

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. III.—NO. 4.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1880.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS:

THE TIMES.	GOSSIPS.
PROPERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.	THE CONCEPT OF TORONTO.
CREDIT.	CORRESPONDENCE.
ART CRITICISM.	TRADE, FINANCE, STATISTICS.
MR. GLADSTONE AS LORD RECTOR.	MUSICAL.
TAXATION.	CHESS.

THE TIMES.

Once more the Toronto *Globe*, that is—the Hon. George Brown has given evidence of his utter incapability to understand the ways of ordinary society. Mr. Brown still believes that the people who read his paper can only comprehend low and vulgar sentiments when expressed in low and vulgar language. Mr. Brown is a Calvinist, and probably believes in fore-ordination—to the effect that what a man is born to be, he will and must be, and trying to be anything else is of no use—so what he was at first he is now, crabbed, vulgar, mean. Nothing but self-interest can appeal to this man; no argument; no sentiment; no fact; no consideration for general or particular welfare—only Brown can find the way to Brown. Here is another specimen of the spleen, and bad logic, and worse manners, and inconsistencies of the Toronto *Globe*, edited by the Hon. George Brown, and managed by Mr. Gordon Brown, his brother. It is an article, headed “The Montreal Malcontents,” and opens thus:—

“On Tuesday evening the Montreal malcontents—Mr. Macmaster being absent from the meeting—discreetly refrained from the advocacy of annexation or independence. One callow politician believed in his right to discuss any revolutionary proposal, but was considerate enough to let our present system go unsmashed a while longer. One flatulent Englishman, a peripatetic ‘friend of humanity,’ posed as the ideal Canadian, talked highly of swamping the French race and demolishing some institution to which he alluded as the Church, abused both political parties, perspired eloquently, and vastly pleased himself. Nearly everybody barked at the *Globe* and the Canadian press in general. ‘Freedom of Speech’ being proposed as the first subject for discussion, failed to produce a debate, everybody being in favour of unlimited liberty of utterance, and quite aware that it is granted in Canada. ‘Legislative Union’ was then brought forward and discussed in a manner to which no one could reasonably take objection. The meeting was perfectly harmless and depressingly tame.”

The reference to Mr. Macmaster is in Mr. Brown’s usual style, for he knew well enough what the “being absent” meant; but, of course, he would not mention the fact that a political opponent was attending to the Parliamentary duties he had undertaken at the request of a constituency. He proceeds: “One flatulent Englishman, a peripatetic ‘friend of humanity,’ &c. So the secret is out at last. It is quite enough to be an Englishman to incur the hatred of Mr. Brown. He is very loyal, oh yes, but he rarely loses a chance of sneering at anything English; he has been in his day most bitterly seditious, and only a few months ago he refused a token of honour from England’s Queen. But this Englishman is “flatulent”—has wind on the stomach that is. The reference must be to his habit of talking and writing—and Mr. Brown says this!! How much talking and writing has Mr. Brown done in Canada since the time when he came uninvited? This “flatulent Englishman” is also a peripatetic “friend of humanity.” Well, Mr. Brown is not a Canadian born; he is only a Scotch-Yankee, who came here and started the newspaper business at once, “posed as an ideal Canadian,” and made money by it. For a long time has this Scotch-Yankee been flatulent and posing, and appears to be in no hurry to be rid of the disease or to change the position.

Mr. Brown puts the words friend of humanity within inverted commas, to convey the impression to his readers that he is quoting a phrase used by the Englishman, when as a matter of fact no such words were uttered by the Englishman on the occasion. I know what ordinary people would call that; but I wonder what Mr. Brown—who often makes a “big push” and a “grand stand” against immorality—would name it? *Globeism* is a peculiar thing, and no one can tell where it gets its standard of morals. We should get a little enlightenment if Mr. Brown would give us his interpretation of the command, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.” Probably he has written in the margin, “Except for personal and political purposes.”

This afflicted Englishman, it is further stated, “talked lightly of swamping the whole French race,” &c., but a little further on the *Globe* states that “Legislative Union was then brought forward and discussed in a manner to which no one could reasonably take objection.” Decidedly the *Globe*—that is, Mr. Brown—could not stop to explain that “swamping the French race” was only applied to the French as a separate and distinct nationality in Canada; and of course the *Globe* would not state the fact that the phrase was used by a Frenchman! But strangely enough all this was said under the caption of “Legislative Union,” which matter the *Globe* declares was “brought forward and discussed in a manner to which no one could reasonably take exception.” The *Globe* has taken exception, and pronounced judgment upon itself. Poor *Globe!* it is not over-wise.

“Nearly everybody barked at the *Globe*.” That is Mr. Brown’s delicate way of calling the members of the Political Economy Society dogs. If we were to say, “The *Globe* has grunted at us,” would that be a Scotch-Yankee way of calling Mr. Brown a hog? Perhaps; but no one said anything so vulgar. Still, there is a difficulty to be got over; the *Globe* says in the same article that Mr. Trenholme is “a fair man,” and yet no one barked more loudly and emphatically than he. The *Globe* fairly snivelled over Mr. Trenholme; tears stood in its dull eyes; its great jaw fell, and its great tongue wobbled; but there is the record—Mr. Trenholme joined those who “barked at the *Globe*.” Poor *Globe!* its reasoning is not very good.

But it is strange that the *Globe* should always and consistently stultify itself by discussing a subject the moment it has condemned all discussion upon it. Annexation was mentioned at the first meeting of the Political Economy Society as one question among many others which it would be well to consider. The *Globe* hurled its anathemas on us, and then proceeded to argue about it as if it had already become a question of great and pressing importance. So now—the matter of Legislative Union is a thing to be scoffed at until the *Globe* begins to talk about it. And yet, the secret of all this is not far to find. Mr. Brown is aware that changes are inevitable—there is a feeling of discontent abroad—not so much with British connection as with our internal economy—there is a strong and growing feeling against the kind of influence the *Globe* has exercised—any change that may happen must affect the *Globe*. In whatever direction there is development the *Globe* must suffer, and Mr. Brown is fighting hard for money, and power, and position. It is a mistake to imagine that he has any concern for Canada at the bottom of all this vulgar abuse of men and societies—he is simply working, as he has always worked, to promote the circulation of the *Globe* newspaper, which promotes the personal interests of Mr. George Brown and Mr. Gordon Brown his brother, but not at all the interests of Canada.