

The Weekly Mail.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION. BY MAIL IN ADVANCE. POSTAGE PAID. Daily edition, one year, \$7.00. Part of a year, one year, \$6.00. Single copies, one cent.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING. THE DAILY MAIL. Per Nonpareil line (12 lines max.) one inch. Ordinary advertising, one cent per line.

THE WEEKLY MAIL. The rate of ordinary advertising is 50 cents per line of solid copy of 10 words.

CONDENSED ADVERTISEMENTS ON FIFTEEN PAGES. WANTED. HOUSES. MONEY. TEACHERS WANTED. ARTICLES FOR SALE. BUSINESS CHANCES. PERSONAL. COULD BE WORTH. ASSISTANTS. OR ASSISTANT.

TORONTO, THURSDAY, JAN. 24, 1884. WARNING. Agents of other papers are through the country representing themselves as agents of THE MAIL.

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S SPEECH. The Governor-General began his address by a graceful reference to his own appointment. Her Majesty's choice has so far been justified by her representative's utterances.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

POINTS IN MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH. Mr. Blake's speech on the address has one merit. It contains all that Mr. Blake has to say. It has one deplorable fault—we are sure to have to read it at least three times more: once in reply to the Budget, once in reply to Sir CHARLES TUPPER, and once at the close of the session.

people of Canada have not found that policy friendly to their interests. If there is any one thing in which the people of Canada can be said to have made up their minds, it is in regard to the Pacific railway. And it is in any one opinion on the subject that Mr. BLAKE has taken an unpopular line. It is in regard to the railway. Up to the present time he has been unable either to control public opinion or to influence the opinion of Parliament, to check the public enthusiasm or to damage the prospects of a successful enterprise.

It is now in his power, of course, to do some damage; to play into the hands of the Northern Pacific railway, who are supposed to have minor paid agents in the Grit ranks; to encourage intimate speculation against Pacific railway stock; to discourage the founders of the enterprise, who have many thousands of men at work on the road; to check the population of the North-West; and to kindle a variety of ways the rivals and enemies of Canada. Mr. BLAKE may not be able to resist a temptation to do mischief that good may do to his party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

But, of course, there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party. National disaster would, of course, be an objection very well, if there is a particle of political prudence or patriotism in the Grit ranks, the policy of the party, as indicated by the course of the party, is not to do mischief to the party.

where to drink champagne and smoke cigars for the rest of their lives. Now the time is ripe for the company to be going on two feet, constructing too much, employing too many men, paying too much wages, and controlling too many lines. The public will probably consider that the Canadian Pacific railway has more manfully and honourably fulfilled their obligations than any public company ever did on this continent, at enormous risk to themselves; at a great disadvantage under adverse Canadian Grit criticism; and yet with such benefit to the country that Parliament will be fully justified in whatever steps may be taken to defend the country's great public work against the enemies who wish to destroy it.

POINTS IN THE PREMIER'S SPEECH. If Sir JOHN MACDONALD, as he said, had no time to prepare any impromptu speech in reply to Mr. BLAKE, he was not less happy in his observations for that lack of opportunity. There is this difference between the two speeches—Mr. BLAKE was factious because he was afraid to be very serious. Sir JOHN MACDONALD was jocular because he was not afraid of the comic politics of a rather clumsy performer. With practical skill and admirable brevity he replied to Mr. BLAKE's elaborate arguments and unseasonable witticisms. As we have elsewhere pointed out, and as Sir JOHN MACDONALD notices, Mr. BLAKE's speeches on the opening are getting yearly longer; but this would be tolerable, perhaps, if we had not to hear them all over again at intervals during the session.

—The point in the Premier's speech on which most interest will centre is that which relates to the Liquor License Act of 1883, as amended. The Premier, Sir JOHN MACDONALD, says that in one of his speeches he "went a little too far" exactly how much too far we do not understand from his speech. The Premier means that he went too far in thinking that the powers of the Legislature were not sufficient for other than merely revenue purposes. But we find our own position on the matter sustained by Sir JOHN MACDONALD by these points:

1. That the decision in *Regina v. Hodge*, as we have from the first contended, does not settle the main question at all. 2. That the Liquor License Act is not only legal but it is made effective. 3. That Mr. BLAKE does not, and dare not, declare that the Liquor License Act is not properly the law of the land to-day. We do not say that, but we do say that Mr. BLAKE's opinion, but none is forthcoming.

We have not, of course, heard the last of this question in Parliament, and we shall wait with a good deal of interest for any further expression of Mr. BLAKE's opinion, which has, so far, been emphatically concealed.

—Another point in Sir JOHN MACDONALD's speech, which must necessarily be effective with the people, is that which relates to Mr. BLAKE's unhappy language for the coming lapse of the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty. This is a subject on which the Grit orators and organs should be silent, for it is one that can only be discussed to their disgrace. The Premier points out, and he was made the victim of needless vituperation for his place in the Washington treaty.

—The Premier has never yet grasped the necessity for building the Pacific railway. From the very first Mr. BLAKE has been the enemy of the line. He conspired against his own colleagues in the House of Commons to break up the Yale-Kamloops line in 1879, but in 1878 he was cautiously silent when Mr. MACKENZIE promised to go on with it in the "open" way. He opposed the Lake Superior section with bitterness. He has been making capital out of the prairie section, with a reluctant opinion in favour of the same. He has always been in the habit of diverting traffic to his own channels. His patriotism has never reached the point of being proud of a through Canadian line. He cannot, we are sure, feel a thrill of satisfaction as that line is broken by the national policy of ideas of crossing the Rocky mountains on Canadian rails. Not having given any aid to the formation of the Dominion, he has no pride in its present and little hope in its future. Not having given any aid to the project of a Canadian Pacific railway, he has no principles to stand by in regard to it, and no honourable desire to see it successful. His name is not now, and never will be, connected with the institution or public work tending to the good of this country.

MR. BLAKE AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL CASE. We call the attention of the public to the position which Mr. BLAKE occupies regarding the two Privy Council cases of *Regina v. Russell* and *Regina v. Hodge*.

In 1878 Mr. MACKENZIE's Government, by means of the Governor-General's speech, declared that it was "very desirable" that there should be uniform legislation in all the provinces on the subject of the liquor traffic. There was then a doubt that the jurisdiction existed in the Dominion. Mr. MACKENZIE confessed as much. He was asked to take steps to settle the doubt, but he would not. Mr. BLAKE refused to do so in 1877 when pressed by Mr. Ross. When the Scott Act came to be passed Mr. BLAKE hid himself during the debates; he never opened his mouth.

In 1883, when the case of *Russell* had been decided, the Governor-General's Government put a law on the statute book. Mr. BLAKE discussed the case before him with great caution. Recognizing that it was against the provincial view of things, he endeavored to get the judgment of "five men" pointed out the absence of authority; and declared it was imperfect; but he never denied that a judgment in

favor of the Dominion Parliament was constitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

—The Premier recognized the right of the Dominion Parliament to supreme control of the liquor traffic; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional. In 1884, when the case of *Regina v. Hodge* followed, Mr. BLAKE discussed it in the same manner as he had done in the case of *Russell*; and he has never asserted that the *Crooks* Act was unconstitutional.

of a conflict of authority as to the jurisdiction of the local authorities." The Premier is very badly written of course, but it contains two confessions: One, that uniform legislation is "very desirable"—although now the Grits do not think so; and the other, that there was a conflict of authority in spite of which the *MacKenzie* Government proceeded to enforce the authority of the Dominion.

The Governor's speech was delivered on 8th February, 1878. The bill called the *Scott Act* and it was not in existence; and the paragraph was probably added to the end of the speech under pressure at the last moment. Whatever may have been the state of the measure, it was not introduced till May 3rd in the Commons (from the Senate), and even Mr. G. W. Ross was compelled to protest against having to discuss so important a matter as late a date. The Act was "rushed through with unseemly and ostentatious haste."

Next as to the *McCarthy Act* of 1883. It had become essential for something to be done. The *Scott Act* had not been very generally accepted. The decisions had been found to be unsatisfactory, and that the Dominion Parliament alone could deal with the liquor traffic as an article of trade and commerce. Mr. MACKENZIE had himself asserted the power of the Dominion, by passing the *McCarthy Act*, and temperance demanded instant action. The announcement in the speech was followed up by the nomination of a committee. The Grits refused to serve, and so the *McCarthy Act* was not passed. The name of the committee was named. Then the committee opened discussed the measure. Then it was discussed for six days in the Commons. And it has been generally accepted as the best compromise between the two Orders of the Dominion. The power of the Dominion Parliament to pass it is unquestioned now. And the Government have determined to enforce it. As Mr. MACKENZIE made the *McCarthy Act* in 1878, it is very desirable to have uniform legislation in all the provinces in regard to the liquor traffic. That is what the *McCarthy Act* provides.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. There can be very little doubt, we judge, in the mind of any sane man, that the Canadian Pacific railway must be completed—and the more speedily the better. And there will be very little doubt, we judge, that it can be best completed by the company that has it now in hand and that has the knowledge, the material, the plans, the men, the experience, and the interest to push it forward to the end. The railway is a national obligation. It is a national necessity. Its failure would mean a national calamity. We have very little to say that the road will fall, or that the company will be in a position to go on with the work, but it is very obvious that the Ottawa Opposition, instead of acting a frank and patriotic part, are endeavouring to render success impossible.

THE SCHOOL BOOK SWINDLE. The silence of the Grit organs on the scandalous school book job has no doubt amused some, amazed others, and made many indignant. The reasons for silence were, we admit, good. It is always best to be silent when you have nothing to say in defence, and when you know that your opponents are in possession of all the facts.

During the campaign of 1879 Mr. Hardy promised the electors of Halimad that if Dr. Baxter were elected he would be the first to denounce the school book job. The promise did not trouble Mr. Hardy very much. Mr. Bethune is anxiously waiting for an apology from the *Globe* for its false statement regarding his opinion on the license question. He may lose confidence in the theological soundness of the organ, unless it tells the truth and chases its party at least once in its history.

The *Globe's* "Newfound correspondent" is a jocular. He saw a relative of Mr. Devine in a "money-louping envelope" to another man two days ago, and at once telegraphed to his paper that bribery was rampant. It requires a good deal of "spoons" a money envelope, but the best are apt to be mistaken.

At the convention of the Halton branch of the Temperance Alliance one of the speakers recommended that candidates for parliament should be elected on the basis of their support the cause of temperance. The adoption of this principle would be embarrassing to the Grit candidate in South Renfrew.

The West Simcoe Reformers have passed a resolution that members of the *Mowat* Ministry should be asked to resign. This is in the late campaign. *Globe*. This is not only polite, but it is probable that had they stayed away this expression of feeling would have assumed the greater proportions of a petition.

Sir Richard Cartwright has had his revenge on his own party. Sunk and neglected because of his lamentable failure as a Finance Minister, it was a species of moral victory to be welcomed back to the bosom of the "party," as the only solitary mortal in, or out of, the ranks capable of dealing with financial matters at all.

Dr. Samson, the Reform candidate for Kent, is a far-seeing man. At the Reform convention held for the purpose of nominating him he stated that he would be responsible for any illegal and corrupt practices which Reformers might have recourse to on his behalf in the coming election. The doctor is wise. He knows his friends best.

The *Pilot*, an Irish Catholic paper published in Montreal, says:—"Sir John A. Macdonald has, all things considered, done more for the Catholics of Canada than any Premier we have ever had. Before and since Confederation he has always had an Irish Catholic in his Cabinet, and he has in a general way done more for Irish Catholics than they ever enjoyed under the Reformers."

The *Christian Guardian*, in its haste to make a point against the University of Toronto, discusses the proposed banquet to be given by that institution in the following style:—"If the banquet could be held back till the day the vote is to be taken, and liquor freely supplied, and the contract for the banquet set direct from the dinner to the 'House,' under such influence the most happy results might be expected."

The Provincial Legislature met yesterday. The session will probably be very interesting. The questions to be discussed are many and pressing. The Opposition is strong in numbers and ability. The Government is exceedingly weak, though not dead. And the public are more than usually interested in the proceedings.

When the session closed last year, it will be remembered that the Grit majority were triumphant, strong, and insolent. They voted down in a body every resolution and amendment proposed by the Opposition. They proclaimed their own popularity; and declared they were going to be stronger after the election than they were before.

Well, after the elections, they found themselves deprived of something like seventeen seats; and the Government would have been totally smashed had not our friends and friends in opposition who deemed nearly defeated; it was quite discredited. The most shocking cases of bribery and whiskey drinking were exposed by the court. The Grit seats were attacked, and several have been vacated before long.

The *Algonquin* outrage was perpetrated at one of the by-elections; and the details are sufficiently notorious. Violence, bribery, illegal casting regarding the ballots, and a most cynical disregard of public opinion—these were the accompaniments of the Grit seats. The personal direction of Mr. Mowat, whose personal part will be fully exposed at the trial of the case.

Since last year several changes have taken place in the Government. Mr. OROON, whom Mr. MOWAT tried to oust from a nomination, was removed from the Cabinet for reasons which no doubt are painfully sufficient. Mr. ROSS, a school inspector, who illegally took money as a book purser or pedlar, was made Minister of Education. Mr. YOUNG succeeded Mr. WOOD as Treasurer; he resigned after a few weeks' on account of ill-health, and was in his turn succeeded by Mr. A. M. ROSS. What the surplus will be this year, after having been manipulated by those successive Ministers, is a mystery which has no means of solving.

The Speakership is to be filled by Col. CLARKE, as before, and we have no objection to an appointment which is, we judge, satisfactory to our side of the House, though it may indicate a certain disapproval on two or three honorable members on the other side of the Chamber. The Speaker is practically out of politics, and Col. CLARKE has maintained a fairly even balance of "order" in the House, though one of his decisions last session was challenged by the leader of the Opposition.

We shall not venture on prophecy, nor indulge in challenge. The debates will be reported by the House of Commons more fully than usual. It will be our duty to make the proceedings as interesting as possible to our readers and to the country at large. The Opposition will in all probability stimulate the Government, and the Government will not be lost sight of in the more generally interesting affairs of the Dominion Parliament.

EDITORIAL NOTES. The silence of the Grit organ on the school book question is very significant. Is it true that Mr. Nelson has been sent for to have a personal hand in the deal?

The Ottawa *Free Press* seeks to escape from the odium of its false statement that Mr. Macintosh was in South Renfrew by saying that he was in Lennox and Middlesex. The logic of this case is worthy of that paper.

During the campaign of 1879 Mr. Hardy promised the electors of Halimad that if Dr. Baxter were elected he would be the first to denounce the school book job. The promise did not trouble Mr. Hardy very much. Mr. Bethune is anxiously waiting for an apology from the *Globe* for its false statement regarding his opinion on the license question. He may lose confidence in the theological soundness of the organ, unless it tells the truth and chases its party at least once in its history.

The *Globe's* "Newfound correspondent" is a jocular. He saw a relative of Mr. Devine in a "money-louping envelope" to another man two days ago, and at once telegraphed to his paper that bribery was rampant. It requires a good deal of "spoons" a money envelope, but the best are apt to be mistaken.

At the convention of the Halton branch of the Temperance Alliance one of the speakers recommended that candidates for parliament should be elected on the basis of their support the cause of temperance. The adoption of this principle would be embarrassing to the Grit candidate in South Renfrew.

The West Simcoe Reformers have passed a resolution that members of the *Mowat* Ministry should be asked to resign. This is in the late campaign. *Globe*. This is not only polite, but it is probable that had they stayed away this expression of feeling would have assumed the greater proportions of a petition.

Sir Richard Cartwright has had his revenge on his own party. Sunk and neglected because of his lamentable failure as a Finance Minister, it was a species of moral victory to be welcomed back to the bosom of the "party," as the only solitary mortal in, or out of, the ranks capable of dealing with financial matters at all.

Dr. Samson, the Reform candidate for Kent, is a far-seeing man. At the Reform convention held for the purpose of nominating him he stated that he would be responsible for any illegal and corrupt practices which Reformers might have recourse to on his behalf in the coming election. The doctor is wise. He knows his friends best.

The *Pilot*, an Irish Catholic paper published in Montreal, says:—"Sir John A. Macdonald has, all things considered, done more for the Catholics of Canada than any Premier we have ever had. Before and since Confederation he has always had an Irish Catholic in his Cabinet, and he has in a general way done more for Irish Catholics than they ever enjoyed under the Reformers."

The *Christian Guardian*, in its haste to make a point against the University of Toronto, discusses the proposed banquet to be given by that institution in the following style:—"If the banquet could be held back till the day the vote is to be taken, and liquor freely supplied, and the contract for the banquet set direct from the dinner to the 'House,' under such influence the most happy results might be expected."

The Provincial Legislature met yesterday. The session will probably be very interesting. The questions to be discussed are many and pressing. The Opposition is strong in numbers and ability. The Government is exceedingly weak, though not dead. And the public are more than usually interested in the proceedings.

When the session closed last year, it will be remembered that the Grit majority were triumphant, strong, and insolent. They voted down in a body every resolution and amendment proposed by the Opposition. They proclaimed their own popularity; and declared they were going to be stronger after the election than they were before.

Well, after the elections, they found themselves deprived of something like seventeen seats; and the Government would have been totally smashed had not our friends and friends in opposition who deemed nearly defeated; it was quite discredited. The most shocking cases of bribery and whiskey drinking were exposed by the court. The Grit seats were attacked, and several have been vacated before long.

The *Algonquin* outrage was perpetrated at one of the by-elections; and the details are sufficiently notorious. Violence, bribery, illegal casting regarding the ballots, and a most cynical disregard of public opinion—these were the accompaniments of the Grit seats. The personal direction of Mr. Mowat, whose personal part will be fully exposed at the trial of the case.

making his followers to let the award go and accept Sir JOHN MACDONALD's and Mr. MEREDITH's proposal to go to the Privy Council.

Since last year several changes have taken place in the Government. Mr. OROON, whom Mr. MOWAT tried to oust from a nomination, was removed from the Cabinet for reasons which no doubt are painfully sufficient. Mr. ROSS, a school inspector, who illegally took money as a book purser or pedlar, was made Minister of Education. Mr. YOUNG succeeded Mr. WOOD as Treasurer; he resigned after a few weeks' on account of ill-health, and was in his turn succeeded by Mr. A. M. ROSS. What the surplus will be this year, after having been manipulated by those successive Ministers, is a mystery which has no means of solving.

The Speakership is to be filled by Col. CLARKE, as before, and we have no objection to an appointment which is, we judge, satisfactory to our side of the House, though it may indicate a certain disapproval on two or three honorable members on the other side of the Chamber. The Speaker is practically out of politics, and Col. CLARKE has maintained a fairly even balance of "order" in the House, though one of his decisions last session was challenged by the leader of the Opposition.

We shall not venture on prophecy, nor indulge in challenge. The debates will be reported by the House of Commons more fully than usual. It will be our duty to make the proceedings as interesting as possible to our readers and to the country at large. The Opposition will in all probability stimulate the Government, and the Government will not be lost sight of in the more generally interesting affairs of the Dominion Parliament.

EDITORIAL NOTES. The silence of the Grit organ on the school book question is very significant. Is it true that Mr. Nelson has been sent for to have a personal hand in the deal?

The Ottawa *Free Press* seeks to escape from the odium of its false statement that Mr. Macintosh was in South Renfrew by saying that he was in Lennox and Middlesex. The logic of this case is worthy of that paper.

During the campaign of 1879 Mr. Hardy promised the electors of Halimad that if Dr. Baxter were elected he would be the first to denounce the school book job. The promise did not trouble Mr. Hardy very much. Mr. Bethune is anxiously waiting for an apology from the *Globe* for its false statement regarding his opinion on the license question. He may lose confidence in the theological soundness of the organ, unless it tells the truth and chases its party at least once in its history.

The *Globe's* "Newfound correspondent" is a jocular. He saw a relative of Mr. Devine in a "money-louping envelope" to another man two days ago, and at once telegraphed to his paper that bribery was rampant. It requires a good deal of "spoons" a money envelope, but the best are apt to be mistaken.

At the convention of the Halton branch of the Temperance Alliance one of the speakers recommended that candidates for parliament should be elected on the basis of their support the cause of temperance. The adoption of this principle would be embarrassing to the Grit candidate in South Renfrew.

The West Simcoe Reformers have passed a resolution that members of the *Mowat* Ministry should be asked to resign. This is in the late campaign. *Globe*. This is not only polite, but it is probable that had they stayed away this expression of feeling would have assumed the greater proportions of a petition.

Sir Richard Cartwright has had his revenge on his own party. Sunk and neglected because of his lamentable failure as a Finance Minister, it was a species of moral victory to be welcomed back to the bosom of the "party," as the only solitary mortal in, or out of, the ranks capable of dealing with financial matters at all.

Dr. Samson, the Reform candidate for Kent, is a far-seeing man. At the Reform convention held for the purpose of nominating him he stated that he would be responsible for any illegal and corrupt practices which Reformers might have recourse to on his behalf in the coming election. The doctor is wise. He knows his friends best.

The *Pilot*, an Irish Catholic paper published in Montreal, says:—"Sir John A. Macdonald has, all things considered, done more for the Catholics of Canada than any Premier we have ever had. Before and since Confederation he has always had an Irish Catholic in his Cabinet, and he has in a general way done more for Irish Catholics than they ever enjoyed under the Reformers."

The *Christian Guardian*, in its haste to make a point against the University of Toronto, discusses the proposed banquet to be given by that institution in the following style:—"If the banquet could be held back till the day the vote is to be taken, and liquor freely supplied, and the contract for the banquet set direct from the dinner to the 'House,' under such influence the most happy results might be expected."

The Provincial Legislature met yesterday. The session will probably be very interesting. The questions to be discussed are many and pressing. The Opposition is strong in numbers and ability. The Government