

done, and Mr. Turcotte be at the same time paid for his services without *contravening or violating the independence of Parliament Act*? Mr. Turcotte, it is well known, is not a rich man. He cannot afford to gratuitously devote his time and energies to official duties. There can be no question that he will be paid, if indeed, he has not already received his reward. However that may be, *the practice is an immoral one*. Mr. Turcotte cannot, as a member of the Government without portfolio, be legally paid. If the administration do not provide for his remuneration in an indirect, irregular and illegitimate manner, they will be forced to introduce during the session *a special bill of indemnification*, trusting to the majority of the House for its adoption. But *where, then, will the economy and retrenchment come in?* If the Government introduces such a bill, they cannot do otherwise than admit that they have *grossly deceived the public*; if they do not, it will be because the public revenue will be levied upon in an indirect manner, and if such be the practice in this case it is reasonable to ask, *How many more such cases are there?*

MR. TURCOTTE'S SECRET.

Why was not Mr. Turcotte given a portfolio in the first instance? Because he dared not again try his chances with the electors of Three Rivers, and because the administration were pledged not to increase the number of Cabinet offices. *They therefore preferred to have a handy man of all work*, who would do what was required of him, and was *prepared to be rewarded either openly or covertly* so long as he was paid. But a policy like this is neither straightforward nor honest. The case of Mr. Turcotte is, without question *a direct violation of the law which requires that every Cabinet Minister before accepting Cabinet office shall go to his constituents for re-election*, and had MR. TURCOTTE NO CONFIDENCE IN THREE RIVERS, OR WAS HE CONVINCED THAT IT HAD NO CONFIDENCE IN HIM?