

"There is a pleasure in being mad which none but madmen know."—Dryden.

Vol. 2. JANUARY 31, 1903. No. 36.

48 Adelaide Street East, Toronto.

THE MOON is published every Week. The subscription price is \$2.00 a year, payable in advance. Single current copies 5 cents.

All comic verse, prose or drawings submitted will receive careful examination, and fair prices will be paid for anything suitable for publication.

No contribution will be returned unless accompanied by stamped and addressed envelope.



THE return of Geo. E. Foster to the House of Commons, which is now assured, is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. Since the wreck of the Conservatives on the Manitoba School Question, the House has not had an Opposition. After the wreck it was impossible for Sir Charles, under whose captaincy disaster had come, to retain the confidence of the people. Then when he was finally defeated, and when he left public life, Mr. Foster, the bright light of the party, went with him. This made our Parliament into a farce. If the Opposition seats had been unoccupied, it could scarcely have been worse than it is. But Mr. Foster is a whole Opposition in himself, when he has no millstone round his neck; so we may now look forward to Parliamentary sessions that will be filled with life and interest. Mr. Foster's return should be welcomed by the whole people, for no government, however honest its members may be, can keep itself in a healthy state without a vigorous Opposition to put it on its metal.

EVENTS, of Ottawa, becomes quite excited over a paragraph that recently appeared in THE MOON, which referred to the opportunity that a new country like Canada offers to the subsidy-hunter. THE MOON, it may be remembered, mentioned the fact that in England such grabbing, or stealing, as is common in Canada is unknown. *Events* holds a different view, it would seem. That paper informs us that such talk as we indulge in is "mischievous." It tells us that Canada has the best set of public men in the world, and that we would be wise not to hold England up as an example, for in England they have had some highly interesting scandals of late over certain army contracts, et cetera. *Events* is good enough to explain why the casting of moon-beams upon our public men is "mischievous." Here is the explanation:

"We are pretty rapidly educating the public mind into

the belief that the public life of this country is rotten, and that our public men are thieves." How shocking! "Under such circumstances it would not take long for a class of men to secure public office to justify statements such as we have quoted." Oh, horror! "If we are determined to make public life corrupt, men will be found to say that they might as well have the game as the name, and such as will not say so may drop out of the arena in which they receive nothing but showers of mud."

Are we to take that last sentence as a threat? It sounds as if Mr. Hays might have written it.

So it is "mischievous" to state the truth. This is the view theologians of the past generation took of higher criticism. If we criticise the stupidity or knavery of any of our public men, it may destroy our faith in all of them? Is that the idea? We must eat our peck of dirt anyway before we die, and we must not stop to measure it. Now that strikes one as being eminently reasonable, and it saves so much time and annoyance! What we don't think about can't worry us, eh? Keen logic!

Again we quote from *Events*:

"Sir John Macdonald gave away more subsidies and concessions and offices than any other Canadian politician, and yet he died leaving an estate worth only about \$100,000. If our public life was corrupt he would have been worth ten millions."

Canadian politicians, take notice: When you die, see to it that you *leave* not more than one hundred thousand dollars. You have the assurance of *Events* also that you cannot be held responsible for permitting companies to rob the people, unless you share the spoils *in cash*.

Events concludes:

"We had better let English public life take care of itself and we will certainly not improve Canadian public life by indiscriminately slandering Canadian public men who have neither been convicted nor even accused of any dishonest or dishonorable act."

We cannot understand how anyone that read our paragraph could accuse us of holding up English public life as a model. We merely stated that in England they cannot steal subsidies because they have all been stolen. Strange as it may seem, we still hold to our views on this point. Did we indulge in any "indiscriminate" slandering? We hope not. But when *Events* states that our public men "have never been convicted nor even accused of any dishonest or dishonorable act," we must raise our hat of Columbine in honor of such simple blindness and deafness as *Events* displays.

The whole article in *Events* is a splendid example of one of the chief characteristics of the Canadian people—self-righteousness. While our daily press is constantly denouncing and defending the political knavery of the country, a great part of the people thank Heaven that we are so much better than our neighbors. *Events*, by its own words, stamps itself as a Pharisee of the first class.