

Through a Monocle

NOW is the time when the man who aspires to represent us in the Legislature must permit us to get a straight look at him.

Usually he keeps a good deal in the shadow, preferring to make his appearances under the fitful lights of a "tea-meeting" or through the haze of a party "smoker." But when the elections are on, he comes right out in the sunlight; for he knows perfectly well that his opponent will, and that a man must bulk large in the public eye to get the public's votes. This feature of an election is distinctly healthy. We grow far too accustomed to thinking of our candidates as nothing more than the standard bearers of their respective parties, and not as definite individuals who will speak for us and vote for us and carry our political "proxies," as it were, for a Legislative term. The tendency of the party system is to make us regard them as so many "little Whitneys" or "little MacKays"; but that is a bad tendency. We will be better represented and better served if we insist upon getting good representatives without too much regard for which party they may support.

* * *

I KNOW it is useless to talk to the party man as if he might be induced to vote for the candidate of the other party because his own candidate was of the "yellow dog" description. He would rather have the yellowest canine who would yelp for his friends than the noblest mastiff who would stand against them. In fact, the true blue party man rather prefers the pup to the mastiff; for the pup will give his leaders no trouble no matter what he is asked to swallow, while the mastiff may. But surely the blind-pup party man must be growing near to extinction in this enlightened country and this enlightened age. Even our faithful adherents of party must realise that their precious party will be better off if they send it men of high ideals and sound principles who will insist upon it giving the country—or the province—honest government, than if they burden it with a motley mob of camp-followers who think only of "graft" and clinging to power.

* * *

EMPHASIS upon the character of the candidate is what our politics needs quite as much as any other one thing just now. It makes a difference whether we elect a William Mulock or a "Billy Boodler" to support Laurier at Ottawa, or whether we send a Foy or "a something for the Boy" to sustain Whitney at Toronto. One class of men makes it easier for the party leaders to stick to their pledges and do their duty, while the other class of men makes it harder. Then, moreover, the better the character of the private members we send, the more satisfactory will be the choice of the Prime Minister when he comes to fill up vacancies in his Cabinet. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for example, has had to go outside of his following in the House of Commons on several occasions to get suitable Ministers. The last two—George Graham and Dr. Pugsley—were both outsiders. Now who was to blame for this? No one but "you and me" who have insisted upon filling up the Commons with inferior timber.

* * *

THERE ought to be enough independent men in each constituency to punish the party which insults the voters by naming a candidate who is not of the best. It is very seldom in our politics that the fate of a Government hangs upon the decision in any one constituency, so that we can forget the Government and punish its indiscreet friends in our constituency without really endangering its existence; and then the cases in which unworthy candidates would have to be rejected would probably work out about equally between the parties throughout the country, so that we could get a better Parliament or Legislature of the same political complexion as the collection of greedy mercenaries whom we might have had. Again, I am so little of a party man that it would seem to me in many elections that the party which put up the distinctly best class of nominees had thereby adopted a plank which would be nearly decisive in commanding my vote. In our politics, as we were saying a week ago, there is precious little to

distinguish the parties from each other; and we might do worse than make it a question of candidates.

* * *

IF we could elevate the tone of our public life, we would do more for our country than by putting either party into power. An election which would weed out the small fry and the concession-hunters and those greedy for "patronage," would be far more profitable than one which should sustain or overthrow any Government we have had in recent years. If we could get a Parliament of Peter Whites, of Edward Blakes, of D'Alton McCarthys, of Sir Henri Jolys, of Girouards, of Weldons, of Francois Langeliers, of Fitzpatricks, of Charles Tupperts and of that ilk, we could afford to settle the question as to which party should form a Government by the flip of a coin. Our trouble in Canada is not that we have a bad party whose victory would set the nation back; but that both our parties have so many camp-followers that the victory of neither can emancipate the nation from its curse of parasites and blood-suckers.

Widmporte

SENATOR Henry Cabot Lodge delivered an address on "Immigration" before the Boston City Club recently, in which he said: "We have heard a great deal lately about Japanese immigration, but it is not a subject which ought to lead, or which will lead, to any ill-feeling between the two countries. Japan does not expect, and no nation can expect, that she should have the right to force her people on another nation, and there is no more cause for offense in the desire of our people in the Western States to exclude Japanese immigration than there is in the Japanese edicts which now exclude our working people from Japan. Moreover, the sentiment of our people is not peculiar to the United States. It is, if anything, more fervent in British Columbia than in California."



JOHN MORLEY.

"Honour and Lordship are his titles."—Punch.