

ficulty which has been under discussion for a year or two past and which commends itself to the unprofessional thinking of a good many citizens, as well as to the professional judgment of some. These would like to know what the Engineer thinks of it, and whether he regards it as useless or impracticable. We refer to the plan which was proposed by a committee of experts several years ago, a modification of which was advocated by Mr. M. J. Clark about two years ago, and which has frequently since been approved by others, that, viz. of changing the force by which the water is propelled through the conduit from suction at this end to pressure at the Island, or to combined suction and pressure. Mr. Clark's proposal to secure the latter by the erection of a small pumping engine on the Island with sufficient power to elevate the whole volume of water flowing through the pipe to a height of ten or twelve feet, thus affording, if the theory be correct, sufficient pressure within the conduit to prevent the admission of water from the bay through the leaks which it is believed cannot wholly be prevented in the conduit, seems to many feasible. The Mail of the 26th ult. gave a description of a very simple experiment which it has caused to be made to test the soundness of the theory, and claims that the result is wholly satisfactory.

Many citizens are persuaded that by the adoption of this plan, the fruitful cause of much sickness and of constant danger and dread may be entirely removed in a few weeks, and at an expense which is not worth a moment's consideration in view of the importance of the result. Whether the theory is sound and the plan feasible is a question for the Engineer. If he has considered it and pronounced upon it, the fact has escaped our notice. If he has not done so, it is highly desirable that he should give it his attention at once, and either give good reasons for regarding it as useless or impracticable, or his decision to try the experiment with the least possible delay.

PARTY POLITICS UNDER BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

We have seen at a very cursory glance that the proposition that "under the British system of Government the universal experience is, that for practical purposes and to accomplish great results, a man must belong to one of two great parties in the state" does not hold good in the history of Great Britain and Ireland.

Is the proposition historically true in Canada? Let us go to the early years of responsible government. Nobody now will say that in 1850 things were in that state, contemplating which a statesman might with propriety exclaim, "Let us rest, and be thankful." The Baldwin Ministry was in power and the loyal cries of those who out of devotion to the empire and British liberty murderously attacked the representatives of her Majesty, sacked and burned the Parliament buildings, had subsided. Baldwin was rather a Whig than a Liberal. Malcolm Cameron who had left the

Ministry aided by Rolph, Caleb Hopkins, James Leslie and Peter Perry laid the foundation of what? Of the present reform party, just as the ultra-Tory opposition to Sir Robert Peel led by Lord George Bentick and Mr. Disraeli laid the foundation of the Conservative party of the day in England. Did Lord George Bentick act with one of the two great parties? Did Mr. Disraeli, the future leader and idol of one of the two great parties act with either one of them in those days when Sir Robert Peel, influenced by the agitation of Richard Cobden, who certainly did not act with one of the two great parties, repealed the corn laws.

On Cameron and his friends, who had just formed the "clear grit" party the Globe, then edited by George Brown, and supporting the Baldwin Government, lavished an extraordinary wealth of violent billingsgate. Most, perhaps all that was practical in their programme has since been carried. Has the course of Legislation been wise? With the exception of some ten years, perhaps one might say eight, the Conservative or Tory party has been in power ever since. Were Cameron and his friends then serving the country or injuring it, when they pressed for changes the most important of which were subsequently carried out by Sir John Macdonald? Ought they to have remained quiet, have hung back in the traces with Baldwin or have pulled Canada in the road of progress? Who accomplished the changes they advocated, they who originated the agitation or the men, who when the public opinion they created, was ripe carried out that public opinion? Who accomplished the "great results?"

The schoolmaster has been sufficiently long abroad in Canada to enable the Canadian people, if they will only pause and think, to see who among politicians are their true benefactors. There are two distinctly marked types of politicians. There is the politician who means to make politics pay, who never originates a new idea, never makes a useful suggestion, but waits to get all he can. The sagacious opportunist, whose wise idea is to bam-boozle and let us say tickle the people and grab all within his reach. Considered from the point of view of patriotism, of manhood, of humanity; regard him morally, intellectually spiritually, politically, this man is of course an object we ought to contemplate with enthusiasm. He is a popular type. He is wise in his generation. The people whose servant he says he is rather like him. If he is "smart", most of them would like to be so. They have no trouble in comprehending him. He does not seek to improve their condition. He does not bother them with nostrums. With the other type it is very different. This politician actually thinks; he sees where evils exist and tries to remove them. He hates injustice; he hates corruption; his altruism forces him to live for others; his strong heart makes him side with the weak and poor. Like the fool he is, he does not lay to heart the truth that the prophets were killed and only honoured when dead, by the sons of their murderers. He is opposed; abused; is called a kicker. At last when he has educated the public mind the men who opposed what the public have come to demand, say:—"Well, we will not forgive this man for showing up our incompetence by advocating right things we could not or cared not to see. But we will

carry out his views and keep our pay and our offices and not only that, we will, at the first opportunity go before the people, and boast of the action into which this man has forced us." And the people will cheer them—and will realize all the profound satisfaction of knowing that they belong to the discerning among mankind.

The platform of the "clear grits" is worth glancing at to-day:—(1) Universal suffrage. (2) Vote by ballot. (3) No qualification for candidates for Parliament. (4) Fixed day for General Election. (5) Retrenchment. (6) No pensions to judges. (7) Lowering of law costs. (8) Abolition of the Court of Chancery and the Court of Common Pleas. (9) Free trade. (10) Direct taxation. (11) Application of the Clergy Reserves to general public purposes. (12) Abolition of Primogeniture. (13) Taking juries by ballot from the whole county. (14) Abolition of laws against usury.

Of the above it will be seen that "Retrenchment," is purely a question of administration. Out of thirteen planks at least eight have been adopted and carried by one or other of the two parties. Mr. afterwards the Hon. George Brown denounced the "Clear Grits" in the Globe as "a little miserable clique of buncombe-talking cormorants," never dreaming he would one day become their leader! Such is the irony of political life!

At the next meeting of Parliament a vigorous opposition to the Reform Government, was led by the "clear grits." The speech from the throne contained no provision for secularizing the Clergy Reserves. Mr. Baldwin was opposed to disturbing what he considered "a just and proper" measure of support for the Protestant clergy. In the session of 1837, Lyon Mackenzie's motion to do away with the Court of Chancery, having been carried by a majority of Upper Canada votes, Baldwin, true to the principles of a double majority, resigned. Hincks on the retirement of Lafontaine, became Prime Minister. As early as July, 1851, the defection of the Globe was complete. The Prime Minister strengthened himself by taking Rolph and Cameron—two of the Clear Grits—into the Cabinet. He then went to the country and came back with a majority.

In 1852 Hincks introduced, and passed a series of resolutions respecting the clergy reserves, pledging the Assembly to a settlement of the question in a similar direction. He informed the House that the Imperial Government would soon pass a measure giving the Canadian Legislature power to deal finally with the question. This session of 1853 was important and fruitful. Among the bills passed was the act providing for the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway. An act redistributing the constituencies and increasing the number of members from 84 to 130 became law. Meanwhile the Imperial Parliament had empowered the Canadian Legislature to deal with the Clergy Reserves as they saw fit.

The Hincks Reform Ministry should have been strong. But Lyon Mackenzie and Geo. Brown was shelling the Ministerial breasting works with much skill and with the characteristic energy and vehemence of both these remarkable and aggressive men. Moreover, Sullivan, Blake, Baldwin, Lafontaine, were no longer in the Government which was a ministry of mediocrities all ways excepting Francis Hincks himself.