the seats warm" for the former men, who were the most active members of the Conservative party at the time, till the scandal caused by their acts had settled down. Subsequent events proved that this idea had a good foundation. At the time then when the arrangements were made for the Government to take over the railways, the ousted Cabinet ministers, who by the way succeeded so well in tanning their political skins that they will never lose their color, began to think they might venture back to the seats they had left, and were besieging Mr. DeBoucherville daily. To their great astonishment they found the Premier was not so ready to add "black sheep" to his fold as they expected. They, however, made a determined onslaught, and the result of this was, in the end, that the best and ablest man they had, Mr. Robertson, was hustled out into the cold, and after that part of the tanned lambs found shelter, and part have been ever since airing their tempers somewhere in the shades between government and opposition.

Second—The Government had decided to take the railways. The state of things was that the works had been altogether discontinued for manymonths, and the contractors were practically insolvent. That this is a true statement is proved by the subsequent facts that the railway commissioners were subjected to insults in the endeavors which they had to make to arrange with the contractors' creditors along the lines, by paying a percentage on the debts, before the people would allow any works to be proceeded with, and also by their guarantee for large sums given to the banks, and by other acts of theirs.

Undoubtedly the public interests required that the works for completion of the lines should have been thrown open to public tender. There can be no question whatever but that this was the course that should have been followed. Tender considerations for feelings of contractors and sentimental desires to keep contractors out of the insolvency court have no right whatever to make a part of the Government policy. In fact all peoples would do well to make it a stern rule, having no exceptions to it, that too close an intimacy of Government and contractors should be sufficient reason for the overthrow of a Government. It is not possible for any such intimacy to exist and yet for the public money not to be squandered or the public interests not to suffer. As a fact, of course, although there was such an intimacy between the late Government and their contractors as to pass beyond a political crime and become idiotic folly, no such tender feelings or sentimental desires existed. Interest and influence alone guided them. The pathetic way in which the commissioners describe their watching of the contractor's struggles and embarrassments exceeds anything that could be made out of "a dying duck in a thunder storm". After watching his struggles (the contractor's, not the duck's) for months they relieved him by giving him some (public) money. (They remembered, no doubt, that there was