

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. I., No. 32.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 10, 1878.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM.

During the summer months THE SPECTATOR will be delivered free to Subscribers residing in the country, if the address be sent to the Office, 162 St. James Street, Montreal.

THE TIMES.

Sir John A. Macdonald seems to think that the elections will take place in about four or five weeks, but we have good reason for saying that Mr. Mackenzie will not take the vote of the country until the end of November or early in December. He means to wait for the time when the farmers are at leisure.

Swift, in one of his Satires, tells us that the candidates for some Brobdignagian constituency were elected or rejected according to the length of their noses. The Conservative candidate for Montreal Centre—as it seems—is chosen because of his peculiar and extraordinary unfitness. The commercial centre of Montreal is the commercial centre of the Dominion, and it is plain to ordinary common sense, that its representative in Parliament should be a commercial man, having wealth, if possible, but certainly having experience. But the first to offer himself is a second-rate lawyer, who comes out as an Independent, and the Conservatives have nominated a law stamp distributor to represent them. A sorry compliment this. Have the Conservatives no more fitting person among the bankers, merchants and ship owners of that constituency? If not, so much the worse for the party, and so much the better for any number of independent and patriotic men who will bring out a man of character and capacity to run against the two who at present are candidates. He would stand a good chance to win—and it is quite time to break with the tradition that Montreal Centre must be represented by an Irish Catholic. Let us have the best man, and never mind his nationality or creed.

The *Evening Post*, of Montreal, clearly had a right to ask who are the gentlemen by whom Mr. M. P. Ryan was nominated, and the *Gazette* was as clearly wrong to get in a passion and call ugly names. It is quite time for electors to declare that they will no longer submit to the indignity of permitting the confab of a few party Hacks on the steps of the Post-office, or on a corner of St. James street to decide on a meeting, and then nominate a Mr. Patrick O'Shaughnessy—or a Mr. Joe Beef, simply because he was born in some county in Ireland, and may be trusted to render perfect obedience to the Church. Even Montreal has need of men who have other and better qualifications.

Irrespective of political questions the Ministerialists have made a good and wise choice in bringing out Mr. Hugh Mackay. For, if he lacks experience of public life, and has not exactly "the gift of the gab," he is a merchant, possessed of a pretty thorough knowledge of Canadian commerce; and, to him, as a man of wealth, the sessional allowance, mileage, and the chance of an office would not be objects of chief solicitude, and not necessities to life. Whether right or wrong in his political opinions, he has the invaluable qualification of independence.

The *Christian Union* says: "Suicide is easy in Montreal now. It is only necessary to appear in the streets of an evening with an orange coloured necktie, or let it be known that one belongs to a Dominion regiment. 'Fact and Rumour' wishes to escape giving offence to his Roman Catholic brethren, and therefore avoids expressing his personal belief as to the authors of these assaults. They are probably Protestants of a fanatical type." The *Christian Union* is kind and considerate. "The authors" are certainly Catholics of a diabolical type.

We offer this to Mr. Mackenzie as food for reflection: The *Statist* has given a comparison of the growth of French with English capital accumulations by contrasting the tables published by Mr. Giffent for the United Kingdom, and those published for France by the official *Bulletin Statistique*, of the amounts liable in the two countries for succession and legacy duty. In 1859, France paid on 85 millions sterling, and the United Kingdom on 94 millions. In 1876, France

paid on 188 millions, and the United Kingdom on 149 millions, indicating plainly enough that whereas in 1859 the United Kingdom had more accumulated capital than France, in 1876 the accumulated capital of France was more than that of the United Kingdom. France lost rich provinces and a tremendous amount of money in and by the war with Prussia, but she is now richer than she was in 1870. Something must be put down to the fact that a Frenchman produces a little less and consumes a great deal less than an Englishman, so effecting a large saving—but does Protection come in as a figure in the sum?

We find that the Commercial authorities of England reckon but little of Canadian securities as an investment. They advise investors to buy the best—France, Belgium, the United States, Sweden, Holland and Italy—but never count in Canada. Can it be that Mr. Cartwright is ruining our foreign credit?

Let Canada fear and quake! The London *Times* has spoken in reference to the 12th July disturbances in Montreal, and informs the world at large that the French-Canadian is a "quiet and conservative citizen in the country (*sic*), but in town he becomes a "ROUGE." Remarkable is it that no sooner does an Englishman in the old country begin to talk about Canadian affairs than he shews his crass ignorance of the subject he proposes to deal with. How we should enjoy a description by the Editor of the *Times* of a French-Canadian! We imagine the Editor of the *Times* knows about as much of the "Country French-Canadian" as the "Country French-Canadian" knows about him!

Says *Truth*—a paper happily not given over to fulsome adulation of the idol of the hour:—"Facts cannot be blown away by mere words, even when uttered by Lord Beaconsfield. The division of provinces of a neighbour between three Powers may not in his Lordship's English signify a partition, but nevertheless it is a partition. The French and Italians, perhaps, ought not to be jealous of our seizure of Cyprus; but they are jealous. The "three Emperors" may, according to us, not have dominated the Congress by their alliance, but they insist that they did dominate it. Batoum may be an insignificant hole, then why did we make such a fuss about the Russians acquiring it? Varna may be only a roadstead, then why were we in an ecstasy of indignation at the Turks being asked to give it up. It may be in accordance with military tactics to allow a mountain frontier to be outflanked, then why did we only discover this interesting military fact after we had surrendered the district of Sofia? It may be desirable that Turkey should remain in the military possession of "Eastern Roumelia," then why did we agree to forbid Turkish troops entrance into this province? The Greeks may be better off by substituting patience for an increase of territory, then why did we promise them an increase of territory after they had laid down their arms, and only discover the superior advantages of patience when they called upon us to redeem our pledges in regard to territory? It may be for our benefit to have an island with harbours in the Ægean Sea, then why did we bargain for one of the few that had no harbours? It may not always be expedient to defend Asia Minor for the Turks, then why did we agree to defend it whether it be expedient in the future or not? Our object was to prevent Russia from interfering in Armenia, then why by the Berlin Treaty, do we give her the right to interfere? It may be necessary for us to interpose in the Turkish administration of Asia Minor, then why did we make our interposition dependent upon the consent of the Sultan? It may be legitimate to make private treaties with Turkey, then why did we protest against Russia making a private treaty? It may be desirable to lay down the law that no territorial alterations can take place in Europe, then why did we acquire Cyprus without asking for the assent of Europe? It may be that we are such poor fools that we are not fit to have a voice in our foreign policy, but if so, why make it so unpleasantly clear to us that we are fools? Parliament may, perhaps, be advantageously reduced to the position of a vestry, then why did we cut off the head of Charles I. and drive James II. out of the kingdom for endeavouring to convert it into a vestry? The system of Personal Government, as typified by that of Napoleon III., may be the triumph of human wisdom, then why have we not adopted it long ago?"

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.—For Clergymen, Public Speakers, &c.; and for all Diseases of the Throat.