

been achieved by the Opposition, another trial of strength and appeal for confidence would have been sound policy. But instead of following that course M. Chapleau made every adverse criticism he could hit upon the basis of a "no confidence motion," and that I maintain was not fair to the taxpayers, was not able statesmanship, was a mere fight for office.

In fact, to take the motions M. Chapleau presented, and on which he invites criticism, only the first, second and eighth can be considered as worthy of being called "no confidence" motions. The strongest of Governments may propose measures which even the weakest of Oppositions can defeat. But in this case a weak Government proposed measures which a strong Opposition found it easy to defeat. With the exceptions of motions 1 and 2, the motions down to No. 8 should not have involved the existence of the Government. They involved points of administration fairly open to criticism—perhaps to condemnation, but were not of sufficient importance upon which to base a motion of no confidence. Motion 8 meant a fair and square trial of strength, but motion 9 was absurd. How could M. Joly provide "for the means of carrying on the Government of the Province" when the Councillors had stopped the Supplies? Those Councillors had determined to turn the Joly Government out, and took the only step possible to them to accomplish that end. But what was M. Chapleau's motion worth when weighed in the balance of common sense? He simply demanded that the so-called Liberal party should find a way of putting an end to the dead-lock which had been brought about by a conspiracy on the part of the so-called Conservatives. M. Chapleau asked for the impossible, which is always easy.

But how are we to gauge M. Chapleau's correctness, or are we to think from this letter that he has fallen into the habit of loose speaking? He says:—"As you see, it makes nine instead of twenty-two; it is the exact number of the Government measures withdrawn by M. Joly during the last session." That means, as I read it, that each of the nine motions compelled M. Joly to succumb to the Opposition. Will M. Chapleau look again? Did motion No. 2 carry a majority? Did motion No. 6 succeed? or motion No. 8? or motion No. 9? If this is the manner in which M. Chapleau interprets the events of the session which has so recently passed into history, what will he say when he comes to deal with "the political history of Canada," which dates back for half a century? We shall see when he ventures to discuss it.

THE "PALL MALL BUDGET" ON MR. CHAPLEAU.

The *Pall Mall Budget*, after denominating Mr. Chapleau's opposition at Quebec as "singularly pertinacious and vindictive," sums up an article by saying: "It is certainly a singular instance of party inconsistency that the Council now asks the Lieutenant-Governor to dismiss a ministry having a majority in the popular representative Assembly—that is, to do the very thing which M. Letellier was censured and ultimately dismissed for doing."

POLITICAL CONSISTENCIES.

But the position taken by the *Gazette* and other Conservative papers is yet more singular; for while they still hold that M. Letellier acted unconstitutionally in dismissing his ministry, they applaud the action of the Council in stopping the Supplies. There is a difference between those two acts, of course, for the Lieut.-Governor did not stop the Supplies, as he had a stronger card to play and he played it. The Councillors could not dismiss the ministry, but they took the strongest measure possible for bringing that about. They are precisely alike in spirit, and only differ as to the mode of applying authority. M. Letellier appealed to the people, was sustained, and then got dismissed. In all justice now the present Lieut.-Governor should allow an appeal to the people, and if M. Joly return with a majority the Legislative Council should be dismissed for having "lost its usefulness."

If M. Chapleau secure a majority when the House meets it will be because some of the so-called friends of M. Joly have been seduced from their allegiance by promises of reward or by the fear some have of appealing again to the constituencies. These latter form no considerable number in the Assembly. The indemnity is about all the income those gentlemen have, and to lose it would be a serious matter. But would M. Chapleau or Dr. Ross care to undertake the Government

with a small majority made up of such weak and unreliable people? The prospect of another crisis six months hence would frighten them just as they are frightened now. Since matters have gone so far, let us have an appeal to the people; and if a few of those who cannot afford the luxury of steady convictions do not return to the Assembly—and if a coalition Government shall be the result also—why, it will be all the better for the people.

THE IRRELIGIOUS "WITNESS."

I could not help feeling contempt for M. Chauveau the younger when he threw up his office in M. Joly's Cabinet, to bring about, as he said, a coalition ministry. He seemed to me to act neither with discretion nor valour. It was whispered that he had been promised the chance of changing the M. P. P. into a permanent P. M. But anything more disgusting than the article on M. Chauveau's apology in the *Witness* I have rarely seen. It first of all advances a most absurd and utterly unsound theory of the reason Judas had for the betrayal of Jesus Christ, and then proceeds to compare Judas and M. Chauveau. The *Witness* announced the other day that the SPECTATOR, among other papers, called it—the *Witness*—a religious daily, and asked where the joke came in; but, judging from the article on M. Chauveau, I should say that the *Witness* may be counted with *Puck*, and such like papers, as being decidedly profane. The following sentence dragging in the Hallelujah Chorus to help in political abuse is about the worst specimen of imbecile impiety I have seen: "If the hallelujah chorus with which his defection was greeted by all the Conservative journals has been in vain, he has certainly not been very pointed in disclaiming their adulation." *O tempora! O mores!*

IMPROVEMENT.

The Marquis of Lorne's advice to the people of Toronto to set about the work of getting up an Art Gallery was good and sound in every particular, and the promise to help liberally in the way of a money donation was a pleasant and practical application. To make such suggestions and to help the people to carry them out is far better than that our Governors-General should be for ever treating us to the oratorical blanc-mange of which we got so much from Lord Dufferin. Undoubtedly this is a great country; we have every kind of resource in profuse abundance; we have "the garden of the world"—in fact many gardens; we have several splendid Governments; we have the best winters and the best summers in all creation, and we are four millions of the most remarkably glorious people (vide Dufferin's speeches) the sun was ever privileged to look down upon. But now that we have learnt the catalogue of our great virtues off by heart, and are absolutely certain of our future, we may as well turn to the practical work of social and political life.

It would hardly do, perhaps, for the Governor-General to go about criticising our institutions too closely and too often, but really the Marquis might find some good useful work to do in helping us to improve the taste and general tone of society. The mild hint about M.P.'s wives at Ottawa will be useful, I hope, though it might well have been more direct and plain. The speech at the Club was so manifestly after the style of Lord Dufferin—as to the substance of it—that it must have lost its point. The Art Gallery, and the suggestion as to strong and unsavoury speech at Ottawa will, probably, do some good however.

THE GRAND TRUNK.

The Directors of the Great Western Railway of Canada have issued a circular calling a special meeting to consider the question of arrangements with the Grand Trunk. The insincerity of the Great Western Directors is apparent when it is known that on nearly all occasions when they have been discussing with the Grand Trunk, they have been coquetting with the New York Central. If competition in the past has been the source of their difficulties, the simple project of the Grand Trunk to fuse all traffic with one management will terminate them, but it seems idle to discuss questions with weak men, who appear to be controlled by people either there (in England) or in Canada, who have selfish ends to serve. The falsehood of charging all their troubles on the Grand Trunk must be glaring, when the Grand Trunk has always been anxious to do that which can only end the difficulty. To talk about dividing only competitive traffic is childish,