not been very many
readily at 16c for
offering has been
have been slow of
ery choice green and
green at run remains
active. Fleece steady
ting only 20c. Super
a small lot sold at
quality are worth 25
b. Cording remains
lot of 14c% changed
but steady at 4½c for
ndered.

	7 00	0 00
	6 00	0 00
	4 00	0 00
	4 00	0 00
	0 11	0 00
	0 12	0 12
	0 12	0 15
	1 80	2 65
	0 35	0 40
	0 36	0 39
	0 09	0 13
	0 04½	0 07
	0 05	0 07

ERK.
ll in this line of busi-
very good. We notice
pply. Prices are fully
ly overpaying for very
stocks are dull, and
ves Tennessee material
rm at quotations.
ughtin... $9 20 to $ 30
... 0 24 0 25
... 0 25 0 26
... 0 25 0 26
... 0 31 0 32
... 0 35 0 36
... 0 29 0 32
... 0 30 0 34
... 0 31 0 32
... 0 29 0 32
... 0 30 0 34
... 0 32 0 34
... 0 30 0 34
... 0 32 0 34
... 0 30 0 34
... 0 30 0 40
per doz.... 0 50 0 60
... 0 45 0 50
... 0 30 0 35
... 0 65 0 70
... 0 60 0 65
... 0 07 0 09
... 0 08 0 09
... 0 15 0 17

ND SHOES.
fairly active since our
rs are have been coming
uyers, however, are pur-
ly and sellers seem in-
ion in so doing. Prices
ll, no change reported.
r running on full time.

	2 90	3 00
	2 80	2 85
	2 50	2 60
	2 00	2 10
	1 50	1 60
	1 40	1 50
	1 30	1 40
	1 50	1 60
	1 40	1 50
	1 30	1 40
	1 15	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 00	1 30
	1 15	1 30

WANTED — LADIES AND G
Gentlemen to qualify as Telegraph
Operators for offices opening in the Dominion.
Address MANAGER, Box 505, Toronto, Ont.

DR. DON, 179 EAST SWAN ST.,
Buffalo, N. Y., Confidential Physician.
Nervous Debility. Pamphlet 24pp; consulta-
tion invited; charges moderate; treating sent
everywhere. 252-26

SUGAR PANS, TIN PAN-
BUCKETS, Sugar Kettles. Most im-
proved patterns. Send for price list. Address,
J. H. PEDLAR, Oshawa, Ont. 254-tf

SEND 25 CENTS AND GET A
handsome present—beautiful charms, or
a box of Brazilian camphor stock, post free.
Your name beautifully written on 25 latest
Bristol cards, 5 tints, 15 cents. Anybody buying
to the amount of 50 cents will receive the cards
as a gift. STAR STAMP AND NOVELTY CO.,
Toronto.

Milton Gold Jew
GENUINE
chain, set shirt studs, sleeve
stud, heavy plain ring, pair
sent post paid 50c. Retail price 75 cents
Address, MONTREAL NOVELTY CO., Montreal, P.Q.

THIS IS NO
By sending 35 cents, with age,
height, colour of eyes and hair, you
will receive by return mail a correct
photograph of your future husband
or wife with name and date of mar-
riage. Address P. O. BOX
BUREAU, 44, Feltonville, N.Y. 261-13

SARSASTILLINGUM, $1
Cures Blood Diseases, Scrofula,
Consumption, Old Sores, all taints
NEURIL, Cures Neuralgia as if
by magic. $1 a bottle

BRAIN AND BODY BUILDER. $1.
For nervousness, over-worked brain, depression.
PAIN SPECIFIC, all pain immediately.
UNIVERSAL MANDRAKE PILLS, 25c.
Constipation, liver disease, headache, dizziness, &c
WOMAN'S FAVORITE TONIC, $1.
For female weakness, and all disease of women.
CENTAUR ASTRINGENT BITTERS, 50c.
This splendid stomach tonic is wanted everywhere.
Wholesale orders solicited. If wanting any of
these, ask your druggist; if not obtained remit us
or more, and we will send by express, charges paid.
Invaluable, illustrated, 100 page, medical adviser on P.D., cured for one paper. "What Should be Observed in Disease."
Whether Sex, Ho
102 Front Street West, Toronto.
Wholesale Druggists and Manufacturing Chemists
and Druggists. Sugar-coated, odorless, tasteless.
We invite all cash and prepaid orders.

	3 00	3 50
	2 50	2 60
	2 50	2 57½
	1 50	1 60
	1 50	1 60
	1 30	1 40
	1 30	1 40
	1 30	1 40
	1 30	1 40
	1 30	1 40
	1 15	1 30

IN CHANCERY.

HUTCHISON V. FERRIBY.

Pursuant to the decree in this cause, bearing date the 7th day of March, A. D. 1877, there will be sold with the approbation of Clarence C. Rapelje, Master of this Court, at Simcoe, by Thomas P. Gray, Auctioneer, at his hotel in the Town of Paris, on the hour of twelve o'clock noon, on Saturday, the 14th day of April, A. D. 1877, the following lands and premises in one parcel, viz.:
The south 4 of lot No. 38, in the 4th concession of the Township of South Dumfries, in the County of Brant, containing over 100 acres.
Eighty-five acres are cleared and in a good state of cultivation. There is a good frame and rough-cast dwelling house, a frame barn 30 x 50 feet, and a shed 16 x 60 feet upon the premises. There is also a good orchard, covering about 3 acres, upon which there is a sufficient clay loam, and it is well watered by a never-failing spring creek, and there is an excellent well near the house which never fails.
The property will be offered for sale subject to a reserved bid which has been fixed by the Master. The purchaser will be required to pay down a deposit in the proportion of five per cent on the purchase money to the vendor or his solicitor, and to pay the remainder of the purchase money on the twelfth day of May next, and upon payment being made the purchaser will be entitled to the conveyance, and to be let into possession on the purchase being completed, or to the same agreement for the completion of the purchase.
In all other respects the conditions of sale will be the standard conditions of the Court of Chancery.
Further particulars can be had from Messrs. Tisdale, Livingstone, Hobbs, & Jackson, Simcoe, John Hoskin, Q. C., Toronto, Hart & Van Normans, Brantford, J. W. Bonilby, Brantford, or Kilmaster & Wade, Simcoe. Dated at Simcoe, this 19th March, A. D. 1877.
(Signed) CLARENCE C. RAPELJE,
Master at Simcoe.
261-2

CAUTION.

THE "ROYCE" REAPER

has by its real merits of lightness, simplicity, and efficiency become the great favorite among reapers. In the accompanying manufactures are striving to imitate the machine, and some have even gone so far as to mention that any infringements of the patents of the "Royce Reaper" will be duly prosecuted.

TO THE FARMERS.

We continue, you from purchasing machines
infringing the Patents of the Royce Reaper, as
the owners of the right to use, sell, or manufacture
that thereby lay yourselves liable to action at
law.
GREEN BROS. & CO., Waterford.
JOHN WATSON, Ayr.
HAGGART BROS., Brampton.
Owners of the "Royce" Reaper patents. 256-f

FEED THE LAND AND IT WILL FEED YOU.

Lamb's Super Phosphate of Lime...250 per t
Fine Bone Dust ..... 20 "
Inch .. .. 25 "
Inch .. .. 30 "
Send for circular.
PETER LAMB & Co., Manufacturers,
Box 796 P. O., Toronto. 257 13

GRAND'S
SPRING SALE
CRYSTAL PALACE, TORONTO
Entries for this Sale will close on the 21st APRIL. Every description of Horse or Pony will be in demand, and find a ready sale at good CASH PRICES. Farmers and others owning sound Stock should not fail to avail themselves of this opportunity of realising GOOD PRICES, as Buyers from all parts will be on hand.
No Horses but those entered for Sale will be allowed on the Grounds.
SMOKERS!
We have again to call your attention to the numerous IMITATIONS of the
MYRTLE NAVY TOBACCO
THE STAMP
T&B
IN GILT LETTERS,
on each Plug of the GENUINE.
Hamilton, 12th June, 1877. 231-13

REDUCED TO A CERTAINTY.
Chance to Gain
$50,000
NO RISK.
Send for circular at once. No time to lose.
READ & CO., Bankers, 72 Madison Ave.
NEW YORK.

ACTICAL FARMERS.
ville Chemical and Superphosphate
mited), manufacture
Dissolved Bone Phosphate, Ammoniated
Bone Phosphate, Ammoniated Superphosphate
Bone Phosphate, Ammoniated Superphosphate
Bone Phosphate, Ammoniated Superphosphate

The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1877.

NOTICE.

Subscribers are reminded that the coloured address label of each paper sent to them shows a figure which indicates that future number of the paper up to which their subscription has been paid, serving in fact as a date. The current weekly number can readily be ascertained by reference to the volume and number printed on the title page.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Subscribers to the *Weekly Mail*, a paper already affording more reading matter than any other weekly published in Canada, may for the future rely on an extended report of Parliamentary proceedings appearing in our second issue. Owing to new bright type, smaller than that hitherto used for Parliamentary reporting has been procured, and while the actual difficulty of reading will not be increased, the amount of matter which we are able to provide in this department of the paper will be doubled.

There is more news and reading matter in the broadsheet of the *Weekly Mail* than in any of the new-fangled weeklies, some of which are printed in a shape purposely intended to mislead the public as to the quantity of their contents.

The *Weekly Mail* costs only $1.50 per annum for a single copy, and is supplied at much lower rates to clubs and agents. Send for terms and prospectus. An energetic man can get up a dozen weekly subscribers in one day, which will give him the *Daily Mail* GRATIS, or a cash bonus in lieu thereof.

The full news and gossip of the week are interspersed with thoughtful and practical information of inestimable value to farmers and others. If you would be abreast of the times and know what is going on in the world take

THE WEEKLY MAIL.

THEN AND NOW.

FIVE years ago, when the Reform Party was almost at the zenith of its fame, the principles on which it appealed to the country were such as to commend themselves to all. The "standard" was to be lifted on high. Canadian commerce, long pent up in the Ulica of Sir JOHN MACDONALD's Tariffs, was to be unfettered, swell under a progressive and enlightened national policy. Corruption in all its forms was to be made odious in the sight of the people. The extravagance of the Tory regime was to give place to sterling and wise economy. Coalitions, the fountains of all political immorality, were to be driven from power, and the country governed by statesmen renowned for the amplitude of their genius and their abundant virtues. The long night of twenty years of Tory misrule was to be succeeded by a glorious day, in which the politics, the morals, and the material welfare of the people would be blessed by the sun of the Reform Idea. Such was, When that singular English Reformer, JACK CADE, was leader of an Opposition, he only pandered to popular prejudice in new era for men's groveling natures: "There shall be in England seven half-penny loaves sold for a penny; the "three-hooped pot shall have ten hoops, "and I will make it felonyto drink small "beer."

But our Reformers, aesthetical hyperdrives, where JACK was but a grub, and Dawn, forsooth, is far more enobling. Dawn. Prohibition, Public Morality, Grace, Decency, Plain Commonsense, Reform all things, Political Purity, were to be cultivated under blue-glass, and their fragrance made to fill the earth.

Doubtless during the campaign of 1872 many an honest Reformer wearied out in his efforts to "pint down" some one who "ruption with lots of money," or exhausted by the stump eloquence of Mr. MACKENZIE, or Mr. MILLS, or Mr. Ross, or the intensely sanguine and vesicous gentleman who is now the hon. member for Lambton, went to his bed and dreamed a dream like the roseate one we have faintly sketched. Had the dreamer slept like Rip Van Winkle, and awoke to-day, how rudely would his nerves and senses have been shocked! Coalition! Corruption! Power at Ottawa. A Tory Minister of Finance and another Secretary of State. A public criminal. President of the Council. A mine-scalper sitting in the Post Office, and a corruptionist who imported the Tories into office! Still he got a portfolio at the receipt of Custom. An auction-puffer in charge of the Inland Revenue Department, and an unscrupulous camp-follower in the War Office. A deficit of two millions in expectancy, although three millions of extra taxes have been levied. The shutters up everywhere. The national motto, "Twenty cents on the dollar." Starving laborers hooting the Premier for work, and unemployed mechanics walking the streets. "Wait and trust" Grits! Wait and trust on the land, while ANGLIN, NORRIS, COOPER, FAIRBANK, & Co., A. B. FOSTER, CHARLES MACKENZIE (the Premier's brother), EDGAR, JAFFRAY, NIXON, NELSON, FARROWE, ADAM OLIVER, and a hundred more swarm like locusts on the Treasury, each carrying his heavy but by no means cruel load. DORION, FOURNIER, St. Jean, LAURIER, LAFLAMME, ROSS, and CHURCHILL, seven members of the Cabinet of November, 1873, abandon the country to its fate in the midst of the crisis and retiring to smug and profitable retreats in the public service. The Speaker of the Commons is the pay of the Executive and members of the House sharing in Government contracts. The First Minister paying out the public money without authority and in defiance of the law. A vast increase in every branch of the public expenditure. Superannuations by the wholesale to make more room for clamorous office-seekers. Jobs here, jobs there, jobs everywhere. A bankrupt nation and a distressed and disheartened people on the one hand, and a horde of rapacious spoilers dissipating the annual loans borrowed on the roaring credit of the country on the other. Is this an exaggerated picture of the state of affairs now prevailing, and in 1872? It is as exaggerated as the hues of 1872 as the night differs from the day.

"OPPOSITION TACTICS" AND MINISTERIAL ROONSHINE.

Is there any absurdity of insinuation, any madness of indictment against political opponents to which the leaders of the Grit Party are not equal at this hour? If Grit measures do not meet with success in operation and fall of winning the approval of the country, if the Hon. GEORGE BROWN is discovered tampering with Senators and bank managers, if the plundering finger of Mr. EDGAR is shown to be in every financial pie in the Government kitchen, if Mr. MACKENZIE loses his popularity or his temper, or both at once, which last is more in accordance with contemporary history, if the people get tired of calling Mr. BLAKE ANASTIDES for the best reason in the world, that they see he is not even a "Brummagem," no, nor even a ginger-bread edition of the lofty Greek, if the economical "Hon. Mr. MILLS, is shown to have nothing about him of the lion, unless it be his hide, like a certain gentleman in the fable whose name we shall not pronounce, because he has long ears and might hear us, if Mr. CAUCHON is like one of those horses of prey which a witty Frenchman maintained would drive an army from the field, if the whole country looking on the pledges which have been broken, the faith which has been violated, the consistency which is only constant to inconsistency, the causes which have been betrayed, the pronounced corruption and premeditated hypocrisy of a Ministry which plays at politics like children on the sand of the sea shore, amusing themselves building the castles of a moment, a Ministry persistent-only in tergiversation, bold put in blundering, great only in its heroic shamelessness, strong nowhere save in the brow of brass and the sublime calousness which defies repentance and towers above remorse, who is in fault? Mr. CARTWRIGHT scowling at the cheap breakfast table of the working man? The Prime Minister with his coarse nature and contempt for the rules and safeguards of Parliament? A subsidized Speaker, and subsidized by the men who were loud hereafter in insisting on the Independence of Parliament? The whole rack of traitors to themselves, to their country, to their cause and every individual they were ever associated with, to truth, and honour, and country, and everything but their pockets! No indeed. Whatever goes wrong with, whatever is unpleasant to this patchwork quilt of a Ministry must be laid on the shoulders of Sir JOHN MACDONALD.

Last week some two hundred and fifty workingmen sent a deputation to the Prime Minister, who is also the Minister of Public Works, with the view, it appears, of arising about the labour market. The deputation was twice summarily told to leave the Parliamentary Buildings. The Minister of Public Works refused to see them. A door was slammed in their faces. We think it would perhaps have been better if the workingmen had sent to the Premier requesting an interview. But it must be remembered that workingmen, though they often have the truest courtesy, the courtesy of the heart, are not masters of etiquette, that imminent want makes men impatient, and that the precedent of a few English kings would not have better fitted to meet such a deputation. If, therefore, we think of the workingmen had communicated beforehand with the Premier, we also think that Mr. MACKENZIE should have met a man and as a Minister in not meeting those men. He should have met them, and having, said a few kindly words to them, appointed an interview. But AESCHYLUS tells us that "every one who "has newly wielded power is angry," and four years of office have not sufficed to soften the stiff dignity which we all remember gave of a sudden such angular complacency and rigid grace to Mr. MACKENZIE's SirFertinax-Mac-Sycophant-Mac. The man retired and passed a vote of censure on the Prime Minister for refusing to meet "the unemployed workingmen of Ottawa." What happens then? *A Globe* editorial writer sits down and pens an article headed "Opposition Tactics," in which article we are told that the Opposition is true to its tradition, that Conservatives out of office are always violent—as witness Sir ROBERT PEEL, the late and present Lord DERBY, Mr. DISRAELI, and Sir JOHN MACDONALD and Dr. TUPPER to-day!—when they are out of office. We are told that the men who waited on Mr. MACKENZIE were not unemployed workingmen, but political tools, that the demonstration was organized by Sir JOHN MACDONALD or else by the Hon. PETER MITCHELL, and the dreadfully base character of "Opposition tactics" is set forth in the most ingenial and deliberate misrepresentation. The article appeared in Saturday's paper, and is a choice specimen-gem from the mine worked with such truthfulness by the *Globe*. The following are some of the phrases and sentences of the articles: "The demonstration—confessedly of starving workmen, but really of pliable political gentlemen." "The crowd that last week swarmed into the Parliament House, as if to play over again the famous scene of Paris, and make Mr. MACKENZIE "appear to be the 'wicked Minister' "that should tremble before them and bend." The Opposition, we are told "encouraged" ed the ignorant perversity" of the unemployed workingmen, who, it appears, were SIR JOHN'S "adherents at Ottawa" practising his "preaching."

Now here it will be observed that a deputation of half-starving unemployed workingmen waiting on the Premier to ask a vital question to them concerning the future prospects of labour is denounced as a manifestation of violence; that, further, these workingmen were the mere charlatans, being in fact "pliable political "partisans;" that, moreover, they were of the character of the Paris *sans-culottes* who introduced the "reign of terror;" that the unemployed were the victims of "ignorant perversity;" that they were organized by SIR JOHN MACDONALD or another ex-Minister. It will be seen that the charge is not self-destructive. If the men were political tools they, of course, could not be workingmen; victims of "ignorant perversity" still less were they of the same kindred as the Paris *sans-culottes*. If, moreover, they were there organized or inspired by ex-Ministers they could not be real workingmen out of employment, the victims of an "ignorant perversity;" they would then be, as they are declared to be in a paragraph of the article, "pliable political partisans." Unfortunately for the writer in the *Globe*, at the time when he was penning his article instinct with the diablerie and scorn of the workingmen which is so characteristic of Tory traditions, Mr. MACKENZIE, who had evidently seen reason to repent his conduct, was addressing those very, despised unemployed workingmen, amongst whom were the deputation of the previous day, at the western door of the Parliamentary Buildings. Does Mr. MACKENZIE say they were only "professedly" workingmen out of employment? No. He says that up to a few weeks ago public works had given employment to several hundred workingmen; that the works are now nearly completed, that only one hundred and fifty men were employed, and that he is in hopes that some one hundred and fifty would, in Ottawa, have no means of earning their bread. "I'm afraid with the Premier," he says, "I am doubtedly bear hard on the workingmen." Later in his speech he says, "I had no doubt that distress would result from "insufficiency of employment in this and "other cities of the Dominion, and that "they organized themselves into some extent from workmen coming in from the "other side." Later still, "the worst "of no more melancholy thing than that "a man who was able to work and willing to work should not be able to get "work." What becomes now of the *Globe's* Opposition tactics, its miserable slander that these workingmen were "pliable political partisans," its execrable figment that the demonstration was inspired and organized by ex-Ministers, its invitation, however, hard on the *Globe*. The two-fold hatred, hatred of SIR JOHN MACDONALD and hatred of the workingman, would leave the eye clear nor may head cool.

THE $100,000 RAID.

MR. FOSTER's highly successful descent on the public chest is a matter of serious moment to a people looking forward to a deficit of two millions, but the Premier's attempt to inculpate the *Chief* Engineer and to deceive the House on the subject is infinitely worse. The raid of $100,000, but the First Minister's disgrace outweighs all the pecuniary considerations involved, not only in this, but in all the jobs that have been perpetrated under Messrs. MACKENZIE and GAUVREAU. The Premier has often of late drawn heavily on his credit at the bank of quondam public confidence in his uprightness, but his drafts have at last come back, not only dishonoured, but protested on them all the world.

Respecting the $41,000 which, with the theft of $65,000, formed the Grit booty the Premier, replying to Mr. MCCARTHY and others who had expressed his amazement that a contractor who had abandoned his contract before entering upon the work seriously should have been paid so much, he said, "I was all for his breach of faith, declared on the 28th February (*Hansard*, p. 343) that "it was certified by Mr. Fleming" for work available in the terms of the "order-in-Council relating to the prosecution of the work." The terms referred to were taken from subsection 3 of section 7 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, as follows: "That the money "consideration to be paid the contractor "shall be at the rate of ten thousand "dollars for each mile of the Pacific Railway, and that such sum shall be paid to "the contractor as the work progresses "by monthly payments in proportion to "the value of the work then actually performed (according to the estimates of "the engineer designated for the purpose by the Minister of Public Works) "as compared with the value of the "whole work contracted for, including "rolling stock and all things to be done "or furnished by the contractors," &c.

Under this provision, as recited in the order-in-Council, varying him the contract, Mr. FOSTER undertook the Georgian Bay branch. In this order-in-Council it was also recited that:

"The Governor-in-Council, in the event of his annulling this contract (for failure on the part of one member of the firm) may direct the letter to proceed to re-let the same, or any portion thereof, or employ additional workmen, tools and materials, as he may see fit, and complete the works at the expense of the contractor, the excess of the cost of the expenditure which may be incurred thereby, and the contractor shall forfeit all right to the moneys/securities deposited."

Mr. Mackenzie abandoned the contract Mr. MACKENZIE not only neglected to see to it that all the money due to the contractor on the work he had done was forfeited to the Crown for his breach of agreement, but proceeded to pay Mr. FOSTER'S claims for such work. Having taken that astounding step, the Premier was bound to observe the provisions of the Railway Act as above quoted. But Mr. MACKENZIE evidently did not consider himself bound to do anything but recoup Mr. FOSTER for his political services, for he deliberately ignored subsection 3 and paid the money in question without obtaining *the certificate of the Engineer* as the law provides, and without observing the other conditions of the Act.

In short, Mr. MACKENZIE paid Mr. FOSTER the $41,000 illegally and in defiance of the provisions of the statute. A friend had to be served who was sticking almost as close as a brother, and the law which stood in the way was set at naught.

The Premier is beyond question liable for this money. He talks of seeing Sir JOHN MACDONALD, who having obtained the consent of his colleagues to spend $100,000 on certain Secret Service claims thought he was doing the Treasury a good turn by beating down the claimants after he had left office and paying the $65,000 for that amount. Rather let him proceed against himself for the recovery of this $41,000. Let the standard be lifted first at home, and cleanliness be established there ere the Premier sallies forth with his avenging broom. Let us have the Minister of Public Works v. Mr. MACKENZIE re this $41,000, next the Premier v. Mr. MACKENZIE re the $65,000, after that Mr. MACKENZIE v. Mr. NORRIS, and lastly the hon. member for Lambton v. Spefton Lister of the Commons; and when all that litigation is over, then let him talk of the Secret Service, sa! it so please him, and of actions of libel also.

THE FIFTY CENT CLAUSE.

AGAINST the counsel of some even of his own supporters, Mr. BLAKE has forced through the House the clause in the Railway Act of 1874, requiring the payment of not less than 50 cents on the dollar as a condition of receiving a discharge, except in certain contingencies specified. Both Mr. HOLTON and Mr. FERRIER pointed out that this clause, which may be taken as some indication of commercial opinion in Montreal in the matter. As a general rule no very important inferences are to be drawn from the support of a Government measure by pronounced friends of the powers that be; but when such as these oppose a Government measure a *primâ facie* case for further inquiry arises at once, and the presumption is that for such a departure from the usual course important reasons exist. Mr. COLBY contended that assets of 100 cents nominal would not generally pay over 40 cents on the dollar, and Mr. JETTS, referring to the fact that the average realized of late years have been only 22½ cents, intimated a doubt whether it could by statutory enactment be raised to over double that figure. Mr. MITCHELL said that raising the limit from 33⅓ to 50 cents was legislation in the wrong direction; and Mr. FARROW suggested that retailers as well as wholesalers had rights which the Parliament was bound to respect. Mr. T. N. GIBBS argued that the new restriction would cause a great loss to the country, and that it was a time of exceptional depression and commercial embarrassment, and that no difficulties should be created for the country. Mr. BLAKE, who having obtained the consent of his colleagues to spend $12,000 on certain Secret Service claims thought he was doing the Treasury a good turn by beating down the claimants after he had left office and paying the $65,000 for that amount. Rather let him proceed against himself for the recovery of this $41,000. Let the standard be lifted first at home, and cleanliness be established there ere the Premier sallies forth with his avenging broom. Let us have the Minister of Public Works v. Mr. MACKENZIE re this $41,000, next the Premier v. Mr. MACKENZIE re the $65,000, after that Mr. MACKENZIE v. Mr. NORRIS, and lastly the hon. member for Lambton v. Spefton Lister of the Commons; and when all that litigation is over, then let him talk of the Secret Service, sa! it so please him, and of actions of libel also.

THE ILLEGAL PAYMENT OF $41,000.

THE Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, subsection 3 of section 7, provides for the method of paying contractors. The payments for the work done are to be made at the rate of $10,000 per mile, "and such sum shall be paid to the contractors as the work progresses by "monthly payments in proportion to the "value of the work then actually performed (according to the estimates of "the engineer designated for the purpose by the Minister of Public Works) "as compared with the value of the "whole work contracted for, including "rolling stock and all things to be done "or furnished by the contractors," &c.

Under this provision, as recited in the order-in-Council, varying him the contract, Mr. FOSTER undertook the Georgian Bay branch. In this order-in-Council it was also recited that:

"The Governor-in-Council, in the event of his annulling this contract (for failure on the part of one member of the firm) may direct the letter to proceed to re-let the same, or any portion thereof, or employ additional workmen, tools and materials, as he may see fit, and complete the works at the expense of the contractor, the excess of the cost of the expenditure which may be incurred thereby, and the contractor shall forfeit all right to the moneys/securities deposited."

Mr. Mackenzie

Mr. MACKENZIE is equal to Mr. MCKELLAR in this respect at least. He granted Mr. A. B. FOSTER, who rendered the Party considerable service in connection with the material on which the Pacific Scandal was founded, the contract for the Georgian Bay branch, or one difficulty. Mr. FOSTER deposited his securities and undertook the job, but without turning even the first sod, broke through the contract and abandoned the contract, thereby forfeiting not only the $65,000 security he had deposited, but, as the order-in-Council provided, all the money due to him for such work as he had done. But the Premier, loving FOSTER as the saintly MCKELLAR loved his DICKEY, not only neglected to confiscate Mr. FOSTER'S securities and "all the money due on the "work," but actually paid Mr. FOSTER $41,000 for compensation for his own political services. It is to be regretted in the House, Mr. MACKENZIE declared that the payment had been made on the certificate of the Chief Engineer, as the law provided. But in his examination before the Public Accounts Committee on Wednesday, Mr. FLEMING testified that he was not responsible for what the Premier had done in this case, as he had never certified the payment!

McKellarism is dead, long live McKellarism!

A PETTY INQUISITION.

We are satisfied that the history of representative institutions affords no parallel to the disgraceful burlesque being enacted at Ottawa, under the guise of a Parliamentary inquiry into the expenditure of the Northern Railway Company. In the purlieus of every large city are ash and garbage heaps, around which, night and day, hover some poor miserable devils of both sexes, who ever and anon stoop to poke their uncanny claws and noses into the pile, in eager expectation of finding a stray scrap to sell to the nearest dealer in second-hand stores. "Cash for rags" is the sign over the door of the place, and thither with the scrap goes the poor creature who can scrape together rush his faithful scavengers. "Rebbish filled!" he advertises, and slay they it him with a vengeance. Mr. FALLOON was quite correct when he said that the connection between a Committee and a Division Court was "rough on the Division Court." It is as bad a factious political inquest with Mr. GUTHRIE for coroner. It is a fishing inquisition in search of a dead carcass. The smallest appearance of a chance to count one for the ministerial scandal-mongers is eagerly seized. For instance, out of the thousands of items which have passed under the review of the Grit inquisitors they pounce only on those which they think likely to weaken the leaders of the Conservative Party, *The Mail*, or somebody in opposition to the powers that be. Even the presence of strangers the books with the view of discovering the *bona fides* of the settlement arrived at with the Government seems to alarm them. An expenditure of ten thousand dollars is not canvassed, though possibly open to criticism—whether it covered for locomotives, cars, or in the course of working expenses. The moment there appeared a voucher with the name of the manager of *The Mail* attached to it down come the harpies with a demand for explanation; and away through the country on the wings of the Grit press flies the statement that that gentleman had received some money from the Northern railway. No matter that only in his chance capacity of secretary to a public dinner to a distinguished Canadian his name was attached to a subscription thereto years before *The Mail* newspaper was thought of—let it go! It may be misunderstood, say the malicious inquisitors, that he had a hand in something he had. No odds that the matters in question occurred years ago, long before *The Mail* was thought of, long before the hole pies on the name of Mr. BELFORD, another gentleman now known as a leading writer for the Grits, and at a time that at the time he only rendered professional services and was paid for them—only evidence enough, if you may be sure some of it will stick! Upon that statemanlike and gentlemanlike principle is the inquisition conducted. It is not to speak of the facility with which the war all in due time will be carried into Africa, and the Carthaginian Hannibal overthrown, they have not the support of the country in this unsalled-for and inquisitorial raid upon the private affairs. The shrewd attempt to provide a set-off to the true bill found against MACKENZIE & Co. will be but a feeble one, however, to palliate the pity—an exceedingly expensive one.

THE KAMINISTIQUIA LAND JOB.

Fifty-one Thousand Dollars for a Terminus!

OTTAWA, April 8.—The returns long looked for, showing the quantity of land purchased for railway purposes by the Dominion Government on the Kaministiquia, for a terminus for the Canadian Pacific railway, the persons from whom such purchase was made, and the amount paid therefor, have been published in the Gazette. The Government and the municipality of Shuniah, including Arthur's Landing, bought the terminus of said railway, or aid thereto, have been brought down. These documents are most interesting, proving conclusively that the Government under partisan pressure permitted the public treasury to be plundered to the extent of thousands of dollars. The terminus chosen was protested against in forcible terms by one hundred petitioners, who set forth a statement that Prince Arthur's Landing is a fashionable town of twelve hundred inhabitants, composed chiefly of active and enterprising men, who have been the means of opening up this isolated section, enduring the usual disadvantages and hardships of a new country, at great expense, of recognition at the hands of the Government; that a large amount of capital, over $300,000, has been expended in actual building improvements, and consequently the value of the land greatly enhanced; whereas the lower plot of Fort William is almost uninhabited, and is owned almost entirely by Indians. Further, that there was already at the Landing, besides an open roadstead for any number of vessels, a good substantial pier, which, with a comparatively small additional expenditure, would be amply sufficient for all the purposes of your petitioners' interest at the hands of the Government; that a large amount of capital, over $300,000, has been expended in actual building improvements, and consequently the value of the land greatly enhanced; whereas the lower plot of Fort William is almost uninhabited, and is owned almost entirely by Indians. Further, that there was already at the Landing, besides an open roadstead for any number of vessels, a good substantial pier, which, with a comparatively small additional expenditure, would be amply sufficient for all the purposes of your petitioners' interest at the hands of the Government; that a large amount of capital, over $300,000, has been expended in actual building improvements, and consequently the value of the land greatly enhanced; whereas the lower plot of Fort William is almost uninhabited, and is owned almost entirely by Indians. Further, that there was already at the Landing, besides an open roadstead,

LIAMENT.

Third Parlia-

...esday, April 4.

...ned his speech on ... SARY also moved ... on the ground that ... been knocked, and that under the present law the poor farmers were prevented ... to get their just portion of the ... ensation.

Mr. LAURIER could not concur ... solvent law being on the statute ... to take advantage of the insolvency law.

After a few remarks from Mr. Ch...

Mr. McCARTHY said the Min... Justice had urged as a reason ... amendment should not be carried that ... enacge ought to be complete. He ... gentleman appeared to have lost sight ... fact that the discharge did not free ... from a large portion of his debts, and ... maintenance of his parents, wife, a... dren, &c. There were other cases ... by the law as it stands from which ... could not be freed by a discharge, and therefore the adoption of the amendment ... posed was only extending the principle which we have now in existence. He (McCarthy) quite agreed that the farmers ... not desire to be included in this Act. They did not desire to be put into a position to be thrown into insolvency, but they did say that they could not get any advantages under this Act, and why, he wished to know, should a farmer who had to trust the merchant in many cases, not have the same advantages as traders of making a proper settlement of his affairs.

A division was then taken and the amendment lost; yeas, 56; nays, 101.

YEAS—Messrs. Baby, Bartha, Bechard, Bellerose, Bergeron, Bourassa, Bourassa, Bowell, Burk, Carron, Casault, Simon, Cimon, Coupal, Currier, Dansereau, Doutre, Desjardins, Dugas, Dugas, Farrow, Fortier, Gaudet, Gill, Girouard, Hagar, Harwood, Hurteau, Jetté, Kaulbach, Kirkpatrick, Landerkin, Lanthier, Little, Macdonald (Cape Breton), McDougall, McJ. McCarthy, McCrae, McIntosh, McQuade, Masson, McDougall, Metcalfe, Orton, Pelletier, Pinsonneault, Pirie, Pohan, Robitaille, Roleau, Roy, Rymal, Thompson (Carleton), Wallace (Norfolk), Wallace (Haldimand), White (Renfrew), Wright (Ottawa)—total, 49.

NAYS—Messrs. Appleby, Archibald, Armour, Bain, Baumgartner, Bertram, Bigger, Blackburn, Blake, Borden, Borron, Bowman, Brooks, Bruce, Brown, Buell, Burpee (St. John), Burpee (Sunbury), Cartwright, Casey, Casgrain, Cheseborough, Chisholm, Church, Cockburn, Coffin, Cunningham, Davies, Delorme, De St. Georgeville, DeVeber, Donahue, Dymond, Fleming, Flynn, Forbes, Fraser, Frechette, Galbraith, Geoffrion, Gibbs (Ontario, North), Gibbs (Ontario, South), Gillies, Gilmor, Gorrie, Guthrie, Hagar, Hightebotham, Holton, Horton, Huntington, Jette, Kerr, Kirk, Lathamme, Lajoie, Lesage, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Kingston), Macdonald (Toronto), Macdonald (Victoria), Macdonald (Sir John), Macdonald (Renfrew), McCay (Queens), McDougall (Renfrew), McGee, McGregor, McIsaac, McLeod, McLeod, McMillan, McMillan, McMillan (Huron), McMillan (Lambton), McMillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Victoria), McMillan (Wellington), McMillan (Wellington), McMillan (Wellington

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from third page.)

the contract was sub-let to Chubb & Co., so that the profits which went into the pocket of the Speaker went there without his giving any time whatever that required in signing the warrants for the money. (Cheers.) The Premier had stated that it was excessively wrong to employ members of Parliament and give them salaries, the law having so declared it, but if that is wrong, giving contracts is infinitely more dangerous. (Cheers.) That appeal the very foundation of the independence of Parliament. When a man had a fixed salary it was no secret, but when he had a contract he might be making enormous profits as the Government well know——

Mr. MILLS—Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—Yes, as the Government well know; look at Mr. A. B. Foster. (Loud cheers.) The Government knew very well how to remunerate a friendly contractor, and how, instead of making him forfeit his security when he abandons his contract, to give it him back and make him a present of a great many thousand dollars more. The practice of giving members of Parliament any interest in contracts was infinitely more destructive of the Independence of Parliament than the payment of a salary for certain work. If he (Mr. Mackenzie) would look back to history, he would find that the most effective measures were taken to sweep out these abuses, but it took long before there were vigorous efforts made to protect the elector from corrupting influence, because it was felt that wrong as it might be to corrupt an elector, it was infinitely worse to corrupt a member representing thousands of electors. (Loud cheers.)

After recess,

Sir JOHN MACDONALD resumed the debate, pointing out that the Premier had in fact offered no excuse for the action of the Government, and there could be no doubt that the Government had given the case up so far as they were concerned. The Premier objected to the second part of the resolution, but he admitted the first part. The Premier was in his (Sir John's) opinion was incontrovertible, alleging as it does the simple fact that such payments were in contradiction of the Independence of Parliament Act. He wished to know if any member could put his hand on his heart and say that the Minister of Justice was not a contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. That was the only proposition in the resolution, and the House would see by the vote which party was required to support the Independence of Parliament and vindicate it. (Cheers). As regards the conduct of the Government, there could be no doubt of the grave responsibility of the Postmaster-General. He was at the head of the Department and was responsible for it, and he it was who deliberately ordered the contract to be given to political friends, in other words, it must be given to the *Freeman*. There was no means of escape for the Postmaster-General. It appeared that it was early in 1875 that this state of affairs was communicated by the Postmaster-General to his colleagues and from that time they had to share the responsibility because they did not close the contract, as was their duty as soon as it came under notice. There was only one thing for the Premier to do when he was informed of the case, and that was to order the contract to be closed, but what was done? From 1875 until, in fact, this session, the country did not know authoritatively of the matter? The facts came out, as he (Sir John) understood it, before the Public Accounts Committee last session, but they were not reported to the House.

Mr. BLAKE—They were public. They were entered in the Public Accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER—Then why did you not stop it?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the names of the parties concerned were not before the House. Individually, the parties were not made known. The contract was thought to have been taken by the Government was at once to have stopped the contract, but it was put into hands from it. Such a course would have been infinitely better, not for the Government, but for themselves, but for Speaker. As for the paper and stationery, they could be sold, and they could be bought, and the prices paid could have been done by other parties. The course of the Speaker would then have been clear. He would at once have resigned, and have been returned by his constituents, and no doubt have been re-elected and entrusted him in the seat which he so worthily filled, but the Government had not the moral boldness to do this. They would not admit that they had made any mistake, that the Postmaster-General had blundered into this unfortunate position. They allowed the matter to go on. They allowed it to run on from 1875 to 1876, and they avoided this discussion with its consequences. The hon. Premier complained that no step had been taken by the Opposition, but who was bound to protect the privileges of Parliament? (Cheers.) It was the duty rested with the majority, with the Government; they alone could vindicate the privileges of Parliament. (Cheers.) Had the Opposition taken action it would no doubt have been called factious action on their part, because complaint had been made of their factiousness already. The Government were backed with a strong majority. They might have risen in their places and stated the facts to the House. The duty rested on them. They alone could do it. They were the men who had stated that when they came into power a golden era was to commence. No longer would a member be bribed, would a contractor sit in Parliament. The reign of purity was to commence. (Great laughter.) The hon. member for North Hastings had framed his resolution in the premier's speech in which he condemned any man who allowed such a thing to be done, yet last session the Opposition sat patiently in their seats and waited to see what hon. gentlemen opposite would do. They waited to see whether they would be true to their profession and to act as they said they would do when they came into power. But the Government sat still all last session. The resolution now proposed contained two propositions, (1) that it was inexpedient that a member should enter into a contract, and (2) that such a contract was in contravention of the laws of Parliament. It was for the House to say whether it would sustain these propositions. The whole country was taking an interest in the question (Laughter from the Ministerial benches.) Hon. gentlemen laughed, but every one knew what that meant. Hon. gentlemen knew in their hearts that the country felt strongly on this matter. To be assured of this it was only necessary to look to the Liberal press of the Dominion. There had never been a press so devoted and so loyal to its party as the Liberal press of Canada had been to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal press supported them often, no doubt, contrary to conviction, yet it was found that papers which generally supported the Government had condemned them in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, but they would find that sacrifice on the altar of party would not be appreciated by the country. (Cheers.) They might do this for the sake of party, but they would have the consciousness that they had ignored their standing and reputation for consistency and independence. It was for them to judge of the course they had taken in the matter. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE said the Government had been charged with corrupting or purchasing a commander-in-chief. He would not say that the hon. member for Kingston had been sincere, as he was certainly warm in his remarks. The member for North Hastings had referred to several of his speeches, and quoted from them. These opinions he held still. He believed it was necessary to dissociate every member of the House from the Government of the day, and he had laboured to make the law such as would render it impossible. It was no crime to give a member an office. Members were appointed as judges and to other positions. The question was whether the law covered the case. In 1868 he (Mr. Blake) had endeavoured to make the law more stringent, but the hon. member for Kingston opposed a change. In 1871, however, he was compelled to admit that the law must be altered. The hon. gentleman had contended that these admirable, but how did these principles contrast with his practice? When the Pacific Railway Company was formed, the then Opposition desired to prevent any member of Parliament from being a member of the Company, but the hon. gentleman said the Company could not succeed without them. His ultimate determination, however, was a compromise. It was decided that none of the original corporators should be members of Parliament, but there was nothing to prevent members from being secret partners in the concern. It was satisfactory to find that conviction had been gradually dawning upon him (Sir John), and that he was now fully persuaded of the correctness of those principles which he had formerly resisted. The hon. gentleman might have brought this matter up before, but he had waited until the moment came when it would be most embarrassing to the Government, and he could say to them "vote that down if you please." He contended that hon. gentlemen opposite could not move a resolution affirming that a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act had been committed without moving to issue a writ on the ground that the seat was vacant. No one who sustained the motion, could refrain from supporting such a proposition. The breach of the Act was in a member continuing to sit in Parliament; therefore the motion really amounted to a complaint that the Speaker continued to fill the chair. He would abstain from expressing any opinion whether this was or was not a contract within the Independence of Parliament Act. (Laughter.) Judgment ought not to be passed on such a question without investigation and inquiry by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Laughter.) He would be for no party would not anticipate judgment. If it came within the Act the effect was that the seat was vacant, and the penalty for sitting in Parliament was fixed at the modest sum of $2 000 per day. There was nothing in the law which prevented the Government from giving a contract to a member, the latter ceasing *ipso facto* to be a member.

A MEMBER—Then why did you stop it?

Mr. BLAKE—Because we did not think the relation should continue between the Government and a continuing member of Parliament.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The offence is one to which a penalty is attached, and the hon. gentleman has said in the House that where there is an offence there must be two, parties to it, the receiver as well as the giver. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE did not think if the hon. gentleman murdered him, he (Mr. Blake) would thereby become a criminal. He went on to say that this matter should have been brought up last session. The pretence that the facts were not known was more worthy of a pettifogger in a Division Court than of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman had just said that the facts were well known even now. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE replied that the fact that a printing job had been given to the Speaker was as well known last session as it was now. He went on to contend that the object of his motion was to declare that the seat for Gloucester was vacant. Disguise it as they might, that was the gist of the motion, and that was a question which ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Opposition had allowed a year to elapse before taking action, and at there had been no much deliberation in the inception, it was not proper that there should be haste in action. The Government would not oppose a reference to that Committee.

Mr. BOWELL—Then why don't you move it? (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE—Governments do not usually make such motions, and he thought it was unfair to expect a different course from the Government. (Laughter.)

Dr. TUPPER could imagine the derision with which the great mass of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite would have received the statement a few years ago that the honest indigenous statesman of the Dominion who had just sat down exhibited when on the Opposition side of the House was succeeded by special pleading for one of the grossest breaches of the privileges of Parliament which had ever been perpetrated. (Cheers.) The hon. gentlemen whose feelings cheers had been heard attempting to sustain the case, because it was felt that wrong as it might be to corrupt an elector, it was infinitely worse to corrupt a member representing thousands of electors. (Loud cheers.)

After recess,

Sir JOHN MACDONALD resumed the debate, pointing out that the Premier had in fact offered no excuse for the action of the Government, and there could be no doubt that the Government had given the case up so far as they were concerned. The Premier objected to the second part of the resolution, but he admitted the first part. The resolution in his (Sir John's) opinion was incontrovertible, alleging as it does the simple fact that such payments were in contradiction of the Independence of Parliament Act. He wished to know if any member could put his hand on his heart and say that the Minister of Justice was not a contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. That was the only proposition in the resolution, and the House would see by the vote which party was required to support the Independence of Parliament and vindicate it. (Cheers). As regards the conduct of the Government, there could be no doubt of the grave responsibility of the Postmaster-General. He was at the head of the Department and was responsible for it, and he it was who deliberately ordered the contract to be given to political friends, in other words, it must be given to the *Freeman*. There was no means of escape for the Postmaster-General. It appeared that it was early in 1875 that this state of affairs was communicated by the Postmaster-General to his colleagues and from that time they had to share the responsibility because they did not close the contract, as was their duty as soon as it came under notice. There was only one thing for the Premier to do when he was informed of the case, and that was to order the contract to be closed, but what was done? From 1875 until, in fact, this session, the country did not know authoritatively of the matter? The facts came out, as he (Sir John) understood it, before the Public Accounts Committee last session, but they were not reported to the House.

Mr. BLAKE—They were public. They were entered in the Public Accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER—Then why did you not stop it?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the names of the parties concerned were not before the House. Individually, the parties were not made known. The contract was thought to have been taken by the Government was at once to have stopped the contract, but it was put into hands from it. Such a course would have been infinitely better, not for the Government, but for themselves, but for Speaker. As for the paper and stationery, they could be sold, and they could be bought, and the prices paid could have been done by other parties. The course of the Speaker would then have been clear. He would at once have resigned, and have been returned by his constituents, and no doubt have re-elected and entrusted him in the seat which he so worthily filled, but the Government had not the moral boldness to do this. They would not admit that they had made any mistake, that the Postmaster-General had blundered into this unfortunate position. They allowed the matter to go on. They allowed it to run on from 1875 to 1876, and they avoided this discussion with its consequences. The hon. Premier complained that no step had been taken by the Opposition, but who was bound to protect the privileges of Parliament? (Cheers.) It was the duty rested with the majority, with the Government; they alone could vindicate the privileges of Parliament. (Cheers.) Had the Opposition taken action it would no doubt have been called factious action on their part, because complaint had been made of their factiousness already. The Government were backed with a strong majority. They might have risen in their places and stated the facts to the House. The duty rested on them. They alone could do it. They were the men who had stated that when they came into power a golden era was to commence. No longer would a member be bribed, would a contractor sit in Parliament. The reign of purity was to commence. (Great laughter.) The hon. member for North Hastings had framed his resolution in the premier's speech in which he condemned any man who allowed such a thing to be done, yet last session the Opposition sat patiently in their seats and waited to see what hon. gentlemen opposite would do. They waited to see whether they would be true to their profession and to act as they said they would do when they came into power. But the Government sat still all last session. The resolution now proposed contained two propositions, (1) that it was inexpedient that a member should enter into a contract, and (2) that such a contract was in contravention of the laws of Parliament. It was for the House to say whether it would sustain these propositions. The whole country was taking an interest in the question. (Laughter from the Ministerial benches.) Hon. gentlemen laughed, but every one knew what that meant. Hon. gentlemen knew in their hearts that the country felt strongly on this matter. To be assured of this it was only necessary to look to the Liberal press of the Dominion. There had never been a press so devoted and so loyal to its party as the Liberal press of Canada had been to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal press supported them often, no doubt, contrary to conviction, yet it was found that papers which generally supported the Government had condemned them in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, but they would find that sacrifice on the altar of party would not be appreciated by the country. (Cheers.) They might do this for the sake of party, but they would have the consciousness that they had ignored their standing and reputation for consistency and independence. It was for them to judge of the course they had taken in the matter. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE said the Government had been charged with corrupting or purchasing a commander-in-chief. He would not say that the hon. member for Kingston had been sincere, as he was certainly warm in his remarks. The member for North Hastings had referred to several of his speeches, and quoted from them. These opinions he held still. He believed it was necessary to dissociate every member of the House from the Government of the day, and he had laboured to make the law such as would render it impossible. It was no crime to give a member an office. Members were appointed as judges and to other positions. The question was whether the law covered the case. In 1868 he (Mr. Blake) had endeavoured to make the law more stringent, but the hon. member for Kingston opposed a change. In 1871, however, he was compelled to admit that the law must be altered. The hon. gentleman had contended that these principles were admirable, but how did these principles contrast with his practice? When the Pacific Railway Company was formed, the then Opposition desired to prevent any member of Parliament from being a member of the Company, but the hon. gentleman said the Company could not succeed without them. His ultimate determination, however, was a compromise. It was decided that none of the original corporators should be members of Parliament, but there was nothing to prevent members from being secret partners in the concern. It was satisfactory to find that conviction had been gradually dawning upon him (Sir John), and that he was now fully persuaded of the correctness of those principles which he had formerly resisted. The hon. gentleman might have brought this matter up before, but he had waited until the moment came when it would be most embarrassing to the Government, and he could say to them "vote that down if you please." He contended that hon. gentlemen opposite could not move a resolution affirming that a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act had been committed without moving to issue a writ on the ground that the seat was vacant. No one who sustained the motion, could refrain from supporting such a proposition. The breach of the Act was in a member continuing to sit in Parliament; therefore the motion really amounted to a complaint that the Speaker continued to fill the chair. He would abstain from expressing any opinion whether this was or was not a contract within the Independence of Parliament Act. (Laughter.) Judgment ought not to be passed on such a question without investigation and inquiry by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Laughter.) He would be for no party would anticipate judgment. If it came within the Act the effect was that the seat was vacant, and the penalty for sitting in Parliament was fixed at the modest sum of $2 000 per day. There was nothing in the law which prevented the Government from giving a contract to a member, the latter ceasing *ipso facto* to be a member.

A MEMBER—Then why did you stop it?

Mr. BLAKE—Because we did not think the relation should continue between the Government and a continuing member of Parliament.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The offence is one to which a penalty is attached, and the hon. gentleman has said in the House that where there is an offence there must be two, parties to it, the receiver as well as the giver. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE did not think if the hon. gentleman murdered him, he (Mr. Blake) would thereby become a criminal. He went on to say that this matter should have been brought up last session. The pretence that the facts were not known was more worthy of a pettifogger in a Division Court than of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman had just said that the facts were well known even now. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE replied that the fact that a printing job had been given to the Speaker was as well known last session as it was now. He went on to contend that the object of his motion was to declare that the seat for Gloucester was vacant. Disguise it as they might, that was the gist of the motion, and that was a question which ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Opposition had allowed a year to elapse before taking action, and as there had been so much deliberation in the inception, it was not proper that there should be haste in action. The Government would not oppose a reference to that Committee.

Mr. BOWELL—Then why don't you move it? (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE—Governments do not usually make such motions, and he thought it was unfair to expect a different course from the Government. (Laughter.)

Dr. TUPPER could imagine the derision with which the great mass of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite would have received the statement a few years ago that the honest indigenous statesman of the Dominion who had just sat down, exhibited when on the Opposition side of the House, was succeeded by special pleading for one of the grossest breaches of the privileges of Parliament which had ever been perpetrated. (Cheers.) The hon. gentlemen whose feelings cheers had been heard attempting to sustain the case, because it was felt that wrong as it might be to corrupt an elector, it was infinitely worse to corrupt a member representing thousands of electors. (Loud cheers.)

After recess,

Sir JOHN MACDONALD resumed the debate, pointing out that the Premier had in fact offered no excuse for the action of the Government, and there could be no doubt that the Government had given the case up so far as they were concerned. The Premier objected to the second part of the resolution, but he admitted the first part. The resolution in his (Sir John's) opinion was incontrovertible, alleging as it does the simple fact that such payments were in contradiction of the Independence of Parliament Act. He wished to know if any member could put his hand on his heart and say that the Minister of Justice was not a contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. That was the only proposition in the resolution, and the House would see by the vote which party was required to support the Independence of Parliament and vindicate it. (Cheers). As regards the conduct of the Government, there could be no doubt of the grave responsibility of the Postmaster-General. He was at the head of the Department and was responsible for it, and he it was who deliberately ordered the contract to be given to political friends, in other words, it must be given to the *Freeman*. There was no means of escape for the Postmaster-General. It appeared that it was early in 1875 that this state of affairs was communicated by the Postmaster-General to his colleagues and from that time they had to share the responsibility because they did not close the contract, as was their duty as soon as it came under notice. There was only one thing for the Premier to do when he was informed of the case, and that was to order the contract to be closed, but what was done? From 1875 until, in fact, this session, the country did not know authoritatively of the matter? The facts came out, as he (Sir John) understood it, before the Public Accounts Committee last session, but they were not reported to the House.

Mr. BLAKE—They were public. They were entered in the Public Accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER—Then why did you not stop it?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the names of the parties concerned were not before the House. Individually, the parties were not made known. The contract was thought to have been taken by the Government was at once to have stopped the contract, but it was put into hands from it. Such a course would have been infinitely better, not for the Government, but for themselves, but for Speaker. As for the paper and stationery, they could be sold, and they could be bought, and the prices paid could have been done by other parties. The course of the Speaker would then have been clear. He would at once have resigned, and have been returned by his constituents, and no doubt have re-elected and entrusted him in the seat which he so worthily filled, but the Government had not the moral boldness to do this. They would not admit that they had made any mistake, that the Postmaster-General had blundered into this unfortunate position. They allowed the matter to go on. They allowed it to run on from 1875 to 1876, and they avoided this discussion with its consequences. The hon. Premier complained that no step had been taken by the Opposition, but who was bound to protect the privileges of Parliament? (Cheers.) It was the duty rested with the majority, with the Government; they alone could vindicate the privileges of Parliament. (Cheers.) Had the Opposition taken action it would no doubt have been called factious action on their part, because complaint had been made of their factiousness already. The Government were backed with a strong majority. They might have risen in their places and stated the facts to the House. The duty rested on them. They alone could do it. They were the men who had stated that when they came into power a golden era was to commence. No longer would a member be bribed, would a contractor sit in Parliament. The reign of purity was to commence. (Great laughter.) The hon. member for North Hastings had framed his resolution in the premier's speech in which he condemned any man who allowed such a thing to be done, yet last session the Opposition sat patiently in their seats and waited to see what hon. gentlemen opposite would do. They waited to see whether they would be true to their profession and to act as they said they would do when they came into power. But the Government sat still all last session. The resolution now proposed contained two propositions, (1) that it was inexpedient that a member should enter into a contract, and (2) that such a contract was in contravention of the laws of Parliament. It was for the House to say whether it would sustain these propositions. The whole country was taking an interest in the question. (Laughter from the Ministerial benches.) Hon. gentlemen laughed, but every one knew what that meant. Hon. gentlemen knew in their hearts that the country felt strongly on this matter. To be assured of this it was only necessary to look to the Liberal press of the Dominion. There had never been a press so devoted and so loyal to its party as the Liberal press of Canada had been to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal press supported them often, no doubt, contrary to conviction, yet it was found that papers which generally supported the Government had condemned them in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, but they would find that sacrifice on the altar of party would not be appreciated by the country. (Cheers.) They might do this for the sake of party, but they would have the consciousness that they had ignored their standing and reputation for consistency and independence. It was for them to judge of the course they had taken in the matter. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE said the Government had been charged with corrupting or purchasing a commander-in-chief. He would not say that the hon. member for Kingston had been sincere, as he was certainly warm in his remarks. The member for North Hastings had referred to several of his speeches, and quoted from them. These opinions he held still. He believed it was necessary to dissociate every member of the House from the Government of the day, and he had laboured to make the law such as would render it impossible. It was no crime to give a member an office. Members were appointed as judges and to other positions. The question was whether the law covered the case. In 1868 he (Mr. Blake) had endeavoured to make the law more stringent, but the hon. member for Kingston opposed a change. In 1871, however, he was compelled to admit that the law must be altered. The hon. gentleman had contended that these principles were admirable, but how did these principles contrast with his practice? When the Pacific Railway Company was formed, the then Opposition desired to prevent any member of Parliament from being a member of the Company, but the hon. gentleman said the Company could not succeed without them. His ultimate determination, however, was a compromise. It was decided that none of the original corporators should be members of Parliament, but there was nothing to prevent members from being secret partners in the concern. It was satisfactory to find that conviction had been gradually dawning upon him (Sir John), and that he was now fully persuaded of the correctness of those principles which he had formerly resisted. The hon. gentleman might have brought this matter up before, but he had waited until the moment came when it would be most embarrassing to the Government, and he could say to them "vote that down if you please." He contended that hon. gentlemen opposite could not move a resolution affirming that a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act had been committed without moving to issue a writ on the ground that the seat was vacant. No one who sustained the motion, could refrain from supporting such a proposition. The breach of the Act was in a member continuing to sit in Parliament; therefore the motion really amounted to a complaint that the Speaker continued to fill the chair. He would abstain from expressing any opinion whether this was or was not a contract within the Independence of Parliament Act. (Laughter.) Judgment ought not to be passed on such a question without investigation and inquiry by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Laughter.) He would be for no party would anticipate judgment. If it came within the Act the effect was that the seat was vacant, and the penalty for sitting in Parliament was fixed at the modest sum of $2 000 per day. There was nothing in the law which prevented the Government from giving a contract to a member, the latter ceasing *ipso facto* to be a member.

A MEMBER—Then why did you stop it?

Mr. BLAKE—Because we did not think the relation should continue between the Government and a continuing member of Parliament.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The offence is one to which a penalty is attached, and the hon. gentleman has said in the House that where there is an offence there must be two, parties to it, the receiver as well as the giver. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE did not think if the hon. gentleman murdered him, he (Mr. Blake) would thereby become a criminal. He went on to say that this matter should have been brought up last session. The pretence that the facts were not known was more worthy of a pettifogger in a Division Court than of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman had just said that the facts were well known even now. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE replied that the fact that a printing job had been given to the Speaker was as well known last session as it was now. He went on to contend that the object of his motion was to declare that the seat for Gloucester was vacant. Disguise it as they might, that was the gist of the motion, and that was a question which ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Opposition had allowed a year to elapse before taking action, and as there had been so much deliberation in the inception, it was not proper that there should be haste in action. The Government would not oppose a reference to that Committee.

Mr. BOWELL—Then why don't you move it? (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE—Governments do not usually make such motions, and he thought it was unfair to expect a different course from the Government. (Laughter.)

Dr. TUPPER could imagine the derision with which the great mass of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite would have received the statement a few years ago that the honest indigenous statesman of the Dominion who had just sat down, exhibited when on the Opposition side of the House, was succeeded by special pleading for one of the grossest breaches of the privileges of Parliament which had ever been perpetrated. (Cheers.) The hon. gentlemen whose feelings cheers had been heard attempting to sustain the case, because it was felt that wrong as it might be to corrupt an elector, it was infinitely worse to corrupt a member representing thousands of electors. (Loud cheers.)

After recess,

Sir JOHN MACDONALD resumed the debate, pointing out that the Premier had in fact offered no excuse for the action of the Government, and there could be no doubt that the Government had given the case up so far as they were concerned. The Premier objected to the second part of the resolution, but he admitted the first part. The resolution in his (Sir John's) opinion was incontrovertible, alleging as it does the simple fact that such payments were in contradiction of the Independence of Parliament Act. He wished to know if any member could put his hand on his heart and say that the Minister of Justice was not a contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. That was the only proposition in the resolution, and the House would see by the vote which party was required to support the Independence of Parliament and vindicate it. (Cheers). As regards the conduct of the Government, there could be no doubt of the grave responsibility of the Postmaster-General. He was at the head of the Department and was responsible for it, and he it was who deliberately ordered the contract to be given to political friends, in other words, it must be given to the *Freeman*. There was no means of escape for the Postmaster-General. It appeared that it was early in 1875 that this state of affairs was communicated by the Postmaster-General to his colleagues and from that time they had to share the responsibility because they did not close the contract, as was their duty as soon as it came under notice. There was only one thing for the Premier to do when he was informed of the case, and that was to order the contract to be closed, but what was done? From 1875 until, in fact, this session, the country did not know authoritatively of the matter? The facts came out, as he (Sir John) understood it, before the Public Accounts Committee last session, but they were not reported to the House.

Mr. BLAKE—They were public. They were entered in the Public Accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER—Then why did you not stop it?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the names of the parties concerned were not before the House. Individually, the parties were not made known. The contract was thought to have been taken by the Government was at once to have stopped the contract, but it was put into hands from it. Such a course would have been infinitely better, not for the Government, but for themselves, but for Speaker. As for the paper and stationery, they could be sold, and they could be bought, and the prices paid could have been done by other parties. The course of the Speaker would then have been clear. He would at once have resigned, and have been returned by his constituents, and no doubt have re-elected and entrusted him in the seat which he so worthily filled, but the Government had not the moral boldness to do this. They would not admit that they had made any mistake, that the Postmaster-General had blundered into this unfortunate position. They allowed the matter to go on. They allowed it to run on from 1875 to 1876, and they avoided this discussion with its consequences. The hon. Premier complained that no step had been taken by the Opposition, but who was bound to protect the privileges of Parliament? (Cheers.) It was the duty rested with the majority, with the Government; they alone could vindicate the privileges of Parliament. (Cheers.) Had the Opposition taken action it would no doubt have been called factious action on their part, because complaint had been made of their factiousness already. The Government were backed with a strong majority. They might have risen in their places and stated the facts to the House. The duty rested on them. They alone could do it. They were the men who had stated that when they came into power a golden era was to commence. No longer would a member be bribed, would a contractor sit in Parliament. The reign of purity was to commence. (Great laughter.) The hon. member for North Hastings had framed his resolution in the premier's speech in which he condemned any man who allowed such a thing to be done, yet last session the Opposition sat patiently in their seats and waited to see what hon. gentlemen opposite would do. They waited to see whether they would be true to their profession and to act as they said they would do when they came into power. But the Government sat still all last session. The resolution now proposed contained two propositions, (1) that it was inexpedient that a member should enter into a contract, and (2) that such a contract was in contravention of the laws of Parliament. It was for the House to say whether it would sustain these propositions. The whole country was taking an interest in the question. (Laughter from the Ministerial benches.) Hon. gentlemen laughed, but every one knew what that meant. Hon. gentlemen knew in their hearts that the country felt strongly on this matter. To be assured of this it was only necessary to look to the Liberal press of the Dominion. There had never been a press so devoted and so loyal to its party as the Liberal press of Canada had been to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal press supported them often, no doubt, contrary to conviction, yet it was found that papers which generally supported the Government had condemned them in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, but they would find that sacrifice on the altar of party would not be appreciated by the country. (Cheers.) They might do this for the sake of party, but they would have the consciousness that they had ignored their standing and reputation for consistency and independence. It was for them to judge of the course they had taken in the matter. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE said the Government had been charged with corrupting or purchasing a commander-in-chief. He would not say that the hon. member for Kingston had been sincere, as he was certainly warm in his remarks. The member for North Hastings had referred to several of his speeches, and quoted from them. These opinions he held still. He believed it was necessary to dissociate every member of the House from the Government of the day, and he had laboured to make the law such as would render it impossible. It was no crime to give a member an office. Members were appointed as judges and to other positions. The question was whether the law covered the case. In 1868 he (Mr. Blake) had endeavoured to make the law more stringent, but the hon. member for Kingston opposed a change. In 1871, however, he was compelled to admit that the law must be altered. The hon. gentleman had contended that these principles were admirable, but how did these principles contrast with his practice? When the Pacific Railway Company was formed, the then Opposition desired to prevent any member of Parliament from being a member of the Company, but the hon. gentleman said the Company could not succeed without them. His ultimate determination, however, was a compromise. It was decided that none of the original corporators should be members of Parliament, but there was nothing to prevent members from being secret partners in the concern. It was satisfactory to find that conviction had been gradually dawning upon him (Sir John), and that he was now fully persuaded of the correctness of those principles which he had formerly resisted. The hon. gentleman might have brought this matter up before, but he had waited until the moment came when it would be most embarrassing to the Government, and he could say to them "vote that down if you please." He contended that hon. gentlemen opposite could not move a resolution affirming that a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act had been committed without moving to issue a writ on the ground that the seat was vacant. No one who sustained the motion, could refrain from supporting such a proposition. The breach of the Act was in a member continuing to sit in Parliament; therefore the motion really amounted to a complaint that the Speaker continued to fill the chair. He would abstain from expressing any opinion whether this was or was not a contract within the Independence of Parliament Act. (Laughter.) Judgment ought not to be passed on such a question without investigation and inquiry by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Laughter.) He would be for no party would anticipate judgment. If it came within the Act the effect was that the seat was vacant, and the penalty for sitting in Parliament was fixed at the modest sum of $2 000 per day. There was nothing in the law which prevented the Government from giving a contract to a member, the latter ceasing *ipso facto* to be a member.

A MEMBER—Then why did you stop it?

Mr. BLAKE—Because we did not think the relation should continue between the Government and a continuing member of Parliament.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The offence is one to which a penalty is attached, and the hon. gentleman has said in the House that where there is an offence there must be two, parties to it, the receiver as well as the giver. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE did not think if the hon. gentleman murdered him, he (Mr. Blake) would thereby become a criminal. He went on to say that this matter should have been

Messrs. Masson and McMillan next spoke with good effect, Mr. Rymal sandwiching a pettifogger in a Division Court than of the leader of the Opposition.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman had just said that the facts were well known even now. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. BLAKE replied that the fact that a printing job had been given to the Speaker was as well known last session as it was now. He went on to contend that the object of his motion was to declare that the seat for Gloucester was vacant. Disguise it as they might, that was the gist of the motion, and that was a question which ought to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Opposition had allowed a year to elapse before taking action, and as there had been so much deliberation in the inception, it was not proper that there should be haste in action. The Government would not oppose a reference to that Committee.

Mr. BOWELL—Then why don't you move it? (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE—Governments do not usually make such motions, and he thought it was unfair to expect a different course from the Government. (Laughter.)

Dr. TUPPER could imagine the derision with which the great mass of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite would have received the statement a few years ago that the honest indigenous statesman of the Dominion who had just sat down, exhibited when on the Opposition side of the House, was succeeded by special pleading for one of the grossest breaches of the privileges of Parliament which had ever been perpetrated. (Cheers.) The hon. gentlemen whose feelings cheers had been heard attempting to sustain the case, because it was felt that wrong as it might be to corrupt an elector, it was infinitely worse to corrupt a member representing thousands of electors. (Loud cheers.)

After recess,

Sir JOHN MACDONALD resumed the debate, pointing out that the Premier had in fact offered no excuse for the action of the Government, and there could be no doubt that the Government had given the case up so far as they were concerned. The Premier objected to the second part of the resolution, but he admitted the first part. The resolution in his (Sir John's) opinion was incontrovertible, alleging as it does the simple fact that such payments were in contradiction of the Independence of Parliament Act. He wished to know if any member could put his hand on his heart and say that the Minister of Justice was not a contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. That was the only proposition in the resolution, and the House would see by the vote which party was required to support the Independence of Parliament and vindicate it. (Cheers). As regards the conduct of the Government, there could be no doubt of the grave responsibility of the Postmaster-General. He was at the head of the Department and was responsible for it, and he it was who deliberately ordered the contract to be given to political friends, in other words, it must be given to the *Freeman*. There was no means of escape for the Postmaster-General. It appeared that it was early in 1875 that this state of affairs was communicated by the Postmaster-General to his colleagues and from that time they had to share the responsibility because they did not close the contract, as was their duty as soon as it came under notice. There was only one thing for the Premier to do when he was informed of the case, and that was to order the contract to be closed, but what was done? From 1875 until, in fact, this session, the country did not know authoritatively of the matter? The facts came out, as he (Sir John) understood it, before the Public Accounts Committee last session, but they were not reported to the House.

Mr. BLAKE—They were public. They were entered in the Public Accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER—Then why did you not stop it?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the names of the parties concerned were not before the House. Individually, the parties were not made known. The contract was thought to have been taken by the Government was at once to have stopped the contract, but it was put into hands from it. Such a course would have been infinitely better, not for the Government, but for themselves, but for Speaker. As for the paper and stationery, they could be sold, and they could be bought, and the prices paid could have been done by other parties. The course of the Speaker would then have been clear. He would at once have resigned, and have been returned by his constituents, and no doubt have re-elected and entrusted him in the seat which he so worthily filled, but the Government had not the moral boldness to do this. They would not admit that they had made any mistake, that the Postmaster-General had blundered into this unfortunate position. They allowed the matter to go on. They allowed it to run on from 1875 to 1876, and they avoided this discussion with its consequences. The hon. Premier complained that no step had been taken by the Opposition, but who was bound to protect the privileges of Parliament? (Cheers.) It was the duty rested with the majority, with the Government; they alone could vindicate the privileges of Parliament. (Cheers.) Had the Opposition taken action it would no doubt have been called factious action on their part, because complaint had been made of their factiousness already. The Government were backed with a strong majority. They might have risen in their places and stated the facts to the House. The duty rested on them. They alone could do it. They were the men who had stated that when they came into power a golden era was to commence. No longer would a member be bribed, would a contractor sit in Parliament. The reign of purity was to commence. (Great laughter.) The hon. member for North Hastings had framed his resolution in the premier's speech in which he condemned any man who allowed such a thing to be done, yet last session the Opposition sat patiently in their seats and waited to see what hon. gentlemen opposite would do. They waited to see whether they would be true to their profession and to act as they said they would do when they came into power. But the Government sat still all last session. The resolution now proposed contained two propositions, (1) that it was inexpedient that a member should enter into a contract, and (2) that such a contract was in contravention of the laws of Parliament. It was for the House to say whether it would sustain these propositions. The whole country was taking an interest in the question. (Laughter from the Ministerial benches.) Hon. gentlemen laughed, but every one knew what that meant. Hon. gentlemen knew in their hearts that the country felt strongly on this matter. To be assured of this it was only necessary to look to the Liberal press of the Dominion. There had never been a press so devoted and so loyal to its party as the Liberal press of Canada had been to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal press supported them often, no doubt, contrary to conviction, yet it was found that papers which generally supported the Government had condemned them in this matter, and called on the members of Parliament to vindicate the purity of Parliament. (Cheers.) Some hon. gentlemen might feel bound to sustain the Government in this matter, but they would find that sacrifice on the altar of party would not be appreciated by the country. (Cheers.) They might do this for the sake of party, but they would have the consciousness that they had ignored their standing and reputation for consistency and independence. It was for them to judge of the course they had taken in the matter. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE said the Government had been charged with corrupting or purchasing a commander-in-chief. He would not say that the hon. member for Kingston had been sincere, as he