

## THE POSITION OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IN QUEBEC.

The Conservative who would have been told eighteen months ago that it were possible for a *Rouge* Government to rule this Province would have scorned the idea, as preposterous and absurd. Proud of their strength, and haughty in their fancied security, the *Bleus* quietly but gradually alienated public confidence, and disregarding the warnings of their friends, launched into an unknown sea—unprotected as a party should be, by the bulwarks of trust and faith of its supporters—and after a perilous voyage they, to-day, lie stranded high and dry upon the beach of Opposition. There can be no doubt about it; we, the *Bleus*—for the writer is a *Bleu*, and a Quebec *Bleu*—are hopelessly in Opposition. Our opponents, in whom the public evidently have a confidence which we consider unmerited, "rule the roost," and it behooves us to ponder well before we again strike for power. Now, what has been the secret of M. Joly's success? I attribute it mainly to one cause,—high personal character. Now, character may be subjective and real, or objective and doubtful. I confess that I doubt the "highness" of M. Joly's "political character." I believe that he has got into bad company. Some of his colleagues are not men, even of "high political character." But it would seem that the unlimited faith which the public, rightly or wrongly, has in M. Joly has dimmed its vision, *quoad* his supporters. Now, I have often heard, at public meetings, a comparison drawn by Liberal orators between MM. Joly and Chapleau, and the point has always told against the latter. Hence the first reason for the *Rouge* success: the *Rouges* have confidence, and the public has confidence, in M. Joly. Neither the Conservatives nor the public entertain a like feeling with regard to M. Chapleau. It were one of the "sweet uses of adversity" if the Conservatives would now change their leader and endeavour to secure some more favourably known—though less fluent—chief than the Deputy for Terrebonne. We have the men,—Loranger of Laval, Beaubien of Hochelaga, Würtele of Yamaska, Robertson of Sherbrooke, Lynch of Brome, Church of Pontiac. But, never mind names, the fact remains evident. The *Bleus* want a new leader if they desire ever to regain and retain power. Now, another point. The *Bleus* have got into bad odour through having some very "scaly"—pardon me the word—hangers-on. There is a crowd of long-haired, oily "*orateurs*" and *wire-pullers* who most do congregate around the office of *La Minerve*, in whom no body has any confidence, and for whom no one has any respect. We must rid ourselves of these. Men who traffic in politics, and who boast of a fancied influence which they profess to be willing to "sell" are not wanted. "Bounce them," gentlemen! Another point. We have lately lost Rouville, St. Hyacinthe and Chambly. In all of these there are English voters. In fact, the English vote is an important factor in elections in this Province. Our French friends often bitterly complain that our reverses are attributable to English defections from the Conservative ranks. I grant that, but a word or two, *mes amis*. The English-speaking people of this Province, as a body, have been *driven out* of the party. Do you forget the insulting way in which they were treated by the late Government? Do you imagine that the English people wish to be allied with fools and fanatics like *Tarte*? Think you that the English care nothing for administration and everything for a party whose leader they do not respect, and whose recognized supporters they despise? I despise a man who would vote for Joly simply because he is a Protestant, but I can comprehend the feelings which lead a thinking man to renounce the ravings of a *Tarte*. The fact of the matter is that we, as a party, want thorough re-organization—new leaders and new policy. We want to clean the ship of the barnacles; we want to heave over the skulking fanatics who mismanage the ship; we want to steer for the port of power by the compass good-government.

I would not have it thought that the English speaking Conservatives are the only ones who are dissatisfied with the present condition of the party. Far from it. Intelligent French Canadians think and feel in the very same way, and recognise the necessity for the movement I have indicated.

In conclusion, I call upon the Conservative deputies in the House to move in the matter.

*Cincinnatus.*

## SCRIPTURE TEACHING AND "NATIONAL POLICY."

The CANADIAN SPECTATOR is justly credited with "broad and liberal views," and with keeping its columns open for the presentation, not of one side only, but of both sides, of this or the other questions of public interest that may arise. Giving to its contributors and correspondents opportunity for the free expression of opinion—of course within such bounds as good morals and good manners prescribe—it certainly fills a void which has been felt by thinking men in Canada, performing for the public an office which the party journals do not take upon them, and which, it will be fair to add, they cannot be expected to take upon them, until the times have changed a good deal, and ourselves with them. While the public, doubtless, appreciate the SPECTATOR's plan of giving a hearing to both sides, it has appeared to me that on the question of National Policy the Free Trade side has so far had much the larger share of space in its columns, and the Protectionist side very little indeed. I suppose that this is simply because Free Traders have been more forward than Protectionists to offer their contributions; and I am the more confirmed in the belief that it has not occurred through any design on the part of the Editor, from the fact that his own comments on the Finance Minister's great work of this year, and the measure of success achieved in its performance, have been not only appreciative but decidedly favourable. Believing this to be the case, I offer something towards redressing the balance.

In the paper of April 19th the people of this Dominion, because they have through their representatives done the best they could to extricate themselves from embarrassment and distress, are sweepingly characterized as "a nation that has lost God." "The devil of selfishness," we are told, has taken possession of us, and we are trying to live by and for ourselves only, without regard to the interests of our fellow men or the claims of a common humanity. The political economy of Richard Cobden and John Stuart Mill is put upon a level with religion itself, and "Eusebius" lays down the dictum that "a life which is a religion demands absolute freedom—to let brotherly love flow out in freedom of trade." As a people we are charged with seeking to become rich, and in need of nothing from others, "while God and His goodness will be left out in the cold," and with placing needless barriers between God's good gifts and their recipients; that is, the poor amongst ourselves. More reckless perversion of Scripture language and teaching than this is seldom seen in print. If in Scripture teaching of the individual's duty to himself, and to his family, we are to find any indication of a man's duty to the State or nation to which he belongs, we shall be guided towards conclusions the very opposite of those so confidently affirmed by this too peremptory moralist. The Apostolic saying that if a man will not work, neither should he eat; the condemnation pronounced upon him that provideth not for his own, especially they of his own house; and the command to be not slothful in business,—all show that individual industry and providing for one's household is a part of Christian duty. It would surely be no performance of such duty for a man to stand idly by and permit his own occupation to be ruined, and his family in consequence to starve, in order that employment might be to that small extent increased somewhere abroad. When Paul and Aquila, with Priscilla helping them, were industriously engaged in tent-making at Corinth, did they think it their duty to be less diligent in seeking sale for their tents, for fear that lest by being too diligent they might be taking the bread out of the mouths of tent-makers in other cities? In the early days of the Christian Church the Disciples had all things in common; but, had they divided everything with those who were outside the brotherhood, they would soon have had nothing more to divide. They might in this way have plunged themselves into misery and want, without the world having been any the better for it. The world would indeed have been the worse for it, for such mistaken self-sacrifice would have done nothing like good enough to counterbalance the evil effect of encouragement given to sloth and improvidence.

The duty of the individual to his own family is so clearly enforced in the New Testament, that as regards that point there can be no dispute at all. In the Apostolic days no Christian government existed, and no Christian nation, as such, and Apostolic precepts do not in this relation go much in detail beyond the Master's command to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's. But we know that the Disciples of these times yielded loyal obedience to the law of the land, wherever it did not conflict with the law of God; and that Paul held his State obligations to be due to the Roman State, and not to any other State. As a pastor and teacher he would undoubtedly have told converted Roman soldiers that they would still have to march under their Generals and fight the battles of the Empire just as before. If we can conceive him giving counsel to a Roman Treasurer of the Empire, we must believe that the latter would be told that his first duty, as *Treasurer*, was to the State which he served and to which he belonged. But, if we go back to the Old Testament, in which matters of national polity are very fully treated, both historically and in the laying down of the law, we find an intense national spirit prevailing throughout, from the time when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt to the time when Nehemiah directed the remnant of the people in the rebuilding of the Temple. From the Song of Miriam to the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in various