

That might have been allowed to pass; but on the 20th instant, the *Mail* published the following:—

“THE TRAITOR GREENWAY.

“The Brantford *Expositor*, a Grit journal, thinks we have been unduly severe on the traitor Greenway. Our contemporary makes two wrong assumptions in this matter which require to be corrected. It is assumed, for one thing, that our denunciation of Mr. Greenway was chiefly because of his having voted on the Free Trade side, and against Sir John Macdonald's motion. Now, it is true enough that this vote was the public occasion which first drew general attention to Mr. Greenway's apostasy: but nevertheless the fact that he was going to “rat” was well known to numbers of people, both in and around the Commons Chamber, and in his own constituency. The London *Free Press* truly says that as far back as a month ago news reached the Liberal-Conservative party (in South Huron) that their member could not be depended upon. Our Brantford contemporary, in its excess of charity, wishes it to be believed that where Mr. Greenway turned was on the trade question, the debate having had the effect of convincing him that Sir John's Protectionist policy was all wrong, and that the Free-Trade policy of Mr. Mackenzie was the thing for Canada. All stuff, we say; what Mr. Greenway turned on was the promise of a Government appointment for himself, expected to be in Manitoba. It sounds very fine to talk about a conscientious change of conviction, and so on, but it takes all the romance out of the affair when you know that the “conscientious conviction,” so called, was a mere vulgar matter of bargain and sale. While sincerely regretting the part we took in recommending Mr. Greenway to our friends in South Huron, we are glad to hear that they have already selected a gentleman upon whom they can depend to carry their banner when Mr. Greenway's time to ‘step down and out’ shall have arrived.”

He regretted that the first occasion on which he rose to address the House should be on a personal matter. He desired to say that whenever the policy enunciated by the Government met his approval he would have no hesitation in supporting it. He denied most emphatically that anything had influenced his vote but this principle. There never had been such a consideration as the *Mail* intimated. There was not now such a consideration offered; he had not been approached by any member of the Government or any of their supporters in such a manner, and the charge was a pure fabrication, utterly without foundation. He was sure the Premier would do him the justice of contradicting a statement which was without a shadow of foundation. At the proper time he (Mr. Greenway) would explain his vote to

Mr. GREENWAY.

the electors, but he would now inform the Conservative candidate who was out in his constituency that he would have about three years to wait before a chance would come to oppose him.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—In response to the call of my hon. friend, I feel bound to say that on no occasion has he, by myself or through any friends or other person, solicited anything whatever at the hands of the Government, either for himself or for any public purpose even. Many gentlemen on both sides of the House have occasion to call upon me about public works in their vicinity, but it so happens that even in this connection I have had no visit and no representation of any kind from the hon. gentleman, nor have I any knowledge of any kind whatever of a desire on the part of the hon. gentleman to seek or obtain any office under the Government, or any favour of any kind from the Administration. I am quite sure that no offer whatever was made to him by myself or any member of the Ministry; nor had we in any way anything to do with influencing the hon. gentleman on the vote to which he refers. I am glad to say that although the paper in question accused the hon. gentleman of deserting his party, no Ministerial journal has accused the seven or eight ministerial members of doing anything of that kind, because they chose, regarding that particular measure, to vote according to their consciences with the Opposition. The Ministerial party could afford to divide in this relation, as it can afford to divide upon many other matters where conscientious differences exist. I observe that there was no conscientious difference of opinion existing in this regard among the Opposition.

CROSSING NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The House went into Committee of the Whole—Mr. Mills in the Chair—to consider a Bill entitled an Act to make provision for the crossing of navigable waters by railway or other road companies incorporated under Provincial Acts, as amended by the Standing Committee on railway, canal, and telegraph lines. The Committee rose and reported the Bill with several amend-