

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. I., NO. 4.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1878.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM

CONTENTS:

THE TIMES.
HELL AND THE UNITED STATES.
OUR NORTH-WEST.
ARE LICENSED COMMISSIONERS A NECESSARY EVIL?

BUSINESS AND BANKING.
TEMPTATION AND LIFE.
THE SOUL AND FUTURE LIFE.
"NO SIGN," by Mrs. CASHEL HOEY.
CURRENT LITERATURE.

THE TIMES.

AFFAIRS IN CANADA.

The Liberal party in Canada must be getting more or less despondent for events are against it. Mr. Vail was promoted to honour by the Cabinet, and with confidence made an appeal to his constituents at Digby; and they failed him at the poll, sending Mr. Wade to Ottawa in support of Sir John. So Mr. Mackenzie has really promoted Mr. Vail out of political existence. The *Toronto Mail* is jubilant, hangs out a flag, shouts "victory" with two notes of exclamation. The *Montreal Gazette* follows suit. They affect to believe that Mr. Jones will be treated in like manner, who has grasped the portfolio so incontinently dropped by Mr. Vail, and goes to make his appeal to the electors of Halifax. The *Mail* loudly calls upon the Prime Minister to accept the logic of events and dissolve Parliament. The *Globe* puts on airs, says it matters nothing, and indicates nothing, beyond what is merely local; says that the "most unblushing bribery" (a pretty phrase rather) was practised, and that "the notorious Thibault, of Montreal," was sent to Digby at the expense of the Local Government of Quebec, which is very vulgar, and very stupid. What becomes of the "interprovincial peace" so loftily spoken of by the *Globe*, when it, the main organ of the Dominion Government, brings such a monstrous charge against the Government of the Province of Quebec?

While politics are falling into a state of chaos, and many are beginning to believe that Sir John Macdonald and his followers can evolve order and prosperity out of it, the time seems opportune for inviting those who seek to take the future of the country into their hands to define the policy they have adopted and propose to carry out. The talk is everywhere about office, power; and the country would fain hear a little about principles and measures. The Liberals are fighting hard to keep office, the Conservatives are fighting hard to get office, and the people are asking "what else, gentlemen—office and what? Will you cease your petty party and personal strifes for a little and address yourselves to the questions of the day and the work of statesmen. Such work waits for brains and hands to do it. What is your conception of that work, and how do you propose to set about it?"

The Dominion Board of Trade has adopted a neutral position on the question of Free Trade *versus* Protection, which has made the Grit organs glad, and the other party organs sad and apologetic. But the Board of Trade seems to have meant nothing much by it—neither a change as to conviction, nor as to policy—for it adopted this wise and harmless resolution:—"That while in the estimation of this Board the present tariff of 17½ per cent. is fair and reasonable, yet in the event of its being found necessary to increase the duties for revenue purposes, this Board would respectfully request the Government to consider the industrial development of the country in any re-adjustment of the tariff."

The *Toronto Globe* has condescended to notice some words we said in criticism on one of its leading articles, which invited friends and foes of the present Government to look with pride upon the peaceful state of all the Provinces, and to mark the fact that no difficulty existed of an "interprovincial character, or between any of the Provinces and the Dominion Government." In answer to that, we mentioned the state of things in the Province of Quebec, especially the speech of M. Tarte, in which the Dominion Government was violently denounced, which "speech was in no way repudiated by the Provincial Cabinet." The *Globe* makes answer: "Neither was it endorsed." The *Globe* must know that when a gentleman, who has been chosen by the Cabinet or Prime Minister representing it, to move the adoption of the speech from the throne, uses words of strong import as to the attitude of his party, and those words are received with cheering from his own side of the House, and then, no disclaimer is put in, and no effort made to tone down the words, they are held as representing the party to which the speaker belongs. So that the words of M. Tarte were endorsed. The *Globe* says:—"Of M. Tarte, or, for the matter of that, as Mr. Bray, had

their way we should despair of anything like peace being secured in a country made up of different races and religions." The grammar of the sentence is peculiar, to say the least of it; but the *Globe* must have some reason for classing Mr. Bray with M. Tarte as an "Extremist," helping to make peace impossible. Of course the reason will be given now that it is asked for. But will the *Globe* tell a humble inquirer what it means by "interprovincial?" Does it use the word as we are accustomed to use the word international? Because, if so, the word is not only ugly, but meaningless. There is not the slightest analogy. Every nation of Europe may be in a blaze of civil war, and yet there may be international peace—each nation content to ruin itself. But the Provinces of this Dominion are not as the countries of Europe. One Government presides over all, and all are linked on to it. To say we have interprovincial peace, is simply to state that the Provinces as such, are not at war with each other. And war of that kind can scarcely be conceived as possible, while the division into Provinces is kept up. Certainly, we cannot specify one interprovincial difficulty that has not been settled, or is not in a fair way of being so, but we can specify differences between the Government at Quebec and the Government at Ottawa; and we can specify difficulties in the Province of Quebec which are neither settled nor in a fair way of being so; difficulties in matters ecclesiastical, educational, and financial, which in all likelihood the Government at Ottawa will some day have to meet and try to master. What is the use of talking of interprovincial peace, when what is wanted is provincial peace. As well have talked of inter States peace awhile ago when almost every town was in riot. This second edition of the *Globe's* boasting is tall, but very thin. We ask at the same time whether it is the custom with the *Globe* to speak of the editor of a journal over his proper name? It is quite unusual and a little lacking in courtesy, but if the *Globe* has decided to do so, we shall have no difficulty in speaking for the future of the Hon. Mr. Brown, instead of using the ordinary impersonal word Editor, or *Globe*.

The *Montreal Gazette* has not taken kindly to our criticism of its article on "RUSSIA'S POSITION," and makes answer in a leader of the 23rd inst., which opens in a way quite unusual, sneering at the editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR for "his apparently abundant leisure." What that has to do with the question it is difficult to see. But it must have occurred to the editor of the *Gazette*, at some period of his long experience, that not men of leisure but men of much toil do the general work of the world. Still, the imputation may be allowed to stand, and we confess to having had sufficient leisure, or time say, to study the Eastern question. The editor of the *Gazette* has been too busy to do that, perhaps, which is unfortunate—for himself always, and for the public when he writes on the subject; and it must be confessed that the second article does not make it manifest that the matter has been more closely considered in the interim. There are many statements made which are incapable of proof—e.g., that Russia excited insurrection in the Turkish provinces by secret emissaries—wanted to create an occasion for war and arouse in Europe such a feeling against the Porte as would palliate her own aggression, &c. We have heard that about the secret emissaries, but thought it had been exploded long ago. When first said, proof was asked, but not given. Has the *Gazette* any special information to give us? When the *Gazette* speaks of Russian schemes of aggression, its statements are based on fancies, not facts. When it condemns Russia for interfering with Turkey it forgets that Russia was one of the six great European powers which signed the Treaty of Paris in 1856, which settled the relations which Turkey was to hold to the rest of Europe—and which recognized a certain "FIRMAN" or Imperial proclamation which the Sultan had issued, and was a sort of magna charta for the subjects of the Ottoman Empire—for it promised safety of person and of property, religious toleration—equality before the law, the pure and prompt administration of justice, &c.,—not a promise of their all being kept. When the *Gazette* says that Russia wanted to create an occasion for war, it forgets the revolt of the Bulgarians, the circumstances attending the issue and consideration of the Andrassy Note, the Berlin memorandum, the declaration of Lord Salisbury and Lord Derby that Russia had been most moderate and pacific in her demands—that Turkey first accepted, and then rejected, the proposals of the Great Powers, counting on the support of England—that then Servia declared war with Turkey, and that Russia, alone of the European powers redeemed her pledge. But in this forgetfulness the *Gazette* only follows in the wake of a large