

what he stated in his address at Brockton, and we therefore most willingly withdraw our charge that he "publicly recanted his opinion" on that occasion.

Our criticism was intended for the author of the *Essay in the British Quarterly*, and was not so much directed against his opinion, as against an incorrect statement of facts. We admit that the essayist, writing, no doubt, quite conscientiously, has described the transaction very much in the same terms as the press of the party hostile to Sir John Macdonald, and we can have no doubt that the English and United States press have adopted that view. We find, for instance, that a paragraph from the *London World* is going the rounds of the press opposed to Sir John A. Macdonald in which we find these words: "Everybody remembers the Pacific Scandal, and the way in which contracts were turned to account in bribing constituencies."

We cited in a former number a passage from the article in the *British Quarterly* which we shall reproduce:—"The gentleman who had been promised, or at least 'expected the contract for the Pacific Railway,' and we pointed out that 'the gentleman' was one of a number wholly unconnected with him, who obtained a charter in accordance with provisions previously sanctioned by Parliament, and that 'the gentleman' had no benefit whatever and could obtain none greater than his colleagues, to not one of whom has it ever been imputed that he was to obtain a valuable contract, and in point of fact it was not in the power of the Government to confer any pecuniary benefit on Sir Hugh Allan. At the very time that we have been required to consider this subject, we have received a copy of a new work entitled 'A Popular History of the Dominion of Canada,' by the Rev. Wm. H. Withrow, author of 'A School History of Canada.' We have no doubt that Mr. Withrow is strictly impartial, and that he has been anxious to write truthfully. It is wholly out of our power at present to offer any opinion on the merits of this history, which we have only been able to glance at in the most cursory manner, but we turned to the history of the Pacific Railway transactions with a view of ascertaining how a calm spectator of passing events would narrate it. We found a fair account of the incorporation of the rival companies: the 'Canada Pacific,' with Sir Hugh Allan at its head, and the Inter-Oceanic, with Hon. Senator McPherson as its President, after which the author thus proceeds: 'The Government was authorized by Act of Parliament to give the contracts for building

"the road to either company, or to the two companies amalgamated, or to any company distinct from either that would undertake the task. A subsidy of \$30,000,000 and a grant of five millions of acres of land in alternate blocks along the line of railway were also to be given to the company constructing the road."

Now, although in the foregoing paragraph it is clearly explained that Sir Hugh Allan was only one of a company, yet it might possibly be inferred that the company was to be a syndicate of contractors to construct a public road for the Government instead of an ordinary railway company incorporated to obtain capital to construct and work a railway on their own account. However, the author proceeds to announce that a charter was at length granted to a new Canada Pacific Railway Company, that the president was Sir Hugh Allan, and "among the directors seventeen in number were members of both the former companies and representative men from the different provinces of the Dominion, together with several leading American capitalists." The last words, which we have italicized, are notoriously incorrect, and yet they are embodied by an impartial writer in a carefully prepared history. We could scarcely produce stronger evidence of the total misconception as to facts which prevails in the public mind. The further account of the historian is not only important but truthful. He gives a brief history of the publication of Sir Hugh Allan's letters, of the consequent charges, and of the defence, winding up as follows: "Intense partisan feeling prevailed throughout the Dominion, and by a large number of persons the case was prejudged and the Government already condemned." The proceedings at the adjourned meeting of the House are fairly reported, including the disallowance of the Oaths Bill and the determination of the Government to issue a Royal Commission of Enquiry. There is an omission to state that in the first instance the Government proposed to constitute the committee appointed by the House the commissioners, the object being to procure testimony on oath in accordance with the decision of the House, and by the committee selected by itself. The appointment of the Commission, consisting of Judges Day, Polette and Gowan, is noticed, and the refusal of Mr. Huntington to appear and cross-examine the witnesses summoned in accordance with his own list. It is admitted that "the testimony of these witnesses seemed considerably to mitigate the burden of the charges," but "the Opposition press complained that there was no cross-

"examination of the witnesses, and the Ministerial press charged the Opposition with seeking evidence in a surreptitious and underhand manner. Party feeling ran very high, and mutual recriminations were very severe." The report of the Commission was confined to a statement of the evidence, and gave no opinion upon the validity of the charges. Of course the Government was not responsible for the non-attendance of Mr. Huntington, nor for the failure to cross-examine. It has never been pointed out that any different course could have been followed by the Government. The committee had no power to examine on oath, the bill was disallowed, and, if there had been any desire for fair play, the committee should have consented to act on the Commission so as to overcome a difficulty not caused by Sir John Macdonald or his colleagues. On the whole Mr. Withrow's history, with the exception of the important error to which we have called attention, and which, strange to say, was never advanced by the Opposition press so far as we know, is very impartial, and conveys a correct account of what took place in Parliament. The report of the Commission seems to have been treated from the first by the Opposition as wholly worthless. We have thought it desirable to direct attention to Mr. Withrow's history in contrast to the article in the *British Quarterly*. The important fact cannot be disputed that the corporators, thirteen in number, of whom Sir Hugh Allan was only one, received no valuable consideration whatever, except what Parliament had agreed should be given to the company which would undertake the construction of the road. We may make one further remark, which is that we scarcely think that there is an intelligent man in the community who would not consider it most advantageous to the Dominion if such an arrangement as that proposed by Sir John Macdonald's Government, for the construction of the Pacific Railway could be made now. Whether it ever could have been successfully carried out, is extremely doubtful, but effectual means were taken to ensure its failure.

BUTTER.

It may surprise some people to learn that butter, sweet, fresh and palatable, such as we described last spring in a series of articles on butter-making, is now selling in Montreal at 40 cents per lb. retail. We have bought it and eaten of it; and the guests of the Windsor hotel also eat of it daily. The article is made but a few miles from the city, and the maker