The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1876.

VOL. V. NO. 221. TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1876. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

SOUTH ONTARIO.

Hon. T. N. Gibbs and Mr. J. D. Edgar the Candidates.

IT appears there were so many local Grit aspirants for the honour of contesting South Ontario, that it was found impossible to select any one of them, and, in consequence, Mr. J. D. EDGAR was chosen on Saturday to carry the standard of the Party. Mr. EDGAR has the reputation of a pretty well, beaten politician. Rejected twice in Monck and once in South Oxford, we venture to think if he accepts the nomination tendered him at Whitby on Saturday last he will undertake the toughest job of his life. But then does he not owe much to the Party? With $6,000 of good money in his pocket for a few months' service in British Columbia, how could he refuse to lend a forlorn hope, be it where it might? We have not to consider, however, merely what he owes to the Party. The path of future preferment lies in the dark valley of defeat at the polls. We are not sure, if Mr. EDGAR enters upon this fight—as he most likely will—that he would not as sure have defeat as victory. Victory would bring him at once a seat in the House of Commons, and $1,000 a year. Defeat would bring him—well, suppose we say the Lieutenant-Governorship of British Columbia. Mr. EDGAR can afford to be a MARK TAPLEY in the contest; and on the whole we are disposed to think that he would prefer defeat to victory. We have sult to the intelligence and common sense of the electors is offered, we hope to hear that the offender has been unceremoniously hooted off the platform or otherwise made to "subside."

A CANDID CONFESSION.

DESPITE the facts, the Toronto organ has taken the ground that in his late Pacific railway notification Mr. MACKENZIE has not been inconsistent with anything said or done by him on the subject. The Hamilton organ, less under bonds, probably, to make black appear white for the Government, says:—

"It is objected to this plan—or, rather, not to the plan so much as to its proposer—that Mr. Mackenzie, in thus proposing to give the work of building the railway to private companies and contractors, is abandoning his old principles, which, it is alleged, was to construct the line as a Government work—and forming an entirely new project. In other words it is complained that the Premier, in making the proposition, is contradicting himself. We are disposed to ask that, as a matter of fact, the country will judge, not whether the proposal thus for the present plan is a good one or the reverse, but whether it is true that it were necessary, MUCH PREFER THAT Mr. MACKENZIE should be INCONSISTENT, and give A RESPECTABLE PACIFIC RAILWAY SCHEME as the OUTCOME OF HIS INCONSISTENCY, that he strictly consistent, and as the fruit of that consistency put forward a ruinously costly and bad project. At its best, the railway must be a heavy burden and great risk, and what is wanted is the least burden and risk possible, no matter should Ministers and Parliament have to change their opinions and purpose half a dozen times in order to secure it. That is common sense, whether it is party politics or not."

Well may Mr. MACKENZIE exclaim, "Save me from my friends!"

LEAVES FROM THE PRIVATE HISTORY OF AN ELECTION.

WITH the result of a suit of the Montreal *Herald* v. WORKMAN, M.P., we have no concern one way or the other, but there is in the evidence adduced a series of revelations which must be placed at the earliest possible moment in that interesting volume which we are told by friends of the Party of Purity is alone to be found. The last addition was poor MALCOLM CAMERON's appeal to the Party to refund to him in his old age the large sums he had spent in carrying on the war against bribery and corruption in Huron. The appeal was not answered. The addition now about to be made is the earnest protest of a wealthy member of the Party against the blood-suckers who lead the Party "through thick and thin."

When Mr. THOMAS WHITE came forward to contest Montreal West in the Conservative interest last September, the Ministry and their friends were sore beset to find an available candidate. Mr. WHITE was not known to be a partizan, and may lead him to a more honourable line of conduct than that he has already followed in Dominion reformation in this respect. Mr. MACKENZIE will leave no stone unturned to retain the seat for his party, and, at the next place, to defeat Mr. GIBBS, whose presence in Parliament, in the Opposition ranks, would be far from pleasing to him. The time is brief. There must be active work, well directed. There is an adverse majority to pull down. It can be pulled down. South Ontario must be as alive as any other part of the country to the painful incompetence—we might almost say, the imbecility—of the Government. The winning of one seat, we know, will not destroy the Ministry, but it will help to awaken them to the measure of their impotency, and that their rejection from office would be a public blessing. It would be like making a vigorous effort to snatch South Ontario from the hands of the Incapables.

A DECEIVER BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

MR. GUTHRIE, just nominated the Grit candidate for South Wellington, may be for all we know a very nice man in private life. But his speech before the Convention last week shows that as a politician, seeking a seat in the House, he is a deceiver before the people on a question of great importance. We all know how the cry of "Reciprocity" has been dinned into our ears by the Grit leaders, until the country is sick of it. Whenever public occasion arises for expression of the opinion that it is high time for Canadians to take care of their own interests, as our neighbours do of theirs, and to put an end to the folly of Free Trade on one side with high Protection on the other—some false prophet is sure to rise up and try to confound good counsel with some such remark as, "Oh! but would it not be far "better if we could get Reciprocity?" Of course the general answer must be that if we could get Reciprocity, exactly fair and even between the two countries in every respect, we should be willing to accept it. But what is the use of spending time talking about that which we know cannot be. If the Americans had been inclined for Reciprocity it would have been re-established long ago; but they are not, and they are now as much opposed to it as ever. Resolutions in its favour, moved by Representative WARD or any other member of Congress do not amount to "a row of pins." The two great parties—Republicans and Democrats—are now framing their platforms and choosing their respective candidates for the presidential election; but neither of them will say a word in favour of Reciprocity with Canada. There is so strong a feeling on the other side that neither Party care to shoulder the load, seeing that there is everything to lose and nothing to gain by it. The contemptuous rejection of the BROWN Draft Treaty, excessively favourable to American interests as it was, should open people's eyes here to the folly of looking for Reciprocity. So plain is all this that we hold that any man, who before a Canadian constituency interposes his miserable "if" with regard to Reciprocity, offers an insult to his audience and should be hooted off the platform. Our people want no more "ifs" on this subject; it has been "if" "push" made by the Grit Party had its origin and its corruption. It is quite possible that the express since made of the doings of Hon. JOHN SIMPSON in that election may have had some influence in the mind of Mr. GUTHRIE, as it has been a very bad one, may lead him to a more honourable line of conduct this time. But we must look for real Grit reformation in this respect. Mr. MACKENZIE will leave no stone untuned to retain the seat for his party, and, at the next place, to defeat Mr. GIBBS, whose presence in Parliament, in the Opposition ranks, would be far from pleasing to him. The time is brief. There must be active work, well directed. There is an adverse majority to pull down. It can be pulled down. South Ontario must be as alive as any other part of the country to the painful incompetence—we might almost say, the imbecility—of the Government. The winning of one seat, we know, will not destroy the Ministry, but it will help to awaken them to the measure of their impotency, and that their rejection from office would be a public blessing. It would be like making a vigorous effort to snatch South Ontario from the hands of the Incapables.

WINSLOW RELEASED.

THE forger WINSLOW is now at liberty, and there has been at once a triumph of red tape and a conspicuous failure of justice. Last week Chief Justice MELLOR granted an order for WINSLOW's release, and he was liberated the same afternoon. In answer to enquiries, it was stated that the British Government did not ask that WINSLOW should be retained in custody, the refusal of the United States to make a supplemental article to the Treaty having put an end to negotiations. We have much respect for her Majesty's Ministers, among the rest for Lord DERBY, whose special duty it is to deal with foreign Governments, and we know that it is a simple justification of the course adopted may yet appear. At present, however, we see only this, that a criminal of the most serious class—dangerous because of its heavy depredations upon society—escapes from prison, and, as far as we know, Governments that are powerless to punish him by reason of the red tape fetters which they have fastened on themselves.

Seeing that Canada, lying for thousands of miles along the American border, was really a greater sufferer by the extradition question than England has, the public here may wish to know whether the authorities at Ottawa have ever remonstrated with the Home Government. WINSLOW being now released, any murderer, robber, forger, or other criminal may find his way, at once on the other side of the border, be able to laugh at officers and courts of justice. Will Canadian Reformers come to a halt, and now we know that a Canadian criminal of the deepest dye has only to get to American soil to be beyond the reach of law. Can we afford to let such a state of things continue, seeing that nearly one-half of the adjacent general demoralization and encouragement to crime caused by the wholesale escape of some criminals, like this, will be felt in our own cities? Even if there should now be a halt in the work of murder, it is a consideration that there is one contemplating rape, arson, robbery, forgery, or embezzlement has only to make sure of reaching the other side of the border to be safe.

EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY FOR INJURY.

An interesting, important, and extensive question has for some time been occupying the respective trade organs of masters and men in England, and has occasioned a long debate in the House of Commons. As the law stands an employer of labour is liable to the utmost farthing of his fortune for any accident happening to a person out of his employment, through the neglect of any person in employment, whether he has, or has not, control over, or possibility of avoiding the act of his negligent or incapable servant, he is liable for all the consequences issuing from that servant's carelessness or incompetence. Take for instance the case of a gentleman who has a large piece of cart in which he sends out vegetables, and whose assistant negligently runs over a passer-by, knocking him down, the employer is responsible, however they may be resulting. This is not complained of by employers. Indeed it is only just that, in such cases, masters should pay for damages occasioned by their servants. But the law is on a different footing when it comes to questions of great force and coercion, masters for damages occasioned to servants by the negligence of fellow servants. In the recent debate a Member interested in a colliery through some grossly reckless or careless act of one of the workmen, had his property blown up, and the lives of many of his workmen, and the lives of many others, and the property of others, and the lives of others, and the property of others, and the lives of others, and the property of others, and the lives of