

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. II.—No. 39.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1879.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS:

THE TIMES.	CHRIST, THE PHARISEES AND THE PUBLI- CANS, A Sermon by Rev. A. J. Bray.
PROTECTION AND PROGRESS.	CORRESPONDENCE.
BUSINESS ACUMEN.	POETRY.
"NO KINGS, NO PRIESTS, NO NOTHING."	MUSICAL.
OUR NORTH-WEST.	CHESS.
THE BEACONSFIELD VINEYARD.	

TO OUR CITY SUBSCRIBERS.

Several complaints as to irregularity in the delivery of THE SPECTATOR have reached us. Some of them, we must say in self-defence, have arisen from the return of friends from the holidays, without notice having been sent to the office. We beg that our subscribers will notify us of any change of address, or irregularity of delivery, and we will endeavour to adjust it, and every effort will be made that the paper may be in the hands of our city subscribers not later than Saturday noon.

PRIZE QUESTIONS IN CANADIAN HISTORY.

We purpose in our next number to commence the replies to the hundred questions which we propounded in THE SPECTATOR; we have to keep in view the space they will occupy in our columns, and therefore shall probably have to carry them through four numbers of the paper. The first twenty-five will appear next week.

THE TIMES.

HOME AGAIN.

Sir John A. Macdonald has come back to us smiling. As well he may. He did not succeed in getting Imperial guarantees for money to build the Pacific Railway, but he dined with the Queen, got the P. C. made out in full, humbugged the Earl of Beaconsfield and compelled him to make a fool of himself before all civilized people, and some others. We smile back on Sir John. He is welcome.

M. CHAPLEAU TO THE EDITOR.

MY DEAR SIR,—I was sorry to read in your last issue an article concerning the French element in the great Canadian family, which is very unjust to us and incorrect according to the political history of Canada. Your article is calculated to injure the English Conservative cause more than would five years of agitation by the most *ultra* Rouge annexationists; but this I do not pretend to discuss in this letter.

Following the statement made in the House by M. Joly, and in the Rouge press, you try to bring me into ridicule before your readers by saying, on the faith of others, that I had presented no less than twenty-two motions of want of confidence since the beginning of this last session. To correct this error, and in justice to myself, I beg to enclose herewith a list of the motions of want of confidence I have presented during the last session, and I invite your criticism on those votes.

1. June 25th.—On the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, deprecating the expenditure of money and the giving of large contracts without the previous consent of Parliament.

2. July 8th.—On the address to the Marquis of Lorne, when the Legislative Assembly, on the proposition of M. Joly, advised the Governor-General to resist and refuse the advice of his Ministers should they ask him to dismiss M. Letellier after the reference in England.

3. August 8th.—On the illegal and useless expenditure of \$92,000 for the Three Rivers loop line.

4. August 12th.—On the proposed changes in the department of Public Instruction substituting a political Minister to the now existing Council, suppressing School Inspectors, &c. The measure was withdrawn after my notice of motion.

5. August 14th.—On the neglect of the Government in not securing the assistance of the Ontario Railway Companies to build the Ottawa bridge.

6. August 21st.—On the folly of the Government in giving a large contract for "Mackay's nut lock," a worthless invention, without first obtaining the advice of their Engineer.

7. August 25th.—On the dismissal of a municipal councillor against the direct provisions of the law, substituting (as M. Letellier in his memorandum to Lord Dufferin said) the authority of the Executive to the action of the Judiciary.

8. August 26.—On the necessity of having a strong administration commanding the confidence of the Legislature, and capable of passing the measures forming an essential part of its programme.

9. September 2nd.—Against the adjournment to the 28th October next, proposed by M. Joly, without providing for the means of carrying on the Government of the Province.

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.

Yours truly,

J. A. Chapleau.

Quebec, 19th Sept., 1879.

THE EDITOR TO M. CHAPLEAU.

As M. Chapleau does "not pretend to discuss in this letter" the injury I have done to "the English Conservative cause," I must wait until he shall find time and the mind to do it. Let me say, however, that up to this date I rejoice in the confidence that I have been just to "the French element in the great Canadian family," and have been strictly correct according to "the political history of Canada." And I am inclined to believe that "to injure the English Conservative cause" in this Province would be a good thing, so far as the general welfare is concerned. For the English Conservatives of the Province of Quebec to-day are, for the most part, men who blindly follow their party. They do not reason; they ignore patriotism; they swear by their party gods, and shriek for the spoils of office. I am anxious to injure that cause. If there are any Englishmen in the Province who side with the fifteen Councillors who have brought about the dead-lock, I can only tell them that they have separated themselves from all that is English in politics and conservative in Constitutional Government, and allied themselves with a form of despotism which is now absurd, and will soon be impossible. But more anon when M. Chapleau has spoken further.

With regard to the number of "motions of want of confidence" presented by M. Chapleau, I must ask him to read again what I said. In a previous article I stated that M. Chapleau "moved, or allowed to be moved," twenty-two motions of no confidence; and in the article referred to I said M. Chapleau "got through" twenty-two motions. If it is true—as of course it is true, since M. Chapleau affirms it—that he himself only moved nine votes of no confidence, then I must come to the conclusion, either that, as leader of his party he consented to the other thirteen, or that he is only nominally the leader, and cannot control the disorderly elements of which his party in the House is made up. Which dilemma will M. Chapleau accept? If the first, it will show that he is disingenuous and has no real grounds for complaining that I have tried to bring him into ridicule; if the second, it follows that the Opposition have no competent and controlling leader; and the inference is, that if M. Chapleau should be called upon to form a Ministry he would find more difficulty in the management of that heterogeneous heap of mortals he calls his party than even M. Joly experienced with his stubborn-headed contract seekers.

With regard to the nature of the motions "presented" by M. Chapleau, I have no particularly adverse criticism to offer. Granted, for the moment, that M. Joly's government committed at least nine blunders, which M. Chapleau very justly and very cleverly exposed, and that in speaking against them, and in bringing all the strength of his side of the House of Assembly against them, he displayed that ability for which even his opponents give him credit, the question comes: Should each have been a vote of "no confidence"? I think not. It was petty; it manifested a censurable desire for office; it turned what should be statesmanship into a poor and contemptible "grab" for the spoils of power. A motion of "no confidence" on the Address, just to try issues, would have been fair and right; a general attitude of hostile criticism when each motion was brought forward, and an effort to defeat every attempt at passing a bad measure, would have been right and praiseworthy; and then, when a series of triumphs had