The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1878.

DEFEAT OF THE JOLY GOVERNMENT.

On Tuesday the Legislative Assembly of Quebec came to a vote on M. Mollleur's amendment to M. Chapleau's amendment to the Address. The amendment to the amendment, being merely an affirmation of the Address, should have been ruled out of order when proposed, but that was too much to expect from the purchased Speaker of the Party of Purity. The Opposition were ready on Saturday last to take a vote on the amendment, but for some reason not known at the time, the Government were unprepared for a division, and put up one supporter after another to talk against time. It now seems pretty evident that this was done because of the absence of Mr. Price, who, it appears fair to assume from what since happened, had notified the Government of his intention not to vote on the Address. On Tuesday afternoon, the delay of days bearing no fruit of the kind fondly hoped for, if not expected, by the Premier, a division was taken upon M. Mollleur's amendment, which was lost by a majority of one—yeas 31, nays 32. The Opposition victory was gained by Mr. Price's absence. The Montreal *Star* of Monday evening declares that the hope of corrupting some other member of the Opposition was the reason for protracting the debate. "Several Conservative members," it says, "have been approached, and we "are informed that the attempted "methods of bribery, if made known, "would be a startling revelation of Grit "corruption." Such proceedings are infamous, and yet they are approved by the Pharisaical brawlers of the Ministerial press as though they were pure as the driven snow and deserving the hearty commendation of every honest man. The sooner such disgraceful conduct is brought to an end the better it will be for the good name of the Province of Quebec, though it would appear from the proceedings after the vote yesterday, that though defeated, the Government intend to hold on to office. This is certainly carrying things with a high hand.

TRAITOR TURCOTTE.

"I have never authorized the statement made in the papers that I will support the Joly-Bachand Government. I have never thought of such a thing. I appeal to the electors as a Conservative, and consequently will be opposed to the Joly Government." *M. Turcotte in a letter dated 2nd April*

What he (M. Chapleau) was at liberty to do was to say that the member for Three Rivers had over and over again protested to him that he was a Conservative, that he was opposed to the Joly-Bachand Government, and that if he was proposed as the Speaker, by the leader of the Government, and that his vote was required to secure his election as such, he would vote against himself, and that statement the member for Three Rivers could not deny.

Mr. Turcotte—It is true, I said it, and I will explain.—*M. Chapleau on M. Joly's motion that M. Turcotte be Speaker.*

"Mr. Turcotte said that no one but a blind partizan could deny that the people approved of the act of the Lieutenant-Governor. No argument could be brought against the necessity of giving a independent support to the present Government. The sole object of the Opposition was to overturn the Joly Ministry. There were no principles at stake on either side. His conduct in the past would be a guarantee of his future conduct. He had never been a blind partizan of the Conservative Government, as his opposition to the Letellier Union policy had testified, and he was prepared to give this Government an equally independent support."—*M. Turcotte's speech on M. Joly's motion.*

These extracts proclaim trumpet-tongued M. Turcotte's infamy. At the date of his election he declared that he was an opponent of the Joly-Bachand Administration; time and again he so declared himself to M. Chapleau, the leader of the Opposition; and he wrote a letter to be read to the members of the Opposition at a meeting lately held in Montreal, in which he declared his unfaltering loyalty to the Conservative cause and his unswerving Opposition to the desperate politicians who, by Lieut.-Gov. Letellier's aid, were enabled to commit an unparalleled act of usurpation. He even went so far as to declare to M. Chapleau that if nominated to the Speakership by M. Joly he would vote against himself. M. Turcotte does not deny this—he says it is all true; yes, as true as he is false. Not only did he vote for himself, and thus become Speaker, but forsooth he can see no reason now why he should not give an "independent" support to the Joly Government! When did M. Turcotte get new light? At what particular moment did this extraordinary change of conviction occur to him? The reader will have little difficulty in judging for himself. In the very sentence in which M. Turcotte unblushingly acknowledged the truth of every allegation made against him by M. Chapleau, he promised to "explain." But his little speech contains no explanation. It is the mere puny whine of the traitor—traitor to his own sense of self-respect, traitor to his Party, traitor to his constituents, traitor to every sentiment of honour. Pity 'tis that such men receive the confidence of constituencies.

CONSERVATISM AND PROGRESS.

The idea is not uncommon that Conservatism is opposed to progress. Macaulay's distinction between a class of men who look with fondness to whatever is ancient, and that other class composed of men sanguine in hope, bold in speculation, always pressing forward, has been taken to be the foundation of the two parties which exist in England and in Canada. A writer in *Fraser* in an article on "English and German Party "Government" points out that this mode of describing and accounting for the rival parties is false historically, for there never was a party that never changed anything. "It is false practically, for "there is no difficulty in showing that "mere conservation is not the prin-"ciple of a Conservative Party. "Macaulay would not pretend that "Conservatives are accustomed to op-"pose improvements when they know "and acknowledge them to be so." The opposite to Conservatism is not progress but change. But progress is change for the better, and here and in England the Conservatives have ever been ready to forward such change. Lord Beaconsfield passed the most sweeping reform bill ever passed in England, and he did this on principles at once Conservative and progressive as was acknowledged by Sir Rowdell Palmer (now Lord Selborne), who declared in 1866 that he would prefer the principle adopted by Mr. Disraeli the following year to the principle of Lord Russell's Bill. In Canada, the credit of most of the beneficial changes must be laid at the door of Conservatism. The writer of the article, who, by the way, is a German, traces the greatness of England to its strong conservative powers; and he looks with despondency on the future because he thinks that these conservative powers are not as likely to remain predominant.

If we look at the political controversies of the present hour in Canada, we shall conclude that not only are Conservatives not opposed to beneficial change, but they have often to fight against obstructionists, who call themselves Liberals and Reformers. Conservatives are to-day advocating a cause which is that of progress and national life. Who are the propagandists of a "National Policy?" The Conservatives; while those who call themselves Reformers, but who have reformed nothing, dig up every old buried fallacy to support their policy of obstruction. They try to prove, so to speak, that wooden ploughs are better than iron ploughs, and that a nation which develops its resources to the minimum degree is happier and richer than one whose various implements of wealth are utilized.

The truth is, as Mr. Goldwin Smith often pointed out, the master of the present so-called Reform party is the very type of what is popularly known as a Tory, and his party bears to him a family resemblance. Hence it is that when Mr. Mackenzie wants to defend Reformers who reform nothing, he has to leave Canada and maunder into a historical disquisition about the building of the pyramids.

A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE.

If they [the Government] should get a new lease of office, which I think in the interest of the country it is sincerely to be desired they should not get, they will have to resort to a system of taxation which will burden this country beyond anything which can be imagined. They will be stigmatized as the Taxationists of the Dominion.

These words were spoken in the Senate, on the Supply Bill, at the very close of the session, by Hon. Mr. Macpherson. In the light of the Estimates, Supplementary and Further Supplementary, brought down in the session's dying hours by "General Distress" Cartwright, and of the eloquent facts bearing upon the Government's lavish expenditure of public money which they disclosed, Mr. Macpherson uttered a fitting note of warning.

It is the fashion of the Grit orators and writers to represent the Opposition as pledged to an increase of taxation. They make this charge on the ground that the Opposition are in favour of a policy of Protection. That the Opposition are in favour of a policy of Protection is true, but we deny *in toto* the inference which is drawn from this truth. To so readjust the tariff as that it will give fair encouragement to our own industries does not imply an increase of taxation; it might lead to a reduction of taxation. There is no warrant for the assertion of the Ministerial Party in this respect.

In the first session of the present Parliament Mr. Cartwright made changes in the tariff which added three millions a year to the taxation of the people of the Dominion. A few years later and he supplemented this large amount with half a million more, chiefly drawn from so common an article of consumption as tea. Next year he had a deficit of nearly two millions of dollars, and the next year following another deficit, which he stated at a million and a half but which was in reality close on to two millions. The deficits are not only discreditable to the Finance Minister and the Government as a whole, but are alarming. One was possible, but a second should have been prevented. Instead of its being prevented, however, we are galloping along at a rapid pace on the road to a third deficit.

There is but one end to all this, and that is the end stated by Mr. Macpherson. The Government preferred to go to the country with the false cry upon their lips, that they were opposed to increasing the taxes, rather than take steps to prevent deficit following deficit at so tremendous a pace. But it only means the piling up of trouble in the future. It means that if this reckless, impotent Government get a fresh lease of power the iron-hand of the Taxationists will be felt in this country as it has never been felt before. The thought is worthy the most serious consideration of the people of Canada.

THE SNOWDON MINES.

If the writers of the *Globe* could so far infringe on the traditionary policy of their journal as to refrain from further untruths concerning the above mines, they might escape a suit for damages which is not unlikely to be brought against them, and concerning which legal advice has already been taken. The following is part of its yesterday's romance on the subject:

"Mr. Myles, to begin with, is virtual owner of the property for mining purposes. According to his own statement he has a 'mining right' covering for one hundred years the whole of the property in question, although for convenience in commencing operations he is limited to certain bounds; and as he has no desire to monopolize the mine he is about disposing of several 'rights' to other parties."

Mr. Myles, "to begin with," is nothing of the sort. The mine contains sixty acres; he has of these leased two. If these become practically exhausted of ore, he is entitled to exchange them for any other two still undisposed of, he abandoning all claim to the first. Were the rest of the mine sold to-morrow, the sale would extinguish his right of future exchange. Mr. Myles' lease is registered at Peterborough; its contents are what we state; the *Globe* editor should read it, ere he find himself disagreeably confronted with it.

Passing over some mis-statements of little interest to the general public, we come to one which should not be left unnoticed:

"The amount of coal required to turn out thirty tons of pig iron per day—the quantity he proposes to produce at the Port Hope works—is something like 28,000 tons of coal yearly. On this the Customs duty at the lowest rate named by the advocates of the 'national policy' would be $14,000 per annum; so that instead of granting to Mr. Myles the protection they chatter so much about, they would by their system diminish his profits to that extent."

The Port Hope people, we hear, are instituting very anxious inquiries as to whether they are to get—or anybody in Canada is to get—such works from Mr. Myles at all. There seems to be no sign of them. But the coal question is the only one we need meddle with. As to the calculations of coal required, they do not square with ours. According to an estimate made up for us at the West Point Foundry, Cold Springs, 48 tons of coal daily, 340 working days in the year, will yield 50 tons of iron every 24 hours. This needs 16,320 tons of coal, not 28,000. Practical Canadians corroborate this. Now as to the duty. None is asked by Protectionists, save on bituminous coal. If Mr. Myles really intends to smelt iron in Canada, he ought to know what all practical men will tell him, that anthracite—not bituminous coal—is what he needs. If the latter be used it must first be freed from sulphur by being made into coke, causing an amount of expense which renders anthracite coal, for smelting purposes, far the cheapest. On anthracite coal no one proposes to levy a duty; it will come, under any Protection schedule, as it now comes, free. The profits, which are, as above stated, to be diminished to the extent of $14,000 per annum, would in fact be diminished to no extent at all.

But we must plainly point out to our readers that there is a tariff under which all coal will have to pay duty, as will many other articles. If the policy of the present Government be persevered in—if deficit be to follow deficit, as under that policy it has, and under that policy it must—there will be no choice but the imposition of a heavy revenue tariff, including every imported article of general use. The United States had to pay heavy taxes, and chose to pay them in that form which never fails to return more than it takes—a Protectionist tariff. Canadians, owing to their debt and other obligations, must for many years to come, pay heavily also into their public exchequer. This must be paid. Canadians must choose, at the coming general elections, whether they will pay it by a revenue tariff, which will tax all they eat, drink, or wear, and help no one; or by a protective tariff, which will directly increase the prosperity of every inhabitant of the country.

MR. MACKENZIE AT TORONTO.

Wherever the remarkable speech of Mr. Mackenzie in Toronto last week has been carefully studied, one conclusion is arrived at, namely, that, while nominally advocating the benefit of Free Trade, he thoroughly proved the value of Protection. His assertions were all Free Trade—his demonstrations all Protectionist; and as he went along, wherever he had succeeded in apparently fortifying some Free Trade principle, he presently opened fire thereon with Protectionist artillery, and blew the unfortunate work to atoms. He described the vast achievements in production and manufacture made by the States under Protection. He is quite right. Over the whole great Union—by Eastern cliff and on Western prairie, under Southern suns and amidst Northern snows—mines have been opened, quarries dug, factories, foundries, and furnaces erected, in a number and with a rapidity startling to Old World imaginations. The number of hands employed—the amount of articles produced—has doubled in most industries—trebled and quadrupled in many. In all directions the resources of the land have been explored and used, and its capacity for supplying many millions with every necessary of life for food, clothing, or habitation; for defence, locomotion, medicine, and education, independently of other countries, fully demonstrated. An immense quantity—many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth—of articles which they used to import from foreign lands, they now produce from the resources of their own, and produce them too, so low of price and of good quality, that Canada buys yearly far more from the States, far less from Britain. At the same time, so far from their foreign trade diminishing, their exports and imports have nearly trebled, and while we have been heavily increasing our debt, they are rapidly diminishing theirs, though in proportion to population it is six times as large as our.

Mr. Mackenzie was right in praising their progress; and we are sure he will admit that if Canada could, in the next few years, by the aid of Protection, make her own goods—her clothing and textiles, her cars and engines, her tools and cutlery, her sugars, her woodenware; if she could give employment to treble the people she does; if we had factories at work by the hundred, and could see workmen by thousands fill the streets of all our towns when the dinner-bell rang; if all over the land we could explore and work mine, quarry and seam as have our neighbours; if we opened a better market here for all our farmers now send elsewhere; if we could treble our foreign trade as have the States, have, as they have, recurring surpluses instead of deficits, and pay off our debt as they are paying theirs, we should be doing very well, and doing a very great deal better than we are. And we are sure he would be willing to accomplish all this by a high tariff, but for certain evils he fears. Now, we will point out to him that these evils are not so formidable as he appears to think them. First, he observes that manufacturing inflation in the end closes many factories, and throws men out of work. Now, if he will turn to any Protectionist author, he will find this stage fully described. When it occurs, the men who have been attracted from country life go back by degrees to the farm, where they form an additional market for goods, and presently enable the closed factories to open again. In the meantime, the manufacturing development obtained is never lost. The signs of this movement farm-wards are clear, and reported in many United States journals, the first indication noticeable being always the call from the farms for labourers. To quote a paper of no party bias, but large circulation, the New York *Ledger* this week editorially says:—"There is said to be an "abundance of work throughout the farming regions for tens of thousands of "labourers, the average wages being $10 to "12.50 per month, with board." Mr. Mackenzie will also admit that this movement has been retarded by over-expenditure of municipalities, inducing men to remain in towns; by the tramp-creating license of the war; and by the possibility of a semi-comfortable begging existence in many States, which the poorhouse would speedily close elsewhere. He will not consider these evils so likely here. He will also allow that in inaugurating Protection in Canada, we should have the example of the States before us, and that our rush of capital into manufacture might therefore be much better managed. He will observe that another security for this would be found in the differing character of the investors. The close of the American war inflation left money in every hand. The shoddy millionaires, flush from war contracts—the disbanded soldiers, placing their thousand or two at increase in manufactures—do not exist here. The money invested here would be that of British, American and Canadian manufacturers, observant of the States' course and carefully avoiding its dangers.

For all these reasons he will, we think, agree that the evils he fears are not so likely here. And now let us remark, by way of clinching the rivet, some little facts which may show him that, even in the States, the calamities he describes and dreads are in great part exaggerated, and in some part imaginary. He will admit Massachusetts to present a fair specimen of Protection. There, if he is right, would be found idleness, poverty, low wages, and so on. Well, the Labour Bureau of Massachusetts has just published its annual report. The number of hands employed in Massachusetts has increased 24 per cent in the year—the average wages paid being $440, counting adults and children. And if he will look in the American Encyclopædia, and in the State Controller's annual reports, he will find that Massachusetts has $244,000,000 in her savings banks, having increased $14,000,000 a year regularly of late, while all Canada has only $13,000,000 in such banks, having decreased some hundred thousands of late years just as regularly. Low wages are caused by over-production, an evil, which as we have pointed out, cures itself. But idleness is produced by other causes as well. In the State we have instanced, two things assist prosperity; first, a poorhouse system, which discourages tramping; next, a more careful city expenditure, thus removing one inducement which injuriously crowds cities elsewhere with labourers. This may be noticed from their city taxation; while Boston pays but $1.37 per $100, Detroit pays $3.92, and St. Louis 4.23. We trust Mr. Mackenzie will be impressed by these facts; and we know that, even should he disregard them, the country at large will not.

THE UNKINDEST CUT OF ALL.

Mr. Thomas Coffin is a member of Mr. Mackenzie's Government. It is necessary to state the fact distinctly, for there are some people in Canada so ignorant as not to be aware of it. A week or two ago, believing then that the writs for the General Election would be issued immediately, he addressed his constituents in a brief letter—Mr. Coffin is a man of few words—declaring that he would again be a candidate. Then came a Grit convention in Shelburne, when, lo and behold! the ungrateful scamps actually refused to re-nominate Mr. Mackenzie's colleague, and selected in his stead Mr. Thomas Robertson, who was lately beaten by Mr. White for the Local Legislature. This is indeed, the unkindest cut of all. It is unparalleled. Nothing like it is known. Has Mr. Coffin suffered vicariously? He has certainly no sins of commission of his own to answer for. We must suppose he was thrown over because he was a member of the Government. 'Tis cruel, 'tis a hard fate, but 'tis true for all that.

THE CONTEST IN MUSKOKA.

Muskoka and Parry Sound are in a fair way of having a representative in the House of Commons who will be a good exchange for one of Mr. Mackenzie's phonographs—Mr. A. P. Cockburn. The Opposition candidate, Mr. W. E. O'Brien, having been nominated by a large and influential meeting, lost no time in issuing his address, which is the manly, straightforward, intelligent document that we should have expected from him. A barrister by profession, for some years of his early life he was a journalist, but for many years past has been a practical farmer. He served for a considerable term in the County Council of Simcoe, and more recently was Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Town Council of Barrie, in which position he gained the confidence of all parties. He possesses in a marked degree that varied experience, general information and practical business capacity which will make him a valuable member of the House of Commons, as well as capable of doing good service to a new constituency of the growing wants and importance of Muskoka. He is above all a gentleman of irreproachable character, and of an independent mind, well able to hold his own in argument, as Mr. Cockburn will find to his cost when he has to face the inevitable. Mr. O'Brien not having sought the position, and no pledges having been either asked or given, he means what he says when he declares his desire is not "to be the delegate of a party, but the representative of the varied interests of a great community, in honour and conscience bound by the principles I profess, but free to exercise my own judgment as to the best means of carrying out those principles in practice." But on the great question now before the country he gives no uncertain sound, and goes to the root of the matter when he says:—

"Our various industrial pursuits are now suffering under a system by which foreign goods are allowed to compete in our markets practically free of duty, while we are debarred from entering the country from whence that competition comes. By this system, directly or indirectly, and in a greater or less degree, all classes suffer. The manufacturer has a right to redress against a policy which makes our exports consist of raw material, and our imports of the manufacture of that material. The farmer has an equal right to complain when he finds his home market destroyed, and when he sees foreign grain admitted free, while he is obliged to pay a high duty on that which he exports. And all who are interested in the political as well as the commercial welfare of the country, will protest against a policy which is cutting off our trade with the Mother Country, and making us commercially dependent upon the United States—which is destroying alike our inter-ocean as well as our Provincial traffic—and which, in its general results, has brought about a state of commercial depression unknown in the previous history of the country."

Mr. O'Brien refuses to enter on the dead issues of the past, but thinks that "after the revelations of the present session the warmest friends of Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues will hardly venture to raise the personal issues which have furnished their staple topics of discussion for so many years back. If they do, it will be no hard matter to show how unfit, in more ways than one, are the late colleagues of Mr. Cauchon, and the present colleagues of Mr. Laflamme, Mr. Huntington, and Mr. Jones, the defenders of Mr. St. Just, and the patrons of Oliver and Davidson, of Sutherland and Nixon, to rule over her Majesty's loyal subjects in Canada."

Mr. O'Brien is making an active personal canvass, in which he is receiving most satisfactory assurances of support.

THE DEPRESSION NOT PASSING AWAY.

Those who seek to help the case of the fly-on-the-wheel Government by representing that the "depression" of the time is rapidly passing away, will not find much to comfort them in the remarks made by Mr. R. B. Angus, General Manager of the Bank of Montreal, at the annual meeting a few days ago. Better authority as to the condition and prospects of business in the Dominion we could scarcely appeal to, and what view does Mr. Angus take? He says that the diminution in the value of banking business has been gradual throughout the year (closing 30th April last), that therefore the full effects of it may not yet have been experienced, and that it is quite possible that the profits of the coming year may be affected to a greater extent than were those of the past. While observing some favourable indications, he thinks it well to caution the shareholders "not to look with too much expectation "on the probable results of the immediate "future." For knowledge of the facts upon which an estimate of prospects must be based we back Mr. Angus against both the "mixer and muddler" of the Finance Department and the philosopher at second hand who presides over that of the Interior.

One statement made by Mr. Angus, important enough in itself, is of further importance because of certain inferences to which it leads. He speaks of a present excess of banking capital, and of banking profits being reduced by too much competition. The time was when profitable employment for no small amount of Canadian banking capital was found in such great commercial cities as New York and Chicago, but that, he regrets to say, has been almost entirely reversed during the last two years. Money has ruled low at these points, and the competition for business has cut down profits to a minimum; and this, too, at a time when "the very "cheap money of Great Britain is finding "its way more and more into this coun-"try." Now, observe what follows. It is an old story, that what a new country like this requires to develope its resources are these two great aids—men and money. We want immigrants to fill up the country, and further, in order that their labour may be turned to account, we want also a liberal influx of capital. Well, the immigrants we have had have forced us to cry, "Hold, enough!" while thousands upon thousands of born Canadians have gone to find work and wages in the States. And Mr. Angus tells us that while banking profits are being cut down through excess of capital invested in banking, the very cheap money of Great Britain is finding its way more and more into this country. We cannot, therefore, as colonists in some quarters have done, raise a whine about the want of capital to develope our resources, and say that if only more capital were sent from the mother country for investment here we would be more prosperous. As for more labour, what would be the use of sending more to a country which has already too many hands idle? What, then, is wanting, if it be neither more hands to labour, nor more capital to employ labour? We answer, that what we need most of all are statesmen, in Parliament and in the Government—men competent to understand what the requirements of the situation are, and to fulfil them.

WHO ARE DISQUALIFIED FROM VOTING.

A correspondent asks us to insert "A list of situations which disqualify from voting at elections." We have printed such a list before, but repeat it for the benefit of our correspondent and it may be of others who have not already seen it. The following are those legally disqualified from voting:—

"The Chief Justice and the Justices of the Court of Appeal, the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of Ontario, the Chief Justices and Judges of the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Ontario, all County Judges, all officers of the Customs of the Dominion of Canada, all Clerks of the Peace, County Attorneys, Registrars, Sheriffs, Deputy Sheriffs, Deputy Clerks of the Crown, and agents for the sale of Crown Lands, all Postmasters in cities and towns, and all officers employed in the collection of any duties payable to her Majesty in the nature of duties of Excise, shall be disqualified and incompetent to vote at any election; and if any public officer or person mentioned in this section vote at any such election, he shall thereby forfet the sum of two thousand dollars, and his vote at such election shall be null and void." 32 Vic., chap. 21, section 2; 39 Vic., chap. 10, section 48.

SOCIALISM AND MODERN SOCIETY.

News from every quarter of the compass bears evidence to the activity of Socialism. A great deal of ignorance prevails as to the source of Socialism and the class among which it takes deepest root. Louis Blanc, one of the High Priests of Socialism, writing many years ago, said: "A labourer is "an object of compassion and we have "not enough of chaplets and bouquets "for a danseuse." This reflection would never occur to the labourer himself, who has no such self-pity as would prove an adequate counterpart to the compassion which a sensitive and imaginative mind like Louis Blanc's felt for the monotony of his toilsome and obscure existence. The starting point of Communism would never occur to men unaccustomed to observe and think. The proprietary instinct asserts itself very early in the child, and the necessity of founding society on the overthrow of private property is a refinement which would not suggest itself to every mind. A rude rhyme of forty years ago defines a Communist as one who wished for an equal division of unequal earnings, and who was always ready "to fork out "his penny and pocket your shilling." But Plato, Robert Owen, Saint Simon, and others whose names readily occur, could hardly be brought under this category. Robert Owen spent $300,000 in promoting Communistic schemes. Louis Blanc's attainments place him on a very high pinnacle. Dr. Nobeling, who has just shocked the world by his attempt on the life of the Emperor of Germany, belongs to the educated class, and clearly could have had no selfish aim in the course he took. In Russia "Nihilism," another name for Socialism, has taken a deep hold of the educated classes, and as we saw in the Vera Sosulitch incident, will carry its votaries very far, and may even take life with impunity. In the United States from very early times in its history social experiments have been rife. Economists, Shakers, Perfectionists, and the like have left the common orbit only to prove more conclusively to the satisfaction of the world at all events that the world was right, and now we see Socialism, such as exists all over the continent, which has its head centres in London, and which aims not at founding isolated societies, but at reforming general society, breaking out amongst our neighbours; we are, indeed, informed that in the person of Mr. Jury and other friends of Mr. Mackenzie it has emissaries here.

The socialist or revolutionist, who aims not merely at the substitution of one form of polity for another, but at wholly overturning society generally, has his birth in a despotic community. The huge oppressive machinery fills him with despair, and careers are so circumscribed that he has plenty of time to ponder over the oppression around him, until pity for its victims, pity really out of proportion to their sufferings, mingles with his revolutionary dream. Now, pity of all impulses carries revolutionists farthest. This, or complex and kindred motives, impelled Nobeling to the assassination of the Emperor, and, perhaps, inspired the plan for the assassination of the Imperial family. The Socialists, we are told, while admitting that there is not a kinder hearted man in Europe than the old Kaiser, yet doomed him as the chief promoter and supporter of the present military system. If he were out of the way, a great standing army, they think, would disappear and a policy of peace and social development would be forced on the Government. The aim, however, goes further than anything to be expected from existing Governments. It is to make everybody better and happier and freer. According to one of the most illustrious of Socialists the gradual improvement in the position of women is the determining cause of each upward movement in the race. We need not be surprised, therefore, that the relations between the sexes comes within the wave of Socialistic revolution, though it seems to be forgotten, what is now pretty well established, that each step in the improvement of the position of women was accompanied by increased demand on, and increased faith in, their self-respect.

Men and women are imperfect creatures, therefore every aggregation of men and women must be imperfect, and must strike as unsatisfactory him who contemplates it from an ideal standpoint. We need not be surprised that constitutional governments fail as surely as despotisms to satisfy socialistic cravings. Indeed the most instructed Socialists very logically point out that in England, the home of constitutionalism, squalour and want and misery are all around the blaze and splendour of London. Free labour they contend is but a small improvement on slavery. It has only the more completely been brought under the yoke of capital. We should be far from saying that society as at present constituted is incapable of improvement. It may be diseased, and socialism may be an evidence of the disease. But we are certain it is not to be improved by any socialistic scheme yet given to the world. Nor, if we may judge by the history of many of the apostles themselves, could we expect ordinary humanity long to retain in full glow the enthusiasm which at first makes the young socialist capable indifferently of great heroism and great crimes. General Cluseret, in his account of the military side of the Commune—many of the leading members of which were Communists proper or Socialists—tells us that all the sprightly young men whom he promoted to command aspired to live in the palace of the Elysée. "What "on earth," he pertinently asks, "had "they to do with the Elysée or the "Elysée with them?" When Ledru Rollin made his nest he pretty well abandoned revolution, as many a demagogue, the sweets of office reached, has ceased to roar. Socialism is an exotic under institutions where careers are perfectly free. Germans and French—principally Germans—have introduced it to the United States. But it cannot live there—for no law exists other than the energy of the individual to determine success in any walk. There is no vast stratification of classes which cannot be altered save by revolution or the attrition of long revolving lustres. Here, too, Socialism can make no way, and for the same reason. In England, where careers are less free than among us, it has made no progress. To flourish it requires an atmosphere where energy has to take refuge in dreamland, thus becoming not so much an aid of the practical reason as of the impractical and constructive imagination. That man is born to trouble, and his life full of vanity and vexation, is true of all, save a few fortunate exceptional natures, and where there is no excuse for attibuting to an individual, or a class, the misery to which humanity is heir, people learn the philosophy of Epictetus—*Anechau kai apechau*—which may be freely translated, grin and bear it.

SENT TO A TWO YEARS' REST.

On Wednesday, 5th inst., the American House of Representatives voted Mr. Fernando Wood's tariff bill into the waste paper basket: an appropriate receptacle for a measure that has for several months disturbed business and done harm incalculable through the agitation of changes which were dreaded by business men generally. After some set speeches for and against the bill respectively, its opponents insisted upon coming without further debate to a square vote on the enacting clause, which was stricken out by 134 to 120. The New York *Sun*, which is on the side of the minority, says that the 20 absentees would, if present, have been about equally divided between the yeas and the nays. Nineteen Democrats voted to throw the bill out, while seven Republicans voted to give it a further hearing. There are reasons for believing that, of the 113 Democrats who voted for the bill, there were more than a few who did so not because they really favoured it, but merely out of compliment to a prominent leader of their own party, well knowing that the bill was doomed. The vote is practically a most important one, making it certain that no further revision of the tariff will be attempted during the lifetime of the forty-fifth Congress, and giving the country assurance that there will be no more tariff tinkering for at least two years to come.

It would a great mistake, meantime, to regard even the vote of 134 to 120 as a fair indication of the strength of the protective and the revenue tariff systems respectively in the country. The fact is that on the question of Protection and National Policy the American people are much in advance of their representatives in Congress, and that those among the latter who indulge in Free Trade antics do in many districts barely save themselves from popular condemnation by stopping short of doing anything, and merely talking about doing it. It has been well remarked that a new feature in tariff discussion in the United States has been the immense mass meetings of working men who "demonstrated" against every proposed change that would favour the substitution of imported goods for those of American make. In time past it has been at least a colourable charge that Protection was promoted chiefly by capitalist manufacturers, although, as we had occasion a few days ago to remark, the emancipation of the national councils from the rule of the slave power was the great change of all that made Protection possible and assured it continuance. But the uprising of the masses of the people against tariff-tinkering in the direction of Free Trade is something new in America; and, it may safely be said that in the United States, at all events, there is no future for that misnamed system. The event ought to give a decided set-back to those blind guides of public opinion, both in England and in Canada, who labour to perpetuate a delusion with regard to the trade question in America—a delusion which after this will deserve to be called an imposter.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

In East Hastings the Reformers, anxious of course to put down bribery and corruption, are buying lambs at $15 a piece from doubtful voters.

The Charlottetown, P.E.I., *Herald* complains of the ostracism of Catholics from the Dominion civil service, and adds:—"Mr. Mackenzie had six supporters from the Island after last elections. We doubt if he gets one at the forthcoming."

Says the Stratford *Herald*:—"Wiser is his name, a whiskey distiller by occupation, and Grit candidate for South Grenville. He is in favour of morality and temperance, and promises, if elected, to make whiskey and vote for Prohibition. Enough said."

The "only religious" can't stand it any longer. We mean the Montreal *Witness*. It is very Gritty, but prohibitionists supporting Wiser in South Grenville is a little too much for it. Consequently, it declares "it is plain that no temperance man can properly vote for the distiller, Mr. J. P. Wiser!" Who's next?

It is estimated that the wheat crop in the United States will yield 450,000,000 bushels, by far the most prolific yield in their history, of which 150,000,000 will be exported. As American wheat is admitted into Canada free, this will be "a cheap country to live in;" but what about the Canadian farmer whom Mr. Mackenzie loves?

The following is doubtless true enough, but many people will wonder to read it in the *Globe* of yesterday: "The St. John *Telegraph's* Halifax correspondent writes: Business is generally dull, very dull. The West India trade shows some favourable symptoms. The everlasting drawback is the uncertainty of return cargoes to this port. Were our long-talked of sugar refinery in operation there would be no danger as regards return cargoes, and the risk on all ventures to the tropics would be reduced one-half or even more."

An "Old Soldier" thus writes us from Niagara:—"I came to Canada three years ago with seven others; we have taken both papers and read both sides. The other day we met and compared notes, and Cornishmen, like their motto, are *one and all* Sir John's men. Some day I may give you our reasons for it. Not one has any axe to grind."

The *Herald* is the name of a new Conservative paper which has just been started at Omemee by Mr. E. D. Passmore. It is a neat quarto sheet, well printed, and promises to do good service to the cause in its neighbourhood. We notice that our contemporary copies in full Mr. Hay's address to the electors of Centre Toronto, which, by the way, has already been more extensively published in this Province than has been any other election address for many years.

Hon. John O'Connor has received the Conservative nomination in Russell. It is a fitting compliment for his unremitting labours, for some years back, in the Ottawa District in the interest of the Conservative Party. Dr. Grant, Russell's old and able representative, magnanimously made way for Mr. O'Connor, and so did Mr. Baker and others. There is every reason to believe that Russell will stand in line with the other constituencies to be redeemed at the General Election.

A correspondent writes us:—"A discussion has arisen here anent the Quebec elections, which we want you to decide. When a Speaker has been duly elected in the Dominion or Provincial Parliament, has the said Speaker a vote in the proceedings of the House on any question; if so, on what question?" The Speaker has in all cases the casting vote, nothing more, unless when the House is in Committee of the Whole, and then, being out of the chair *pro tempore*, he may vote in the same way as any ordinary member.

Montreal *Star*: "A boot and shoe machine which was being sold in the United States at $500, was commenced to be manufactured here by one of our machine companies, when the price of the American machine *for Canada* ran gradually down till it was delivered here duty paid for $208. The Canadian manufacturer could not stand the competition, gave up the manufacture and the price of the machine is on the upward march once more, and now cannot be had for less than $300." Undersell, kill off competition and the Canadian market is at our mercy. Such is the Yankee doctrine in every branch of manufacture. It pays them, too; but it is death to us.

The *Journal des Trois-Rivieres* publishes a protest against the conduct of M. Turcotte signed by 773 of the electors of the constituency of Three Rivers, which is an absolute majority of the total electoral vote. It condemns M. Turcotte for having declared by his vote in favour of the legitimacy of the Joly Government before the Chamber had pronounced upon the constitutional question on which he had already expressed views adversely to the Government, and calls upon him to resign his seat in the Assembly, and again appeal to a District whose views he has ceased to represent. The man who deliberately commits an act of treason is not likely to yield to a request of this kind, fairly and legitimately made though it is.

Mr. Lorne Macdougall, it seems, is to receive the reward of his labours in behalf of Gritism. It was said he was to do battle in South Renfrew once more before falling into the comfortable chair soon to be vacated by Mr. Auditor Langton. But evidently the party managers discovered that as a politician he was utterly broken down; and so he goes to his reward at once, and the riding is to be contested by Mr. Robert Campbell, of Eganville, who was nominated last week at a Grit Convention held at Renfrew. It is said that Mr. Campbell will be unable to make a personal canvass, having but recently recovered from a serious illness. He is leading a forlorn hope. Mr. Bannerman is warmly supported by many men who have heretofore been active in the Grit cause, and altogether the probability of his election amounts almost to a certainty.

Sir Alexander Galt's views on the Tariff are particularly worthy of note in view of the prominence given to him—a deserved prominence, we may say—by the present Government in connection with the Fishery arbitration. Writing to Mr. Mills in 1876 he said:—

"The real question at issue is whether the present tariff is the best possible for the present circumstances of Canada. Yes, by your direction, assume the affirmative, and must consequently be held to the position that when unexampled commercial suffering exists in the country you can, as a Government, do nothing whatever to relieve it. You allege that the causes are beyond your control, and that nature must supply the remedy. I take the contrary position, and affirm that the present tariff is eminently artificial, and therefore open at all times to beneficial changes, and that in a period of severe distress the duty of the Government is to try the effect of changes. It has a most gloomy and depressing influence upon the mind of the country for the Parliament to assume the attitude of admitted incapacity to afford relief for two successive years."

The Moorhead Furniture Manufacturing Company, of London, suspended operations on Saturday last, and a meeting of the creditors of the concern will be called for an early day. Quebec has a similar case, a special meeting of those interested in the Drum Furniture Manufacturing Company having been called for yesterday to consider the question of winding up. The *Free Press* says that so far as the London enterprise is concerned, it may be possible for it to pass into new hands, and an attempt made to carry it on in spite of the disabilities under which it has had to labour. But even if that expectation comes to be realised, it will only be after a loss of capital variously estimated at from $200,000 to $250,000. Our contemporary recalls the fact that only a few days since, the *Globe* pointed to the Moorhead Company as an illustration of successful manufacture, and was of opinion that no "National Policy" was wanted in its case. The Radical organ did not then seem to know that Moorhead's was hopelessly insolvent, and that a similar institution at Quebec is in a like condition. We are glad to see that the *Free Press* has come to realise that the policy which leads to such results is not the best for Canada.

South Huron.

(From the Parkhill Gazette, Reform.)

Mr. Porter, a very respectable and talented Conservative, is the Opposition candidate in South Huron, and Mr. T. Greenway the Reform nominee. We don't like political traitors, and whatever Mr. Greenway's real principles may be, they have not proved sufficiently tangible or enduring to be worthy of respect. While we feel every desire to see South Huron represented by a Reform member, we should certainly prefer to support a man of Mr. Porter's reputation to a political weathercock like Greenway. The Reformers of that constituency would do better to allow the election to go by default than to bring out a man of Mr. Greenway's antecedents.

While more personal preferences should always give way for the sake of political principles, there is no excuse sufficient for supporting a disreputable politician—a mere pla e-hunter—no matter to which party he may belong.

THE METHODIST CHURCH.

London Conference.

St. Thomas, June 8.—The Conference met at o'clock, the President in the chair. Hymn 707 was sung, and the Rev. B. B. Keefer led in prayer. The Secretary read the minutes of the previous session, which were approved.

A letter was read from Rev. A. J. Vancamp, tendering his resignation and asking for certificate of standing.

Rev. Dr. Rice moved, and Rev. G. N. A. Dickson seconded; that the certific