dice to give them to judges to throw, than it was to throw them themselves. The government was giving the old gerrymander a new one, and was doing it at a time when the constitution called for it. He thought the liberal party "struggled in a spasm of admiration for the judges. But with all their admiration they were unwilling to allow the judges to choose from among themselves the court to divide the constituencies. They would not allow the judges to choose three of themselves to do the work, but would choose a whole of them and then allow the decision of two to rule. Mr. Robertson hopes that the bill will not be amended by the senate, but that it will be wholely adopted. As a prohibitionist, he dwelt upon the injustice to that city, which was allowed about half the representation of other towns because it happened to be conservative. Mr. Robertson has a few more suggestions for county boundaries in federal elections. He says parliament does not represent counties but people. Yet Clarke Wallace's county, which had not

been disturbed for 30 years, was now to be carved up in order to gerrymander Clarke Wallace out of the house. Sir Wilfrid could leave conservative part of the city of Ottawa in Russell county for the sake of helping his liberal friends, but he was taking conservative parts of Toronto out of East and West York for the sake of helping his liberal opponents in closing Mr. Robertson's "present government may be clever, but it suffers from chronic lack of time. Whenever there is a proposal for the country's benefit, the government forgets that there is a time to pass a copyright act, which would give employment to thousands of Canadians; it is too busy to deal with an insolvency law; too busy to pass a prohibition law; too busy to pass a measure to regulate the western farmer and elevator men in the west; too busy to create machinery to regulate the railways; and an ardent prohibitionist says it is too busy to pass a prohibition law. When anything is to be done for the country's sake the government has not a minute to spare, but when anything has to be done for the party's sake it has oceans of time. It is prepared to give months for an unnecessary gerrymander to get votes for the party, but cannot give a minute to measures which would give profit to the country. It is a pity that the government does not look to the party for its pay. The government forgets that there is a country except upon pay day, when it draws its salary from the country and keeps on working for the party."

An interesting departure in our penal system is introduced this year. The minister of justice proposed yesterday the second reading of his bill which would give the government an adoption of the English system. The prisoner is released long before the expiration of his time if his conduct be such that he is deemed safe to let him out. He obtains a license which releases him from the prison at a time to the time to the sheriff of the county where he resides. If the convict is found idling or any way misbehaving he is sent back to prison which releases him from the prison. He is not guilty. He knew that and courted the fullest research into the matter. So would this government if it were in the same position, but now they dodge an investigation in every possible way and had thus brought on themselves not only the rebuke of the great thunder, but what is more important, the contempt of public opinion in Canada.

Dr. Landerkin, who has not yet recovered from the effect of the correspondence about his son, took occasion to say that Sir Charles Hilbert Tupper's motion was not supported by Dr. Sproule and Mr. Haggart. The doctor did not intend to do the opposition service, but his remarks led to strong declarations from both these members declaring that the motion was more than justified and deserved their hearty support. Dr. Sproule went so far as to say that if the government continued to choke off investigation it would be the duty of the governor general to call them to account.

Mr. Sifton did not let the opportunity go without repeating his vain challenge and request that somebody would make some more charges. As for the London Times, he did not intend to allow that paper to decide on the policy of the Canadian government. Mr. Sifton was childish enough to intimate that Sir Charles Hilbert had gone away from the house and was apparently afraid to meet the government in these matters. As Mr. Sifton showed, Sir Charles Hilbert had given the highest proof of his willingness to meet the government in the motion he had made and his speech supporting it. The member for Pictou could hardly be accused of cowardice, even by his most slanderous opponents. It would be much more to the point if the ministers would meet the charges he had made, and try to re-establish the good name of this country, than to be casting reflections on the courage of a man whose charges they dare not meet.

This was a preliminary skirmish. The gerrymander bill was the principal theme of discussion for the day. The speaking was of a rather lively character, the opposition taking the aggressive and attacking both the motives and the character of the bill in a vigorous and clear terms. Mr. McInnes began by showing the dishonesty of Mr. Mulock's argument, the inaccuracy of his statements of history, and the utter unfairness of his reflections on the character of the bill. He had asked Mr. Mulock to be present, and demanded from him a statement as to whether he thought a certain arrangement of townships in the Bruce ridings was justified or not. Mulock had answered it in his first speech. But as a matter of fact the arrangement had been made at the request of one of Mulock's colleagues in the government. Moreover, it is likely to continue in the present bill, and Mr. Mulock by a direct answer would probably condemn the arrangement which he was advocating. Mr. Mulock dodged as well as he could, and finally refused an answer.

The constitutional discussion was carried on by Mr. Borden of Halifax and Mr. Powell on the opposition side, and by Dr. Russell, Mr. Britton and Lighton McCarthy for the government. Mr. Powell is of the opinion that the bill is not constitutional, a view which had been expressed earlier in the debate by Sir Charles Tupper himself. Mr. Borden thinks the constitutionality of the measure is at least doubtful, and that was Mr. Powell's view until Mr. Russell's argument to the contrary convinced him that Mr. Russell's view was wrong.

On the question of expediency both Mr. Powell and Mr. Borden, together with Mr. Oiler, Mr. Clarke and other earnest and thoughtful men on the opposition side, held strong opinions. They explained that the nature of the measure was to introduce a new element of distrust and suspicion into the public affairs.

On the merits of the bill itself there were some pretty strong expressions,

as well as in regard to the motives behind it. Mr. Oiler who is usually a very moderate man, expressed the view that this was a part of the operation of the same political machine which is owned jointly by the Laurier and Hardy governments, and whose operations have been exposed in the election campaign of the year. Mr. Oiler, two of the Toronto members who protest strongly against the injustice done to that city and against the mean attempt to deprive such men as Clarke Wallace and McInnes of their seats, state positively that the Hardy government is at the end of its rope. They affirm that the purpose of this bill, among other things, is to secure a poor pretence, for everybody knows that the judges were not to pronounce sentence but to report the results of their investigation to parliament.

After all, the most the premier can say for Mr. Sifton in the face of these charges was that he loved him for the enemies he had made. According to this view, no matter what crimes Mr. Sifton may commit the premier will back him up, provided the opposition does not like him. Sir Wilfrid had cited the Parnell case. It is true the Times was misled, but Parnell was not such a coward as to object to a judicial enquiry. He boldly challenged an investigation, and that by a commission of judges. "Why," asked Sir Charles, "For this reason. Parnell was not guilty. He knew that and courted the fullest research into the matter. So would this government if it were in the same position, but now they dodge an investigation in every possible way and had thus brought on themselves not only the rebuke of the great thunder, but what is more important, the contempt of public opinion in Canada."

OTTAWA, July 6. - The minister of the interior fell back on Mr. Oiler's report, which is still incomplete, and held that it was the duty of the cabinet not to resign their political responsibility to a committee commission of judges. There is perhaps something to be said for this position from a purely constitutional standpoint, but the government would have been better advised had they shown a deeper sense of the "necessity of meeting it."

This is the conclusion reached by the London Times concerning the action of the government in refusing a judicial investigation into the charges of blundering and plundering in the Yukon. Whatever may be said of the London Times in its treatment of the case, the Canadian government, Mr. Sifton was childish enough to intimate that Sir Charles Hilbert had gone away from the house and was apparently afraid to meet the government in these matters. As Mr. Sifton showed, Sir Charles Hilbert had given the highest proof of his willingness to meet the government in the motion he had made and his speech supporting it. The member for Pictou could hardly be accused of cowardice, even by his most slanderous opponents. It would be much more to the point if the ministers would meet the charges he had made, and try to re-establish the good name of this country, than to be casting reflections on the courage of a man whose charges they dare not meet.

Not only is it a just conclusion, but it is a damaging one for the government. It is important that the minority should stand with English opinion. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has realized this and has secured the advantages of such favorable advertising as could be obtained by spectacular appearances at the premier to be able to make a picturesque appearance at the jubilee. He has obtained some applause out of the preferential tariff penny postage. But what is the value of all this if it is not to be used for the purpose of the premier to be able to make a picturesque appearance at the jubilee. He has obtained some applause out of the preferential tariff penny postage. But what is the value of all this if it is not to be used for the purpose of the premier to be able to make a picturesque appearance at the jubilee.

So much the worse also for the Dominion of Canada, its prospects and its interests. So thought Mr. Davin when he brought the article in the London Times to the attention of the house and the government yesterday. It was shown to the government that while Mr. Sifton might cause himself by investigating himself, that process of enquiry did not satisfy imperial sentiment or remove the distrust that has become lodged in the heart of the empire. Mr. Davin in a few impressive words brought the matter to the attention of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and left the premier to deal with it.

Sir Wilfrid was hardly above the level of frivolity in his reply. He really seemed to think it no consequence that in Great Britain as well as in Canada "a dark cloud" rested on the name and fame of this country. He admitted that the Times was a respectable newspaper, but it had been mistaken sometimes and was often misinformed, particularly when it made some charges against the late Mr. Parnell. The threat here and here shattered promise that the government would probe the Yukon scandals to the bottom was repeated to a skeptical house which is rather tired of these barren pledges.

And then Sir Charles Tupper had his say, and for some twenty minutes he pressed home the lesson taught by the

Times. The government, as he showed, has simply been playing with the question. They had sent Mr. Ogilvie, their own servant, to try charges against themselves. Mr. Ogilvie had himself declared that his powers were not sufficient, and that his enquiry could not be complete. Yet the government refused all other enquiries. They threw blatant challenges across the house and backed out when a member took them up. To say that Sir Charles Hilbert Tupper was risking nothing in making charges and offering to withdraw from public life if he could not sustain them was a miserable subterfuge. The member for Pictou had held high positions in several administrations, and had taken part in some of the most important transactions, both in national and imperial, that had occurred in his time. No charge had ever been made against him as a public man or the head of a department. He placed in the scale whatever position he had attained and whatever advancement he could hope for in the future.

On their side the ministers were careful to risk nothing. They refused to allow themselves to be tried, evidently fearing that the result of a judicial enquiry would drive them from their positions. Sir Wilfrid refused an investigation on the ground that ministers should not be tried by judges. The government forgets that there is a country except upon pay day, when it draws its salary from the country and keeps on working for the party."

After all, the most the premier can say for Mr. Sifton in the face of these charges was that he loved him for the enemies he had made. According to this view, no matter what crimes Mr. Sifton may commit the premier will back him up, provided the opposition does not like him. Sir Wilfrid had cited the Parnell case. It is true the Times was misled, but Parnell was not such a coward as to object to a judicial enquiry. He boldly challenged an investigation, and that by a commission of judges. "Why," asked Sir Charles, "For this reason. Parnell was not guilty. He knew that and courted the fullest research into the matter. So would this government if it were in the same position, but now they dodge an investigation in every possible way and had thus brought on themselves not only the rebuke of the great thunder, but what is more important, the contempt of public opinion in Canada."

Dr. Landerkin, who has not yet recovered from the effect of the correspondence about his son, took occasion to say that Sir Charles Hilbert Tupper's motion was not supported by Dr. Sproule and Mr. Haggart. The doctor did not intend to do the opposition service, but his remarks led to strong declarations from both these members declaring that the motion was more than justified and deserved their hearty support. Dr. Sproule went so far as to say that if the government continued to choke off investigation it would be the duty of the governor general to call them to account.

Mr. Sifton did not let the opportunity go without repeating his vain challenge and request that somebody would make some more charges. As for the London Times, he did not intend to allow that paper to decide on the policy of the Canadian government. Mr. Sifton was childish enough to intimate that Sir Charles Hilbert had gone away from the house and was apparently afraid to meet the government in these matters. As Mr. Sifton showed, Sir Charles Hilbert had given the highest proof of his willingness to meet the government in the motion he had made and his speech supporting it. The member for Pictou could hardly be accused of cowardice, even by his most slanderous opponents. It would be much more to the point if the ministers would meet the charges he had made, and try to re-establish the good name of this country, than to be casting reflections on the courage of a man whose charges they dare not meet.

This was a preliminary skirmish. The gerrymander bill was the principal theme of discussion for the day. The speaking was of a rather lively character, the opposition taking the aggressive and attacking both the motives and the character of the bill in a vigorous and clear terms. Mr. McInnes began by showing the dishonesty of Mr. Mulock's argument, the inaccuracy of his statements of history, and the utter unfairness of his reflections on the character of the bill. He had asked Mr. Mulock to be present, and demanded from him a statement as to whether he thought a certain arrangement of townships in the Bruce ridings was justified or not. Mulock had answered it in his first speech. But as a matter of fact the arrangement had been made at the request of one of Mulock's colleagues in the government. Moreover, it is likely to continue in the present bill, and Mr. Mulock by a direct answer would probably condemn the arrangement which he was advocating. Mr. Mulock dodged as well as he could, and finally refused an answer.

The constitutional discussion was carried on by Mr. Borden of Halifax and Mr. Powell on the opposition side, and by Dr. Russell, Mr. Britton and Lighton McCarthy for the government. Mr. Powell is of the opinion that the bill is not constitutional, a view which had been expressed earlier in the debate by Sir Charles Tupper himself. Mr. Borden thinks the constitutionality of the measure is at least doubtful, and that was Mr. Powell's view until Mr. Russell's argument to the contrary convinced him that Mr. Russell's view was wrong.

On the question of expediency both Mr. Powell and Mr. Borden, together with Mr. Oiler, Mr. Clarke and other earnest and thoughtful men on the opposition side, held strong opinions. They explained that the nature of the measure was to introduce a new element of distrust and suspicion into the public affairs.

SURPRISE
is stamped on every cake of Surprise Soap.
There is only one Surprise. See to it that your soap bears that word -
SURPRISE
A pure hard soap.

As well as in regard to the motives behind it. Mr. Oiler who is usually a very moderate man, expressed the view that this was a part of the operation of the same political machine which is owned jointly by the Laurier and Hardy governments, and whose operations have been exposed in the election campaign of the year. Mr. Oiler, two of the Toronto members who protest strongly against the injustice done to that city and against the mean attempt to deprive such men as Clarke Wallace and McInnes of their seats, state positively that the Hardy government is at the end of its rope. They affirm that the purpose of this bill, among other things, is to secure a poor pretence, for everybody knows that the judges were not to pronounce sentence but to report the results of their investigation to parliament.

On the government side the speaking was unusually languid and ineffective. Lighton McCarthy, who keeps up an air of independence and who never speaks without a reference to "my late lamented uncle," adjusted himself as well as he could on the defence, announcing his intention of voting for the second reading, and then in committee of voting against those clauses which abolish the constituency of Cardwell and Bothwell. Mr. McCarthy knows very well that if his motion should carry, that if his motion will have to be changed, and that whatever shadow of principle there may be in it would be swept away. But he thinks that his late lamented uncle might have done something of the kind if he were alive, and so he will do it. The late lamented Dalton McCarthy, as known by other people, did not usually do things by halves. Whatever his faults, he was a man who held a course of his own, and did not bother himself trimming around to keep in touch with the party in power.

The government majority on the vote was only 36, while Sir Wilfrid claimed a majority of 50. It was a straight party vote so far as it went, but the diminished majority shows that the opposition did something of their guns better than the government. Three grit members who voted for Sir Charles H. Tupper's Yukon motion, Oliver, Richardson and McInnes, were absent without pairs.

While the commons is dealing with the gerrymander everybody is keeping a close watch on the proceedings in the other chamber, where Mr. Blair's Drummond and Grand Trunk bills are on their trial. Before this letter is printed the fate of the measure will probably be settled for this year, but just now it is a matter of great and grave uncertainty. There is undoubtedly a considerable feeling among senators that they have done all that can be expected of them in this emergency. They found the two bills crude and imprudent bargains, and they have suspended proceedings until they have been greatly improved. They found the Grand Trunk bill a measure calling for a payment of \$6,000,000 a year and have held it up until now it asks for only \$4,000,000 a year. They found a payment of \$6,000,000 a year demanded for the Chaudiere branch, and have wiped that out altogether. They found the government ready to pay five per cent on half the cost of Grand Trunk improvements, and have now before them a bill requiring the payment of only four per cent on a quarter of the cost. They found the bill permitting the Grand Trunk to exchange freight with the Intercolonial at Levis, and have now a measure to make the transfer in Montreal, giving the Intercolonial 30 miles haul that the Grand Trunk would otherwise obtain for itself. These and other improvements have been secured, and there is almost a certainty that a complete change in the traffic arrangement will be obtained which will free the Intercolonial of the servitude that Mr. Blair's Grand Trunk bargain imposed upon it.

The question has been whether the senate shall be content with these enormous gains and allow the measure to go through or shall hold it up another year. In either case the past action of the chamber is abundantly vindicated. The impression prevails that the two ex-ministers, Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Mr. Ferguson, are rather inclined to allow the bill to go through if these remaining concessions can be maintained, and that a number of senators are disposed to close up the campaign on these terms. The minister over the Drummond line and has equipped it with rolling stock. Enormous expenditure has been made already on the basis of this extension. The question is whether anything more can be accomplished by holding up the arrangement another year.

This question at least a score of senators answer strongly in the affirmative. Those who are in doubt as to the wisdom of repeating the action of two years ago, and those who think it ought to be repeated, are agreed that the bargain is a bad one and that the Grand Trunk has decidedly the

best of it. It is deemed that the are still doing these concessions and distinct and majority of prove it. been in the measure and many hold that the resists should give adopted by. Between whose more logical those who in policy, that a strong decision seems impossible can be sure to be if the large obtain could Trunk. It is abandoned say re-elected 487 St. Basile is done, but a whole agree impossible. Mr. Oiler and Mr. Perley, Prin Breton and are very measure. Meanwhile is operating Mr. Greenall. The railway making lists has been canvassed have tried times of re- find the m- de to per- suggestion a Grand Trunk paration was at the next. PEAC The Planar Dr Wessely the Arbitr THE HAC of the prop made public 50 sections. A perman the diploma signatory a Hague and character of relations of the at the Hag the ratified council will and organized which will and control the powers court and draw up the necessary questions in the working solute power must suspension of appointments the general of five meetings with the party of the v- dress annu powers a re- court the v- services THIS HAG discussion amended art when powers serious dispute all in- the disputed considered a mediatory p- Three addi list the bill adopted at t- of the Gen Njgra, head and Sir Julia British Dele- Members shall enjoy a- tions of dip- munities. The bur- its officers an- posal of the proper exerci- jurisdiction. The signa- communicate any stipula- decided betw- of them the- uments set- judgments p- A Dr. H. D. day received Australia, of place of his Fritz. The with Mrs. F. larly sad, F. twenty-fifth F. Peterson, bride of has been married Fritz, who is Jacob Fritz in the Cedar Capt. H. J. been promi- steamship In- bourne and of his marr- Argus, a ves- tons. Capt. his home in- ing a shore taken ill w- time he rec- death, while Mrs. Fritz's that of her on May 24th