

lot was either a mineral lot or it was not. If it was, then the reasons which induced Mr. Langelier to cancel the sale to Johnston, and advertise it at public auction, were not removed by the representations of the Rev Mr. Ball and his neighbors. If it was not, then the sale should have been confirmed as an agricultural lot at thirty cents an acre. It was not confirmed. Mr. Langelier by his own act declared it to be a mineral lot, and having done so, he left himself without the shadow of an excuse for having withdrawn it from public sale. What was the motive for this action? The subsequent facts sufficiently establish that the whole thing was done in the interests of a prominent supporter in the Legislature, Mr. George Irvine. Here is the proof:—According to the records in the registry office at Inverness, it appears that on the 1st October last, Mr. Johnston sold to the Hon. George Irvine and John Mooney two-fifths of the lot, or about ninety-one acres, for \$100; and curiously enough in the deed of sale, the following passage occurs:—"This deed is made subject to and in conformity with a certain agreement made between the said parties at Quebec on the "seventh day of June last" (1878). We have thus these facts established:—(1) A sale of lot 27 in the Township of Thetford as an agricultural lot at thirty cents an acre. (2) The cancellation of this sale on the ground that the lot was a mineral one, and its advertisement to be sold at public auction on the 5th June. (3) The withdrawal of the lot on the morning of the sale, notwithstanding the presence of persons willing to bid upon it, at the solicitation, among others, of Mr. George Irvine. (4) The sale of the lot, by private sale, not as an agricultural, but as a mineral lot, to Mr. Johnston at a dollar an acre, on the 8th of June. (5) The sale by Johnston to Messrs. Irvine and Mooney on the 1st of October following of two-fifths of the lot, in pursuance of an agreement made on the 7th of June, two days after its withdrawal, at Mr. Irvine's instance, from public sale, and the day before its private transfer by the Crown Lands Department. (6) **A loss to the Province of over eleven thousand dollars**, as Messrs. Shuster and Ross were prepared to give at least fifty dollars an acre for the land, the minerals upon it being of very great value. The whole proceeding was simply

a scandalous job, the money sacrificed being more than all the savings effected in the Civil Service, including the reduction of Ministers' salaries, in one year.

### THE NUT-LOCK SCANDAL.

During their short term of office the Joly Ministry succeeded in piling up so many scandals that they may fairly claim to have carried out the peculiar political theories of the Liberal party to a greater extent than even the Mackenzie Administration at Ottawa had done. The most glaringly corrupt of these is known as the Nut-Lock Scandal, and the evidence adduced as to the relations of the Government in the transaction shows them to have been guilty of selling a public contract for money with which to assist their friends in the elections then pending. In November last Hon. Mr. Joly recommended to Mr. Peterson, Engineer-in-Chief of the Government railway, the trial on ten miles of the road of a nut-lock, patented by a Mr. Mackay, a clerk in the Railway Department. The cost of the new lock was to be thirty dollars per mile, the Government bearing the expense of placing them, but for some reason or other, Mr. Peterson did not act on the suggestion of the Premier, probably because he regarded the proposed outlay as useless, and nothing more is heard of Mr. Mackay and his nut-lock until the following May, when Hon. Mr. Joly being absent in England, and that distinguished purist, the Hon. Mr. Starnes, discharging the duties of the Commissioner of Railways, an opportunity was afforded for the hatching of a job. On May 15th, on the recommendation of Hon. Mr. Starnes, an order-in-council was passed directing that the nut-lock be supplied over the whole length of the Government railway, sidings and branches included, at a cost of fifty dollars per mile, the contractor providing the labor. It is important to notice that the first offer of the inventor was to furnish the nut-locks for thirty dollars a mile, so that in his second proposition, that accepted by the Government, he allows twenty dollars a mile for the labour of placing them. The order-in-council having been passed, and no obstacle interposing to prevent the carrying out of his little scheme, Mr. Starnes wrote to Hon. Mr. McGreevy, contractor for the eastern section of the railway, urging that the work should be gone on with, but in the meantime a more pro-