

## CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1873.

The fact that Lord Dufferin was travelling from place to place all last summer, making triumphal entries in different cities and receiving ovations all through the Maritime Provinces, would naturally have led one to imagine that he knew little or nothing of what was going on in the country. Or if he did know, the ease and calm he displayed at Ottawa, on the occasion of prorogation, seemed to betoken on his part a philosophic indifference to the keen party strife that was raging around him. It was therefore with some degree of surprise that, when his despatches to the Imperial Government were published, the exact contrary of these surmises were made manifest. From these papers it is clear that he not only knew of the issues at stake, but followed every phase of the contest with the keenest judgment; and so far was he from being indifferent that he threw into his share of it all the personal interest of an ardent nature. In one respect, then, the despatches of Lord Dufferin to Lord Kimberley are a revelation. They show us the man in a new and unsuspected light. They lighten his character both as a gentleman and as a Governor. In another respect, viewed merely as state papers, they have not met such general approval. The Opposition press, we are sorry to say, has judged fit to attack them both in substance and form with a great deal of violence. They have forgotten that the Governor-General is independent of all party influence in this country; that he has admitted our public men of all shades of opinion to his table and his society; that he has absolutely no interest in favouring one side to the detriment of the other; nay, more, that, considering his own training, if he were led away by mere names, he would rather incline towards the Liberal party here. They have forgotten also his right and even his duty, as representative of Her Majesty, to keep the Imperial authorities advised of all that takes place within his jurisdiction. Because in a few incidental remarks he gently touches upon some of the tactics of the Opposition party during the late contest, the Reform papers seize the occasion to abuse him. Lord Dufferin has a grain of humour in his composition, and will doubtless be amused at these attacks. In cases where the insults are gross, he will avail himself of a nobleman's privilege to condemn them in lofty silence. For ourselves, we may say that were we so disposed, we might easily find fault with these despatches in more than one particular; but we imagine that a little hypercriticism would not mend matters and could certainly not counterbalance the ungraciousness of the act. The despatches are written in an easy conversational style, which we, with others, might consider below the dignity of state papers; but it must be remembered that they were addressed to a nobleman who was lately a colleague of Lord Dufferin's in the actual British administration, and with whom the latter is evidently on terms of intimacy. We doubt much whether he could have rendered his thoughts clear by clothing them in formal diplomatic language. We have left ourselves no space to discuss the contents of these papers, but there are two points to which we desire to draw attention. When the telegrams of Sir John A. Macdonald were published in Mr. McMullen's statement, he did not, with some Ministerial journals, draw the inference that they formed a *prima facie* case against the Government, but distinctly says "they do not necessarily connect themselves with these nefarious transactions to which Mr. McMullen asserts he was privy. Under these circumstances, though without attaching too much importance to mere conjectural pleas of this kind, I was unwilling to jump to a hasty conclusion on a matter involving both the private and the public honour of my ministers; and above all things, I feel bound not to allow my judgment to be swayed by the current of popular suspicion which this concatenation of documents would naturally produce." Another point connected with Mr. Huntington's refusal to appear before the Royal Commission we regard as very significant indeed. His Lordship says: "While the Parliamentary Committee was still in existence, he approached me officially and directly with communications incriminating sworn members of my Privy Council. It is scarcely competent for him—the committee having ceased to exist—to decline the jurisdiction of the Commission so far as it is concerned with what he himself brought to my notice. By his own act he has invited my intervention and submitted the matter to the direct cognizance of the Crown." The general tendency of the despatches will be to strengthen the hands of the Ministry, and, spite of our own views on the results of the Commission, as expressed in prior articles, we are quite satisfied that the Government should have whatever aid the impartial and independent judgment of an enlightened man may fetch.

Our remarks in a recent issue upon the subject of party journalism have received hearty welcome in many quarters, and we have received numerous expressions of encouragement and thanks from esteemed and valued correspondents. This week we print one of these letters in which the writer goes at once to the fountain and origin of the evil of which we complained. We leave the correspondence to speak for itself, contenting ourselves merely with drawing attention to one point mentioned by the writer. He expresses his astonishment that

independent men should not long ago have rebelled against the impudent attempts made by party journals to throw dust in their eyes—impudent, because there is hardly any pretence of concealing the thoroughly partisan (i. e. dishonest) character of the representations made by them. Impudent, we say, because of the loud protestations of independence which such journals are wont to make when they are particularly anxious that their sayings should carry weight. It is astonishing how virtuous they suddenly become on such occasions, how unprejudiced, how entirely unfettered by party obligations. Only the other day on the occasion of the opening of the session we find the Government organ at the Capital crying "Our wish in this instance to speak in, simply, tenderness for the reputation of the Dominion, demands that we stop here short of a suspicion of being influenced by any consideration of party," while only the day before the leading Opposition journal reiterated its assertion that "the question awaiting the decision of Parliament is not to be approached in a party spirit. It is peculiarly one of those great issues which should lift men above the narrow influences and prejudices that too often surround them and enable them to look fully in the face the personal responsibility attaching to the course they decide on taking." These two journals, the fiercest political opponents, both protest their impartiality, for we presume we are to take the *Globe's* assertion as applicable to itself, and yet who believes them? Is there any Government supporter who believes that his party organ, notwithstanding all its protestation, is under no suspicion of being influenced by any consideration of party? Where is the "Grit," even of the veriest ingrain, who can honestly admit that he believes the leader of his party organs to be lifted above the narrow influences and prejudices of party? Such talk about independence and impartiality coming from such sources is more than mere impudence, it is a deliberate insult to the intelligence of the community. Small wonder that Lord Dufferin, in his despatch of the 15th August to the Colonial Secretary, complains that he has no other means of acquainting himself with what goes on in Parliament than through his Ministers, as he is "precluded from being present at its proceedings, and the newspaper reports are quite untrustworthy." This is a harsh reproof, but is it undeserved? We know the reply that every honest man must make. And yet in the face of the most glaring facts a Western editor barefacedly remarks that the Press of Canada, taken as a whole, and considering the age and population of the country, has no reason to shirk comparison with the Press of any other English-speaking section of the globe. And yet a scholarly gentleman, a politician and statesman of no mean order, finds the newspaper reports "quite untrustworthy."

*Appropos* of Mr. Young. His is a name that one can hardly take up a newspaper without coming across. His escapade in the stolen letter business has done more to make him a character, a celebrated man, than even the Caughnawaga canal project. It appears, however, that he is now coming out in a new rôle, that of a martyr no less, and certain of the Opposition papers are lamenting over him in a style that is not a little absurd. One of the principal organs of that party in Western Ontario says: "There is something brutal in the manner in which the Corruptionists are acting towards the Hon. John Young. We mean in the matter of betrayal of confidence alone, apart from the other ways in which he has been attacked. First, Sir John meanly published a private letter, written to him by Mr. Young, and so worded that no one possessed of any honour would have made the use of it that the Premier did." By transposing the names, the last sentence may be made equally effective in the opposite direction, "Mr. John Young meanly published a private letter, written to another person by Sir John, and so worded that no one possessed of any honour would have made the use of it that the then Flour Inspector did." The cap fits on both sides it seems.

We are compelled to protest against the very rash and too frequently unfounded assertions in which some of our contemporaries, led by a blind party spirit, often indulge at the expense of their political opponents. It says very little for the morality or the tone of the Canadian press that so many editors give way to their spiteful hostility by indulgence in spiteful bitter attacks upon those who may happen to differ with them. And, further, it speaks very little for the taste of Canadian readers that newspapers which are notoriously given to this species of argument—save the mark!—should receive hearty and consistent support. It is not many months ago that a Western Ontario editor gleefully recorded the fact, that the manager of a rival sheet was seen reeling drunk on the streets in broad daylight, and proceeded, by a logical process peculiarly his own, to make the astounding deduction that the party of whose views his rival was the exponent was utterly and totally corrupt. This is, we grant, an extreme case, but anyone who has the opportunity, day after day, and week after week, of perusing the numerous journals published in the country must have remarked the undignified manner in which so many Canadian editors lower themselves by petty bickering and personal abuse. These gentlemen—we use the term by courtesy—seem to forget that their papers are intended to amuse as well as instruct the public; that they are not merely the vehicles for the indulgence of private malice.

They seem to forget that the office of an editor is one of high responsibility. They appear to look at it as a very comfortable position which ensures them unlimited free circus tickets, presents innumerable of fruit and flowers from their neighbours, and what is dearer still to their small minds, the privilege of abusing their enemies before the public. And yet with such men in our journalistic ranks we are pleased to thank Heaven that we are not as other men are—that we in no way resemble these publicans on the other side of the line, whose country journalism is a reproach. The latest flagrant case of the kind we have already signalized occurred a few days ago. The *Leader*—a paper not usually given to undue indulgence in what is gracefully called the amenities of journalism—goes out of its way to make a most unwarrantable assertion with regard to the management of the Post Office. In reply to a correspondent who complains of his English newspapers having strayed, the editor remarks that "our friend Awde seems to forget that there is an organized gang of political letter and paper purloiners in all the principal Post Offices of the Dominion, and that the head-quarters are at Montreal. He should also remember that the Governor-General himself prudently avoids these letter thieves by sending his correspondence by trusty officials." A more absurd statement it has never been our lot to come across in a public print—a more unjustifiable statement we were going to say, but the thing is too ridiculous to merit such a term. For the sake of having a slap at Mr. John Young, for whose action in the matter of the Macdonald-Pope letter no one has more contempt than ourselves—the *Leader* takes the trouble of attacking the administration of a department which is carried on by its own political friends. Such impartiality is indeed rare. If the editor of the *Leader* believes his own statement why does he not follow the example of the Governor-General and "prudently avoid these letter thieves" (and newspaper thieves) "by sending his correspondence" (and papers) "by trusty officials?" No one will deny that our Post Office managements are not what they might be: that there is a great deal of avoidable as well as unavoidable delay; that mail-bags sometimes turn up a mile or so—say two miles—out of their destination. We have said so time and time again, in more forcible than exact language perhaps, but "an organized gang of political letter and paper purloiners in all the principal Post Offices in the Dominion, and that the head-quarters are in Montreal!"—'tis dreadful. And stranger still is the fact that the *Leader* still patronizes this iniquitous Post Office.

The question of Disestablishment, or separation of Church and State, is one which is making great progress in England. The Disendowment and Disestablishment of the Irish Church was the entering wedge, which it requires no great perspicacity to foretell, will yet force the Disestablishment of the Church of England. Public opinion is so far awakened to this subject at the present time that the Duke of Argyll, a member of the Gladstone Ministry, took occasion at a late meeting in Scotland to inform his hearers that the circumstances of the Irish Church were very different from those of the English and Scottish Churches, and that Government had therefore no intention of meddling with the latter. But whatever may be done in Britain, a country on this side the water has gone into the matter with a thoroughness which is fairly astonishing. The constitution of the Mexican Republic has just been remodelled and among the amendments made to it, we find the following:—The Church and the State are to be separate; Congress makes laws prohibiting or establishing any religion; Matrimony is to be by civil contract; religious institutions cannot possess property; a simple promise to speak the truth, complying with obligations contracted, with penalties in case of violation, is substituted for the religious oath; nobody is obliged to give his or her services without just compensation; no contract is to be permitted which aims at the sacrifice of man in the matter of work, education and religious vows; no contract will be allowed to be made among persons consenting to their own proscription or banishment. From this it will be seen that the State does not recognize monastic orders, nor permit their establishment by any denomination under any pretence. The Jesuits are summarily banished the country and are given their choice of leaving either by the French, English or American packets. It is said that these radical changes have been inaugurated without any opposition from the people. That they will exert a powerful influence on the social and political conditions of Mexico is evident from the lengths to which they reach.

## THE FLANEUR.

Hello! Look at Seedy yonder passing through the Square. What a swell. He must have assisted at some funeral lately. How so? He has a bran new pair of black kids on.

Two young laddos are speaking of a mutual friend. "How changed Albert is, of late," says one. "He used to be so kind and polite, but now ——" "Oh! don't you know the reason?" "I can't imagine, I'm sure." "He is a railroad ticket agent."

The other day I was passing with a friend along a certain narrow, dingy street, commonly called Lawyers street, lined