

Parliament in 1880, by the Act 43 Vict., c. 9, doing for England and Ireland what Mr. MacInnes wants us to do for Canada. It seems, then, that something may be done by Congress for the United States, which has hitherto been prevented by a supposed difficulty as to State and Congress jurisdiction. If Congress takes the matter up we may perhaps follow; I would rather we had led.

Our session was stormy as well as long, the "Outs" accusing the "Ins" of all sorts of wickedness, legislative and otherwise, and the "Ins" retorting, as of old, "*tu quoque*"; each calling the other very ugly names, and receiving the same answer, "you're another," supposed to be a quite sufficient and unanswerable reply. But we had, as you know, two first-class scandals, of which General Middleton and Mr. Rykert were the central figures. In the General's case everyone grieves that a man so much respected and liked, and to whom our country is indebted, and has acknowledged its indebtedness, for most excellent service in the North-West, did not, when convinced of his mistake in declaring certain furs *confiscated*, and acting as if he were the *Fisc* and had a right to divide them between himself and his friends, say at once, as we are told and are willing to believe he has since done, that he was ready to pay the sum which the committee had reported as the value of the furs, and recommended that Bremner should be paid for them. In spite of Mr. Blake's clear exposition of the rules of the British service, I cannot believe that the General knowingly intended to do wrong. Mr. Rykert's case admits of no excuse. Elected as a member of that branch of Parliament especially entrusted with the care of the property and pecuniary interests of the people, and paid for his services as such, he, by means which a select committee of his fellow-members has formally declared to be "discreditable, corrupt and scandalous," and by misusing the faith which from his position members of the Ministry and public officers under them placed in him, is reported to have obtained from the Government for \$500 a grant of timber limits which is said to have produced \$200,000 to him, or the party for whom he obtained them, and from whom he says he received \$3,000 for thirty days, during which he was using the means aforesaid for procuring them. Mr. Rykert, having resigned as a member of the Commons, is appealing to his former constituents for re-election; but would the House, after declaring his conduct to be discreditable, corrupt and scandalous, allow him to sit as one of its members, remembering the old adage as to similarity of plumage? Mr. Macdougall defended him very cleverly, but the defence was only a demurrer to the jurisdiction of the House, not a plea to the merits or an assertion of the morality of his client's conduct. And if the Attorney-General (Sir John Thompson) had, as some assert, previously prepared or agreed to a report favourable to Mr. Rykert, it must have been of the same nature as Mr. Macdougall's defence, and not an approval of what Mr. R. did. As to the question whether an offender can lawfully retain effects obtained by his offence, and whether the law affords means of compelling him to give them up, the answer on moral grounds is pretty clearly given in one of your late numbers, by Hamlet's uncle, that he cannot lawfully retain them; and the said uncle says further:—